| Ca | se 2:18-cv-08605-JVS-SS Document 67 | Filed 06/11/20 Page 1 of 10 Page ID #:254 | | | |
|----------|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | Tina Wolfson, SBN 174806 twolfson@ahdootwolfson.com | | | | |
| 2 | Robert Ahdoot, SBN 172098 rahdoot@ahdootwolfson.com | | | | |
| 3 4 | Theodore Maya, SBN 223242 <i>tmaya@ahdootwolfson.com</i> Bradley King, SBN 274399 | | | | |
| 5 | bking@ahdootwolfson.com AHDOOT & WOLFSON, PC 10728 Lindbrook Drive | | | | |
| 6 7 | Los Angeles, California 90024 Telephone: (310) 474-9111 Facsimile: (310) 474-8585 | | | | |
| 8 | Counsel for Plaintiffs | | | | |
| 9 | [Additional Counsel on Signature Page] | | | | |
| 10 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | | |
| 11 | CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | | | |
| 12 | SOUTHERN DIVISION | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | PHILIP ALVAREZ, RANDALL BETTISON, MARC KELLEHER, and | | | | |
| 15 | DARLENE VAUGH, individually and | | | | |
| 16 | on behalf of all others similarly situated, | Case No. 2:18-cv-8605-JVS-SS | | | |
| 17 | Plaintiffs, | AMENDED CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT | | | |
| 18 | V. | DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL | | | |
| 19 | SIRIUS XM RADIO INC., | | | | |
| 20 | Defendant. | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | |
| 24 25 | | | | | |
| 23 26 | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 1 - | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Plaintiffs Philip Alvarez, Randall Bettison, Marc Kelleher, and Darlene Vaugh
 (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), individually and on behalf of the Class defined below of
 similarly situated persons, allege the following against Defendant Sirius XM Radio Inc.
 ("Defendant"), based upon personal knowledge with respect to themselves and on
 information and belief derived from, among other things, investigation of counsel and
 review of public documents as to all other matters:

SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Defendant owns various digital radio stations that transmit programming 8 via satellite. In an effort to gain subscribers and substantially increase revenue -9 especially at the outset of its operations - Defendant offered and sold lifetime 10 11 subscriptions to consumers. Purchasers of the lifetime subscriptions took a chance and paid large upfront lifetime subscription fees to Defendant with no guarantee that 12 Defendant would survive as an ongoing business, but in the hope that if Defendant did 13 survive, their lifetime subscription purchases would pay off over time. Defendant is 14 now failing to honor the lifetime subscriptions it sold to consumers, thereby harming 15 those consumers who purchased the lifetime subscriptions. 16

Plaintiffs are consumers harmed by Defendant's failure to honor the
 lifetime subscriptions Defendant sold to them. Plaintiffs seek to represent themselves
 as well as a class of all other consumers similarly situated to whom Defendant sold a
 lifetime subscription and whose lifetime subscription Defendant is not honoring.

21

7

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under the Class
Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2). The amount in controversy exceeds \$5
million exclusive of interest and costs. Plaintiffs and Defendant are citizens of different
states. There are more than 100 putative Class Members.

4. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it regularly
conducts business in California, has sufficient minimum contacts with California, and
the events giving rise to this matter arose out of those contacts. Defendant intentionally

availed itself of this jurisdiction by marketing and selling products and services to
 thousands of consumers in California.

5. Venue is appropriate pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391. A substantial portion
of the events and conduct giving rise to the violations alleged in this complaint occurred
in this District.

PARTIES

7 6. Plaintiff Philip Alvarez is an individual residing in Los Angeles County,
8 California.

9 7. Plaintiff Randall Bettison is an individual residing in Multnomah County,
10 Oregon.

8. Plaintiff Marc Kelleher is an individual residing in Cape May County,
New Jersey.

13 9. Plaintiff Darlene Vaugh is an individual residing in Atlantic County, New14 Jersey.

15 10. Defendant Sirius XM Radio Inc. is a Delaware corporation headquartered
16 in New York, New York, and doing business in the state of California. Defendant is a
17 wholly owned subsidiary of Sirius XM Holdings Inc.

