1	HUSSIN LAW FIRM	FRANCIS & MAILMAN, P.C.					
2	Tammy Hussin (Bar No. 155290)	James A. Francis*					
3	1596 N. Coast Highway 101 Encinitas, CA 92024	David Searles* 1600 Market St. Suite 2510					
4	Tel: (877) 677-5397	Philadelphia, PA 19103					
5	Fax: (877) 667-1547 tammy@hussinlaw.com	Tel: (215) 735-8600 Fax: (215) 940-8000					
6		jfrancis@consumerlawfirm.com					
7	THE GOLAN LAW FIRM, LLP	dsearles@consumerlawfirm.com					
8	Yvette Golan* 1712 N Street, N.W., Suite 302						
9	Washington, DC 20036						
10	Tel: (866) 298-4150, ext. 101 Fax: (928) 441-8250						
11	ygolan@tgfirm.com						
12	* Pro hac vice pending						
13							
14	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Haley Martinez,						
15	Matthew Sheridan, and the Class	-					
16							
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
18	HALEY MARTINEZ and MATTHEW)					
19		CASE NUMBER: '20 CV1946 GPC WVG					
20	Plaintiffs,						
21	·						
22	V.	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT					
23	UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO,) Demand for Jury Trial					
24	Defendant.						
25							
26							
27	Plaintiffs Halev Martinez and Matthe	w Sheridan ("Plaintiffs") bring this action					
28	on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated against Defendant University						

1 of San Diego ("USD"), and complain and allege upon personal knowledge as to 2 themselves and their own acts and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon 3 | information and belief, including investigation conducted by their attorneys, and say:

NATURE OF THE CASE I.

5

9

11

14

20

21

26

- 1. USD is a prestigious private university in San Diego, California, 6 providing higher education in the arts, sciences, law, business, nursing and health science, engineering, leadership and education, and peace studies. Plaintiffs are students at USD's Paralegal Certificate Program.
- On March 12, 2020, USD announced that it was canceling in-person 10 classes due to the pandemic of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 ("COVID-19").
- 3. Plaintiffs do not dispute that USD's decision to cease in-person 12 instruction was warranted. Plaintiffs ask merely to be refunded the money they spent 13 for educational services that were not provided.
- 4. Prior to its March 12, 2020 announcement that it would cease in-person 15 instruction, USD forbade students from transferring credits earned through an online 16 format. For the few classes for which USD provided online instruction, USD charged 17 | far less in tuition. For example, USD charged \$1,580 per unit of on-campus classes for 18 its Master of Science in Health Care Informatics, but charged 41% less – \$925 per unit - for the online version of the same class, for the same degree.²

USD Petition to Transfer Credits, available at http://web.archive.org/web/20200611012018/https://www.sandiego.edu/cas/student-23 resources/transferring-credits.php (last viewed 9/22/2020). See also USD School of Business Requirements ("Currently, the School of Business does not accept any online courses or hybrid courses for continuing students at the undergraduate level.") available at https://catalogs.sandiego.edu/undergraduate/colleges-schools/businessadministration/#requirementstext (last viewed 9/22/20).

Financial Aid for Graduate Students at USD, available at https://onlinedegrees.sandiego.edu/become-a-student/tuition-financial-aid/ (last viewed 9/24/2020).

University of San Diego								
M.S. in Health Care Informatics								
M.S. In Health Care Informatics								
On-Campus								
• Cost per unit: \$1,580								
• Total units: 42								
Total program tuition: \$66,360								
Online								
• Cost per unit: \$925								
Total units: 37								
• Total program tuition: \$34,225								

- 5. Though USD could no longer provide the promised hours of instruction, USD demanded that students pay the full tuition price.
 - 6. Adding insult to injury, USD in fact *increased* its tuition.
- 7. Similarly, students paid fees for services and access to facilities and equipment over the full semester. Though USD provided these services and facility/equipment access for only part of the semester, and could not provide them for the full semester, USD demanded that students pay fees for the entire semester.
- 8. While the effects of the COVID-19 crisis are shared by all individuals and institutions across the country, USD has failed to apportion the burden in an equitable manner or consistent with its obligations as an educational institution.
- 9. USD is not entitled, by either contract or equitable principles, to pass the entire cost of its COVID-19 related closure to its students and their families. Plaintiffs and the putative class are entitled to a partial refund of the tuition, fees, and other related payments for in-person educational services, access to facilities, and/or related opportunities for which they paid that USD did not provide.
- 10. USD's deeply discounted online course tuition reflects the inability of online classes to replicate the full academic opportunities and experiences of in-person

9

14

19

20

21

26

28

1 | instruction. Remote learning options cannot replace the comprehensive educational $2\parallel$ experience promised by USD. Access to facilities, materials, laboratories, faculty, 3 student collaboration, and the opportunity for on campus living, school events, dialogue, feedback and critique are essential to the in-person educational experience.

