

CARLSON LYNCH, LLP
Todd D. Carpenter (234464)
tcarpenter@carlsonlynch.com
1350 Columbia Street, Suite 603
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel: 619-762-1910
Fax: 619-756-6991

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EUGENE BOLTON, on behalf of himself and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

ACCELLION, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No.:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff Eugene Bolton (“Plaintiff”) brings this Class Action Complaint on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, against Defendant, Accellion, Inc. (“Accellion” or “Defendant”), alleging as follows based upon information and belief and investigation of counsel, except as to the allegations specifically pertaining to him, which are based on personal knowledge:

NATURE OF THE CASE

1. Businesses whose systems and products are designed and marketed for the purposes of storing and transferring sensitive, personally identifying information (“PII”) and personal medical information¹ (“PMI”) owe a duty of reasonable care to the individuals to whom that data relates. This duty arises because it is foreseeable that the exposure of PII or PMI to unauthorized persons—and especially hackers with nefarious intentions—will result in harm to the affected individuals.

¹ As used herein, Plaintiff uses the term “personal medical information” to mean: individually identifiable information, in possession of or derived from a provider of health care, health care service plan, pharmaceutical company, or contractor regarding a patient’s medical history, mental or physical condition, or treatment.

2. This harm manifests in a number of ways, including identity theft and financial fraud, and the exposure of a person's PII or PMI through a data breach, which puts that person at a substantially increased and certainly impending risk of these crimes compared to the rest of the population, potentially for the rest of their lives. Mitigating that risk, to the extent it is even possible to do so, requires individuals to devote significant time and money to closely monitor their credit, financial accounts, and email accounts, and take a number of additional prophylactic measures.

3. Accellion provides cloud-based file transferring solutions to a variety of different industries, including governmental agencies, healthcare, financial services, legal, and higher education.

4. Accellion advertises safety as a major selling point for its products and services. "When employees click the Accellion button, they know it's the safe, secure way to share sensitive information with the outside world."² With respect to the healthcare industries, Accellion touted its platforms' ability to "provide[] secure access to sensitive content such as Electronic Health Records (EHRs) that must be protected for HIPAA compliance."³

5. After choosing Accellion as a file management and security provider, its clients use Accellion's products to store and transfer data that frequently includes highly sensitive PII and/or PMI. Due to the nature of its business and the purposes for which Accellion marketed its products and services, Accellion knew or should have known that vulnerabilities in its products or systems would risk the exposure of consumer PII and PMI. Accellion had a resulting duty to ensure the security of its products and services.

6. Accellion's offerings include a product known as Accellion File Transfer Appliance ("FTA").

7. Unauthorized third parties exploited vulnerabilities in Accellion's FTA product in December 2020 and January 2021 to gain access to sensitive files stored or transferred using FTA by Accellion's clients (the "Data Breach").

² <https://www.accellion.com/company/>

³ Accellion, Inc., *Healthcare Data Breaches are Common, Putting Patient Data and HIPAA Compliance at Risk* (Oct. 11, 2016), available at <https://www.accellion.com/blog/healthcare-data-breaches-are-common-putting-patient-data-and-hipaa-compliance-at-risk/>

1 8. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Classes as defined herein, brings claims for actual
2 damages, statutory damages, and punitive damages, with attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses under the
3 California Confidentiality of Medical Information Act ("CMIA"), Cal. Civ. Code § 56, *et seq.*, and further
4 sues Defendant for negligence, negligence *per se*, unjust enrichment, and declaratory judgment.

5 9. The information accessed and exposed during the Data Breach was derived from hundreds
6 of Accellion's institutional clients, involving the PII or PMI of millions of individual consumers.

7 10. Based on the public statements of Accellion and certain of its institutional clients to date,
8 a wide variety of PII and PMI was implicated in the breach, including, but not limited to: names, drivers
9 license information, dates of birth, phone numbers, email addresses, bank account information, social
10 security numbers, pharmacy records, and insurance information.

11 11. One of Accellion's customers, The Kroger Company ("Kroger"), recently confirmed that
12 they used Accellion's services, and that some of their clinic and pharmacy customers' information was
13 accessed and exposed during the Data Breach.

14 12. Since the Data Breach, more Accellion institutional clients have announced—either in
15 public statements, notice letters, or both—that their consumers' PII and/or PMI was also compromised in
16 the Data Breach.

17 13. As a direct and proximate result of Accellion's inadequate data security, Plaintiff and Class
18 Members' PII and/or PMI has been accessed by hackers and exposed to an untold number of unauthorized
19 individuals.

