

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC

Abbas Kazerounian, Esq. (SBN: 249203)

ak@kazlg.com

Jason A. Ibey, Esq. (SBN: 284607)

jason@kazlg.com

Nick Barthel, Esq. (SBN: 319105)

nicholas@kazlg.com

245 Fischer Avenue, Unit D1

Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Telephone: (800) 400-6808

Facsimile: (800) 520-5523

[Additional Plaintiff's Counsel on Signature Page]

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
EASTERN DIVISION**

**LAKESIA COOK, Individually
and On Behalf of All Others
Similarly Situated,**

Plaintiff,

v.

INTUIT, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No.:

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
VIOLATIONS OF:**

- 1) CONSUMER LEGAL REMEDIES ACT, CAL. CIVIL CODE §§ 1750, ET SEQ.;**
- 2) FALSE ADVERTISING LAW, CAL. BUS. & PROF. §§ 17500, ET SEQ.;**
- 3) UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW, CAL. BUS. & PROF. §§ 17200, ET SEQ.;**
- 4) NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION; AND**
- 5) INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION.**

[JURY TRIAL DEMANDED]

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT D1
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

INTRODUCTION

- 1
2 1. Plaintiff, LAKESIA COOK, (“Plaintiff”) brings this Class Action Complaint
3 to challenge the deceptive advertising and business practices of Defendant,
4 Intuit, Inc. (“Intuit” or “Defendant”) with regard to Defendant’s tax filing
5 software commonly known as “Turbo Tax,” by which Intuit used to
6 promote/advertise purportedly “Free” tax filing services to millions of low
7 earning Americans, only to deliberately divert them to their paid software
8 services despite the consumers being eligible to obtain such tax-filing services
9 at no cost at all.
- 10 2. Intuit and other electronic tax filing service providers entered into an
11 agreement with the IRS (“Internal Revenue Service”) to service millions of
12 low-income earning taxpayers. The initiative that sprung from this agreement
13 came to be known as the “Free File Program”. See ([https://www.irs.gov/e-file-
14 providers/about-the-free-file-program](https://www.irs.gov/e-file-providers/about-the-free-file-program)). The Free File Program requires all the
15 tax filing service providers that are a party to the agreement to provide online
16 tax preparation and electronic filing at no cost to those taxpayers who make
17 less than \$66,000 or less in gross annual income.
- 18 3. However, due to the manner in which Intuit’s markets the Turbo Tax software
19 online through search engines such as Google, more often than not consumers
20 like the Plaintiff and others are intentionally lead to paid versions of the tax
21 filing software of the Defendant, or a very limited “free” version of tax filing
22 that helps only the most basic of tax returns before prompting the individual to
23 pay for extra services if your tax return is not the simplest.
- 24 4. Although Defendant does have a software program that complies with the Free
25 File Program (“Turbo Tax Freedom Edition”) that was initiated in partnership
26 with the IRS, Defendant employs practices that make this particular program
27 difficult to find online by using certain coding tactics that segregate the true
28

1 Free File Program compliant program that includes numerous tax file forms
2 from the very limited “free” edition.

3 5. The Turbo Tax Free File Program compliance software is not even accessible
4 on Intuit’s main Turbo Tax website. Instead, consumers have to type in the
5 specific phrase in the search engine to ensure they got the right link to pop up
6 during the search.

7 6. These kinds of deceptive practices are a direct breach of the agreement that
8 Intuit entered into via the Free File Program and result in the exploitation of
9 millions of consumers paying for services that should have been truly free as
10 advertised and per the qualifications set by the Free File Program.

11 7. Plaintiff allege as follows upon personal knowledge as to their own acts and
12 experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief,
13 including investigation conducted by Plaintiff’s attorneys.

14 8. Defendant’s nationwide sale and advertising of deceptively marketed
15 electronic tax filing products are violations of: (1) California’s Consumer
16 Legal Remedies Act (“CLRA”), Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750, *et seq.*; (2)
17 California’s False Advertising Law (“FAL”), Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, *et*
18 *seq.*; (3) California’s Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”), Bus. & Prof. Code §§
19 17200, *et seq.*; and constitute (4) negligent misrepresentation; and (5)
20 intentional misrepresentation.

21 9. This conduct caused damages to Plaintiff and others similarly situated in
22 California, and requires restitution and injunctive relief to remedy and prevent
23 further harm.