- 11. Plaintiffs and the putative class contracted and paid for an education, not 6 course credits. They paid for the robust education and full experience of academic life $7\parallel$ on USD's campus; remote online learning cannot provide the same value as in-person education.
- 12. As a result, USD has financially damaged Plaintiffs and the putative class 10 members. Plaintiffs bring this suit because Plaintiffs and the class members did not 11 receive the full value of the services for which they paid. They lost the benefit of their 12 | bargain and/or suffered out-of-pocket loss. They are entitled to recover compensatory damages, trebling where permitted, and attorneys' fees and costs.
- 13. Plaintiffs seek, for themselves and the putative class members, a return 15 of a prorated portion of the tuition, fees and other related costs, proportionate to the 16 diminished value of online classes and the amount of time in the Spring 2020 and 17 | following semesters when USD ceased in-person classes, campus services and access 18 to campus facilities, continuing through to such time as USD reinstates in-person classes.

II. **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 14. The Court has original jurisdiction of this action pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d), because at least one member of the Class, as defined below, is a citizen of a different state than USD, there are more than 100 24 members of the Class, and the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00), exclusive of interest and costs.
- Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because 15. 27 USD is headquartered in this district.

5

6

10

14

15

19

21

26

16. The Court has personal jurisdiction over USD because USD is $2\parallel$ headquartered in this district, because many of the acts and transactions giving rise to 3 | this action occurred in this district, and because USD conducts substantial business 4 in this district.

III. **PARTIES**

- 17. Plaintiff Haley Martinez is a citizen and resident of the State of California. 7 Plaintiff Martinez is attending USD's Paralegal Certificate Program during the Fall 8 2020 semester. Plaintiff Martinez paid, either directly or through a third party paying 9 on her behalf, \$6,840 in tuition for the 2020 Fall semester (accelerated program).
- 18. Plaintiff Matthew Sheridan is a citizen and resident of the State of California. Plaintiff Sheridan is attending USD's Paralegal Certificate Program during 12 the Spring 2020, Summer 2020, and Fall 2020 semesters. Plaintiff Sheridan paid, 13 either directly or through a third party paying on his behalf, \$6,525 in tuition for the 2020 Spring, Summer, and Fall semesters.
- USD is a private research university comprised of seven constituent 16 schools. USD had a total enrollment of 5,919 undergraduate students, 2,450 graduate 17 students, and 812 law students for the 2019-2020 academic year. USD reported it had 18 an endowment of \$546 million for the 2019 fiscal year.

IV. **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

Contract Terms $20\|\mathbf{A}.$

- 20. Plaintiffs and Class members entered into a contract with USD whereby, 22 | in exchange for the payment of tuition, fees and other related costs, USD would 23 provide an agreed-upon number of classes through in-person instruction (as described 24 | in the course catalog) and access to physical resources and school facilities such as 25 | libraries, laboratories, and classrooms.
- 21. USD committed to providing the courses as described in its marketing 27 materials, website, and the course catalog. As USD promises, "The catalog is the 28 official record of courses offered by USD and has an annual deadline of March 1 for

USD's changes to its Paralegal Certificate Program have not yet been approved by the American Bar Association.

1 classes and effectively closed its campus.

