

**BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**

Yeremey Krivoshey (State Bar No. 295032)

Blair E. Reed (State Bar No. 316791)

1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940

Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Telephone: (925) 300-4455

Facsimile: (925) 407-2700

E-mail: ykrivoshey@bursor.com

breed@bursor.com

**BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**

Scott A. Bursor (State Bar No. 276006)

2665 S. Bayshore Dr., Suite 220

Miami, FL 33133-5402

Telephone: (305) 330-5512

Facsimile: (305) 676-9006

E-Mail: scott@bursor.com

*[Additional counsel on signature page]*

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MILAN STEIJN, ABBAS GOKAL, and  
JOSEPH PANGANIBAN, individually  
and on behalf of all others similarly  
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALTERRA MOUNTAIN COMPANY  
U.S. INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 8:20-cv-755

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

1 Plaintiffs Milan Steijn, Abbas Gokal, and Joseph Panganiban (“Plaintiffs”)  
 2 bring this action on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated against  
 3 Defendant Alterra Mountain Company U.S. Inc. (“Alterra” or “Defendant”).  
 4 Plaintiffs make the following allegations pursuant to the investigation of their  
 5 counsel and based upon information and belief, except as to the allegations  
 6 specifically pertaining to themselves, which are based on personal knowledge.

7 **FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

8 1. Defendant has made the unconscionable decision to retain its millions of  
 9 customers’ passholder fees while closing 100% of its mountain resorts as the novel  
 10 coronavirus, COVID-19, rages throughout the world and the United States economy  
 11 has gone into a deep recession.

12 2. For the 2019-2020 ski season, Defendant sold two annual passes, the  
 13 Ikon Pass and the Ikon Base Pass (the “Ikon Pass Products” or “passes”), to  
 14 costumers in the United States and throughout the world. Defendant offered holders  
 15 of Ikon Pass Products access to 40 mountain resort destinations, promising that its  
 16 passes offer “matchless access” to “the planet’s most iconic destinations.”<sup>1</sup>

17 3. Defendant sold the Ikon Pass Products promising pass holders  
 18 “unlimited skiing and riding destinations” for many of its resorts and up to 5 or 7  
 19 days of skiing at other ones.<sup>2</sup> To visit Defendant’s mountain resorts, consumers

20 \_\_\_\_\_  
 21 <sup>1</sup> <https://www.ikonpass.com/en/shop-passes/ikon-pass-2019-2020> (last accessed  
 22 April 16, 2020) and [https://www.ikonpass.com/en/shop-passes/ikon-base-pass-2019-  
 23 2020](https://www.ikonpass.com/en/shop-passes/ikon-base-pass-2019-2020) (last accessed April 16, 2020), and  
<https://www.ikonpass.com/en/destinations#moduleDestinationNavigation4> (last  
 24 accessed April 16, 2020).

25 <sup>2</sup> <https://www.ikonpass.com/en/shop-passes> (last accessed April 16, 2020). Ikon Pass  
 26 purchasers were promised “unlimited access at 14 iconic destinations” and up to 7  
 27 days of skiing at its remaining resorts. [https://www.ikonpass.com/en/shop-  
 28 passes/ikon-pass-2019-2020](https://www.ikonpass.com/en/shop-passes/ikon-pass-2019-2020) (last accessed April 16, 2020), while Ikon Base Pass  
 holders were promised unlimited access at 12 iconic destinations, with limited  
 blackout dates at 4 of these 12 destinations,” and up to 5 days of skiing at its  
 remaining resorts. [https://www.ikonpass.com/en/shop-passes/ikon-base-pass-2019-  
 2020](https://www.ikonpass.com/en/shop-passes/ikon-base-pass-2019-2020) (last accessed April 16, 2020).

1 could have purchased either of the Ikon Pass Products, which range anywhere from  
2 \$40 to over \$1000 depending on the Product and the age of the consumer.

