UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EAST ST. LOUIS DIVISION

Elizabeth Steines, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

3:22-cv-03099

Plaintiff,

- against -

Class Action Complaint

Apple, Inc.,

Defendant

Jury Trial Demanded

Plaintiff alleges upon information and belief, except for allegations about Plaintiff, which are based on personal knowledge:

1. Apple, Inc. ("Defendant") manufactures, markets, and sells the iPhone smartphone, pictured next to the box it is sold in ("Product").¹²





¹ References to a model or version of an iPhone are for example only, as the subject devices include the 12 through 14 series.

² This action is not related to or coordinated with ongoing enforcement activities in other countries related to substantially similar allegations.

2. To use the Product requires electricity, supplied by a charger, which refers to a power adapter (left) plugged into an outlet with a cable (right) taking energy from a wall to the phone.



- 3. An iPhone purchaser previously received a charger with their phone so they could supply it with energy and use it for its intended purposes, whether email, browsing the internet, work, reading or playing games.
- 4. Beginning last year, Defendant no longer included the power adapter, citing environmental benefits from forgoing the mining of precious metals required for its production and a reduction in waste, presumably by encouraging customers to use their old chargers.
- 5. This explanation fails to account for the situation of a large percentage of iPhone purchasers for multiple reasons.
- 6. First, not all iPhone purchasers previously had iPhones or other Apple devices, which meant they did not have extra or any chargers to use.
- 7. Second, iPhone purchasers upgrading to a new model may (1) no longer have the charger which came with their device, (2) not have received a charger with their prior iPhone, (3) have a charger which is no longer compatible with the iPhone they are buying and/or (4) have a charger which has become non-functional due to age and/or usage.
- 8. Plaintiff and consumers were not aware they were purchasing an incomplete Product, devoid of essential functionality, because this was only disclosed on the back of the box, in small

print, stating, "Includes: iPhone 14 Pro Max and USB-C to Lightning Cable; power adapter and headphones sold separately."





- 9. By selling the Product without a charger, it is not adequate for its intended use, which was to function as a phone and mini-computer, because it requires power or energy to operate.
- 10. Where the utility of a good depends upon another good which is not provided by the manufacturer, the good is considered defective or at a minimum, diminished in value.
- 11. By not providing a charger, customers like Plaintiff are forced to spend additional money on a charger.
- 12. When Defendant removed the charger, not only was the price of the Product not correspondingly reduced by the amount of the power adapter, the price increased, unrelated to

other added functionality which could justify this increase.

- 13. If a customer realizes in the store that the iPhone they purchased does not come with a charger, they will almost always want to go home with a charger.
- 14. Though lower-priced chargers are available online, the stores where most purchases are made operated by Apple and cell phone companies only sell costly chargers for not less than \$30.
- 15. Defendant could have taken other measures to promote environmental sustainability, by adopting industry standard USB-C chargers, instead of rendering the Product non-functional unless an additional purchase was made.
- 16. Defendant could have made chargers available for free to iPhone purchasers who request them.
- 17. As a result of the false and misleading representations and omissions, the Product is sold for a price premium, approximately no less than \$700 for the lowest price version, excluding tax and sales.

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 18. Jurisdiction is based on the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA"). 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2).
- 19. The aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$5 million, including any statutory and punitive damages, exclusive of interest and costs.
 - 20. Plaintiff is a citizen of Illinois.
 - 21. Defendant is a California corporation with a principal place of business in California.
- 22. The class of persons Plaintiff seeks to represent includes persons who are citizens of different states from which Defendant is a citizen.

- 23. The members of the class Plaintiff seeks to represent are more than 100, because the Product has been sold with the representations described here for several years, from Defendant's stores and website, and from third-parties including mobile phone companies and retail stores and online in the States covered by Plaintiff's proposed classes.
- 24. Venue is in this District with assignment to the East St. Louis Division because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to these claims occurred in Madison County, including Plaintiff's purchase and/or use of the Product, and awareness of and/or experiences with the issues described here.