24 10. Unless otherwise indicated, the use of Defendant’s name in this Complaint
25 includes all agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors,
26 assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives and insurers
27 of the named Defendant.
28

KAZERONI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, SUITE DI
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1
2 11. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C.
3 §1332(d)(2) of the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 because: (i) there are
4 100 or more class members, (ii) there is an aggregate amount in controversy
5 exceeding \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and (iii) there is
6 minimal diversity because at least one Plaintiff is from a different state than
7 that of the Defendant.
- 8 12. Venue is proper, as many of the acts and transactions giving rise to this action
9 occurred in California and within this judicial district, since Defendant:
- 10 (a) is authorized to conduct business in California and has
11 intentionally availed itself of the laws and markets within this
12 district;
- 13 (b) does substantial business within this judicial district through
14 marketing and advertising of its TurboTax Product in this
15 district; and,
- 16 (c) is subject to personal jurisdiction because it has availed itself
17 of the laws and markets within this Judicial District.

PARTIES

- 18
- 19 13. Plaintiff is a natural person and citizen of the State of California.
- 20 14. Upon information and belief, Defendant is a corporation that is organized and
21 exists under the laws of the State of Delaware.
- 22 15. For many years, Defendant has manufactured and/or distributed various
23 products, including Turbo Tax, a widely used electronic tax preparation and
24 filing software product and service.

NATURE OF THE CASE

- 25
- 26 16. At all times relevant, Defendant made and continues to make affirmative
27 misrepresentations and deceptive marketing practices regarding its product
28 Turbo Tax.

- 1 17. Defendant Intuit, Inc. is a software development company that sells a wide
2 variety of accounting and tax preparation software, among these Turbo Tax is
3 the company's most profitable software, as it provides step-by-step guidance
4 for filing/preparing state and federal tax returns electronically through a
5 computer or even most mobile devices.
- 6 18. In or around October of 2002, a coalition of tax preparation service providers
7 spearheaded by Turbo Tax created a group known as the "Free File Alliance,"
8 this group entered into an agreement with IRS for the purpose of offering free
9 online tax preparation services to taxpayers who were considered low-income
10 earners and therefore least likely to be able to afford electronic tax filings for
11 their returns.
- 12 19. This agreement between the Free File Alliance and the IRS has come to be
13 known as the "Free File Program" and has been extended several times since
14 2002 in documents known as "Memorandums of Understanding" or ("MOU").
- 15 20. The benefits of this agreement served objectives of both parties, it served the
16 IRS's objective of giving low-income taxpayers a way of being able to afford
17 electronic tax filings, as well as shifting the American public toward e-filing
18 as a whole opposed to paper filing. It also helped the Free File Alliance
19 members goals of not having to compete with a government ran e-file tax
20 service, as the agreement specifically prevents the federal government from
21 entering into the electronic tax preparation software marketplace.
- 22 21. The MOU is currently in effect and is extended until October 31, 2021.
- 23 22. Although generally the Free File Program allows taxpayers who make
24 \$66,000 or less gross annual income to be eligible for the Free File Program
25 software, the agreement allows for Turbo Tax's eligibility requirements to be a
26 bit more stringent due to its high traffic.
- 27 23. For Turbo Tax, a consumer qualifies for a free federal tax return if one has: 1)
28 A gross annual income of \$34,000 or less; 2) is eligible for the Earned Income

KAZERONI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, SUITE DI
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

1 Tax Credit; or 3) is on active military duty and has an annual gross income of
2 \$66,000 or less.

3 24. The official name of Turbo Tax’s Free File Program software is “Turbo Tax
4 Freedom Edition,” this fully functional tax filing software handles virtually all
5 kinds of tax returns no matter the complexity. It includes basic tax filing forms
6 like IRS Form 1040 and nearly 125 additional federal tax forms.

7 25. Where a consumer qualifies for the “Freedom Edition” software from Turbo
8 Tax, there is no reason/need to purchase any of the Turbo Tax paid e-filing
9 products.

10 26. Turbo Tax also has another purportedly “free” tax filing software called Turbo
11 Tax “Free Edition.” This particular software is made for the most basic of tax
12 returns which generally includes people with a W-2 income, have limited
13 interest and dividend income reported on a 1099-INT or 1099-DIV, claim
14 standard deductions, claim the Earned Income Tax credit, or claim child tax
15 credits.

16 27. Taxpayers who need to file additional forms or use schedules as a part of their
17 tax return cannot fully use the “Free Edition” software, and would be forced
18 after spending all the time inputting the correct information, to purchase of
19 one Turbo Tax’s upgraded software platforms to e-file their return with the
20 correct functionality.

21 28. In fact, this is a fate that many taxpayers like the Plaintiff’s endure despite
22 being eligible under one of the categories to receive Turbo Tax’s “Freedom
23 Edition” software that complies with the Free File Program and is absolutely
24 of no charge to the taxpayer.

25 29. This is due in large part to the fact that Intuit purposefully makes Turbo Tax
26 “Freedom Edition” incredibly difficult to access online. For starters, Freedom
27 Edition is not accessible from Turbo Tax’s main page website,
28

1 <https://turbotax.intuit.com>. However, all of the paid e-filing software products
2 are directly accessible on the main page website.

