Case No.

 (Ξ)

Ļ,

(3)

14.7 (Ξ)

Milton, et al. v. Guess?, Inc., et al.

Plaintiff Versil Milton ("Named Plaintiff") is informed and believes, and thereupon

3

4

5

14

11

12

20

27

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. Jurisdiction is proper in this Court under California Code of Civil Procedure § 410.10 and the California Constitution, Article VI § 10. This Court, and not the United States District Court, has jurisdiction of this class action, because Plaintiffs' claims fall within the provisions of 29 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(4)(a) (a provision of the Class Action Fairness Act) for the following reasons:
- (a) more than two-thirds of the members of the Plaintiff Class are citizens of the State of California;
- (b) Guess?, Inc. and Guess? Retail, Inc. are defendants: (i) from whom significant relief is sought by members of the proposed class, (ii) whose alleged conduct forms a significant basis for the claims asserted by the proposed class, and (iii) who are citizens of the State of California;
- (c) the principal injuries resulting from the alleged conduct or any related conduct of each defendant were incurred in the State of California; and
- (d) during the 3-year period preceding the filing of the original complaint in this class action, no other class actions have been filed asserting the same or similar factual allegations against any of the defendants on behalf of the same or other person.
- 8. Venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles as Guess?, Inc. and Guess? Retail, Inc. filed a statement of designation with the California Secretary of State identifying its principal business office in Los Angeles, California. Therefore, Los Angeles County is a proper venue for this action.

III. PARTIES

- Named Plaintiff Versil Milton is a resident of San Diego County, California. Mr.
 Milton is a member of the Plaintiff Class.
- 10. Defendant Guess?, Inc. is a Delaware Corporation doing substantial business in the State of California, with its corporate, wholesale, and retail headquarters located in Los Angeles, California.

- 11. Defendant Guess? Retail, Inc. (together with Guess?, Inc., hereinafter referred to as "Guess") is a Delaware Corporation doing substantial business in the State of California, with its corporate headquarters located in Los Angeles, California.
- 12. Guess markets and distributes clothing and accessories via retail and wholesale channels in California, throughout the United States, and internationally.
- 13. Plaintiffs are unaware of the true names or capacities of defendants named herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sue these defendants by these fictitious names. When the names and capacities of these defendants are ascertained, Plaintiffs will amend this complaint accordingly. Each of the defendants named herein or designated as a Doe is liable for, and engages in, the conduct complained of in this complaint in Alameda County, California

IV. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 14. Guess designs, markets, and distributes designer clothing. Guess represents itself as a purveyor of fine, upmarket apparel, describing its clothing line as "one of the world's leading lifestyle collections of contemporary apparel." Guess owns and operates high-end retail stores ("Boutiques") and also sells products for distribution in premium department stores such as Nordstrom and Macy's. Additionally, Guess owns and operates factory outlet stores ("Factory Stores" or "Outlets"). There are approximately 113 Guess Factory Stores in the United States, including approximately 23 in California.
- otherwise available for full price at Boutiques and/or department stores. Outlets are generally grouped together in large complexes, at great distance from other retail centers, and solicit and attract consumers eager to obtain prestigious label items at discounted prices. For example, the outlet complex at which Named Plaintiff Versil Milton purchased his Guess items, Las Americas Premium Outlets, advertises "Exceptional Brands," and "extraordinary savings of 25% to 65%. For shopping that is always worth the trip." The Las Americas Premium Outlets complex also purports to offer "impressive" savings at "125 Outlet Stores" (including Guess).