3 4. The Ikon Pass Products are tiered. The Ikon Base Pass provides  
4 unlimited access to 12 of Defendant’s resorts, subject to “Blackout Dates” during  
5 peak holiday times for 4 of these resorts and up to 5 days of skiing at its remaining  
6 28 resorts.<sup>3</sup> The Ikon Pass grants pass holders unfettered access to 14 of Defendant’s  
7 resorts with no “Blackout Dates” and up to 7 days of skiing at its remaining 26  
8 resorts.<sup>4</sup>

9 5. On March 14, 2020, Defendant announced that it was closing all of its  
10 mountain resorts indefinitely. Defendant initially announced “Alterra Mountain  
11 Company will suspend operations at our 15 North American ski resorts, starting the  
12 morning of Sunday, March 15, until further notice.”<sup>5</sup> Defendant then stated that  
13 “[a]ll Northern Hemisphere Ikon Pass destinations are closed for the 19/20 winter  
14 season until further notice.”<sup>6</sup>

15 6. In response to the indefinite closure of Defendant’s resorts, Defendant  
16 created a “Covid-19 Update” page where it stated that Defendant has “doubled the  
17 renewal discount on 20/21 Ikon Pass products” to “address the shortened 19/20  
18 season.”<sup>7</sup> Instead of offering a refund, Defendant retained the full price of its  
19 customers’ Ikon Pass Product fees while 100 percent of its mountain resorts remain  
20 closed to the public.

21 7. Defendant has not refunded any consumers for their lost mountain resort  
22 access. Accordingly, customers who did not have a chance to use all of their

23 <sup>3</sup> <https://www.ikonpass.com/en/shop-passes/ikon-base-pass-2019-2020> (last accessed  
24 April 16, 2020).

25 <sup>4</sup> *Id.*

26 <sup>5</sup> [https://www.alterramtnco.com/news/2020/03/14/alterra-mountain-company-  
closure-announcement](https://www.alterramtnco.com/news/2020/03/14/alterra-mountain-company-closure-announcement) (last accessed April 16, 2020).

27 <sup>6</sup> <https://www.ikonpass.com/en/covid-19> (last accessed April 16, 2020).

28 <sup>7</sup> *Id.*

1 purchased Ikon Pass Products get zero consideration or compensation for their  
2 inability to use those unused, purchased days, even if they wanted to. Subsequently,  
3 Defendant has unjustly enriched itself by retaining passholder fees of hundreds of  
4 thousands of consumers – while denying passholders access to all of Defendant’s  
5 mountain resorts.

6 8. Plaintiffs seek relief in this action individually, and on behalf of all of  
7 Defendant’s customers nationwide that purchased Ikon Pass Products for the 2019-  
8 2020 season who, as of March 15, 2020, had not used up all of the days remaining on  
9 their Ikon Pass Products for Defendant’s violations of the California Consumer Legal  
10 Remedies Act (“CLRA”), Civil Code §§ 1750, *et seq.*, Unfair Competition Law  
11 (“UCL”), Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, False Advertising Law (“FAL”), Bus.  
12 & Prof. Code §§ 17500, *et seq.*, for breach of express warranties, negligent  
13 misrepresentation, fraud, unjust enrichment, money had and received, conversion,  
14 and breach of contract.

### 15 PARTIES

16 9. Plaintiff Milan Steijn is a citizen of California, residing in Orange  
17 County, California. Mr. Steijn and his wife are annual pass holders of the Ikon Pass  
18 Products, specifically of the Ikon Base Pass. Mr. Steijn purchased the Ikon Base  
19 Passes for himself and his wife in April of 2019 and paid \$1,398 (\$649 per pass). On  
20 March 15, 2020, Defendant closed all of its mountain resorts nationwide. Defendant  
21 has retained the full amount of his annual pass fees even though Plaintiff and his  
22 wife do not have access to any of Defendant’s resorts. Further, Defendant has not  
23 refunded Plaintiff any part of the annual pass fees for March 15 through the present,  
24 when Defendant’s resorts were closed (and continue to remain closed). Plaintiff  
25 purchased Defendant’s annual passes with the understanding that he and his wife  
26 would be able to access Defendant’s resorts through July 2020, so long as there was  
27 snow on the mountains. Plaintiff would not have paid for the Ikon Pass Products, or  
28 would not have paid for them on the same terms, had he known that he and his wife

1 would not have access to any of Defendant's resorts beyond March 15, 2020.