20 14. Plaintiff and Class Members are now at a significantly increased risk of fraud, identity
21 theft, and similar forms of criminal mischief, which risk may last for the rest of their lives. Consequently,
22 Plaintiff and Class Members must devote substantially more time, money, and energy protecting
23 themselves, to the extent possible, from these crimes.

24 15. To recover from Accellion for these harms, Plaintiff and the Classes seek damages in an
25 amount to be determined at trial, declaratory judgment, and injunctive relief requiring Accellion to:
26 1) disclose, expeditiously, the full nature of the Data Breach, the institutional clients affected, and the
27 types of PII and PMI accessed, obtained, or exposed by the hackers; 2) implement improved data security
28

practices to reasonably guard against future breaches of PII and PMI; and 3) provide, at its own expense, all impacted victims with lifetime identity theft protection services.

PARTIES

16. Plaintiff Eugene Bolton is an adult individual who at all relevant times has been a citizen and resident of the State of Tennessee. Plaintiff used Kroger's pharmacy on a continuous basis, starting in approximately 2015 and continuing through the present.

17. In February 2020, Plaintiff learned of the Data Breach, that Kroger used Accellion's services, and that as a result of that relationship, Plaintiff's PII, including his PMI, may have been accessed or exposed to unknown, unauthorized third parties during the Data Breach.

18. Defendant, Accellion, Inc., is a Delaware corporation in the business of cloud-based file transfer solutions with its principal place of business in Palo Alto, California. Defendant is a citizen of California.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

19. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A), as modified by the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, because Plaintiff and at least one member of each of the Classes, as defined below, is a citizen of a different state than Defendant, there are more than 100 members of each of the Classes, and the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000 exclusive of interests and costs.

20. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it is headquartered in and is a citizen of the State of California.

21. Venue is proper in this District, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1), because a substantial part of the acts, omissions, and events giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in this District. Further, Defendant resides in this District and is a resident of California.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Background of Accellion's Business Model

22. Accellion advertises itself as a defense to data breaches, stating: "[t]he Accellion enterprise content firewall prevents data breaches and compliance violations from third party cyber risk."⁴ "With

⁴ <https://www.accellion.com/company/>

on-premise, private cloud, hybrid and FedRAMP deployment options, the Accellion content firewall provides the security and governance CISOs need to protect their organizations, mitigate risk, and adhere to rigorous compliance regulations.”⁵

23. Accellion claims to have “protected more than 25 million end users at more than 3,000 global corporations and government agencies”⁶

24. Accellion recognizes that “[q]uality patient care requires accurate diagnosis, effective treatment, and bullet-proof data security.”⁷ Accellion markets its secure solutions to its healthcare clients, stating “[t]he Accellion enterprise content firewall allows hospitals and clinics, payers, and government health agencies to share X-rays, diagnoses, insurance information and other PHI securely and in compliance with patient privacy regulations like HIPAA, HITECH and GDPR.”⁸

25. Accellion offers many different software solutions to its customers, including secure email, secure file sharing, secure mobile sharing, secure web forms, and secure managed file transfer.⁹

26. These programs perform a variety of functions, the most crucial being to share or transfer sensitive content in an easy and safe manner.

27. In short, the very nature of Accellion’s core business involves providing its clients with a way to securely share sensitive and private data, including the PII and PMI of the institutional clients’ own clients, patients, and consumers.

28. Due to the very nature of its business, then, Accellion knew that its applications are and were used to transfer sensitive PII and PMI and as a result, that Accellion’s software posed an attractive target for cybercriminals.

29. As a result, Accellion knows that its customers, and the individuals whose PII and PMI is stored or transferred using Accellion products, must rely on Accellion to ensure that its software is protected from outside attack.

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ <https://www.accellion.com/solutions/healthcare/>

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ <https://www.accellion.com/platform/enterprise-content-firewall/>

30. Accellion refers to FTA as “Accellion’s 20 year old legacy product,” and has scheduled an “end of life” date for FTA on April 30, 2021.¹⁰

31. Accellion knew that maintenance of FTA’s underlying operating system, CentOS 6, ended on November 30, 2020, which would limit Accellion’s “ability to support the FTA software.”¹¹

32. Despite Accellion’s knowledge that it could no longer fully support FTA, after November 30, 2020, Accellion was aware that many of its clients continued to use FTA in December 2020 and January 2021.