- 16. In fact, the purported savings offered at Outlets are a sham. Despite the carefully-cultivated public perception that modern Outlets, like their traditional forerunners, offer discounted premium merchandise, many or most of the clothing companies operating Outlets now produce clothing and other items exclusively for their Outlets, items which are never sold at Boutique or department stores, nor for the higher prices from which consumers believe they are receiving discounts. In short, these clothiers: (1) surreptitiously produce entire lines of inferior products, (2) offered at illusory markdowns, (3) to induce consumers to purchase items they would not purchase if their true origin, characteristics, and pricing status were known, or to pay more than they would otherwise pay.
- 17. This is precisely the practice followed by Guess. The clothing and other items sold at Guess Outlets are manufactured for, and sold exclusively by, those Outlets. These items are never offered to the public at the "full" prices from which Guess Outlets claim to offer discounts, nor at department stores or Guess Boutiques. Nevertheless, the price tag for each Guess Outlet item prominently and conspicuously displays two purported prices: a higher price and a seemingly discounted price. The higher price is labeled either as an "MSR" or "Value Was" price. The lower price is identified by Guess Outlets as "Our Price." In fact, no Guess Outlet item is ever offered or sold at the higher "MSR" or "Value Was" price, but rather is always sold for the lower "Our Price" amount.
- 18. Accordingly, the price of each Guess Outlet item the "Our Price" amount is improperly advertised as a discount from a former price the "MSR" or "Value Was" price that was not the prevailing market price within the three months immediately preceding the advertised discount.
- 19. Guess, however, goes well beyond improperly advertising a discount from a stale market price by fabricating a wholly imaginary former price. Because no item is *ever* sold at the MSR or Value Was price, those prices are entirely fictitious and arbitrary. These prices are contrived and displayed solely to dupe consumers into the mistaken belief that Guess Outlet items are the same premium items available at Guess Boutiques and high-end department stores, and that these items are offered for dramatically discounted prices at Guess Outlets.

- 20. By this pricing scheme, Guess induces consumers to purchase items they would not otherwise purchase or to pay more for items than they would otherwise pay; misrepresents the source of Guess Outlet items; misrepresents the quality and grade of Guess Outlet items; advertises goods with the intent not to sell them as advertised; makes false and misleading statements of fact concerning reasons for, existence of, and amounts of price reductions; and provides false information about the worth of each item sold at Guess Outlets.
- 21. Guess styles its Outlets as "Factory Stores" precisely so that consumers will believe that those stores operate as outlets in the traditional sense, that is, as stores offering steeply-discounted items otherwise available at more prestigious retail locales. Guess furthers this illusion by the wording of its Outlet price tags, which mislead consumers into the false belief that they are obtaining premium items, identical to those offered at Guess Boutiques and department stores, at significant discounts.
- 22. Each price tag displaying a "MSR" price misrepresents the existence and amount of a manufacturer's suggested retail price. However, because Guess produces each item with the specific intent of selling that item at the lower "Our Price" amount, never intends those items to be sold at the "MSR" price, and in fact, sells each item only at the lower "Our Price" amount, the "MSR" price is fictitious and arbitrary.
- 23. Similarly, each price tag displaying a "Value Was" price misrepresents that the attached item "was" formerly sold at a higher price and that the item has or had an alternative "value." Again, however, no item is ever sold at the "Value Was" price, and that price is therefore fictitious and arbitrary.
- 24. Additionally, display of an "Our Price" amount on all Guess Outlet price tags is misleading because: (1) Guess fails to disclose that the attached item was never offered for a higher price (that there is no, as it were, "their price"); (2) that the item was never offered at Guess Boutiques, department stores, or any retailers other than Guess Outlets; (3) that the item was produced exclusively for Guess Outlets; and (4) that the item is inferior in quality to items offered at Guess Boutiques and department stores.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 25. Further, the display of two prices on each price tag misrepresents the existence and amount of a fictitious discount: that is, the difference between the higher "MSR" or "Value Was" Price and the "Our Price" Amount.
- 26. Because each and every item sold at Guess Outlets contains a misleading price tag as described above, Guess' misrepresentations and statements rendered misleading by material omissions are conveyed through uniform writings given to each member of the Plaintiff Class.

V. ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING NAMED PLAINTIFF

- 27. Named Plaintiff was deceived by Guess' pricing scheme as described herein.
- 28. On December 19, 2014, Named Plaintiff Versil Milton visited the Guess Outlet at the Las America Premium Outlets, the "Guess Las Americas Premium Outlet." Based on Guess' characterization of its Las Americas Outlet as a Factory Store, Named Plaintiff believed that shopping at that Outlet would allow him to obtain bargains on prestigious Guess merchandise.
- 29. During his visit to the Guess Las Americas Premium Outlet, Named Plaintiff Versil Milton purchased a jacket for \$35.00, two shirts for \$9.75 and \$15.00, respectively, and a pair of sweatpants for \$27.99. The price tag for each of these items had a "MSR" listing that was higher than the "OUR PRICE" listed. Named Plaintiff Versil Milton believed that these items were offered at Guess Boutiques and department stores for the higher "MSR" price, and that he was therefore receiving a substantial discount. In reality, the items were never offered or intended for sale at the MSR listed prices, nor were the items ever sold at Guess Boutiques or department stores. Rather, the items were manufactured exclusively for sale at Guess Outlets for the "OUR PRICE" listed.
- 30. The "MSR" price displayed on the price tag of the items purchased by Named Plaintiff was not the prevailing market price of the items within the three months preceding the advertisement of the purported discount, and in fact, was never the prevailing market price for the items, but rather, was illusory, fabricated, and arbitrary.

28 | / /

 (\mathbb{Z})

- 31. The price tag affixed to the items purchased by Named Plaintiff falsely represented the existence and amount of a non-existent manufacturer's suggested retail price and a false discount; was misleading because it included an "Our Price" amount without disclosing that the item had never been offered at any location other than Guess Outlets nor at any price other than the "Our Price" amount, was manufactured for sale exclusively at Guess outlets, and was inferior in quality to items sold in at Guess Boutiques and department stores; and otherwise had the effects described in ¶¶ 15-26, above.
- 32. Named Plaintiff read, believed, and relied on the misrepresentations and omissions displayed on the price tag for the Guess Outlet item she purchased. Named Plaintiff would not have purchased the item, and would not have parted with the money paid for the item, if they had known the true facts misrepresented and omitted by Guess.
- 33. The misrepresentations and omissions displayed on the price tag for the Guess Outlet item purchased by Named Plaintiff are typical of the price tags for all Guess Outlet items.
- 34. These misrepresentations and omissions are material because a reasonable consumer would consider them important in making a decision to purchase the item purchased by Named Plaintiff, or to purchase any Guess Outlet item.
- 35. As a direct result of Guess' conduct as alleged herein, Named Plaintiff was injured, lost money or property, and has been damaged in an amount to be proved at trial.

VI. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

36. Named Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. The class that Named Plaintiff seeks to represent is defined as follows: All persons who purchased clothing or other items from a Guess Factory Store in the State of California during the Class Period. Excluded from the Plaintiff Class are Guess, its parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, and officers and directors.

27 / / / / 28 / / / /

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 37. The claims alleged herein may properly be maintained as a class action because there is a well-defined community of interest among ascertainable class members with regard to the claims asserted.
- 38. The Plaintiff Class is believed to be numbered in the tens of thousands, and joinder of all class members is therefore impractical.
- 39. Questions of law and fact common to Named Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class predominate over questions of law and fact affecting only individual members of the Plaintiff Class. Said common questions of law and fact include, but are not limited to, the following:
- (a) Whether the price tags affixed to all items sold at Guess Outlets contain misrepresentations and omissions;
 - (b) Whether such misrepresentations and omissions are material;
- (c) Whether Guess made such misrepresentation and omissions with the intent to induce the reliance of Plaintiff Class, and whether the Guess' conduct as alleged herein was knowing and intentional;
- (d) Whether such misrepresentation and omissions were disseminated to Plaintiff Class in uniform, written form;
- (e) Whether the "MSR" and "Value Was" prices displayed on the price tags of Guess Outlet items were the prevailing market prices for those items during the three month periods preceding the dissemination and/or publication of those advertised former prices;
- (f) Whether Guess falsely advertises price discounts on all items sold at Guess Outlets;
- (g) Whether the conduct alleged herein constitutes unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent business practices under California law and therefore violates California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.;
- (h) Whether the conduct alleged herein constitutes false advertising under California law;
- (i) Whether Plaintiff Class is entitled to restitution and/or damages, and the amount of such restitution and damages;