2

5

6

11

14

18

20

21

- 26. While USD's decision to close campus and end in-person classes was 3 warranted by circumstances, it effectively breached or terminated the contract USD $4\|$ had with each and every student and tuition provider, who paid for the opportunity to participate fully in the academic life on the USD campus.
- 27. Though all in-person instruction ended after USD's March 12, 2020 $7\parallel$ announcement, some classes were taught in an online format beginning March 23, 8 2020. Even students with concentrations in areas where in-person instruction is 9 especially crucial (such as music, theatre, and the sciences), USD provided either no 10 | instruction or only remote, online instruction.
- 28. For example, while USD provided online instruction for some of Plaintiff 12 | Sheridan's Spring 2020 classes after its March 12, 2020 closure announcement, it provided fewer hours of instruction and fewer days of instruction than promised.
- As a result of the closure of USD's campuses and facilities, USD has 29. 15 failed to deliver the educational services, facilities, access and/or opportunities for 16 which Plaintiffs and the putative class contracted and paid, either directly or through 17 a third-party on their behalf.
 - 30. On July 29, 2020, less than a month before the Fall semester began for most students, USD canceled all in-person classes for the Fall 2020 semester and announced that all Fall 2020 semester courses would be taught only online.
- 31. Though Plaintiffs and members of the Class paid USD tuition in exchange for a full semester of in-person education, USD ceased to provide the inperson education it promised, and thus has failed to uphold its side of the agreement. 24 Nonetheless, USD insists that students uphold their side of the agreement, and refuses 25 to refund tuition and related expenses.
- 32. In so doing, USD is attempting to replace the irreplaceable – on-campus 27 | life at an elite university – with "virtual learning" via online classes, and is attempting 28 to pass off this substitute educational experience as the same as or just as good as full

1 participation in the university's academic life.

2

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

28

33. Plaintiffs and members of the Class paid USD tuition in reliance on its 3 promise of teaching a certain number of courses in an in-person course format and with in-person facility access. Plaintiffs did not choose to attend and/or pay tuition for 5 an online institution of higher learning, but instead chose to attend USD's institution 6 and enroll on an in-person basis.

C. **Inferiority of Online Educational Experience**

- At least one academic study found that "[o]nline courses do less to 9 promote academic success than do in person courses." The study found that:
 - a) Taking a course online reduced student achievement in that course by .44 points on the traditional four-point grading scale, a full onethird of a standard deviation:
 - b) Specifically, students taking the in-person course earned roughly a B- (2.8 GPA) versus a C (2.4 GPA) for students taking an online version of the same course:
 - Taking a course online also reduces future grades by 0.42 points c) for courses taken in the same subject area in the following semester; and
 - d) Taking an online course reduced the probability of the student remaining enrolled in the university a year later by over ten percentage points.
- 22 | Eric P. Bettinger et al., Virtual Classrooms: How Online College Courses Affect 23 | Student Success, American Economic Review, Vol. 107, No. 9, p. 2857.
- 35. The move to online-only classes deprived students of the opportunity to 25 | benefit from a wide variety of academic and student events, on-campus entertainment, 26 facilities, and athletic programs, which provided considerable value to Plaintiffs and 27 the Class members.
 - 36. The online learning options USD offered for the Spring 2020, Summer

8

14

17

18

21

23

24

1 | 2020, and Fall 2020 semesters, though consistent with safety measures, cannot provide 2 the academic and collegiate experience USD extols.

- 37. For example, USD lauds its Paralegal Certificate Program as giving 4 students "[i]nternships to gain real world experience and hit the ground running."⁵ 5 Plaintiff Sheridan attended the internship program at USD in the Summer 2020 6 semester. But instead of providing the "real world" internship as promised, USD 7 provided only a "simulated" internship.
- USD itself recognized that the "simulated" internship it provided was not 38. 9 reasonably equivalent to its promised internship; USD instructed students such as 10 Plaintiff Sheridan that while the normal internship program qualified as "experience" 11 and could be listed as such in their resume, the internship program USD actually 12 provided qualified only as "education," and could not be listed as "experience" in their 13 resume.
- USD's own policies recognize the inferiority of online classes. For 39. 15 example, as of June 2020, USD forbade students from transferring course credits 16 earned through an online format.⁶

USD Paralegal Program, Prospective Students, "Why Choose USD's Paralegal Program?" available at

https://www.sandiego.edu/law/academics/paralegal/prospective-

students.php#content-accordion3 (last viewed 9/29/20). See also USD Paralegal Studies, Curriculum ("each student in the day program completes an internship in a corporation, law office, legal clinic or government agency."), available at https://catalogs.sandiego.edu/graduate/colleges-schools/paralegal-studies/#text (last

viewed 9/29/20).