2 Plaintiff continues to face imminent harm, as Defendant retains Ikon Pass Product  
3 holders' fees while all of its resorts remain closed.

4 10. Plaintiff Abbas Gokal is a citizen of California, residing in Rancho  
5 Santa Margarita, California. Mr. Gokal and his family are annual pass holders of the  
6 Ikon Pass Products, specifically of the Ikon Pass. Mr. Gokal purchased the Ikon  
7 Passes for him, his wife, and three children in July of 2019 and paid \$2,945 (\$1049  
8 per adult pass, \$399 per child pass, and \$49 per child under 4 pass). On March 15,  
9 2020, Defendant closed all of its mountain resorts nationwide. Defendant has  
10 retained the full amount of his annual pass fees even though Plaintiff and his family  
11 do not have access to any of Defendant's resorts. Further, Defendant has not  
12 refunded Plaintiff any part of his annual pass fees for March 15 through the present,  
13 when Defendant's resorts were closed (and continue to remain closed). Plaintiff  
14 purchased Defendant's annual passes with the understanding that he and his family  
15 would be able to access Defendant's resorts through July 2020, so long as there was  
16 snow on the mountains. Plaintiff would not have paid for the Ikon Pass Products, or  
17 would not have paid for them on the same terms, had he known that he and his  
18 family would not have access to any of Defendant's resorts beyond March 15, 2020.  
19 Plaintiff continues to face imminent harm, as Defendant retains Ikon Pass Product  
20 holders' fees while all of its resorts remain closed.

21 11. Plaintiff Joseph Panganiban is a citizen of California, residing in Orange  
22 County, California. Mr. Panganiban and his family are annual pass holders of the  
23 Ikon Pass Products, specifically of the Ikon Base Pass. Mr. Panganiban purchased  
24 the Ikon Base Passes for him, his wife, and two children in March of 2019 and paid  
25 \$2,216 (\$619 per adult pass and \$489 per young adult pass). On March 15, 2020,  
26 Defendant closed all of its mountain resorts nationwide. Mr. Panganiban and his  
27 wife had yet to use their Ikon Pass Products at all because they were planning on  
28 skiing in March and April. Defendant has retained the full amount of his annual pass

1 fees even though Plaintiff and his family do not have access to any of Defendant's  
2 resorts. Further, Defendant has not refunded Plaintiff any part of his annual pass  
3 fees for March 15 through the present, when Defendant's resorts were closed (and  
4 continue to remain closed). Plaintiff signed up for Defendant's annual passes with  
5 the understanding that he and his family would be able to access Defendant's resorts  
6 through July 2020, so long as there was snow on the mountains. Plaintiff would not  
7 have paid for the Ikon Pass Products, or would not have paid for them on the same  
8 terms, had he known that he and his family would not have access to any of  
9 Defendant's resorts beyond March 15, 2020. Plaintiff continues to face imminent  
10 harm, as Defendant retains Ikon Pass Product holders' fees while all of its resorts  
11 remain closed.

12 12. Defendant Alterra Mountain Company U.S. Inc. is a Delaware  
13 corporation, with its principal place of business at 3501 Wazee Street, Suite 400  
14 Denver, CO 80021. Defendant offers consumers access to over 40 mountain resort  
15 locations through its Ikon Pass Products. Defendant conducts substantial business  
16 throughout the United States, and specifically in the state of California.

### 17 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

18 13. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §  
19 1332(d)(2)(A) because this case is a class action where the aggregate claims of all  
20 members of the proposed class are in excess of \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and  
21 costs, and most members of the proposed nationwide class are citizens of states  
22 different from the states of Defendant.