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- (j) Whether Guess will, unless enjoined, continue the practices alleged herein; and
 - (k) The terms and conditions of the injunction to be issued against Guess.
- Named Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Plaintiff Class because Named Plaintiff was subjected to the unlawful practices alleged herein common to the Plaintiff Class. Named Plaintiff's claims are based on, and arise out of, uniform misrepresentations and omissions. Guess' common course of conduct has caused Named Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class to sustain the same or substantially similar injuries and damages and to lose money or property in the same manner. Named Plaintiff's claims are therefore representative of the claims of Plaintiff Class.
- 41. Named Plaintiff has no conflict of interest with any other members of the Plaintiff Class, and Named Plaintiff will vigorously prosecute this case on behalf of the Plaintiff Class.
- 42. Counsel who represent Named Plaintiff is competent and experienced in litigating complex actions pertaining to fraudulent, unfair, and unlawful practices, including many class action claims. Named Plaintiff and his counsel will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the members of the Plaintiff Class.
- 43. The identity of each member of the Plaintiff Class is ascertainable from available records maintained by Guess or by third parties. There is a well-defined community of interest between the members of Plaintiff Class.

VII. CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Deceit (Fraud)

- 44. Named Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 45. As alleged herein, including in ¶¶ 15-26, above, Guess made material misrepresentations to, and concealed and suppressed facts from, Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class.

- 46. As alleged herein, including in ¶¶ 15-26, above, Guess knew these misrepresentations were false, and Guess knew that the facts it concealed and suppressed were necessary to make material statements made by Guess not misleading.
- 47. As alleged herein, including in ¶¶ 15-26, above, Guess made these misrepresentations, and concealed and suppressed these facts, with the intent to induce the reliance of and to defraud Named Plaintiff and the other the members of the Plaintiff Class.
- 48. Guess' misrepresentations and omissions were conveyed through uniform writings given to Named Plaintiff and each member of the Plaintiff Class.
- 49. Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class believed that Guess' misrepresentations and statements rendered misleading by concealment and suppression of facts were true or were ignorant of their falsity or misleading nature.
- In reliance on Guess' misrepresentations and omissions, Named Plaintiff and the 50. other members of the Plaintiff Class, were induced to, and did in fact, purchase clothing and other items they would not have otherwise purchased, and/or pay more for such clothing and items than they otherwise would have. Had Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class known the truth, they would not have taken such actions.
- 51. The reliance of Named Plaintiff, and of the other members of the Plaintiff Class, was reasonable and justified.
- 52. As a proximate result of Guess' fraudulent conduct as alleged herein, Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class have been injured.
- 53. Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1709, Guess is liable for the damages suffered by Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class.
- 54. The actions of Guess as alleged herein constitute oppression, fraud, or malice, as those terms are defined in California Civil Code § 3294, thus entitling Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class, and each of them, to an award of punitive damages.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

 (Ξ)

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Unfair, Unlawful, and Fraudulent Business Acts and Practices - Restitution