11. Defendant was formed after the FCC approved the merger of XM Satellite
 Radio Holding, Inc. and Sirius Satellite Radio, Inc. in July of 2008. Upon its formation,
 Defendant assumed and acquired all duties, obligations, and liabilities of its
 predecessors.

22

6

STATEMENT OF FACTS

12. Defendant is a satellite radio service that transmits music, sports,
entertainment, comedy, talk, news, traffic and weather stations, as well as
"infotainment" services, in the United States on a subscription fee basis. Defendant
touts these stations as being superior to free terrestrial radio stations because they are
commercial free, crystal clear, and available across the continent. As of December 31,
2015, Defendant had approximately 29.6 million subscribers in the United States of

which approximately 24.3 million were self-pay subscribers and approximately 5.3
 million were paid promotional subscribers.

3 13. Defendant's satellite radios are primarily distributed through automakers, retail stores nationwide, and through Defendant's website. Defendant has agreements 4 with every major automaker to offer satellite radios as a factory or dealer-installed 5 option in the majority of vehicles sold in the United States. Most automakers include a 6 subscription to Defendant's radio service in the sale or lease of their new vehicles. In 7 certain cases, Defendant receives subscription payments from automakers in advance of 8 the activation of Defendant's service. Defendant shares with certain automakers a 9 portion of the revenues Defendant derives from subscribers using vehicles equipped to 10 11 receive Defendant's service. Defendant also reimburses various automakers for certain costs associated with the satellite radios installed in new vehicles, including, in certain 12 cases, hardware costs, engineering expenses and promotional and advertising expenses. 13

14 14. Defendant sells the right to listen to its programming to consumers and its
primary source of revenue is subscription fees, with most customers subscribing on an
annual, semi-annual, quarterly or monthly basis. Defendant offers discounts for prepaid
and longer-term (including "lifetime") subscription plans as well as discounts for
multiple subscriptions. Defendant also derives revenue from the sale of advertising on
select non-music channels, activation and other fees, the direct sale of satellite radios
and accessories, and other ancillary services, such as weather, traffic and data services.

21 15. At various times during its existence, Defendant has considered filing for bankruptcy protection. In an effort to gain subscribers and substantially increase 22 revenue - especially at the outset of its operations - Defendant offered and sold lifetime 23 subscriptions to consumers. Purchasers of the lifetime subscriptions took a chance and 24 paid large upfront lifetime subscription fees to Defendant with no guarantee that 25 Defendant would survive as an ongoing business, but in the hope that if Defendant did 26survive, their lifetime subscription purchase would pay off over time. Defendant is now 27 28

failing to honor the lifetime subscriptions it sold to consumers, thereby harming those
 consumers who purchased the lifetime subscriptions.

Defendant offered and sold lifetime subscriptions to consumers in 3 16. California and throughout the United States. Defendant systematically advertised and 4 sold its lifetime subscriptions to consumers by leading consumers to believe that such 5 lifetime subscriptions were for the lifetime of the consumer. However, when 6 consumers have tried to transfer their lifetime subscriptions from one receiver to 7 another or from one automobile to another, Defendant has taken the position that the 8 "lifetime" referred to is not the lifetime of the purchasing consumer, but the lifetime of 9 the receiver or automobile. 10

11 17. Defendant's refusal to honor the lifetime subscriptions has allowed it to
12 reap millions of dollars in profits while individual consumers find they have spent
13 hundreds of dollars for a lifetime subscription that is not as it was represented and not
14 as expected.