The Data Breach and Public Disclosure

33. On December 16, 2020, FTA triggered a built-in anomaly detector on one of Accellion’s client’s devices.¹²

34. From December 16 to 19, 2020, Defendant investigated the anomaly and detected the vulnerabilities affecting Accellion FTA - 9.12.370 – SQL Injection (CVE-2021-27101) and OS Command Execution (CVE-2021-27104).¹³

35. On December 20 and 23, 2020, Defendant released two patches: FTA 9.12.380 and FTA 9.12.411, respectively, to remedy the vulnerabilities.¹⁴

36. Attacks on the FTA software continued into January, 2021, however.¹⁵

37. Accellion experienced a second exploit on January 20, 2021, and became aware of it on January 22, 2021, through multiple customer service inquiries.¹⁶ In response, Accellion issued a critical security alert advising its FTA customers to shut down their FTA system immediately.¹⁷

¹⁰ <https://www.accellion.com/sites/default/files/resources/fta-eol.pdf> (last accessed March 4, 2021).

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² Mandiant (FireEye, Inc.), *Accellion, Inc. File Transfer Appliance Security Assessment*, at 5–6 (Mar. 1, 2021), available at <https://www.accellion.com/sites/default/files/trust-center/accellion-fta-attack-mandiant-report-full.pdf> (hereinafter, Mandiant Report).

¹³ *Id.* at 6.

¹⁴ *Id.* at 5, 8–9.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 7.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 5, 7.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 5.

38. From January 22 to 25, 2021, Defendant investigated the new exploits and identified two more vulnerabilities - Server-Side Request Forgery (CVE-2021-27103) and OS Command Execution (CVE-2021-27102).¹⁸

39. On January 25th and 28th, Defendant released patches FTA 9.12.416 and FTA_9.12.432, respectively, to remediate the vulnerabilities.¹⁹

40. In Accellion's initial public statement disclosing the Data Breach, it indicated that less than 50 clients were affected.²⁰

41. In announcing that the December fix did not completely contain the Data Breach, Accellion stated: "This initial incident was the beginning of a concerted cyberattack on the Accellion FTA product that continued into January 2021. Accellion identified additional exploits in the ensuing weeks and rapidly developed and released patches to close each vulnerability."²¹

42. Kroger was notified of the Data Breach on January 23, 2021, at which point Kroger discontinued the use of Accellion's services.²²

43. The University of Colorado, one of Accellion's higher-education clients affected by the Data Breach, puts the number of Accellion clients affected by the Data Breach at approximately 300.²³

44. One governmental agency client of Accellion affected by the Data Breach, the Washington State Auditor's Office, has indicated that approximately 1.4 million individuals who filed unemployment insurance claims in 2020 were at risk of having their PII exposed in this Data Breach.²⁴

45. News reports indicate that other major Accellion clients have also confirmed that they have been affected by Data Breach. These clients include the law firm Jones Day,²⁵ Singapore telephone

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ <https://gizmodo.com/the-accellion-data-breach-seems-to-be-getting-bigger-1846250357>

²¹ <https://www.accellion.com/company/press-releases/accellion-provides-update-to-recent-fta-security-incident/>

²² <https://www.kroger.com/i/accellion-incident>

²³ <https://gizmodo.com/the-accellion-data-breach-seems-to-be-getting-bigger-1846250357>

²⁴ <https://www.databreachtoday.com/washington-state-breach-tied-to-accellion-vulnerability-a-15909>

²⁵ <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/business-and-practice/jones-day-hit-by-data-breach-as-vendor-accellion-hacks-widen>

company Singtel,²⁶ the Reserve Bank of New Zealand,²⁷ and the Australian Securities and Investments Commission.²⁸

46. Kroger believes the following information, which includes Plaintiff's information, has been involved in the Data Breach²⁹:

What information may have been involved?

At this time, based on the information provided by Accellion and our own investigation, Kroger believes the categories of affected data may include certain associates' HR data, certain pharmacy records, and certain money services records. Importantly, there was no impact to grocery store data or systems; credit or debit card information; or customer account passwords.

47. The total number of institutional clients and individual clients affected by the Data Breach is unknown.

48. Public reports indicate that the perpetrators of the Data Breach are using the stolen data to perpetrate extortion schemes, and threatened to publish or have already published stolen data on publicly-accessible websites.