3 30. In addition to hiding Freedom Edition away from the main website, Intuit as of
4 approximately April 26, 2019 had structured the online code in a way that
5 makes certain search engine keywords like “turbo tax free,” “turbo tax free
6 file,” or “turbotax” to lead consumers directly to a website where Freedom
7 Edition is not located.

8 31. Several articles have highlighted how Turbo Tax took deliberate steps to
9 ensure that the average consumer would not find Turbo Tax’s Free File
10 Program software.¹

11 32. Intuit purchased advertisements on Google that would result in the paid
12 products being displayed at the top of search inquiry, but the Free File
13 Program software would be absent from the page.

14 33. According to ProPublica, after both these articles highlighted the deceptive
15 practices put on by Intuit in hiding the Freedom Edition from search inquiries,
16 Intuit changed the code as of April 28, 2019, so that Freedom Edition was not
17 hidden from Google and other online search engines anymore.

18 34. Intuit engaged in conduct that contradicted the very purpose of forming the
19 Free File Alliance, which was designed to prevent lower-income taxpayers
20 from being directed to paid products.

21
22
23
24 ¹ This was first reported by ProPublica in an article published on April 22, 2019
25 titled “*Here’s How Turbo Tax Just Tricked You Into Paying To File Your Taxes*”
26 [https://www.propublica.org/article/turbotax-just-tricked-you-into-paying-to-file-](https://www.propublica.org/article/turbotax-just-tricked-you-into-paying-to-file-your-taxes)
27 [your-taxes](https://www.propublica.org/article/turbotax-just-tricked-you-into-paying-to-file-your-taxes). Subsequently, in another article published by the same media outlet,
28 ProPublica put out an article titled “*Turbo Tax Deliberately Hid Its Free File Page From Search Engines*” [https://www.propublica.org/article/turbotax-deliberately-](https://www.propublica.org/article/turbotax-deliberately-hides-its-free-file-page-from-search-engines)
[hides-its-free-file-page-from-search-engines](https://www.propublica.org/article/turbotax-deliberately-hides-its-free-file-page-from-search-engines).

1 35. The most recent iteration of the MOU requires developers who participate in
2 the Free File Program to redirect consumers to other members Free File
3 product if they end up not qualifying under their own.

4 36. The direct result of this conduct is that millions of tax payers every year who
5 would qualify for Turbo Tax's Free File Program, end up paying unnecessary
6 amounts of money for e-file programs that would otherwise be free if they
7 knew about it and weren't be deceived into purchasing another product.

8 37. Defendant marketed the Free Edition of the e-file product as "FREE
9 GURANTEED, \$0 State. \$0 Federal. \$0 To File." This enticed most
10 consumers to believe that the Free Edition software was the Freedom Edition
11 software that is compliant with the Free File Program, only to later find out
12 that unless their tax return was the most basic they would ultimately end up
13 having to pay a price.

14 38. ProPublica reported as a result of the intentional deceit, concealment, and
15 misrepresentations Turbo Tax has made about its e-filing product, its brought
16 them approximately \$1 billion annually in unnecessary fees from the
17 unsuspecting consumer.

18 39. Defendant's conduct as alleged herein violates several California laws, as
19 more fully set forth herein.

20 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

21 40. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs
22 of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

23 41. On or about December 2018, Plaintiff Cook, a resident of the County of San
24 Bernardino, California, sought to have her taxes filed and used Turbo Tax.

25 42. Since Plaintiff Cook made less than \$34,000 working part-time she qualified
26 for the Free File Program with Turbo Tax.

27 43. At the time Plaintiff Cook filed her taxes, she believed that the filing would be
28 free, as that is the option she chose.

1 44. After filling in her private information and submitting the filing, Plaintiff was
2 charged a filing fee of approximately \$73.

3 45. At the time Plaintiff was charged for Defendant's product, Plaintiff believed
4 and relied upon the representations made on Defendant's site and emails that
5 such products were "Free" and that the Free Edition of the software she was
6 using was the only "free" software available.

7 46. Plaintiff reasonably believed that Defendant's Product would actually be free
8 of charge and due to Plaintiff's financial status was in fact eligible to have her
9 tax return filed for free pursuant to the Free File Program.

10 47. Defendant knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care, should have known that
11 its advertisements for Turbo Tax "Free Edition" and materials were materially
12 misleading or false.

13 48. As a consequence of Defendant's unfair and deceptive advertising and
14 manufacturing practices, Plaintiff and other consumers similarly situated
15 purchased Defendant's Product under the false impression that no free
16 alternative was available for them for their type of tax return.

17 49. Plaintiff would not have purchased Defendant's Product but for the
18 representations on the software's advertisements and marketing materials.

19 50. Plaintiff and others similarly situated were exposed to and relied upon the
20 same material misrepresentations made on Defendant's website and
21 advertisements, where Defendant sold, and currently sells, its product to
22 consumers throughout the State of California.