Plaintiffs purchased Sirius XM "lifetime" subscriptions directly from 18. 15 Defendant. No service agreement or other written agreement was provided to Plaintiffs 16 at the time of their purchase. At the time of purchase of their lifetime subscriptions, no 17 verbal or written notice was provided to Plaintiffs that the lifetime subscriptions were 18 subject to or conditioned upon a service agreement, other written agreement, or other 19 terms to be presented at a later date. At the time of purchase of their lifetime 20subscriptions, Plaintiffs understood "lifetime" to be their lifetimes, as is used in the 21 ordinary course of business. At the time of purchase of their lifetime subscriptions, 22 Plaintiffs received no verbal or written notice that "lifetime" meant anything other than 23 their lifetimes. At the time of purchase of their lifetime subscriptions, Plaintiffs 24 received no verbal or written notice that the lifetime subscriptions were limited to the 25 original devices only, were subject to a limited number of device transfers, or were 26subject to any other encumbrance. When Plaintiffs subsequently attempted to transfer 27 28

their lifetime subscriptions to other receiver devices, Defendant required Plaintiffs to
 pay \$75 transfer fees to continue the lifetime subscriptions and/or refused the transfers.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

19. Plaintiffs bring this class action lawsuit individually and on behalf of the proposed Class members under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

20. Plaintiffs seek certification of the following Class:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

23

24

25

26

27

28

All persons in the United States who purchased a paid subscription from Sirius XM (or one of its predecessors) that was marketed as a "lifetime plan" or "lifetime subscription."

Specifically excluded from the above Class are: Defendant and its parents,
subsidiaries, or any entities in which it has a controlling interest, as well as Defendant's
officers, directors, employees, affiliates, legal representatives, heirs, predecessors,
successors, and assigns. Also excluded are any Judges to whom this case is assigned as
well as their judicial staff and immediate family members.

15 21. The proposed Class meets the criteria for certification under Federal Rule16 of Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b):

17 22. *Numerosity.* There are hundreds of thousands of putative Class members
18 throughout the United States. Class members are so numerous that joinder of all
19 members is impracticable.

20 23. *Commonality.* Common questions of law and fact exist and predominate
21 over any questions affecting only individual Class members. The common questions
22 include:

- a. Whether Defendant offered to Plaintiffs and Class members"lifetime" satellite radio subscriptions;
- b. Whether Plaintiffs and Class members accepted Defendant's offer for "lifetime" satellite radio subscriptions;

| 1 | c. Whether Defendant breached its agreements with Plaintiffs and | |
|----|---|--|
| 2 | | Class members by failing to honor the lifetime subscriptions without |
| 3 | | encumbrances never disclosed at the time of purchase; |
| 4 | d. | Whether Defendant acted in bad faith or abused its discretion in |
| 5 | | failing to honor the lifetime subscriptions without encumbrances |
| 6 | | never disclosed at the time of purchase; |
| 7 | e. | Whether Defendant's failure to honor the lifetime subscriptions |
| 8 | | without encumbrances never disclosed at the time of purchase was |
| 9 | | contrary to Plaintiffs' and Class members' objectively reasonable |
| 10 | | expectations; |
| 11 | f. | Whether Defendant's promise of a "lifetime" satellite radio |
| 12 | | subscription was likely to mislead objectively reasonable consumers; |
| 13 | g. | Whether Plaintiffs and Class members are entitled to restitution and |
| 14 | | other equitable relief; |
| 15 | h. | Whether Plaintiffs and Class members are entitled to damages, and |
| 16 | i. | Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in this type of |
| 17 | | conduct. |
| 18 | 24. Typic | cality. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of Class members' claims. |
| 19 | Plaintiffs and the Class members all sustained injury as a direct result of Defendant's | |
| 20 | practice of regularly failing to honor the lifetime subscriptions without encumbrances | |
| 21 | never disclosed at the time of purchase. | |
| 22 | 25. <i>Adequacy</i> . Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect Class members' | |
| 23 | interests. Plaintiffs have no interests antagonistic to Class members' interests, and | |
| 24 | Plaintiffs have retained counsel who have considerable experience and success in | |
| 25 | prosecuting complex class action and consumer protection cases. | |
| 26 | 26. <i>Superiority</i> . A class action is the superior method for fairly and efficiently | |
| 27 | adjudicating this controversy for the following reasons without limitation: | |
| 28 | | |

a. Class members' claims are relatively small compared to the burden
 and expense required to litigate their claims individually, so it would be impracticable
 for Class members to seek individual redress for Defendant's illegal and deceptive
 conduct;

b. Even if Class members could afford individual litigation, the court
system could not. Individual litigation creates the potential for inconsistent or
contradictory judgments and increases the delay and expense to all parties and the court
system. By contrast, a class action presents far fewer management difficulties and
provides the benefits of single adjudication, economy of scale, and comprehensive
supervision by a single court; and

c. Plaintiffs anticipate no unusual difficulties in managing this classaction.