Parties

- 25. Plaintiff Elizabeth Steines is a citizen of Godfrey, Madison County, Illinois.
- 26. Defendant is a California corporation with a principal place of business in California.
- 27. Plaintiff purchased an iPhone at a T-Mobile Store, 317 Homer M Adams Pkwy Ste I, Alton IL 62002 between roughly December 2021 and May 2022.
 - 28. Plaintiff expected the iPhone would come with a charger so she could use her device.
- 29. Plaintiff did not have numerous chargers from previous iPhones because like most people, she did not get a new one every year.
- 30. Plaintiff's most recent iPhone purchase was made more than two years ago when chargers were included and/or were not compatible with the current iPhone.
- 31. Plaintiff expected that if she was buying something which required the purchase of another item to render the purchase functional, this information would be prominently disclosed to her.
 - 32. Plaintiff bought the Product at or exceeding the above-referenced price.
 - 33. Plaintiff paid more for the Product than she would have had she known it did not

come with a necessary element, a charger, as she would not have bought it or paid less.

- 34. Plaintiff was forced to pay at least \$30 for an additional charger and/or go without a charger until she was able to buy one to charge and use her phone.
- 35. Plaintiff intends to, seeks to, and will purchase an iPhone again at the price indicated if she could do so with assurances it comes with the necessary components to render it functional or if the price is reduced by the amount of the charger.
- 36. Plaintiff is unable to rely on the labeling of not only iPhones, but other products where another item is required and essential for use, such as a remote control without batteries, because she is unsure whether she would be buying only part of what she expects.

Class Allegations

37. Plaintiff seeks certification under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 of the following classes:

Illinois Class: All persons in the State of Illinois who purchased the Product during the statutes of limitations for each cause of action alleged; and

Consumer Fraud Multi-State Class: All persons in the States of Arkansas, South Dakota, Wyoming, North Carolina, Utah, Montana, Idaho, Mississippi, Virginia, and Oklahoma, who purchased the Product during the statutes of limitations for each cause of action alleged.

- 38. Common questions of issues, law, and fact predominate and include whether Defendant's representations were and are misleading and if Plaintiff and class members are entitled to damages.
- 39. Plaintiff's claims and basis for relief are typical to other members because all were subjected to the same unfair, misleading, and deceptive representations, omissions, and actions.
- 40. Plaintiff is an adequate representative because her interests do not conflict with other members.

- 41. No individual inquiry is necessary since the focus is only on Defendant's practices and the class is definable and ascertainable.
- 42. Individual actions would risk inconsistent results, be repetitive and are impractical to justify, as the claims are modest relative to the scope of the harm.
- 43. Plaintiff's counsel is competent and experienced in complex class action litigation and intends to protect class members' interests adequately and fairly.
 - 44. Plaintiff seeks class-wide injunctive relief because the practices continue.

Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act ("ICFA"), 815 ILCS 505/1, et seq.

- 45. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs.
- 46. Plaintiff relied on a basic expectation that a mobile phone requiring the necessary element for functionality, such as a charger, would be included with the phone, because anything else would be the sale of an incomplete and/or non-functional product.
- 47. Plaintiff would not have purchased the Product or paid as much if the true facts had been known, suffering damages.

Violation of State Consumer Fraud Acts (Consumer Fraud Multi-State Class)

- 48. The Consumer Fraud Acts of the States in the Consumer Fraud Multi-State Class are similar to the consumer protection statute invoked by Plaintiff and prohibit the use of unfair or deceptive business practices in the conduct of commerce.
- 49. The members of the Consumer Fraud Multi-State Class reserve their rights to assert their consumer protection claims under the Consumer Fraud Acts of the States they represent and/or the consumer protection statute invoked by Plaintiff.
 - 50. Defendant intended that members of the Consumer Fraud Multi-State Class would

rely upon its deceptive conduct, which they did, suffering damages.

Breach of Contract

- 51. Plaintiff and Defendant entered into a contract for the sale of the Product.
- 52. The terms included the Product would include the necessary components to render it functional, such as a charger.
 - 53. Plaintiff paid money for the Product, which Defendant received.
- 54. Defendant breached the contract because the Product did not include the necessary components to render it functional, such as a charger.
- 55. Plaintiff was injured by having to go without a charger and/or paying additional money for a charger, without paying any reduced price for the Product.

Breaches of Express Warranty, Implied Warranty of Merchantability/Fitness for a Particular Purpose and Magnuson Moss Warranty Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 2301, et seq.

- 56. The Product was manufactured, identified, marketed, and sold by Defendant and expressly and impliedly warranted to Plaintiff that it included the necessary elements for functionality, such as a charger, because anything else would be the sale of an incomplete and/or non-functional product.
- 57. Defendant directly marketed the Product to Plaintiff through its advertisements and marketing, through various forms of media, on the packaging, in print circulars, direct mail, product descriptions distributed to resellers, and targeted digital advertising.
- 58. Defendant knew the product attributes that potential customers like Plaintiff were seeking and developed its marketing and labeling to directly meet those needs and desires.
- 59. Defendant's representations about the Product were conveyed in writing and promised it would be defect-free, and Plaintiff understood this meant that it included the necessary elements for functionality, such as a charger, because anything else would be the sale of an

incomplete and/or non-functional product.