23 51. As a result of Defendant's false and misleading statements and failure to
24 disclose (or adequately disclose), Plaintiff and others similarly situated
25 consumers collectively paid millions of dollars for unnecessary e-filing
26 software, and have suffered, and continue to suffer, injury in fact through the
27 loss of money and/or property.
28

KAZERONI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, SUITE DI
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

1 52. This action seeks, among other things, equitable and injunctive relief,
2 restitution of all amounts illegally obtained, and disgorgement of any and all
3 ill-gotten gains as a result of the misconduct alleged herein.

4 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

5 53. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs
6 of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

7 54. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others similarly
8 situated against Defendant, pursuant to Federal Rules of civil Procedure 23(a)
9 and 23(b)(2) and/or (b)(3).

10 55. Subject to additional information obtained through further investigation and/or
11 discovery, the proposed class (the “Class”) and (“Sub-Class”) consists of:

12 **National Class**

13 All persons within the United States who were qualified
14 pursuant to the Free File Program to use a Turbo Tax product
15 free of charge after meeting eligibility requirements, but who
16 were charged to file their return with Turbo Tax since four
17 years prior to the filing of the Complaint.

18 **California Sub-Class**

19 All persons within the State of California who were qualified
20 pursuant to the Free File Program to use a Turbo Tax product
21 free of charge after meeting eligibility requirements, but who
22 were charged to file their return with Turbo Tax since four
23 years prior to the filing of the Complaint.

24 56. The Class and Sub-Class are sometimes herein referred to as the “Classes.”

25 57. Excluded from the Class and Sub-Class is Defendant and any of its officers,
26 directors, and employees, or anyone who purchased Defendant’s Product for
27 the purpose of resale. Plaintiff reserves the right to modify or amend the Class
28 or Subclass definition before the Court determines whether certification is
appropriate.

1 58. The “Class Period” means four years prior to the filing of the Complaint in
2 this action.

3 59. **Ascertainability.** The members of the Class are readily ascertainable from
4 Defendant’s filing records and/or Defendant’s agent’s records of filings and
5 online sales, as well as through public notice.

6 60. **Numerosity.** The members of the Class and Sub-Class are so numerous that
7 their individual joinder is impracticable.

8 61. Plaintiff is informed and believe that the Defendant’s e-filing software is a
9 top-selling product with a majority of the market share in tax filing, and
10 millions of people use it every year, Plaintiff alleges that the putative Class
11 consists of millions of members in the United States.

12 62. **Existence and Predominance of Common Questions of Law and Fact.**

13 Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Classes and
14 predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class members. All
15 members of the Class have been subject to the same conduct and their claims
16 are based on the same standardized marketing, advertisements and online code
17 manipulation. The common legal and factual questions include, but are not
18 limited to, the following:

- 19 a. Whether Intuit engaged in fraud and intentional misrepresentation of
20 its software product;
- 21 b. Whether the Intuit engaged in negligent misrepresentation of it
22 software product;
- 23 c. Whether Defendant’s claims and representations regarding Free
24 Edition version of its software, as alleged herein, are untrue,
25 misleading, and/or reasonably likely to deceive the average
26 consumer;
- 27 d. Whether Intuit deliberately violated its agreement with the IRS
28 regarding the Free File Program;

KAZERONI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, SUITE DI
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

- 1 e. Whether Defendant’s conduct violates California Civil Code §§
- 2 1750, *et seq.*;
- 3 f. Whether Defendant’s advertising is false, untrue, or misleading
- 4 within the meaning of California Business & Professions Code §§
- 5 17500, *et seq.*;
- 6 g. Whether Defendant’s conduct is an unfair, fraudulent, or unlawful
- 7 act or practice within the meaning of California Business &
- 8 Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
- 9 h. Whether Defendant’s advertising is unfair, deceptive, untrue or
- 10 misleading within the meaning of California Business & Professions
- 11 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
- 12 i. Whether Plaintiff and members of the Class are entitled to actual
- 13 damages and/or statutory damages;
- 14 j. Whether Plaintiff and the putative Class members are entitled to
- 15 equitable relief, including but not limited to restitution and/or
- 16 disgorgement of ill-gotten gains; and
- 17 k. Whether Plaintiff and the putative Class members are entitled to
- 18 injunctive relief as sought herein.

19 63. **Typicality.** Plaintiff’s claims are typical of the claims of the members of the
20 Class and the Sub-Class in that Plaintiff are a member of the Class and Sub-
21 Class that Plaintiff seek to represent.

22 64. Similar to members of the putative Class and Subclass, Plaintiff purchased the
23 e-filing software after reasonably believing it to offer free filing services, and
24 who were eligible for free e-filing pursuant to the Free File Program.