USD Petition to Transfer Credits, available at http://web.archive.org/web/20200611012018/https://www.sandiego.edu/cas/studentresources/transferring-credits.php (last viewed 9/22/2020). See also USD School of Business Requirements ("Currently, the School of Business does not accept any online courses or hybrid courses for continuing students at the undergraduate level.") available at https://catalogs.sandiego.edu/undergraduate/colleges-schools/businessadministration/#requirementstext (last viewed 9/22/20).

Case 3:20-cv-01946-GPC-WVG Document 1 Filed 10/01/20 PageID.10 Page 10 of 20

Lower Tuition for Online Education D.

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

23

- 42. In-person education is worth more than online education.
- Accordingly, the tuition and fees for in-person instruction at USD are 43. 4 higher than tuition and fees for its own online classes and for other online institutions. Such costs cover not just the academic instruction, but encompass an entirely different experience which includes but is not limited to:
 - Face to face interaction with professors, mentors, and peers; a)
 - Access to facilities such as libraries, laboratories, computer labs, b) and study rooms;
 - Student governance and student unions; c)
 - d) Extra-curricular activities, groups, intramural sports, etc.;
 - Student art, cultures, and other activities; e)
 - Social development and independence; f)
 - Hands on learning and experimentation; and g)
 - Networking and mentorship opportunities. h)
- 44. The fact that USD students paid a higher price for an in-person education 17 than they would have paid for an online education is illustrated by the vast price 18 difference in USD's in-person, on-campus programs versus USD's own online learning program.
- 45. For example, USD charged \$1,580 per unit of on-campus classes for its 21 Master of Science in Health Care Informatics, but charged 41% less – \$925 per unit – 22 for the online version of the same class, for the same degree.

Financial Aid for Graduate Students at USD, available at https://onlinedegrees.sandiego.edu/become-a-student/tuition-financial-aid/ (last viewed 9/24/2020). Compare USD Undergraduate Educational Cost, available at https://www.sandiego.edu/one-stop/tuition-and-fees/undergraduate.php (last viewed 9/24/2020); USD Graduate and Doctoral Educational Cost, available at

²⁸ https://www.sandiego.edu/one-stop/tuition-and-fees/graduate.php_(last viewed 9/24/2020); USD School of Law Cost of Attendance, available at

$\|\mathbf{E}_{\bullet}\|$ **Damages**

1

9

111

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 46. Through this lawsuit, Plaintiffs seek for themselves and Class members 3 USD's disgorgement of the pro-rated portion of tuition and fees, proportionate to the 4 amount of time that remained in the Spring 2020 semester when classes moved online and campus services ceased being provided, accounting for the diminished value of educational opportunities, the reduced hours of instruction, as well as for each subsequent semester and continuing until USD resumes in-person classes. Plaintiffs seek return of these amounts on behalf of themselves and the Class as defined below.
- Plaintiffs also seek damages relating to USD's passing off an online, 47. 10 "virtual" college experience as similar in kind to full immersion in the academic life of a college campus.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS V.

Plaintiffs seeks to represent a class defined as: 48.

> Any person who paid or caused to be paid tuition and/or fees to attend the University of San Diego when classes and/or coursework were limited in whole or in part to online attendance as a result of or in connection with COVID-19.

Specifically excluded from the Class are USD, USD's officers, directors, trustees and agents, the judge assigned to this action, and any member of the judge's immediate family.

- Subject to additional information obtained through further investigation and discovery, the foregoing definition of the Class may be expanded or narrowed by amendment or amended complaint.
- 50. **Numerosity.** The members of the Class are geographically dispersed and are so numerous that individual joinder is impracticable. Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs reasonably estimate that there are thousands of members in the Class.

https://www.sandiego.edu/law/financial-aid/cost-of-attendance/ (last viewed 9/24/2020).

14 15

16

17 18

19

23

28

1 Although the precise number of Class members is unknown to Plaintiffs at this time, 2 the true number of Class members is known by USD and may be determined through 3 discovery. Class members may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail and/or 4 publication through the distribution records of USD and third-party retailers and vendors.