23 14. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant  
24 conducts substantial business within California such that Defendant has significant,  
25 continuous, and pervasive contacts with the State of California. Defendant is  
26 registered to do business in the State of California.



1           22. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all Class members and  
2 predominate over questions affecting only individual Class members. Common legal  
3 and factual questions include, but are not limited to whether Defendant has breached  
4 its contract with its customers and whether its actions are fraudulent and unlawful.

5           23. The claims of the named Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Class  
6 in that the named Plaintiffs were exposed to Defendant's false and misleading  
7 advertising and were charged for their Ikon Pass Product promising mountain access  
8 through July 2020 despite being barred from entry into Defendant's resort properties  
9 and suffered losses as a result.

10           24. Plaintiffs are adequate representatives of the Class because Plaintiffs'  
11 interests do not conflict with the interests of the Class members Plaintiffs seek to  
12 represent, Plaintiffs have retained competent counsel experienced in prosecuting  
13 class actions, and Plaintiffs intend to prosecute this action vigorously. The interests  
14 of Class members will be fairly and adequately protected by Plaintiffs and their  
15 counsel.

16           25. The class mechanism is superior to other available means for the fair  
17 and efficient adjudication of the claims of the Class members. Each individual Class  
18 member may lack the resources to undergo the burden and expense of individual  
19 prosecution of the complex and extensive litigation necessary to establish  
20 Defendant's liability. Individualized litigation increases the delay and expense to all  
21 parties and multiplies the burden on the judicial system presented by the complex  
22 legal and factual issues of this case. Individualized litigation also presents a  
23 potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments. In contrast, the class action  
24 device presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefits of single  
25 adjudication, economy of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court on  
26 the issue of Defendant's liability. Class treatment of the liability issues will ensure  
27 that all claims and claimants are before this Court for consistent adjudication of the  
28 liability issues.

**COUNT I**

**Violation of California’s Consumers Legal Remedies Act,  
California Civil Code §§ 1750, *et seq.*  
(Injunctive Relief Only)**

1  
2  
3  
4       26. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in  
5 all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

6       27. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of members of the  
7 proposed Nationwide Class against Defendant. Plaintiffs also bring this claim  
8 individually and on behalf of members of the proposed California Subclass against  
9 Defendant.

10       28. Plaintiffs and Class members are consumers who paid fees for use of  
11 Defendant’s mountain resorts for personal, family or household purposes. Plaintiffs  
12 and the Class are “consumers” as that term is defined by the CLRA in Cal. Civ. Code  
13 § 1761(d).

14       29. Defendant’s mountain resort access that Plaintiffs and Class members  
15 purchased from Defendant was a “service” within the meaning of Cal. Civ. Code §  
16 1761(b).

17       30. Defendant’s actions, representations, and conduct have violated, and  
18 continue to violate the CLRA, because they extend to transactions that intended to  
19 result, or which have resulted in, the sale of services to consumers.

20       31. Defendant’s advertising that consumers would have access to all of its  
21 ski resorts and that its customers would have access to its ski resorts upon paying a  
22 fee is false and misleading to a reasonable consumer, including Plaintiffs, because  
23 Defendant in fact closed all of its mountain resorts while continuing to retain the full  
24 price consumers’ Ikon Pass Products.

25       32. California’s Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code §  
26 1770(a)(5), prohibits “[r]epresenting that goods or services have sponsorship,  
27 approval, characteristics, ingredients, uses, benefits, or quantities which they do not  
28 have or that a person has a sponsorship, approval, status, affiliation, or connection

1 which he or she does not have.” By engaging in the conduct set forth herein,  
2 Defendant violated and continue to violate Section 1770(a)(5) of the CLRA, because  
3 Defendant’s conduct constitutes unfair methods of competition and unfair or  
4 fraudulent acts or practices, in that Defendant misrepresent the particular  
5 characteristics, benefits and quantities of the services.