25 65. **Adequacy of Representation.** Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the
26 interests of the members of the putative Class and Subclass.

27 66. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in consumer protection law,
28 including class actions, and specifically, false and deceptive advertising.

1 Plaintiff has no adverse or antagonistic interest to those in the Class and
2 Subclass will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class and
3 Subclass.

4 67. Plaintiff's attorneys are aware of no interests adverse or antagonistic to those
5 of Plaintiff and proposed Class and Subclass.

6 68. **Superiority.** A class action is superior to all other available means for the fair
7 and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Individualized litigation would
8 create the danger of inconsistent and/or contradictory judgments arising from
9 the same set of facts. Individualized litigation would also increase the delay
10 and expense to all parties and the court system. The damages or other financial
11 detriment suffered by individual Class and Sub-class members may be
12 relatively small compared to the burden and expense that would be entailed by
13 individual litigation of the claims against the Defendant. The injury suffered
14 by each individual member of the proposed class is relatively small in
15 comparison to the burden and expense of individual prosecution of the
16 complex and extensive litigation necessitated by Defendant's conduct. It
17 would be virtually impossible for members of the proposed Class and Sub-
18 class to individually redress effectively the wrongs to them. Even if the
19 members of the proposed Class and Sub-class could afford such litigation, the
20 court system could not. Individualized litigation of the complex legal and
21 factual issues of such a case increases the delay and expense to all parties,
22 including the court. By contrast, the class action device presents far fewer
23 management difficulties, and provides the benefits of single adjudication,
24 economy of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court.

25 69. Unless the Class and Sub-class is certified, Defendant will retain monies
26 received as a result of Defendant's unlawful and deceptive conduct alleged
27 herein. Unless a class-wide injunction is issued, Defendant will also likely
28 continue to, or allow its resellers to, advertise, market, promote, and sell the

KAZERONI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, SUITE DI
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

1 Class and Sub-class Product in an unlawful and misleading manner, and
2 members of the Class and Sub-class will continue to be misled, harmed, and
3 denied their rights under California law.

4 70. Further, Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds that are generally
5 applicable to the class so that declaratory and injunctive relief is appropriate to
6 the Class as a whole, making class certification appropriate pursuant to Fed. R.
7 Civ. P. 23(b)(2).

8
9 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR**
10 **VIOLATIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT**
11 **CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 1750, ET SEQ.**

12 71. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs
13 of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

14 72. California Civil Code Section 1750, *et seq.*, entitled the Consumers Legal
15 Remedies Act (hereinafter “CLRA”), provides a list of “unfair or deceptive”
16 practices in a “transaction” relating to the sale of “goods” or “services” to a
17 “consumer.” The Legislature’s intent in promulgating the CLRA is expressed
18 in Civil Code Section 1760, which provides, *inter alia*, that its terms are to be:

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Construed 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.

73. Defendant’s software product constitutes a “good” as defined pursuant to Civil
Code Section 1761(a).

74. Plaintiff and the members of the Classes are each a “consumer” as defined
pursuant to Civil Code Section 1761(d).

75. Plaintiff and each of the putative Class and Sub-class members’ purchase of
Defendant’s software product constitutes a “transaction” as defined pursuant
to Civil Code Section 1761(e).

76. Civil Code Section 1770(a)(2), (5), (7) and (9) provide that:

The 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:

(2) [m]isrepresenting the source, sponsorship, approval, or certification of goods or services;

(5) [r]epresenting that goods or services have sponsorship, approval, characteristics, ingredients, uses, benefits, or quantities which they do not have . . . ;

(7) [r]epresenting that goods or services are of a particular standard, quality, or grade . . . if they are of another; [and]

(9) [a]dvertising goods or services with intent not to sell them as advertised.”

77. Defendant violated Civil Code Section 1770(a)(2), (5), (7) and (9) by marketing and representing its Free Edition software for e-filing as “guaranteed free” for federal and state taxes, but drastically limiting the use of the “free” functionality of the software to the most basic of tax returns.

78. Throughout the Class Period, if Plaintiff and members of the Class and Sub-class had any slight deviation from the most basic of tax returns or had alternative forms from the standard W-2, Plaintiff and members of the class would be prompted to “upgrade” the Free Edition of the software to a paid product.

79. On information and belief, Defendant’s violations of the CLRA, as set forth herein, were done with awareness of the fact that the conduct alleged was wrongful and was motivated solely by Defendant’s self-interest, monetary gain, and increased profit.

KAZERONI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, SUITE DI
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

KAZERONI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, SUITE DI
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

1 80. Defendant committed these acts knowing the harm that would result to
2 Plaintiff and Defendant engaged in such unfair and deceptive conduct
3 notwithstanding such knowledge.