49. According to Accellion's forensic investigator, Mandiant/FireEye, following the FTA exploits, several of Accellion's impacted clients received extortion threats in which the extortionists threaten to publish stolen data if their demands are not met.³⁰

²⁶ <https://www.singtel.com/personal/support/about-accellion-security-incident>

²⁷ <https://www.bankinfosecurity.com/nz-reserve-bank-issues-update-on-accellion-breach-a-16008>

²⁸ <https://www.securityweek.com/australian-corporate-regulator-discloses-breach-involving-accellion-software>

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ Andrew Moore, Genevieve Stark, Isif Ibrahima, Van Ta, Kimberly Goody, FireEye Threat Research Blog, *Cyber Criminals Exploit Accellion FTA for Data Theft and Extortion*, Feb. 22, 2021, available at <https://www.fireeye.com/blog/threat-research/2021/02/accellion-fta-exploited-for-data-theft-and-extortion.html>.

Accellion Knew the Risks of Attacks on FTA and that Harm to Consumers Would Result

50. At all relevant times, Accellion knew its FTA product was used for transferring valuable, sensitive PII and PMI and that as a result, Accellion's software would be attractive targets for cybercriminals.

51. Accellion also knew that any exploitation of its FTA software, and exposure of the information transferred using FTA, would result in the increased risk of identity theft and fraud against the individuals whose PII and PMI was compromised.

52. These risks are not merely theoretical; in recent years, numerous high-profile breaches have occurred at businesses such as Equifax, Yahoo, Marriott, Anthem, and many others.

53. PII and PMI has considerable value and constitutes an enticing and well-known target to hackers. Hackers easily can sell stolen data as a result of the "proliferation of open and anonymous cybercrime forums on the Dark Web that serve as a bustling marketplace for such commerce."³¹

54. The prevalence of data breaches and identity theft has increased dramatically in recent years, accompanied by a parallel and growing economic drain on individuals, businesses, and government entities in the U.S. According to the IRTC, in 2019, there were 1,473 reported data breaches in the United States, exposing 164 million sensitive records and 705 million "non-sensitive" records.³²

55. In tandem with the increase in data breaches, the rate of identity theft and the resulting losses has also increased over the past few years. For instance, in 2018, 14.4 million people were victims of some form of identity fraud, and 3.3 million people suffered unrecouped losses from identity theft, nearly three times as many as in 2016. And these out-of-pocket losses more than doubled from 2016 to \$1.7 billion in 2018.³³

56. Even if stolen PII does not include financial or payment card account information, that does not mean there has been no harm, or that the breach does not cause a substantial risk of identity theft.

³¹ Brian Krebs, *The Value of a Hacked Company*, Krebs on Security (July 14, 2016), <http://krebsonsecurity.com/2016/07/the-value-of-a-hacked-company/>.

³² *Data Breach Reports: 2019 End of Year Report*, IDENTITY THEFT RESOURCE CENTER, at 2, available at <https://notified.idtheftcenter.org/s/resource#annualReportSection>.

³³ Insurance Information Institute, *Facts + Statistics: Identity theft and cybercrime*, available at [https://www.iii.org/fact-statistic/facts-statistics-identity-theft-and-cybercrime#Identity%20Theft%20And%20Fraud%20Reports,%202015-2019%20\(1\)](https://www.iii.org/fact-statistic/facts-statistics-identity-theft-and-cybercrime#Identity%20Theft%20And%20Fraud%20Reports,%202015-2019%20(1)) (last accessed Mar. 1, 2021).

Freshly stolen information can be used with success against victims in specifically targeted efforts to commit identity theft known as social engineering or spear phishing. In these forms of attack, the criminal uses the previously obtained PII about the individual, such as name, address, email address, and affiliations, to gain trust and increase the likelihood that a victim will be deceived into providing the criminal with additional information.

57. Stolen names and email addresses can also facilitate attacks known as “credential stuffing,” where the attacker, armed with a known valid email address, can attempt to log-in to online accounts using the common formulas for usernames (email address, first initial and last name, or full name) and common passwords, or use software to mount a brute-force attack (guessing many passwords in rapid succession) against weak login portals.

Plaintiff and Class Members Suffered Damages

58. For the reasons mentioned above, Accellion’s negligence, which allowed the Data Breach to occur, caused Plaintiff and members of the Classes significant injuries and harm in several ways. Plaintiff and members of the Classes must immediately devote time, energy, and money to: 1) closely monitor their credit, financial accounts, email and other accounts; 2) change login and password information on any sensitive account even more frequently than they already do; 3) more carefully screen and scrutinize phone calls, emails, and other communications to ensure that they are not being targeted in a social engineering or spear phishing attack; 4) search for suitable identity theft protection and credit monitoring services, and pay to procure them.

59. Once PII or PMI is exposed, there is virtually no way to ensure that the exposed information has been fully recovered or contained against future misuse. For this reason, Plaintiff and Class members will need to maintain these heightened measures for years, and possibly their entire lives, as a result of Accellion’s negligence.