- 51. Existence and predominance of common questions of law and fact. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class and predominate 8 over any questions affecting only individual Class members. These common legal and 9 factual questions include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - whether USD accepted money from Class members in exchange a) for the promise to provide services;
 - **b**) whether USD provided the services for which Class members contracted:
 - c) whether Class members are entitled to a refund for that portion of the tuition and fees that was contracted for services that USD did not provide; and
 - d) whether USD is liable to Plaintiffs and the Class for unjust enrichment.
- 52. **Typicality.** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the other 20 members of the Class in that, among other things, all Class members were similarly situated and were comparably injured through USD's wrongful conduct as set forth 22 herein. Further, there are no defenses available to USD that are unique to Plaintiff.
- 53. **Adequacy of Representation.** Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately 24 protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiffs have retained counsel that is highly 25 experienced in complex consumer class action litigation, and Plaintiffs intend to 26 vigorously prosecute this action on behalf of the Class. Furthermore, Plaintiffs have no 27 | interests that are antagonistic to those of the Class.
 - 54. **Superiority.** A class action is superior to all other available means for the

1 fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. The damages or other financial 2 detriment suffered by individual Class members are relatively small compared to the $3\parallel$ burden and expense of individual litigation of their claims against USD. It would, thus, $4\parallel$ be virtually impossible for the Class on an individual basis, to obtain effective redress 5 for the wrongs committed against them. Furthermore, even if Class members could 6 afford such individualized litigation, the court system could not. Individualized 7 litigation would create the danger of inconsistent or contradictory judgments arising 8 from the same set of facts. Individualized litigation would also increase the delay and 9 expense to all parties and the court system from the issues raised by this action. By 10 contrast, the class action device provides the benefits of adjudication of these issues in 11 a single proceeding, economies of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court, and presents no unusual management difficulties under the circumstances. 55. In the alternative, the Class may also be certified because: a) the prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members

- would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual Class members that would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the USD; and/or
- b) the prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other Class members not parties to the adjudications, or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests; and/or
- c) USD has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class as a whole, thereby making appropriate final declaratory and/or injunctive relief with respect to the members of the Class as a whole.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

COUNT I

2

Breach of Contract

3 4

56. Plaintiffs restate, reallege, and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.

5

57. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the members of 6 the Class against USD.

7

58. Through its policies, the admission agreement, and payment of tuition 8 and fees, Plaintiffs and each member of the Class entered into a binding contract with 9 USD.

10

59. As part of the contract, and in exchange for the aforementioned 11 consideration, USD promised to provide in-person education services, including in-12 person instruction and access to on-campus resources, for the full duration of the 13 | Spring 2020 semester, and continuing into the 2020-2021 academic year.

60. Plaintiffs and Class members fulfilled their end of the bargain when they 15 paid monies due for tuition, fees, and related expenses.

16

14

USD has failed to provide the contracted-for services but has retained 17 tuition monies paid by Plaintiffs and the Class, and refuses to issue a corresponding 18 tuition adjustment.

19

62. Plaintiffs and members of the Class have suffered damage as a direct and 20 proximate result of USD's breach, including but not limited to deprivation of the education, experience, and services that they were promised and for which they have 22 already paid.

23

63. As a direct and proximate result of USD's breach, Plaintiffs and the Class 24 | are entitled to damages, to be decided by the trier of fact in this action, to include but 25 | not be limited to reimbursement of certain tuition, fees, and other expenses that were 26 collected by USD for services that USD has failed to deliver.

27

COUNT II

3

4

5

7

11

12

14

17

20

21

22

24

26

Unjust Enrichment

- 64. Plaintiffs restate, reallege, and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 65. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the Class against USD, and in the alternative to Count I.
- 66. Plaintiffs and members of the Class conferred a benefit on USD in the 8 form of monies paid for tuition, fees, and related expenses in exchange for certain 9 service and promises. This tuition was intended to cover in-person educational services 10 for the academic semester.
 - 67. USD voluntarily accepted and retained this benefit by accepting payment.
 - 68. USD has retained this benefit even though it ceased providing the full education, experience, and services for which the tuition and fees were collected.
- 69. The online education services USD substituted for the in-person 15 deducation for which Plaintiffs and class members paid has a substantially lesser value, 16 but USD has nonetheless retained full payment.
- 70. It would be unjust and inequitable for USD to retain benefits in excess of 18 the services it provided, and USD should be required to disgorge any tuition, fees and 19 related expenses that exceed the value of online education.