4 81. Plaintiff suffered an “injury in fact” because Plaintiff’s money was taken by
5 Defendant as a result of Defendant’s false representations set forth on
6 Defendant’s website and emails.

7 82. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s violations of the CLRA,
8 Plaintiff and members of the putative Class and Sub-class are entitled to a
9 declaration that Defendant violated the Consumer Legal Remedies Act.

10 83. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is the affidavit of Plaintiff pursuant to Cal. Civ.
11 Code § 1780(d).

12 84. Plaintiff and the members of the putative Class are entitled to, and seek,
13 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

14 85. Plaintiff served a demand letter pursuant to California Civil Code § 1782,
15 which was served on Defendant on or about May 30, 2019, by certified U.S.
16 mail.

17 86. Should TurboTax not comply with Plaintiff’s CLRA demand letter within 30
18 days of service, pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1782(d), Plaintiff intends to
19 amend the Complaint to add damages under California Civil Code §§ 1750, *et*
20 *seq.*

21 87. In the interim, and until Court grants such an amendment or amendment is
22 made as a matter of right, TurboTax may be enjoined from continuing the
23 aforementioned conduct, as no cure period is required for an injunction sought
24 under the CLRA. Cal. Civ. Code § 1782(a).

25 ///
26 ///
27 ///
28 ///

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR
VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA’S FALSE ADVERTISING LAW (“FAL”)
BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17500, ET SEQ.**

1
2
3 88. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs
4 of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

5 89. Plaintiff and Defendant are both “person[s]” as defined by California Business
6 & Professions Code § 17506.

7 90. California Business & Professions Code § 17535 authorizes a private right of
8 action on both an individual and representative basis.

9 91. Defendant represents that its software product is “guaranteed free” for any
10 federal and state tax return, when, in fact, the software product is only free for
11 the most basic of tax returns and would serve less than a majority of taxpayers
12 under the current model.

13 92. Such misrepresentations, acts, and non-disclosures by Defendant constitute
14 false and misleading advertising in violation of Business & Professions Code
15 §§ 17500, *et seq.*

16 93. At all times relevant, Defendant’s advertising and promotion of its software
17 product was, and is, untrue, misleading, and likely to deceive the reasonable
18 consumer and the public.

19 94. Defendant deceived Plaintiff and the members of the Classes by representing
20 that its e-filing software was free, when Defendant knew that the likelihood of
21 the product being free for a majority of taxpayers was nonexistent and that
22 most would ultimately end up paying for the e-filing service despite the
23 individuals being eligible to file a free tax return electronically.

24 95. Upon information and belief, Defendant engaged in the false and/or
25 misleading advertising and marketing of its software product, as alleged
26 herein, with the intent to directly or indirectly induce consumers to purchase
27 its software product, which Defendant knew, or had reason to know, would
28 not end up being free to qualifying Free File Program taxpayers.

KAZERONI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, SUITE DI
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

1 96. Such conduct violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17500, *et*
2 *seq.*

3 97. Had Defendant truthfully advertised that its software product was not
4 guaranteed to be free and directed consumers to the Free File Program version
5 of their software to see if they qualified, Plaintiff and the members of the
6 Classes would not have purchased the paid e-filing software, and would have
7 been able to file their taxes with all the relevant information totally free of
8 charge.

9 98. The false and/or misleading advertising of the Product by Defendant presents
10 a continuing threat to consumers, as such conduct is ongoing to this day.

11 99. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned acts and omissions by
12 Defendant, Defendant received and continues to hold monies rightfully
13 belonging to Plaintiff and the putative Class and Sub-class members, who
14 were led to purchase Defendant's software product during the Class Period.

15 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR**
16 **VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW ("UCL")**
17 **BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, *ET SEQ.***

18 100. Plaintiff re-allege and incorporate by reference all of the above paragraphs of
19 this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

20 101. Plaintiff and Defendant are each a "person" as defined by California Business
21 & Professions Code § 17201. California Business & Professions Code § 17204
22 authorizes a private right of action on both an individual and representative
23 basis.

24 102. "Unfair competition" is defined by Business and Professions Code § 17200 as
25 encompassing several types of business "wrongs," including: (1) an
26 "unlawful" business act or practice, (2) an "unfair" business act or practice, (3)
27 a "fraudulent" business act or practice, and (4) "unfair, deceptive, untrue or
28 misleading advertising." The definitions in § 17200 are drafted in the

1 disjunctive, meaning that each of these “wrongs” operates independently from
2 the others.

3 103. By and through Defendant’s conduct alleged in further detail above and
4 herein, Defendant engaged in conduct which constitutes unlawful, unfair,
5 and/or fraudulent business practices, and unfair, deceptive, untrue or
6 misleading advertising, as prohibited by California’s UCL.