60. Plaintiff and Class members are also at a continued risk to the extent their PII or PMI continues to be stored in or transferred using Accellion’s systems, which have already been shown to be susceptible to compromise and attack.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

61. Plaintiff brings this case individually and, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on behalf of the following classes:

The PII Class

All individuals in the United States whose PII was compromised in the Accellion data breach which occurred starting in December 2020 (the “PII Class”).

The PMI Class

All individuals in the United States whose PMI was compromised in the Accellion data breach which occurred starting in December 2020 (the “PMI Class”).

62. Excluded from the Classes is Defendant, its subsidiaries and affiliates, its officers, directors and members of their immediate families and any entity in which Defendant has a controlling interest, the legal representative, heirs, successors, or assigns of any such excluded party, the judicial officer(s) to whom this action is assigned, and the members of their immediate families.

63. Plaintiff reserves the right to modify or amend the definition of the proposed Classes prior to moving for class certification.

64. The requirements of Rule 23(a)(1) are satisfied. The classes described above are so numerous that joinder of all individual members in one action would be impracticable. The disposition of the individual claims of the respective class members through this class action will benefit both the parties and this Court. The exact size of the classes and the identities of the individual members thereof are ascertainable through Defendant’s records, including but not limited to, the files implicated in the Data Breach, but based on public information, the Classes include millions of individuals.

65. The requirements of Rule 23(a)(2) are satisfied. There is a well-defined community of interest and there are common questions of fact and law affecting members of the Classes. The questions of fact and law common to the Classes predominate over questions which may affect individual members and include the following:

a. Whether Defendant had a duty to protect the PII and PMI of Plaintiff and Class Members;

1 b. Whether Defendant's failure to adequately secure its software used to transfer
2 Plaintiff's and the Classes' PMI violated CMIA;

3 c. Whether Defendant was negligent in failing to protect Plaintiff's and Class
4 Members' PII and PMI, and breached its duties thereby;

5 d. Whether Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to damages as a result of
6 Defendant's wrongful conduct;

7 e. Whether Plaintiff and Class Members are third-party beneficiaries of contracts
8 between Defendant and its Accellion FTA customers;

9 f. Whether Defendant breached the contracts with its Accellion FTA customers and
10 thereby damaged Plaintiff and Class Members;

11 g. Whether Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to restitution as a result of
12 Defendant's wrongful conduct; and

13 h. Whether Defendant's conduct violated Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*;

14 i. Whether Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to injunctive relief to redress the
15 imminent and currently ongoing harm faced as a result of the Data Breach.

16 66. The requirements of Rule 23(a)(3) are satisfied. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims
17 of the members of the Classes. The claims of the Plaintiff and members of the Classes are based on the
18 same legal theories and arise from the same failure by Defendant to safeguard PII and PMI.

19 67. Plaintiff and members of the Classes were each consumers who had relationships with
20 organizations that were clients of Accellion, and Plaintiff and members of the Classes all suffered harm
21 when their PII and/or PMI was accessed and copied by an unauthorized third party.

22 68. The requirements of Rule 23(a)(4) are satisfied. Plaintiff is an adequate representative of
23 the Classes because his interests do not conflict with the interests of the members of the Classes. Plaintiff
24 will fairly, adequately, and vigorously represent and protect the interests of the members of the Classes
25 and has no interests antagonistic to the members of the Classes. In addition, Plaintiff has retained counsel
26 who are competent and experienced in the prosecution of class action litigation. The claims of Plaintiff
27 and the Class members are substantially identical as explained above.
28

69. The requirements of Rule 23(b)(3) are satisfied here because a class action is the superior method of litigating these issues, and common issues will predominate. While the aggregate damages that may be awarded to the members of the Classes are likely to be substantial, the damages suffered by the individual members of the Classes are relatively small. As a result, the expense and burden of individual litigation make it economically infeasible and procedurally impracticable for each member of the Classes to individually seek redress for the wrongs done to them. Certifying the case as a Class will centralize these substantially identical claims in a single proceeding, which is the most manageable litigation method available to Plaintiff and the Classes and will conserve the resources of the parties and the court system, while protecting the rights of each member of the Classes. Defendant's uniform conduct is generally applicable to the Classes as a whole, making relief appropriate with respect to each Class member.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
NEGLIGENCE
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Classes)

70. Plaintiff restates and realleges all proceeding allegations above as if fully set forth herein.

71. Accellion owed a duty under common law to Plaintiff and Class Members to exercise reasonable care with respect to the PII and PMI stored or transferred using Accellion's software products and services.