- 55. Named Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 56. California's Unfair Competition Law, Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq. prohibits acts of unlawful and unfair competition, including any "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice," and "unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising" and any act prohibited by Business & Professions Code § 17500.
- 57. Guess has committed unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business acts and practices by engaging in the conduct alleged herein.
- 58. The conduct of Guess as alleged herein constitutes unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent acts and practices because such conduct violates California Civil Code §§ 1710 and 1770(a)(2), (a)(7), (a)(9), and (a)(13); California Business & Professions Code § 17501; 15 U.S.C. § 45(a)(1); 15 U.S.C. § 52; and 16 C.F.R. § 233.3.
- 59. The conduct of Guess as alleged herein also constitutes unfair competition in that Guess' acts and practices offend public policy and are unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous, and are substantially injurious to the public.
- 60. The conduct of Guess as alleged herein was a proximate cause of the injuries of Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class, and it caused and continues to cause substantial injury to Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class.
- 61. By its conduct as alleged herein, Guess has improperly obtained money and property from Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class, and Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class have been injured in fact, and have lost money and property, as the result of Guess' conduct as alleged herein. By reason of the foregoing, Guess should be required to pay restitution to Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class.

27 | / / 28 | / /

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

 $(\Xi)^{\perp}$

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

False Advertising

- 62. Named Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 63. California Business & Professions Code §§ 17500, et seq. prohibits untrue, misleading, or deceptive advertising, including, but not limited to such false advertising relating to the worth, value, and/or former value of any item.
- 64. Guess' conduct as alleged herein violates California Business & Professions Code §§ 17500, et seq. because Guess' advertisements as described herein make untrue statements of material fact and omit material facts necessary to make facts stated not misleading. By advertising fictional former prices for its Outlet items which are materially greater than the actual prices of those items, Guess conveys the false impression that Guess Outlet items which are manufactured exclusively for Guess Factory Stores are routinely sold in department stores and Guess Boutiques at higher prices. This practice conveys false information about the value and worth of the items sold at Guess' Factory Outlets, and is intended to, and does in fact, mislead California consumers. Further, the "MSR" and "Value Was" prices advertised for all Guess Outlet items that is, the alleged former prices of those items were not the prevailing market prices of those items within the preceding three months, nor does Guess indicate in any manner the date when the advertised former prices prevailed.
- 65. By its conduct as alleged herein, Guess has improperly obtained money and property from Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class, and Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class have been injured in fact, and have lost money and property, as the result of Guess' conduct as alleged herein. By reason of the foregoing, Guess should be required to pay restitution to Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class.

26 | / / / 27 | / / / 28 | / / /

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Class Action Complaint Milton, et al. v. Guess?, Inc., et al. Page 12

 (\mathbb{T})

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act

- 66. Named Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 67. Named Plaintiff brings this cause of action pursuant to the California Consumers Legal Remedies Act.
- 68. Named Plaintiff, and each of the members of the Plaintiff Class, are "consumer[s]" within the meaning of California Civil Code § 1761(d); the purchases of Guess Outlet items as described herein are "transaction[s]" within the meaning of California Civil Code § 1761(e); and the Guess Outlet items purchased by Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class are "goods" within the meaning of California Civil Code § 1761(a).
- 69. By engaging in the conduct alleged herein, Guess violated California Civil Code \$ 1770(a)(2), (a)(7), (a)(9), and (a)(13), by, respectively: misrepresenting the source of Guess Outlet items, misrepresenting the standard and quality of Guess Outlet items, advertising goods or services with intent not to sell them as advertised, and making false or misleading statements of fact concerning reasons for, existence of, and amounts of price reductions.
- 70. Named Plaintiff, and the other members of the Plaintiff Class, relied on Guess' misrepresentations and misleading statements in deciding to purchase Guess Outlet items, and would not have purchased Guess Outlet items absent Guess' conduct as alleged herein.
- 71. Named Plaintiff, and the other members of the Plaintiff Class, were injured as the proximate result of Guess' conduct as alleged herein.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Unfair, Unlawful, and Fraudulent Business Acts and Practices - Injunction

72. Named Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

27 | / / /

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28 || / / /

- 73. Each violation of California law by Guess as alleged herein constitutes a separate and distinct unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent act and practice in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

 74. Named Plaintiff and the other members of the Plaintiff Class have been harmed by Guess' unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent acts and practices as alleged herein.