COUNT III

Unfair and Deceptive Acts and Practices

- 71. Plaintiffs restate, reallege, and incorporate by reference the allegations 23 contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 72. This cause of action is brought pursuant to California's Consumers Legal 25 | Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750-1785 (the "CLRA").
- 73. Plaintiffs and the other members of the Class are "consumers," as the 27 term is defined by California Civil Code § 1761(d), because they bought USD's educational services for personal purposes. USD is a "person" under Cal. Civ. Code §

1761(c).

1

2

5

6

11

15

20

21

22

231

24

26

- 74. USD's educational services are "services" under Cal. Civ. Code § 3 | 1761(b). Plaintiffs, the other members of the Class, and USD have engaged in "transactions," as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1761(e). These transactions all occurred on in the State of California.
- 75. The conduct alleged in this Complaint constitutes unfair methods of $7\parallel$ competition and unfair and deceptive acts and practices for the purposes of the CLRA, 8 and the conduct was undertaken by USD in transactions intended to result in, and 9 which did result in, the sale of services to "consumers," as that term is defined in the 10 CLRA.
- 76. USD's false and fraudulent representations and omissions have violated, 12 and continue to violate the CLRA because they extend to transactions that are intended 13 to result, or have resulted, in the sale of services to consumers, including the Plaintiffs 14 and the Class members.
- USD's conduct violates Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(5), which prohibits 77. 16 "[r]epresenting that . . . services have . . . characteristics . . . that they do not have," 17 and Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(7), which prohibits: "[r]epresenting that . . . services are 18 of a particular standard, quality, or grade . . . if they are of another," causing injury to 19 Plaintiffs and the Class.

COUNT IV

Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law

- 78. Plaintiffs restate, reallege, and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 79. This cause of action is brought pursuant to California's Unfair Competition Law (the "UCL"), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.
- 80. By committing the acts and practices alleged herein, USD has engaged in 27 deceptive, unfair, and unlawful business practices in violation of the UCL and similar 28 statutes.

81.

5

10

11

13

16

18

20

22

24

25

27 28

3 Class members also have suffered injury in fact and have lost money or property as a 4 result of USD's actions as set forth above. 82. The violation of any law constitutes an "unlawful" business practice 6 under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 and similar statutes.

Plaintiffs have standing to pursue this claim as they have suffered injury

83. USD has violated the UCL's proscription against engaging in unlawful 8 conduct as a result of its violations of, *inter alia*, the CLRA and similar statutes, as 9 alleged above.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly 12 situated, seeks judgment against USD as follows:

- For an order certifying the Class under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of A. 14 Civil Procedure and naming Plaintiffs as representatives of the Class and Plaintiffs' 15 attorneys as Class Counsel to represent the Class;
- A declaration that USD is financially responsible for notifying members 17 of the Classes of the pendency of this suit;
 - C. An order requiring an accounting for, and imposition of a constructive trust upon, all monies received by USD as a result of the conduct alleged herein;
- D. For an order finding in favor of Plaintiffs and the Class on all counts 21 asserted herein:
- E. For actual, compensatory, and punitive damages in amounts to be 23 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, 26 including disgorgement;
 - H. For injunctive and declaratory relief as the Court may deem proper;
 - I. For an order awarding Plaintiffs and the Class reasonable attorneys' fees

1 and expenses and costs of suit; and All other relief to which Plaintiffs and members of the Class may be 3 entitled by law or in equity. **JURY DEMAND** 4 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Plaintiffs demand a trial by 5 6 jury of any and all issues in this action so triable of right. 7 Dated: October 1, 2020 Respectfully submitted, HALEY MARTINEZ and MATTHEW 9 SHERIDAN, on behalf of themselves and 10 all others similarly situated. 11 /s/Tammy Hussin By: Tammy Hussin, Esq. 12 **HUSSIN LAW** 13 1596 N. Coast Highway 101 Encinitas, CA 92024 14 Tel: (877) 677-5397 15 Fax: (877) 667-1547 tammy@hussinlaw.com 16 17 /s/Yvette Golan By: 18 Yvette Golan* 19 THE GOLAN FIRM 2000 M Street, NW, Suite #750-A 20 Washington, D.C. 20036 21 T: (866) 298-4150 F: (928) 441-8250 22 ygolan@tgfirm.com 23 /s/James A. Francis By: 24 James A. Francis* 25 John Soumilas* David A. Searles* 26 Edward H. Skipton* 27 FRANCIS MAILMAN SOUMILAS, P.C. 28