6 33. Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(7) prohibits representing that goods or  
7 services are of a particular standard, quality, or grade, or that goods are of a  
8 particular style or model, if they are of another. By engaging in the conduct set forth  
9 herein, Defendant violated and continues to violate Section 1770(a)(7) of the CLRA,  
10 because Defendant’s conduct constitutes unfair methods of competition and unfair or  
11 fraudulent acts or practices, in that Defendant misrepresents the particular standard,  
12 quality or grade of the services.

13 34. Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(9) further prohibits “[a]dvertising goods or  
14 services with intent not to sell them as advertised.” By engaging in the conduct set  
15 forth herein, Defendant violated and continues to violate Section 1770(a)(9), because  
16 Defendant’s conduct constitutes unfair methods of competition and unfair or  
17 fraudulent acts or practices, in that Defendant advertises services with the intent not  
18 to sell the services as advertised.

19 35. Plaintiffs and the Class acted reasonably when they purchased  
20 Defendant’s Ikon Pass Products on the belief that Defendant’s representations were  
21 true and lawful.

22 36. Plaintiffs and the Class suffered injuries caused by Defendant because:  
23 (a) they would not have purchased or paid for Defendant’s passes absent Defendant’s  
24 representations and omission of a warning that it would retain members’ passholder  
25 fees while all mountain resorts nationwide are closed; (b) they would not have  
26 purchased passes on the same terms absent Defendant’s representations and  
27 omissions; (c) they paid a price premium for Defendant’s passes based on  
28

1 Defendant's misrepresentations and omissions; and (d) Defendant's passes did not  
2 have the characteristics, benefits, or quantities as promised.

3 37. Under California Civil Code § 1780(a), Plaintiff and members of the  
4 Class seek injunctive and equitable relief for Defendant's violations of the CLRA.  
5 Plaintiff has mailed an appropriate demand letter consistent with California Civil  
6 Code § 1782(a). If Defendant fails to take corrective action within 30 days of receipt  
7 of the demand letter, Plaintiff will amend his complaint to include a request for  
8 damages as permitted by Civil Code § 1782(d).

9 38. Wherefore, Plaintiffs seek injunctive and equitable relief for these  
10 violations of the CLRA.

## 11 **COUNT II**

### 12 **Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law, 13 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.***

14 39. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in  
15 all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

16 40. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the members of  
17 the proposed Nationwide Class against Defendant. Plaintiffs also bring this claim  
18 individually and on behalf of members of the proposed California Subclass against  
19 Defendant.

20 41. Defendant is subject to California's Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus.  
21 & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* The UCL provides, in pertinent part: "Unfair  
22 competition shall mean and include unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practices  
23 and unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising ...."

24 42. Defendant's advertising that its passholders would have access to its  
25 mountain resorts, and that its customers would have access to its mountain resorts  
26 upon paying a pass fee is false and misleading to a reasonable consumer, including  
27 Plaintiffs, because Defendant in fact closed all of its mountain resorts while  
28 continuing to retain the full price of customers' Ikon Pass Products.



1           49. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the members of  
2 the proposed Nationwide Class against Defendant. Plaintiffs also bring this claim  
3 individually and on behalf of the members of the proposed California Subclass  
4 against Defendant.

5           50. California’s False Advertising Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500,  
6 *et seq.*, makes it “unlawful for any person to make or disseminate or cause to be  
7 made or disseminated before the public in this state, ... in any advertising device ... or  
8 in any other manner or means whatever, including over the Internet, any statement,  
9 concerning ... personal property or services, professional or otherwise, or  
10 performance or disposition thereof, which is untrue or misleading and which is  
11 known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be untrue or  
12 misleading.”

13           51. Defendant engaged in a scheme of retaining customers’ pass fees while  
14 100 percent of its mountain resorts were closed. Defendant’s advertising and  
15 marketing of its passes as providing access its mountain resorts misrepresented  
16 and/or omitted the true content and nature of Defendant’s services. Defendant’s  
17 advertisements and inducements were made in California and come within the  
18 definition of advertising as contained in Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500, *et seq.* in that  
19 the promotional materials were intended as inducements to purchase passes, and are  
20 statements disseminated by Defendant to Plaintiffs and Class members. Defendant  
21 knew that these statements were unauthorized, inaccurate, and misleading.