 75. Guess continues to engage in the unlawful and unfair practices alleged herein
- through the present day.

 76. Unless enjoined by this Court, Guess will continue to engage in the unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent practices alleged herein.
- 77. Named Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class are entitled to, and therefore request, an injunction of this Court requiring that Guess permanently cease and desist from engaging in the unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent acts and practices alleged herein, and, further, that this Court make such orders as are necessary to monitor Guess' compliance with said injunction.
- 78. Named Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class are further entitled to costs and attorney's fees for pursuing the injunction requested herein.

VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Named Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all members of the Plaintiff Class, pray for relief as follows:

- 1. That the Court certify this action as a class action on behalf of the Plaintiff Class pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382;
- 2. That the Court designate Named Plaintiff as a representative of the Plaintiff Class;
- 3. That Guess be ordered to pay all amounts owed to the Plaintiff Class arising out of the actions complained of herein, including damages;
- 4. That Guess, at its own expense, be ordered to provide full and adequate notice as required in class actions to all members of the Plaintiff Class;

27 | / / /

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28 | / / /

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 5. That this action and the Plaintiff Class be further designated, respectively, as a representative action and representative class under California Business & Professions Code § 17200, et seq.;
- 6. That Guess, pursuant to California Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq., be ordered to make full restitution of all amounts received by Guess as a result of the conduct alleged herein;
- 7. That in addition to any constitutionally sufficient notice that is or might otherwise be required in a class action under California law, Guess be ordered to pay for all necessary efforts to actually locate members of the representative class under Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.;
- 8. That this Court determine, and provide its declaratory judgment, that the practices complained of herein were done willfully, knowingly, and intentionally;
- 9. That this Court issue a permanent injunction, on terms the Court may deem appropriate and necessary, prohibiting Guess from engaging in the practices complained of herein, requiring Guess to make appropriate reports to the Court or its appointed agent or expert regarding its compliance with said injunction, and requiring Guess to pay all costs associated with said monitoring said injunction;
 - 10. For attorney's fees as provided by statutory and common law;
 - 11. For costs of suit incurred;
 - 12. For punitive damages; and
 - 13. For such other legal and equitable relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: April 28, 2015

aiman-smith & marcy

Hallie VonRock

Attorneys for Plaintiff Versil Milton

Class Action Complaint
Milton, et al. v. Guess?, Inc., et al.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Named Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Plaintiff Class, hereby demanda a jury on all causes of action and claims with respect to which Named Plaintiff has a right to jury trial.

Dated: April 28, 2015

<u>(</u>_)

<u>.</u>

1, 1

()

 $|\zeta\rangle$

(<u>;</u>) |--

IJ1

aiman-smith & marcy

Ħallie VonRock

Attorneys for Plaintiff Versil Milton

Class Action Complaint
Milton, et al. v. Guess?, Inc., et al.
Page 16

Case No.