7 **A. “UNLAWFUL” PRONG**

8 104. Beginning at a date currently unknown and continuing to the time of the filing
9 of this Complaint, Defendant has committed acts of unfair competition,
10 including those described above, by engaging in a pattern of “unlawful”
11 business practices, within the meaning of Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*,
12 by marketing, advertising, and distributing Defendant’s Product in violation of
13 California’s Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Civil Code § 1750, *et seq.* and
14 California’s False Advertising Law, Business & Professions Code §§ 17500,
15 *et seq.*, as alleged herein.

16 105. Defendant violated the above-referenced statutes by falsely representing that
17 its product was guaranteed free when it truly was not, and by deliberately
18 hiding the truly free version from consumers via search inquiry code
19 manipulation.

20 106. By advertising, promoting, advertising, and selling its Product in violation of
21 those California laws, Defendant engaged in a pattern of “unlawful” business
22 practices within the meaning of California’s UCL.

23 **B. “UNFAIR” PRONG**

24 107. Beginning at a date currently unknown and continuing to the time of the filing
25 of this Complaint, Defendant has committed acts of unfair competition as
26 prohibited by Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

27 108. Had Plaintiff and the putative class members been informed that Defendant’s
28 software product was not guaranteed free, and that there was another version

1 of the software that they would have qualified for that would have enabled
 2 them to file their tax returns no matter the complexity for completely free, then
 3 Plaintiff and members of the Classes would not have paid for the any of the
 4 software that cost money.

5 109. In other words, Defendant earned the business of Plaintiff and the putative
 6 Class and Sub-class members by using deceptive advertising, which placed
 7 competitors at a disadvantage.

8 110. Further, Plaintiff and the members of the Classes were harmed in that they
 9 paid a price premium for the software product.

10 C. "FRAUDULENT" PRONG

11 111. Beginning at a date currently unknown and continuing to the time of the filing
 12 of this Complaint, Defendant engaged in acts of unfair competition, including
 13 those described above and herein, in violation of Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200,
 14 *et seq.*, by engaging in a pattern of "fraudulent" business practices within the
 15 meaning of Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, by falsely advertising its
 16 software as guaranteed free and deliberately hiding the truly free version of the
 17 software from the search inquiries of consumers so that they had to pay for
 18 something they could have gotten for free.

19 112. Plaintiff reserves the right to allege further conduct that constitutes other
 20 fraudulent business acts or practices. Such conduct is ongoing and continues
 21 to this date.

22 FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION 23 NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION

24 113. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference the above
 25 allegations as if fully stated herein.

26 114. Beginning at a date currently unknown and continuing to the time of the filing
 27 of this Complaint, Defendant represented to Plaintiff and others similarly
 28

1 situated, through website promotion, advertising materials and emails, that
2 Defendant's e-filing software was guaranteed free even though it was not.

3 115. Defendant made these representations knowing, or having reason to know, that
4 a majority of consumers would end up having to pay for a paid version of the
5 software to file their tax returns due to the limited functionality of the
6 purportedly "free" version.

7 116. Defendant acted with the intent to induce the public, including Plaintiff and
8 putative Class and Sub-class members, to purchase Defendant's software
9 product.

10 117. Plaintiff and the putative Class and Sub-class members saw, believed, and
11 relied upon Defendant's representations in making the decision to purchase
12 Defendant's software product.

13 118. At all times relevant, Defendant knew or should have known that such
14 representations were untrue, and Defendant had no reasonable basis for
15 believing the representations to be true.

16 119. As a proximate result of Defendant's negligent misrepresentations, Plaintiff
17 and other consumers similarly situated were induced to purchase, purchase
18 more of, or pay more for Defendant's Product due to the unlawful acts of
19 Defendant, in an amount to be determined at trial, during the Class Period.

20
21 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION

22 120. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates herein by reference the above
23 allegations as if fully stated herein.

24 121. Beginning at a date currently unknown and continuing to the time of the filing
25 of this Complaint, Defendant intentionally represented to Plaintiff and others
26 similarly situated, through website promoting and advertising materials, that
27 Defendant's software product was guaranteed free even though Defendant
28 knew most people would end up having to pay for it to be filed.

1 122. Defendant acted intentionally by willfully and purposefully induced
2 unsuspecting consumers to believe that even complex tax returns could be
3 electronically filed free of charge.

4 123. Because the software has such a limited functionality in relation to the amount
5 of information that can be included on your tax return Defendant knew
6 induced consumers to pay for a product many of them could have truly got for
7 free.

8 124. Defendant knew or had reason to know such representations were false, and
9 continued to represent its software in a false or misleading way.

10 125. Plaintiff and the putative Class and Sub-class members saw, believed, and
11 relied upon Defendant's representations in making the decision to purchase
12 software not knowing that there was a totally free version of that software that
13 they were eligible for.

14 126. As a proximate result of Defendant's intentional misrepresentations, Plaintiff
15 and the putative Class and Sub-class members were damaged in an amount to
16 be determined at trial.