CAUSE OF ACTION

Breach of Contract

15 27. Plaintiffs incorporate all previous factual allegations as if fully set forth16 herein.

28. Plaintiffs and Class members have entered into contracts with Defendant.

18 29. Defendant offered Plaintiffs and Class members lifetime satellite radio19 subscriptions in exchange for large upfront fees.

20 30. Plaintiffs and Class members have paid for their lifetime subscriptions and
21 thus fully performed their obligations under the contracts.

22

13

14

17

31. Defendant is now refusing to honor the lifetime subscriptions.

32. By refusing to honor the lifetime subscriptions for the life of Plaintiffs and
Class members who have purchased them, without encumbrances never disclosed at the
time of purchase, Defendant has breached the contracts.

33. This breach has damaged Plaintiffs and Class members in that they have
not received the benefits of their bargains with Defendant.

28

| 1 | 34. As a result of Defendant's breach, Plaintiffs and the Class Members | |
|---|---|--|
| 2 | sustained damages in an amount to be determined by this Court, including the costs of | |
| 3 | the lifetime subscriptions and reasonable attorneys' fees. | |
| 4 | PRAYER FOR RELIEF | |
| 5 | WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of the Class set forth | |
| 6 | herein, respectfully request that the Court order relief and enter judgment against | |

Defendant as follows: 7

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

27

28

A. An order certifying the proposed Class, appointing Plaintiffs as class 8 representatives of the proposed Class and their undersigned counsel as Class counsel; 9

A judgment awarding Plaintiffs and Class members appropriate monetary B. 10 relief, including actual damages, restitution, and disgorgement; 11

A judgment awarding Plaintiffs and Class members appropriate injunctive C. 12 relief, including reinstatement of terminated lifetime subscriptions without 13 encumbrances on device transfers; 14

Pre- and post-judgment interest; D.

E. Attorneys' fees, expenses, and the costs of this action; and

All other and further relief as the Court deems necessary, just, and proper. F.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Respectfully submitted,

tmaya@ahdootwolfson.com

Bradley King, SBN 274399 bking@ahdootwolfson.com

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury for all issues so triable under the law.

22 DATED: June 11, 2020 /s/ Tina Wolfson 23 Tina Wolfson, SBN 174806 twolfson@ahdootwolfson.com 24 Robert Ahdoot, SBN 172098 25 rahdoot@ahdootwolfson.com Theodore Maya, SBN 223242 26

AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

| 1 | AHDOOT & WOLFSON, PC 10728 Lindbrook Drive | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2 | Los Angeles, California 90024 | | |
| 3 | Telephone: (310) 474-9111 | | |
| 4 | Facsimile: (310) 474-8585 | | |
| 5 | Cornelius P. Dukelow*, OK Bar No. 19086 cdukelow@abingtonlaw.com | | |
| 6 | ABINGTON COLE + ELLERY | | |
| 7 | 320 S. Boston Avenue, Suite 1130 | | |
| 8 | Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103 Talanhana & Fassimila: (018) 588-3400 | | |
| | Telephone & Facsimile: (918) 588-3400 | | |
| 9 | Keith S. Dubanevich*, OR Bar No. 975200 | | |
| 10 | kdubanevich@stollberne.com STOLL STOLL BERNE LOKTING & | | |
| 11 | STOLL STOLL BERNE LOKTING & SHLACHTER P.C. | | |
| 12 | 209 SW Oak Street, Suite 500 | | |
| 13 | Portland, Oregon 97204 | | |
| 14 | Telephone: (503) 227-1600 Facsimile: (503) 227-6840 | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | * <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> application to be submitted | | |
| 17 | Counsel for Plaintiffs | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| | | | |
| 28 | | | |
| | AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT | | |
| | - 10 - | | |
| | | | |