22           52. Defendant’s advertising that passholders would have access to its  
23 mountain resorts and that its customers would have access to its mountain resorts  
24 upon paying a passholder fee is false and misleading to a reasonable consumer,  
25 including Plaintiffs, because Defendant in fact closed all of its mountain resorts  
26 while retaining the full price of customers’ Ikon Pass Products.







1 Dates.” However, Defendant in fact retains the full price for passes even when 100  
2 percent of its mountain resorts are closed to the public. These misrepresentations  
3 and omissions were made with knowledge of their falsehood.

4 73. The misrepresentations and omissions made by Defendant, upon which  
5 Plaintiffs and Class members reasonably and justifiably relied, were intended and  
6 actually induced Plaintiffs and Class members to Defendant’s passes.

7 74. The fraudulent actions of Defendant caused damage to Plaintiffs and  
8 Class members, who are entitled to damages and other legal and equitable relief as a  
9 result.

10 **COUNT VII**  
11 **Unjust Enrichment**

12 75. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in  
13 all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.

14 76. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the members of  
15 the proposed Nationwide Class against Defendant. Plaintiffs also bring this claim  
16 individually and on behalf of the members of the proposed California Subclass  
17 against Defendant.

18 77. Plaintiffs and members of the Class conferred benefits on Defendant by  
19 paying, and being charged, pass fees while 100 percent of Defendant’s mountain  
20 resorts were and remain closed.

21 78. Defendant has knowledge of such benefits.

22 79. Defendant has been unjustly enriched in retaining the revenues derived  
23 from Plaintiffs and Class members’ pass fees. Retention of those moneys under  
24 these circumstances is unjust and inequitable because Defendant is retaining its  
25 customers full pass fees while 100 percent of its mountain resorts remain closed.  
26 These misrepresentations and charges caused injuries to Plaintiffs and members of  
27 the Class because they would not have paid Defendant’s pass fees had the true facts  
28 been known.





- b) For an order certifying the California Subclass under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and naming Plaintiffs as representatives of the California Subclass and Plaintiffs’ attorneys as Class Counsel to represent the California Subclass members;
- c) For an order declaring that Defendant’s conduct violates the statutes and laws referenced herein;
- d) For an order finding in favor of Plaintiffs, the Class, and the California Subclass, on all counts asserted herein;
- e) For compensatory and punitive damages in amounts to be determined by the Court and/or jury;
- f) For prejudgment interest on all amounts awarded;
- g) For an order of restitution and all other forms of equitable monetary relief;
- h) For injunctive relief as pleaded or as the Court may deem proper; and
- i) For an order awarding Plaintiffs and the Class their reasonable attorneys’ fees (except on the breach of contract count) and expenses and costs of suit.

**JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all causes of action and issues so triable.

Dated: April 16, 2020

**BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**

By:           /s/ Blair E. Reed            
Blair E. Reed

Yeremey Krivoshey (State Bar No. 295032)  
Blair E. Reed (State Bar No. 316791)  
1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Telephone: (925) 300-4455  
Facsimile: (925) 407-2700  
E-mail: ykrivoshey@bursor.com  
breed@bursor.com

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

**BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**  
Scott A. Bursor (State Bar No. 276006)  
2665 S. Bayshore Dr., Suite 220  
Miami, FL 33133-5402  
Telephone: (305) 330-5512  
Facsimile: (305) 676-9006  
E-Mail: scott@bursor.com

**REICH RADCLIFFE & HOOVER LLP**  
Marc G. Reich (State Bar No. 159936)  
Adam T. Hoover (State Bar No. 243226)  
4675 MacArthur Court, Suite 550  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
Telephone: (949) 975-0512  
Email: mgr@reichradcliffe.com  
adhoover@reichradcliffe.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