1600 Market Street, Suite 2510 Philadelphia, PA 19103 T: (215) 735-8600 F: (215) 940-8000 jfrancis@consumerlawfirm.com jsoumilas@consumerlawfirm.com dsearles@consumerlawfirm.com eskipton@consumerlawfirm.com *Pro hac vice forthcoming Attorneys for Plaintiff

Case 3:20-cv-01946-GPC-WVG Document 1 Filed 10/01/20 PageID.20 Page 20 of 20

Case 3:20-cv-01946-GPC-WVG_Document 1-1_Filed 10/01/20 PageID.21 Page 1 of 2

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the ervir a	oener oneen (obb morne o	110110 011 11211 11102 0		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS			
Haley Martinez and Matthothers similarly situated	new Sheridan, on beha	alf of themselves ar	nd all	University of San D	iego		
(b) County of Residence of	of First Listed Plaintiff S	an Diego		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant			
(EZ	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	ASES)		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)			
				NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A	Address, and Telephone Numbe	r)		Attorneys (If Known)			
Tammy Hussin (SBN 155 101, Encinitas, CA 92024		n, 1596 N. Coast H	ighway		<u>'2</u> (0CV1946 GPC WVG	
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)	III. C		RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif	
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citiz	(For Diversity Cases Only) PI ten of This State			
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	★ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	1	Principal Place 5 5 5	
				ten or Subject of a oreign Country	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT						of Suit Code Descriptions.	
CONTRACT	PERSONAL INJURY	ORTS PERSONAL INJUR		ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane	☐ 365 Personal Injury -	1 D 6.	25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC	
130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	□ 69	90 Other	28 USC 157	3729(a)) ☐ 400 State Reapportionment	
 □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment 	☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical			PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 400 State Reapportforment ☐ 410 Antitrust	
& Enforcement of Judgment		Personal Injury			☐ 820 Copyrights	☐ 430 Banks and Banking	
 ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted 	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability	Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal			☐ 830 Patent ☐ 835 Patent - Abbreviated	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation	
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine	Injury Product			New Drug Application	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
(Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 345 Marine Product Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPER	ety —	LABOR	□ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit	
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	□ 370 Other Fraud		10 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)	☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lending		Act	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	□ 850 Securities/Commodities/	
■ 190 Other Contract ■ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage	U //	20 Labor/Management Relations	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	Exchange ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions	
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	☐ 385 Property Damage		40 Railway Labor Act	□ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts	
	☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Product Liability	□ 7:	51 Family and Medical Leave Act		☐ 893 Environmental Matters☐ 895 Freedom of Information	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION	NS 🗆 79	90 Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	Act	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:		91 Employee Retirement	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	☐ 896 Arbitration	
☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting	☐ 463 Alien Detainee		Income Security Act	or Defendant)	□ 899 Administrative Procedure	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment240 Torts to Land	☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/	☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	;		☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision	
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations	□ 530 General				950 Constitutionality of	
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	☐ 535 Death Penalty Other:	□ 4	IMMIGRATION 62 Naturalization Application		State Statutes	
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	☐ 540 Mandamus & Oth		65 Other Immigration			
	Other	☐ 550 Civil Rights		Actions			
	☐ 448 Education	☐ 555 Prison Condition☐ 560 Civil Detainee -					
		Conditions of					
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" is	n One Roy Only)	Confinement					
		Remanded from	■ 4 Reir	nstated or	erred from	strict	
	ate Court	Appellate Court	Reo	pened Anothe (specify)	r District Litigatio Transfer	on - Litigation -	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	28 USC Section 1	332(d)	re filing (Do not cite jurisdictional stat	utes unless diversity):		
VII 011002 01 110110	Brief description of Ca		ıt: unfaiı	r and deceptive acts	and practices		
VII. REQUESTED IN		IS A CLASS ACTION		DEMAND \$		y if demanded in complaint:	
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 2		, -	Ψ	JURY DEMANI		
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S)					· ·	
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT					
10/01/2020 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		s/ Tammy Huss	sin, Esc	վ			
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JU	JDGE	

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- **II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
 - United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
 - Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
 - Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- **III. Residence** (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.
- **V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
 - Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
 - Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.
 - Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
 - Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
 - Multidistrict Litigation Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407
 - Multidistrict Litigation Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. **PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.
- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- **VII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P. Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction. Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.