		CM-010
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Be) Hallie Von Rock, Esq., SBN 233152	number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY
Aiman-Smith & Marcy	•	
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 1150		HENRY MENTS
Oakland, California 94621 телерноме мо.: 510/562-6800	FAX NO.: 510/562-6830	Superior Court Of California
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiffs Versil Milt	on. et al.	County Of Los Angeles
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LO		
STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street	77 1118	APR 2 8 2015
MAILING ADDRESS:		
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, Califor BRANCH NAME: Stanley Mosk Courth	nia 90012	Diletti Carrolla outicer/Cle
	ouse	By Deput
CASE NAME:	at al	Total Lang.
MILTON, et al. V. GUESS?, INC.,		CASE NUMBER: DO E O A O 1 P
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER: BC 5 8 0 2 1 6
Unlimited Limited (Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder	
demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defend	dant Jupge:
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)		DEPT:
llems 1–6 be	low must be completed (see instructions	on page 2).
Check one box below for the case type that		
Auto Tort	Contract Breach of contract/warranty (06)	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400–3.403)
Auto (22)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)
Uninsured motorist (46)	Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10)
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)
Asbestos (04)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)
Product liability (24)	Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)
Medical maipractice (45)	Emlnent domain/Inverse	Insurance coverage claims arising from the
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	condemnation (14)	above listed provisionally complex case types (41)
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	Enforcement of Judgment
Business tort/unfair business practice (07	, —	Enforcement of judgment (20)
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer Commercial (31)	· - · ·
Defamation (13) Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint RICO (27)
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Professional negligence (25)	Indialal Barian	Miscellaneous Civil Petition
Olher non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfelture (05)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)
Employment	Petilion re: arbitration award (11)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)
Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)	
Other employment (15)	Other Judicial review (39)	
2. This case is is not comfactors requiring exceptional judicial mana		iles of Court. If the case is complex, mark the
a. Large number of separately repre	· —	r of witnesses
b. Extensive motion practice raising		with related actions pending in one or more courts
issues that will be time-consumin		les, states, or countries, or in a federal court
c. Substantial amount of documenta		ostjudgment judicial supervision
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a		
 1. Number of causes of action (specify): Pir 		declaratory or injunctive relief cv punitive
— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —	ss action suit.	
 5. This case is is is not a cla 6. If there are any known related cases, file a 		may use form CM-015.)
Date: April 28, 2015		2
Hallie Von Rock, Esq., SBN 233152	▶ 7 \ \ €	nosele
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		IGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)
• Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the	NOTICE	a (except small plaims eaces or eaces filed
under the Probate Code, Family Code, or	Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rule	es of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result
in sanctions.	• •	,
File this cover sheet in addition to any cover this case is complex under rule 3,400 et		must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all
other parties to the action or proceeding	· ·	• •
Unless this is a collections case under rule	e 3.740 or a complex case, this cover she	et will be used for statistical purposes only.
Form Adopted for Mandatory Use	CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Cal. Rules of Court, rules 2.30, 3.220, 3.400-3.403, 3.740;
Judicial Council of California CM-010 [Rov. July 1, 2007]		Cel. Standards of Judicial Administration, std. 3.10 www.courdinfo.ca.gov

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION (CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)

This form is required pursuant to Local Rule 2.0 In all new civil case fillings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.

item I.	Check the types	of hearing and fill in	the e	estimated length	n of heari	ng expected for this case:	
JURY	TRIAL? YES	CLASS ACTION?	YES	LIMITED CASE?	YES	TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 21	☐ HOURS/ 🖾 DAYS
Item II.	Indicate the cor	rect district and court	hous	se location (4 st	eps – If y	ou checked "Limited Case", ski	o to Item III, Pg. 4):

Step 1: After first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, find the main Civil Case Cover Sheet heading for your case in the left margin below, and, to the right in Column A, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected.

Step 2: Check one Superior Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature of this case.

Step 3: In Column C, circle the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action you have checked. For any exception to the court location, see Local Rule 2.0.

Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C below)

- Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district.
 May be filed in central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage).
 Location where cause of action arose.
 Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred.
 Location where performance required or defendant resides.

- 6. Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle.
 7. Location where petitioner resides.
 8. Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly.
 9. Location where one or more of the parties reside.
 10. Location of Labor Commissioner Office

Step 4: Fill in the information requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration.

Civil Case Cover Sheel Calegory No.	Type of Action (Check anly one)	Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Auto (22)	☐ A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
Uninsured Motorist (46)	☐ A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
Asbestos (04)	□ A6070 Asbestos Property Damage □ A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.
Product Liability (24)	☐ A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
Medical Malpractice (45)	☐ A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons ☐ A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4. 1., 4.
Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	 □ A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) □ A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.) □ A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress □ A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death 	1., 4. 1., 4. 1., 3. 1., 4.