17 127. Plaintiff alleges the "who, what, when, where, and how" of the alleged
18 deception by Defendant as follows:

- 19 i. The "who" is Defendant;
- 20 ii. The "what" is the representation that Defendant's software was free
21 when it in fact would not be free;
- 22 iii. The "when" is the date Plaintiff was charged for use of the software
23 product, and the Class Period of four years prior to the filing of this
24 Complaint;
- 25 iv. The "where" is in Defendant's product, advertisements, and online
26 marketing; and
- 27 v. The "how" is the allegation that Defendant did not disclose that its
28 software product is not guaranteed free, and did not direct consumers

KAZERONI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, SUITE DI
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

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
27
28

to the true free version of its software pursuant to the Free File Program.

128. By engaging in the acts described above, Defendant is guilty of malice, oppression, and fraud, and Plaintiff and the members of the Classes are therefore entitled to recover exemplary or punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court grant Plaintiff and the putative Class members the following relief against Defendant:

- that this action be certified as a Class Action;
- that Plaintiff be appointed as the Class Representative;
- that Plaintiff’s attorneys be appointed as Class Counsel;
- that Defendant’s wrongful conduct be adjudged and decreed to violate the consumer protection statutes raised herein;
- An order requiring imposition of a constructive trust and and/or disgorgement of Defendant’s ill-gotten gains and to pay restitution to Plaintiff and all members of the Classes and to restore to the Plaintiff and members of the class all funds acquired by means of any act or practice declared by this court to be an unlawful, fraudulent or unfair business act or practice, in violation of laws, statutes or regulations, or constituting unfair competition;
- Distribution of any monies recovered on behalf of members of the Classes via fluid recovery or *cy pres* recovery were necessary and as applicable, to prevent Defendant from retaining the benefits of their wrongful conduct;
- that Plaintiff and each of the other members of the Class recover the amounts by which Defendant has been unjustly enriched;
- A temporary, preliminary and/or permanent order for injunctive relief requiring Defendant to: (i) discontinue its false and/or misleading

1 statement/s; and (ii) undertake an immediate public information
2 campaign to inform members of the proposed class as to their prior
3 practices;

- 4 • that Defendant be enjoined from continuing the wrongful conduct alleged
- 5 herein and be required to comply with all applicable laws;
- 6 • Pre-judgment interests from the date of filing of this suit;
- 7 • that Plaintiff and each member of the Classes recover their costs of suit.

8
9 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR**
10 **VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA’S CONSUMER LEGAL REMEDIES ACT**
11 **CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 1750, ET SEQ.**

- 12 • Injunctive relief to Cal. Civ. Code § 1780(a); and
- 13 • an award of costs and attorney’s fees pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code §
14 1780(d).

15 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR**
16 **VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA’S FALSE ADVERTISING LAW**
17 **CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17500, ET SEQ.**

- 18 • Restitution and injunctive relief pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203;
19 and
- 20 • recovery of reasonably attorney’s fees pursuant to, *inter alia*, California
21 Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

22 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR**
23 **VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA’S UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW**
24 **CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, ET SEQ.**

- 25 • Restitution and injunctive relief pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code § 17535;
26 and
- 27 • recovery of reasonable attorneys’ fees pursuant to, *inter alia*, California
28 Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

KAZERONI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, SUITE DI
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, SUITE DI
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR
NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION**

- A judgment against Defendant for general and compensatory damages in an amount to be determined at trial; and

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR
INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION**

- A judgment against Defendant for general and compensatory damages in an amount to be determined at trial;
- punitive damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 3294; and
- that Plaintiff and the members of the Class be granted any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY

129. Pursuant to the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiff are entitled to and demand a trial by jury.

Dated: June 1, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC

By: /s/ Abbas Kazerounian
ABBAS KAZEROUNIAN, ESQ.
Attorney for Plaintiff

[ADDITIONAL PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL]

HYDE & SWIGART

Joshua B. Swigart, Esq. (SBN: 225557)
josh@westcoastlitigation.com
2221 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 101
San Diego, CA 92108-3551
Telephone: (619) 233-7770
Facsimile: (619) 297-1022

EXHIBIT A

1
2
3 **DECLARATION OF LAKESIA COOK**

4 **I, LAKESIA COOK, declare:**

- 5 1. In or around December of 2018, I filed my taxes using Turbo Tax software,
6 in which was ultimately charged a fee of approximately \$73.00.
7 2. I purchased the Turbo Tax software from their website.
8 3. Since at least the time that I purchased the Turbo Tax software through the
9 time I was charged the fee mentioned above, I have been a resident of San
10 Bernardino, California.

11 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California and the
12 United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this
13 declaration was executed on May 31, 2019.

14 By: 
15 Lakesia Cook