72. Accellion's duty to use reasonable care arose from several sources, including but not limited to those described below.

73. Accellion had a common law duty to prevent foreseeable harm to others. This duty existed because Plaintiff and Class Members were the foreseeable and probable victims of any inadequate security practices on the part of Defendant. By providing software products and services specifically designed for and marketed for the collection and transfer of valuable PII and PMI, Accellion was obligated to act with reasonable care to protect against these foreseeable threats.

74. Accellion's duty also arose from Accellion's position as a data services vendor to healthcare, educational, and other organizations. Accellion knows and intends that its software will be used for collection, storage, and transfer of highly sensitive information. Consumers generally have no knowledge that Accellion's software will be used for the transmission of their PII or PMI, and therefore do not have the opportunity to consent to or "opt out" of Accellion's involvement.

1 75. Accellion holds itself out as a trusted provider of software to be used in the collection,
2 storage, and transfer of sensitive data, and thereby assumes a duty to reasonably protect that data. Because
3 of its role as a cloud computing and file transfer vendor to a large number of organizations, Accellion was
4 in a unique and superior position to protect against the harm suffered by Plaintiff and Class Members as
5 a result of the Data Breach.

6 76. Accellion breached the duties owed to Plaintiff and Class Members and thus was negligent.
7 Accellion breached these duties by, among other things: (a) mismanaging its software and failing to
8 identify reasonably foreseeable internal and external risks to the security, confidentiality, and integrity of
9 sensitive information that resulted in the unauthorized access and compromise of PII and PMI;
10 (b) allowing clients to continue utilizing the outdated FTA software for sensitive file transfers after
11 Accellion knew that FTA could no longer be fully maintained and supported in accordance with modern
12 security standards; (c) failing to design and implement information safeguards to control these risks;
13 (d) failing to adequately test and monitor the effectiveness of the safeguards' key controls, systems, and
14 procedures; (e) failing to evaluate and adjust its information security program in light of the circumstances
15 alleged herein; and (f) failing to detect the breach at the time it began or within a reasonable time
16 thereafter.

17 77. But for Accellion's wrongful and negligent breach of its duties owed to Plaintiff and Class
18 Members, their PII and PMI would not have been compromised.

19 78. As a direct and proximate result of Accellion's negligence, Plaintiff and Class Members
20 have suffered injuries, including:

- 21 a. Theft and exposure of their PII and/or PMI;
- 22 b. Costs associated with requested credit freezes;
- 23 c. Costs associated with the detection and prevention of identity theft and
24 unauthorized use of the financial accounts;
- 25 d. Costs associated with purchasing credit monitoring and identity theft protection
26 services;
- 27 e. Unauthorized charges and loss of use of and access to their financial account funds
28 and costs associated with inability to obtain money from their accounts or being limited in the

amount of money they were permitted to obtain from their accounts, including missed payments on bills and loans, late charges and fees, and adverse effects of their credit;

f. Lowered credit scores resulting from credit inquiries following fraudulent activities;

g. Costs associated with time spent and the loss of productivity from taking time to address and attempt to ameliorate, mitigate, and deal with the actual and future consequences of the Accellion Data Breach—including finding fraudulent charges, cancelling and reissuing cards, enrolling in credit monitoring and identity theft protection services, freezing and unfreezing accounts, and imposing withdrawal and purchase limits on compromised accounts;

h. The imminent and certainly impending injury flowing from the increased risk of potential fraud and identity theft posed by their PII and/or PMI being placed in the hands of criminals;

i. Damages to and diminution in value of their PII and/or PMI entrusted, directly or indirectly, to Accellion; and

j. Continued risk of exposure to hackers and thieves of their PII and/or PMI, which continues to be stored and transferred using Accellion’s software and is subject to further breaches so long as Accellion fails to undertake appropriate and adequate measures to protect Plaintiff and Class Members.

79. As a direct and proximate result of Accellion’s negligence, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to damages, including compensatory, punitive, and/or nominal damages, in an amount to be proven at trial.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
NEGLIGENCE PER SE
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Classes)

80. Plaintiff restates and realleges all proceeding factual allegations above as if fully set forth herein.

81. Section 5 of the FTC Act prohibits “unfair . . . practices in or affecting commerce” including, as interpreted and enforced by the FTC, the unfair act or practice by companies such as

Accellion or failing to use reasonable measures to protect PII and PMI. Various FTC publications and orders also form the basis of Accellion's duty.

82. Pursuant to the CMIA, Defendant had a duty to implement safeguards to protect Plaintiffs' and the Patient Class members' PMI.

83. Accellion violated Section 5 of the FTC Act (and similar state statutes) and the CMIA by failing to use reasonable measures to protect PII and PMI and not complying with the industry standards. Accellion's conduct was particularly unreasonable given the nature and amount of PII and PMI it obtained and stored and the foreseeable consequences of a data breach involving PII and PMI of organizations' patients, clients, and consumers.

84. Accellion's violation of Section 5 of the FTC Act (and similar state statutes) and the CMIA constitutes negligence *per se*.

85. Plaintiff and members of the Classes are consumers within the class of persons Section 5 of the FTC Act (and similar state statutes) was intended to protect.

86. Plaintiff and members of the PMI Class are patients within the class of persons CMIA was intended to protect.

87. Moreover, the harm that has occurred is the type of harm that the FTC Act (and similar state statutes) and CMIA was intended to guard against. Indeed, the FTC has brought dozens of enforcement actions against businesses which, as a result of their failure to employ reasonable data security measures and avoid unfair and deceptive practices, caused the same harm suffered by Plaintiff and Class Members.

88. As a direct and proximate result of Accellion's negligence, Plaintiff and Class Members have been injured as described herein, and are entitled to damages, including compensatory, punitive, and nominal damages, in an amount to be proven at trial.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
THIRD PARTY BENEFICIARY CLAIM
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Classes)

89. Plaintiff restates and realleges all proceeding allegations above as if fully set forth herein.

90. Accellion entered into contracts directly with its clients, including Kroger, to provide them with Accellion FTA.

91. Defendant purported that Accellion FTA would provide a convenient and secure solution for its clients to transfer and store PII and PMI.

92. Although Plaintiff and members of the Classes were not a direct party to the Accellion FTA services contract, part of the purpose of the contract was to securely transfer and store PII and/or PMI belonging to Plaintiff and members of the Classes.

93. According to Defendant's own marketing, Defendant knew, or should have known, that the PII and PMI that it transferred and stored on behalf of its clients needed to be transferred and stored securely.

94. Defendant knew or should have known that its clients, including Kroger, would use Accellion FTA as advertised to transfer and store Plaintiff's and members of the Classes PII and/or PMI.

95. Defendant breached the contract with its clients, including Kroger, by failing to maintain the PII and PMI secure and confidential.

96. As a result of Accellion's wrongful conduct as alleged in this Complaint (including among other things its utter failure to employ adequate data security measures, its continued maintenance and use of the PII and PMI belonging to Plaintiff and Class Members without having adequate data security measures, and its other conduct facilitating the theft of that PII and PMI), Plaintiff and Class members have suffered and continue to suffer harm.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
CALIFORNIA CONFIDENTIALITY OF MEDICAL INFORMATION ACT,
Cal. Civ. Code § 6, *et seq.*
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the PMI Class)

97. Plaintiff restates and realleges all proceeding allegations above as if fully set forth herein.

98. Defendant is a "provider of health care" as defined in Cal. Civ. Code § 56.06, and is therefore subject to the requirements of the CMIA, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 56.10(a) and (d), 56.35, 56.36(b), 56.101(a) and (b).

99. Defendant is organized in part for the purpose of maintaining medical information in order to make that information available to an individual or provider of health care, for purposes of information management, diagnosis, or treatment, and is therefore a "provider of health care" under the CMIA.

100. Plaintiff and the Patient Class members are “patients,” as defined in CMIA, Cal. Civ. Code § 56.06(k), as they are “natural person[s], whether or not still living, who received health care services from a provider of health care and to whom medical information pertains.”

101. Defendant disclosed “medical information,” as defined in CMIA, Cal. Civ. Code § 56.05(j), to unauthorized persons without first obtaining consent, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 56.10(a).

102. Defendant’s negligence resulted in the release of individually identifiable medical information pertaining to Plaintiff and the Patient Class to unauthorized persons and the breach of the confidentiality of that information. Defendant’s negligent failure to maintain, preserve, store, abandon, destroy, and/or dispose of Plaintiff’s and Patient Class members’ medical information in a manner that preserved the confidentiality of the information contained therein, in violation of the CMIA.

103. Defendant’s computer systems did not protect and preserve the integrity of electronic medical information in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 56.101(b)(1)(A).