Other Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort

 (Ξ) Ŀ,

h.) ();)

(v.) (\mathbb{T})

ŲΊ

Auto Tort

SHORT TITLE: Millon v. Guess?, Inc.

CASE NUMBER

n-Personal Injury/ Property	mage/ Wrongful Death Tort
Non-Pe	Damag

-mployment

ntract

Real Property

(<u>;</u>) _<u>f</u>;

(3)

(E)

IJŢ

Unlawful Detainer

Milton v. Guess?, Inc.		
A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Business Tort (07)	A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 3.
Civil Rights (08)	☐ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
Defamalion (13)	□ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
Fraud (16)	☐ A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
Professional Negligence (25)	Professional Negligence (25) A6017 Legal Malpractice A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	
Olher (35)	☐ A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2.,3.
Wrongful Terminalion (36)	☐ A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
Other Employment (15)	□ A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case □ A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1., 2., 3. 10.
Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance)	□ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) □ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) □ A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) □ A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)	2., 5. 2., 5. 1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5.
Collections (09)	☐ A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff ☐ A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	2., 5., 6. 2., 5.
Insurance Coverage (18)	Insurance Coverage (18) A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	
Olher Contract (37)	☐ A6009 Contractual Fraud ☐ A6031 Tortious Interference ☐ A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)	1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 8.
Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	☐ A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels	2.
Wrongful Eviction (33)	☐ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
Other Real Property (26)	 ☐ A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure ☐ A6032 Quiet Title ☐ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure) 	2., 6. 2., 6. 2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	☐ A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	☐ A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	☐ A6020FUnlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	☐ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.

SHORT TITLE: Milton v. Guess?, Inc. CASE NUMBER

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
	Asset Forfeilure (05)	☐ A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
/iew	Petition re Arbitration (11)	☐ A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
Judicial Review	Writ of Mandate (02)	□ A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus □ A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter □ A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2., 8. 2. 2.
	Other Judicial Review (39)	☐ A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
uo	Antilrust/Trade Regulation (03)	☐ A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
Litigat	Construction Defect (10)	☐ A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
mplex	Claims involving Mass Tort (40)	□ A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
II∕ Co	Securities Lillgation (28)	☐ A6035 Securitles Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	□ A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	□ A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Enforcement of Judgment	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	□ A6141 Sister State Judgment □ A6160 Abstract of Judgment □ A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) □ A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) □ A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax □ A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 9. 2., 6. 2., 9. 2., 8. 2., 8. 2., 8., 9.
ិ ស	RICO (27)	☐ A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Complaints	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	 □ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only □ A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) □ A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) □ A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex) 	1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.
	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	☐ A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	□ A6121 CMI Harassment □ A6123 Workplace Harassment □ A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case □ A6190 Election Contest □ A6110 Petition for Change of Name □ A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law	2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2. 2., 7.
		☐ A6100 Other Civil Petitlon	2., 9.

Οĵ

Item III. Statement of Location: Enter the address of the accident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or other circumstance indicated in Item II., Step 3 on Page 1, as the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.

REASON: Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown 1444 South Alameda St. under Column C for the type of action that you have selected for \square 1. \square 2. \square 3. \square 4. \square 5. \square 6. \square 7. \square 8. \square 9. \square 10. CITY: STATE ZIP CODE: LOS CA 90021

Item IV. Declaration of Assignment: I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that the above-entitled matter is properly filed for assignment to the Stanky Mosk courthouse in the Central West District of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local Rule 2.0, subds. (b), (c) and (d)].

Dated: 4/28/15

PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY COMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE:

- 1. Original Complaint or Petition.
- 2. If filling a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form CM-010.
- Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement of Location form, LACIV 109, LASC Approved 03-04 (Rev.
- 5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- 6. A signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, Judicial Council form CIV-010, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age will be required by Court in order to issue a summons.
- 7. Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.