- 60. Defendant's representations affirmed and promised that the Product (1) included the necessary elements for functionality, such as a charger, by depicting it in ads that highlighted its capabilities and features, which required the device to be on with sufficient power and (2) would not be sold missing any essential components that would render it incomplete and/or non-functional.
- 61. Defendant described the Product so Plaintiff believed it included the necessary elements for functionality, such as a charger, because anything else would be the sale of an incomplete and/or non-functional product, which became part of the basis of the bargain that it would conform to its affirmations and promises.
- 62. Defendant had a duty to disclose and/or provide non-deceptive descriptions and marketing of the Product.
- 63. This duty is based on Defendant's outsized role in the market for this type of Product, a company known for its commitment to its customers, often with the phrase, "it just works," which was false because the absence of a power source meant it could not work.
 - 64. Plaintiff recently became aware of Defendant's breach of the Product's warranties.
- 65. Plaintiff provided or provides notice to Defendant, its agents, representatives, retailers, and their employees that it breached the Product's express and implied warranties.
- 66. Defendant received notice and should have been aware of these issues due to complaints by third-parties, including regulators, competitors, and consumers, to its main offices, and by consumers through online forums.
- 67. Defendant has been under investigation in countries including Brazil, where it was fined by governmental authorities for failing to provide a charger with its iPhones.

- 68. Authorities there even issued orders requiring Defendant to include a charger with its iPhones based on principles of fair dealing and consumer expectations to receive a functional device.
- 69. The Product did not conform to its affirmations of fact and promises due to Defendant's actions.
- 70. The Product was not merchantable because it was not fit to pass in the trade as advertised, not fit for the ordinary purpose for which it was intended and did not conform to the promises or affirmations of fact made on the packaging, container or label, because it did not include the necessary elements for functionality, such as a charger.
- 71. The Product was not merchantable because Defendant had reason to know the particular purpose for which the Product was bought by Plaintiff, because she expected it would function as a smartphone, which meant the ability to make calls, send text messages, use the internet, study, do work and/or play games among other things, and she relied on Defendant's skill and judgment to select or furnish such a suitable product.

Negligent Misrepresentation

- 72. Defendant had a duty to truthfully represent the Product, which it breached.
- 73. This duty was non-delegable, based on Defendant's position, holding itself out as having special knowledge and experience in this area, a trusted company known for its commitment to providing products that are reliable and just work, without customers having to know all the technical details of how those things happen.
- 74. These representations and omissions went beyond the specific representations on the packaging, as they incorporated the extra-labeling promises and commitments to quality, transparency and putting customers first that Defendant has been known for.

- 75. These promises were outside of the standard representations that other companies may make in a standard arms-length, context where products are sold through retailers.
- 76. The representations took advantage of consumers' cognitive shortcuts made at the point-of-sale and their trust in Defendant.
- 77. Plaintiff reasonably and justifiably relied on these negligent misrepresentations and omissions, which served to induce and did induce, her purchase of the Product.

Fraud

- 78. Defendant misrepresented and/or omitted the attributes and qualities of the Product, that it contained cream, a dairy ingredient.
- 79. Defendant is the one of the two largest sellers of smartphones in the world, and it knew a significant percentage of its customers would be negatively affected by removing the charging capability from the iPhone.

Unjust Enrichment

80. Defendant obtained benefits and monies because the Product was not as represented and expected, to the detriment and impoverishment of Plaintiff and class members, who seek restitution and disgorgement of inequitably obtained profits.