104. Plaintiff and the Patient Class were injured and have suffered damages, as described above, from Defendant’s illegal disclosure and negligent release of their medical information in violation of Cal. Civ. Code §§ 56.10 and 56.101, and therefore seek relief under Civ. Code §§ 56.35 and 56.36, including actual damages, nominal statutory damages of \$1,000, punitive damages of \$3,000, injunctive relief, and attorney fees, expenses and costs.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
UNLAWFUL, UNFAIR, AND FRAUDULENT BUSINESS PRACTICES
Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Classes)

105. Plaintiff restates and realleges all proceeding allegations above as if fully set forth herein.

106. Defendant’s conduct has violated and continues to violate the California Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*, which prohibits unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business acts or practices.

107. Defendant’s conduct of violating the CMIA and Section 5 of the FTC Act is unlawful under the UCL.

- b. For an order finding in favor of Plaintiff and the Classes on all counts asserted herein;
- c. For damages in an amount to be determined by the trier of fact;
- d. For an order of restitution and all other forms of equitable monetary relief;
- e. Declaratory and injunctive relief as described herein;
- f. Awarding Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses;
- g. Awarding pre- and post-judgment interest on any amounts awarded; and,
- h. Awarding such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

A jury trial is demanded on all claims so triable.

Dated: March 8, 2021

CARLSON LYNCH LLP

By: /s/Todd D. Carpenter

Todd D. Carpenter (234464)
tcarpenter@carlsonlynch.com
1350 Columbia St., Ste. 603
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel.: 619-762-1900
Fax: 619-756-6991

Gary F. Lynch (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)
glynch@carlsonlynch.com
Kelly K. Iverson (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)
kiverson@carlsonlynch.com
Nicholas Colella (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)
ncolella@carlsonlynch.com
CARLSON LYNCH LLP
1133 Penn Ave., 5th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
Tel.: 412-322-9243
Fax: 412-231-0246

Attorneys for Plaintiff

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-CAND 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 in its original form by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court to initiate the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

EUGENE BOLTON, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Davidson County, TN
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)
CARLSON LYNCH, LLP
1350 Columbia St., Ste. 603, San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 762-1900

DEFENDANTS

ACCELLION, INC.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)

☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☒ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4
Citizen of Another State	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment Of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury -Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/ Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities-- Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities--Other <input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury -- Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS HABEAS CORPUS <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty OTHER <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition <input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee-- Conditions of Confinement	<input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC § 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other LABOR <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Management Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC § 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC § 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 835 Patent--Abbreviated New Drug Application <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS--Third Party 26 USC § 7609	<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act <input type="checkbox"/> 376 Qui Tam (31 USC § 3729(a)) <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced & Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration <input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)
☒ 1 Original Proceeding ☐ 2 Removed from State Court ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened ☐ 5 Transferred from Another District (specify) ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation--Transfer ☐ 8 Multidistrict Litigation--Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A) and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1)
Brief description of cause:
Negligence; Negligence Per Se, Third Party Beneficiary Claim, CA Confidentiality of Medical Information Act, & Unlawful, Unfair and Fraudulent Business Practices

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: ☒ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, Fed. R. Civ. P. **DEMAND \$** **CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND:** ☒ Yes ☐ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S), IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (Civil Local Rule 3-2)
(Place an "X" in One Box Only) ☒ SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND ☐ SAN JOSE ☐ EUREKA-MCKINLEYVILLE

DATE 03/08/2021 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Todd D. Carpenter

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS-CAND 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet. The JS-CAND 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 in its original form by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court to initiate 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 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), 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.
- (1) United States plaintiff. Jurisdiction based on 28 USC §§ 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
 - (2) United States defendant. When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an “X” in this box.
 - (3) Federal question. This refers to suits under 28 USC § 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.
 - (4) Diversity of citizenship. This refers to suits under 28 USC § 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-CAND 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 the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin.** Place an “X” in one of the six boxes.
- (1) Original Proceedings. Cases originating in the United States district courts.
 - (2) Removed from State Court. Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 USC § 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.
 - (3) Remanded from Appellate Court. Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
 - (4) Reinstated or Reopened. Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
 - (5) Transferred from Another District. For cases transferred under Title 28 USC § 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
 - (6) Multidistrict Litigation Transfer. Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 USC § 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.
 - (8) Multidistrict Litigation Direct File. Check this box when a multidistrict litigation case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. Please note that there is no Origin Code 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- 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 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23. 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-CAND 44 is used to identify related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.
- IX. Divisional Assignment.** If the Nature of Suit is under Property Rights or Prisoner Petitions or the matter is a Securities Class Action, leave this section blank. For all other cases, identify the divisional venue according to Civil Local Rule 3-2: “the county in which a substantial part of the events or omissions which give rise to the claim occurred or in which a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is situated.”
- Date and Attorney Signature.** Date and sign the civil cover sheet.