Jury Demand and Prayer for Relief

Plaintiff demands a jury trial on all issues.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment:

- 1. Declaring this a proper class action, certifying Plaintiff as representative and the undersigned as counsel for the class;
- 2. Injunctive relief to remove, correct and/or refrain from the challenged practices;
- 3. Awarding monetary, statutory and/or punitive damages and interest;
- 4. Awarding costs and expenses, including reasonable fees for Plaintiff's attorneys and

experts; and

5. Other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: December 27, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Spencer Sheehan

Sheehan & Associates, P.C. 60 Cuttermill Rd Ste 412 Great Neck NY 11021 (516) 268-7080 spencer@spencersheehan.com

$_{ m JS~44~(Rev.~04/21)}$ Case 3:22-cv-03099 Document Coving \$2127/22 Page 1 of 1 Page ID #13

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 decket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT BACK OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil d	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	CTIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	F THIS F							
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Elizabeth Steines, individually and on behalf of all oth similarly situated				DEFENDANTS						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Madison (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				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.						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Sheehan & Associates, P. 11021 (516) 268-7080			k NY	Attorneys (If Kno		F LAND IN	NVOLVED.			
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. C	TIZENSHIP OI		NCIPA			-	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	•		Citiz	(For Diversity Cases O	nly) PTF ☑ 1	DEF □ 1	Incorporated or Pri of Business In T		Defendant) PTF □ 4	DEF □ 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	, in the second			zen of Another State	□ 2		Incorporated and F		□ 5	☑ 5
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country			3 Foreign Nation 6 6				
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		•	l r				Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Des			
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIO Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	Y	CARFEITURE/PENAL/ 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 8 90 Other LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 62 Naturalization Applic 65 Other Immigration Actions	5881	422 App 423 With 28	USC 157 CLLECTUAL CRTY RIGHTS yrights nt nt-Abbreviated v Drug Application lemark end Trade Secrets of 2016 L SECURITY (1395ff) de Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	375 False C 376 Qui Ta 3729(a 400 State F 410 Antitr 430 Banks 450 Comm 460 Deport 470 Racket Corrup 480 Consu (15 US 485 Teleph Protec 490 Cable/ 850 Securii 891 Agricu 893 Enviro 895 Freedo Act 896 Arbitra 899 Admin Act/Re	am (31 USG a)) Reapportion st and Banki herce tation teer Influer to Organiza mer Credit SC 1681 or tone Consu tion Act Sat TV ties/Comm nge Statutory A ditural Acts normental M om of Infor ation histrative Pr view or Af y Decision tutionality	nnment ing nced and itions it r 1692) inmer nodities/ Actions s Matters mation rocedure ppeal of
- 6	emoved from 3 ate Court	Appellate Court	Reo	(spe	other D	District	☐ 6 Multidistri Litigation Transfer		Multidist Litigatio Direct F	on -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	28 II S C & 1332	atute under which you a	ie iiing	Do noi cue jurisdictiono	u statute	es uniess di	versuy):			
VII. REQUESTED IN	False advertising	S IS A CLASS ACTION	N I	DEMAND \$		C	HECK YES only	if demanded in	complai	nt:
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 2		-				URY DEMAND:		□ No	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE				DOCKI	ET NUMBER			
DATE	25.000	SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY			_				
December 2 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	27, 2022			/5	s/Spenc	er Sheeha	ın			
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		IIIDO	ΉE		MAG III	DGE		

United States District Court

for the Southern District of Illinois

Elizabeth Steines, individual others similarly situated,	lly and on behalf of all)	
DI	<u> </u>	
Plaintiff(s	<i>,</i>)	Civil Action No. 3:22-cy-03099
V.)	CIVII ACTIOII No. 3.22-CV-03099
Apple, Inc.,)	
)	
)	
Defendant((s)	
	SUMMONS IN A	CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	Apple, Inc.	
	c/o C T Corporation Syst	em
	330 N Brand Blvd Ste 70	
	Glendale CA 91203-2336	
A lawsuit has been file	ed against you.	
are the United States or a United P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must the Federal Rules of Civil Proc	ed States agency, or an officer serve on the plaintiff an answ redure. The answer or motion	(not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. Fer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, C., 60 Cuttermill Rd Ste 412 Great Neck NY 11021
If you fail to respond, you also must file your answer	, ,	ntered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. **CLERK OF COURT**
D .		
Date:		Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk
		g = -F,

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No. 3:22-cv-03099

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

	This summons for (na	me of individual and title, if a	any)						
was rec	ceived by me on (date)		·						
	☐ I personally served	I the summons on the in	dividual at (place)						
			on (date)						
	☐ I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with (name)								
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,								
	on (date), and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or								
	☐ I served the summe		, who is						
	designated by law to	accept service of proces	ss on behalf of (name of	of organization)					
			on (d	; or					
	☐ I returned the sum		; or						
	☐ Other (specify):								
	My fees are \$	for travel and	\$ f	For services, for a total of \$		·			
	I declare under penalt								
Date:									
Date.		Server's signature							
			Printed name and title						
		-		Server's address					

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc: