ORIGINAL FILED COURT

JAN 09 2012

John A Placks, Executive Officer/Clerk By DOROTHY SWAIN

SEAN REIS (sreis@edelson.com) - SBN 184044 EDELSON MCGUIRE LLP 30021 Tomas Street, Suite 300 Rancho Santa Margarita, California 92688

Tel: (949) 459-2124 Fax: (949) 459-2123

This case is assigned to Dept. 324 at the Central Civil West Courthouse

Or COMPLEX DETERMINATION ONLY

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

61/69/12

Counsel for Plaintiff and the putative class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

BC476413

PAYMENT: \$550.00

01/09/12 09:48:09 AM

CHCK:

IT/CASE: 31007641 LEA/NEF#;

MAX SMITH, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

(1) Violations of Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83

v.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

Defendant.

Defendant.

CLASS ACTION

FINED

CIT/CA RECEIP

TT/CASE: 31007641 LEA/DEF#:

CHECK:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

61/38/13

Plaintiff, Max Smith ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, upon personal knowledge as to himself and his own acts, and upon information and belief as to all other matters, complains and alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. In 2003, the California Legislature passed the Shine the Light Law, Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83 (the "Shine the Light Law" or the "Act"), to protect consumers from companies that collect and surreptitiously share their sensitive personal information with third parties. In support of the bill, its author, Senator Liz Figueroa, aptly commented:

[s]ecret direct marketing "profiles" of consumers are being exchanged every hour invisibly and routinely by the companies with which they do business. Not only are consumers powerless to stop such invasions of privacy, they do not even know whether and to what extent it is taking place.¹

- 2. The Act empowers consumers to "shine the light" on companies' data sharing methods by requiring businesses to establish a procedure by which customers can receive an explanation of how their personal information is disclosed to third parties (the "Shine the Light Disclosures" or "Disclosures").
- 3. Businesses governed by the Act are required to: (1) designate a dedicated mailing address (physical or electronic) or phone/facsimile number where customers can request the company's Shine the Light Disclosures, and (2) ensure that interested customers can readily make such requests or otherwise obtain the Disclosures.
- 4. Shine the Light Disclosures are necessary because without knowledge of companies' data sharing practices, consumers cannot make informed decisions about which businesses they should entrust with their personal information:

Because privacy is, by definition, so intensely personal, for a consumer to make a

CALIFORNIA SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, SB 27 BILL ANALYSIS, Sept. 16, 2003, available at http://info.sen.ca.gov/pub/03-04/bill/sen/sb_0001-0050/sb_27_cfa_20030916_115403_sen_comm.html (last visited January 6, 2012).

rational and informed and personal choice to opt-in, opt-out, or simply take their business elsewhere, the consumer must know the "who, what, where and when" of how a business handles personal information.²

- 5. While traditional businesses may display or otherwise make Shine the Light Disclosures available at their physical storefront locations, the Act requires companies with no "brick and mortar" locations to either provide the Shine the Light Disclosures on their websites or to train their managers and employees to notify customers of the addresses and phone numbers where the Shine the Light Disclosures can be obtained.
- 6. Defendant Microsoft Corporation ("Microsoft")—a computer and media technology company with no "brick and mortar" storefronts—owns and operates the Internet websites www.microsoft.com, www.login.live.com, and www.xbox.com.
- 7. Microsoft collects and stores a wealth of information about its subscribers, and shares such data with third parties for direct marketing purposes.
- 8. Despite the fact that Microsoft profits by sharing its users' personal information, it intentionally keeps its users in the dark on its information sharing practices by failing to make the Shine the Light Disclosures on its website.
- 9. As a result, Microsoft violates the Shine the Light Law by willfully denying its users an opportunity to exercise their legally proscribed rights under the Act. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to civil penalties of three thousand dollars (\$3,000.00) per violation pursuant to California Civil Code section 1798.84(c).

PARTIES

- 10. Plaintiff, Max Smith, is a natural person and resident of the State of California.
- 11. Defendant, Microsoft Corporation, is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at One Microsoft Way, in the City of Redmond, and State of Washington.

 Microsoft does business throughout California and the United States.

Supra, note 1, pp. 4-5.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 12. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the causes of action asserted herein pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, §10, because this case is a cause not given by statute to other trial courts.
- 13. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Microsoft because the improper conduct alleged in the Complaint occurred in, was directed to, and/or emanated from California.
- 14. Venue is proper in this Court because a substantial part of Microsoft's conduct at issue originated or occurred in this County, and because Plaintiff resides in this County.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

I. The Personal Information Market: Consumer Data Has Monetary Value

- 15. In 2001, Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") Commissioner Orson Swindle recognized that "the digital revolution ... has given an enormous capacity to the acts of collecting and transmitting and flowing of information, unlike anything we've ever seen in our life ... [and] individuals are concerned about being defined by the existing data on themselves."³
- 16. More than a decade later, Commissioner Swindle's comments ring truer than ever, as consumer data feeds an information marketplace that supports a \$26 billion dollar per year online advertising industry in the United States.⁴
- 17. The FTC has also recognized that consumer data possesses inherent monetary value within the new information marketplace:
 - Most consumers cannot begin to comprehend the types and amount of information collected by businesses, or why their information may be commercially valuable. Data is currency. The larger the data set, the greater

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

空 27 28

The Information Marketplace, Merging and Exchanging Consumer Data, http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/workshops/infomktplace/transcript.htm (last visited January 6, 2012).

See, Web's Hot New Commodity: Privacy, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703529004576160764037920274.html (last visited January 6, 2012).

Ì

- 18. In today's digital marketplace, consumers engage in *quid pro quo* transactions with online businesses whereby individuals exchange personal information for services.
- 19. It is now a nearly ubiquitous practice for online companies that collect consumer information—such as, names, addresses, occupations, political and religious affiliations, sexual orientation, education, and cultural interests—to share such data, for a profit, with numerous third party marketers without any input from, or disclosure to, the source consumer.
- 20. In fact, consumers' personal information has become such a valuable commodity that companies now offer individuals the opportunity to sell their personal information themselves.⁶ In this way, consumers are becoming more empowered to direct where their personal information is shared, and to directly profit from their own data.
- 21. Because Microsoft deprives its users the ability to control the dissemination of their personal information—by denying them the ability to ascertain where such data is flowing—Microsoft has diluted the value of its users' property as it exists in the personal information market.

II. California's Shine the Light Law

22. The Shine the Light Law was enacted because while "transparency is the touchstone of consumer confidence in information handling ... by and large, consumers are not aware of the extent to which their personal information is sold." Thus, the Act is designed to "shine the light" on how businesses share and profit from their customers' personal information.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

E1/88/18

Statement of FTC Commissioner Pamela Jones Harbour, http://www.ftc.gov/speeches/harbour/091207privacyroundtable.pdf (last visited January 6, 2012) (emphasis added).

[&]quot;You Want My Personal Data? Reward Me for It," http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/18/business/18unboxed.html (last visited January 6, 2012).

See, California Senate Judiciary Committee, SB 27 Bill Analysis, Sept. 16, 2003, available at http://info.sen.ca.gov/pub/03-04/bill/sen/sb_0001-0050/sb_27_cfa_20030916_115403_sen_comm.html (last visited January 6, 2012).

- 23. As such, under the Act, customers may request, and companies doing business in California must provide, a list of all categories of personal information disclosed by the business within the preceding year, as well as the names and addresses of the companies receiving that information. Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(a).
- 24. To facilitate such requests, the Act requires businesses to "designate a mailing address, electronic mail address, or, if the business chooses to receive requests by telephone or facsimile, a toll-free telephone or facsimile number, to which customers may deliver requests" to discover how their personal information is being shared with third parties. Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b)(1).
- 25. The term "personal information" is broadly defined under the Act, and includes, but is not limited to, an individual's:
 - (A) name and address; (B) electronic mail address; (C) age or date of birth; (D) names of children; (E) electronic mail or other addresses of children; (F) number of children; (G) age or gender of children; (H) height; (I) weight; (J) race; (K) religion; (L) occupation; (M) telephone number; (N) education; (O) political party affiliation; (P) medical condition; (Q) drugs, therapies, or medical products or equipment used; (R) the kind of product the customer purchased, leased, or rented; (S) real property purchased, leased, or rented; (T) the kind of service provided; (U) social security number; (V) bank account number; (W) credit card number; (X) debit card number; (Y) bank or investment account, debit card, or credit card balance; (Z) payment history; and (AA) information pertaining to the customer's creditworthiness, assets, income, or liabilities.

Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(e)(7).

26. An Internet business with no "brick and mortar" locations may comply with the Act by adhering to the following provision:

Add to the home page of its Web site a link either to a page titled "Your Privacy Rights" or add the words "Your Privacy Rights" to the home page's link to the business's privacy policy ... The first page of the link shall describe a customer's rights pursuant to this section and shall provide the designated mailing address, email address, as required, or toll-free telephone number or facsimile number, as appropriate.

Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b)(1)(B).

27. Alternatively, and in cases where an Internet business has "employees who

regularly have contact with customers," a business may:

Notify all agents and managers who directly supervise employees who regularly have contact with customers of the designated address or numbers or the means to obtain those addresses or numbers and instruct those employees that customers who inquire about the business's privacy practices or the business's compliance with this section shall be informed of the designated addresses or numbers or the means to obtain the addresses or numbers.

Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b)(1)(A).

28. In short, the Act affords California citizens the right to discover whether businesses are sharing their personal information, and if so, which companies or organizations they are sharing such data with.

III. A Brief Overview of Microsoft

- 29. Microsoft is a computer, media, and gaming technology company that operates several websites, including, www.microsoft.com, login.live.com, and www.xbox.com.
- 30. In order to subscribe to one of its websites, consumers are required to provide Microsoft with certain personal information, including, *inter alia*, their name and address, e-mail address, telephone number, gender, and date of birth.
 - 31. Microsoft maintains this data on its servers.

IV. Microsoft Willfully Violates California's Shine the Light Law

- 32. Microsoft shares its subscribers' personal information, including their names, addresses, e-mail addresses, gender, and dates of birth with third parties for direct marketing purposes.
- 33. Despite the fact that Microsoft shares information about its users with third parties for direct marketing purposes, it fails to provide its customers with the Shine the Light Disclosures, or the means through which its customers may obtain the Disclosures, as required by the Act.
- 34. As such, Microsoft has chosen to deny California customers their legal right to learn what personal information is being disclosed, who is receiving it, and other legal protections afforded under the Act.

西主人经验人主包

35. Accordingly, Microsoft intentionally violates California's Shine the Light Law and is liable for civil penalties of three thousand dollars (\$3,000.00) per violation pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.84(c).

FACTS RELATING TO PLAINTIFF MAX SMITH

- 36. Plaintiff Max Smith is a natural person domiciled in the State of California.
- 37. In or around 2010, Plaintiff registered for an online account with Microsoft.
- 38. At the time that Plaintiff signed up for his subscription, he provided personal information to Microsoft, including, *inter alia*, his full name, mailing address, e-mail address, ZIP code, telephone number, gender, and birth date.
- 39. Plaintiff has visited www.login.live.com and www.xbox.com on numerous occasions since registering in or around 2010. At all relevant times, Plaintiff used Microsoft and the websites primarily for personal, family, and household purposes.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

40. **Definition of the Class:** Plaintiff Max Smith brings this action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 on behalf of himself and a Class of similarly situated individuals, defined as follows:

All California residents who have provided personal information to Microsoft.

Excluded from the Class are (1) Defendant, Defendant's agents, subsidiaries, parents, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the Defendant or their parents have a controlling interest and their current and former employees, officers, and directors, (2) the Judge or Magistrate Judge to whom this case is assigned and the Judge's or Magistrate Judge's immediate family, (3) persons who execute and file a request for exclusion, (4) the legal representatives, successors, or assigns of any such excluded person, and (5) all persons who have previously had claims similar to those alleged herein finally adjudicated or who have released their claims against Defendant.

41. Numerosity: The exact number of the members of the Class is unknown and is

§ 28

not available to Plaintiff, but the Class is believed to consist of millions of individuals. Thus, individual joinder in this case is impracticable. Class members can be easily identified through Defendant's records.

- 42. Commonality and Predominance: There are many questions of law and fact common to the claims of Plaintiff and the other members of the Class, and those questions predominate over any questions that may affect individual members of the Class. Common questions for the Class include but are not limited to the following:
 - (a) Whether the Class members are "customers" of Defendant, as that term is defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(e)(1);
 - (b) Whether each Class member had an "established business relationship" with Defendant, as that term is defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(e)(5);
 - (c) Whether Defendant made the Shine the Light Disclosures required by Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b)(1)(B);
 - (d) Whether Defendant's website violates Civ. Code § 1798.83(b)(1)(B);
 - (e) Whether Defendant has employees who regularly have contact with customers, as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(e)(4);
 - (f) Whether Defendant otherwise complied with the requirements of Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b)(1);
 - (g) Whether Defendant's failure to meet the notice requirements of § 1798.83(b)(1)(B) constitutes a violation of § 1798.83;
 - (h) Whether Defendant's conduct constituted a willful, intentional, or reckless violation of § 1798.83; and
 - (i) Whether Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to injunctive relief.
 - 43. **Typicality:** The factual and legal bases of Microsoft's liability to Plaintiff and to the other members of the Class are the same and resulted in injury to Plaintiff and all of the other members of the Class. Plaintiff and the other members of the Class have all suffered harm as a

result of Microsoft's wrongful conduct.

- 44. Adequate Representation: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class members, and have retained counsel competent and experienced in complex class actions. Plaintiff has no interest antagonistic to those of the Class and Defendant has no defenses unique to Plaintiff.
- Appropriateness: This class action is appropriate for certification because class proceedings are superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy and joinder of all members of the Class is impracticable. The damages suffered by the individual members of the Class will likely be small relative to the burden and expense of individual prosecution of the complex litigation necessitated by Defendant's wrongful conduct. Thus, it would be virtually impossible for the individual members of the Class to obtain effective relief for Defendant's misconduct. Even if each member of the Class could sustain such individual litigation, it would not be preferable to a class action because individual litigation would increase the delay and expenses to all parties due to the complex legal and factual controversies presented in this Complaint. By contrast, a class action presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefits of single adjudication, economy of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court. Economies of time, effort, and expense will be fostered and uniformity of decisions will be ensured.
- 46. Policies Generally Applicable to the Class: This class action is also appropriate for certification because Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole. The policies of the Defendant challenged herein apply to and affect all members of the Class uniformly, and Plaintiff's challenge of these policies hinges on Defendant's conduct, not on facts or law applicable only to Plaintiff.

- 47. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.
- 48. Plaintiff and the Class are "customers" of Microsoft, as that term is defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(e)(1).
- 49. Plaintiff and the Class are engaged in an ongoing "established business relationship" with Microsoft as that term is defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(e)(5).
- 50. Microsoft cannot utilize the notice option available under Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b)(1)(A) because, as a business operating almost exclusively online, it does not have "employees who regularly have contact with customers," as that term is defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(e)(4).
- 51. In any event, and upon information and belief, Microsoft does not instruct or otherwise train its employees to respond to customer inquiries about obtaining Microsoft's Shine the Light Disclosures as required by Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b)(1)(A).
- 52. Further, on information and belief, Microsoft does not conduct business through "brick and mortar" stores in California, meaning it cannot avail itself of the notice option set forth in Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b)(1)(C).
- 53. Consequently, Microsoft must utilize the notice option under Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b)(1)(B). As such, Microsoft must affirmatively disclose specific information to its customers through its Web site.
- 54. Microsoft willfully violates the Act by, among other things, (i) failing to add a hyperlink entitled "Your Privacy Rights" to its home page, (ii) failing to add a hyperlink to a page titled "Your Privacy Rights," (iii) failing to designate a mailing address, e-mail address, telephone number, or facsimile number for customers to deliver requests, and/or (iv) failing to describe its California customers' rights under the Shine the Light Law. See Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b)(1)(B). (True and accurate copies of Microsoft's xbox.com and login.live.com home

pages and privacy policies are attached as Exhibits A, B, and C, respectively.)

- Microsoft's failure to comply with Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b)(1) deprives Plaintiff and the Class of their statutorily-guaranteed right to monitor and control the disclosure and use of that data. As such, Microsoft has diluted the value of Plaintiff's and the Class's personal property, and deprived them of the opportunity to sell their personal property for their own financial gain. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class have sustained, and continue to sustain, monetary injuries as a direct and proximate cause of Microsoft's violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83.
- 56. Microsoft's failure to comply with Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b) also deprives Plaintiff and the Class of the ability to make informed decisions with respect to their privacy and transmission of their personal information. Further, Microsoft's supposed privacy procedures provide fewer protections to Plaintiff and the Class, thereby depriving them of their protections and rights under the Act.
- 57. At all times relevant to this lawsuit, Microsoft has failed to provide Plaintiff or the Class with disclosures required by Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b)(1).
- 58. Microsoft is a "business required to comply with [Section 1798.83]." and none of the exceptions in Sections 1798.83 or 1798.84 apply. See Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b)(1).
- 59. Microsoft shares its customers' personal information with third parties for direct marketing purposes.
- 60. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to civil penalties of three thousand dollars (\$3,000.00) per violation pursuant to California Civil Code section 1798.84(c).

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)

- 61. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.
- 62. California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL"), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code

§§ 17200, et seq., protects both consumers and competitors by promoting fair competition in commercial markets for goods and services.

- 63. The UCL prohibits any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice.
- 64. As discussed above, Microsoft has violated the unlawful prong of the UCL in that its conduct violated the Shine the Light Law, Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83.
- 65. Plaintiff's and the Class's personal information has monetary value, and Microsoft's failure to comply with Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83(b) deprives Plaintiff and the Class of their statutorily-guaranteed right to monitor and control the disclosure and use of that data. As such, Microsoft has diluted the value of Plaintiff's and the Class's personal property, and deprived them of the opportunity to sell their personal property for their own financial gain.
- 66. Pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, Plaintiff, on his own behalf and on behalf of the Class, seeks an order requiring Microsoft to (1) immediately cease the unlawful practices described herein; (2) make full restitution of all funds wrongfully obtained by sharing and/or selling Plaintiff's and the Class's personal information; and (3) pay interest, attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Max Smith, individually and on behalf of the Class, prays for the following relief:

- A. Certify the Class as defined above, appoint Plaintiff as Class representative, and designate his counsel as Class Counsel;
- B. Declare that Defendant's actions, as described herein, violate California's Shine the Light Law, Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.83, and the Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.;
- C. Award injunctive and other equitable relief as is necessary to protect the interests of the Class, including, *inter alia*, entering an Order: (i) prohibiting Defendant from engaging in

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT



SHORT THE

Smith v. Microsoft

CASE NUMBER

BC476413

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION (CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)

This form is required pursuant to Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court. Item I. Check the types of hearing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case: JURY TRIAL? YES CLASS ACTION? YES LIMITED CASE? YES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 7 HOURS! DAYS Item II. Indicate the correct district and courthouse location (4 steps - If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg. 4): Step 1: After first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, find the main Civil Case Cover Sheet heading for your case in the left margin below, and, to the right in Column A, the Civil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected. Step 2: Check one Superior Court type of action in Column B below which best describes the nature of this case. Step 3: In Column C, circle the reason for the court location choice that applies to the type of action you have checked. For any exception to the court location, see Local Rule 2.0. Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthouse Location (see Column C below) 1. Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district. Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle. Location where petitioner resides.
 Location where petitioner resides.
 Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly.
 Location where one or more of the parties reside.
 Location of Labor Commissioner Office May be filed in central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage). Location where cause of action arose.
 Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred.
 Location where performance required or defendant resides.

Step 4: Fill in the information requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration.

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check anly one)	C Applicable Reasons See Step 3 Above
Auto Tort	Auto (22)	☐ A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
	Uninsured Motorist (46)	☐ A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Molorist	1., 2., 4.
Other Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort	Asbestos (04)	☐ A6070 Asbestos Property Damage ☐ A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.
	Product Liability (24)	☐ A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
	Medical Malpractice (45)	☐ A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons ☐ A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4. 1., 4.
	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	□ A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) □ A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.) □ A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress □ A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 4. 1., 4. 1., 3. 1., 4.

Smith v. Microsoft

CASE NUMBER

Α ₿ Applicable Reasons -See Step 3 Above Civil Case Cover Sheet Type of Action Category No. (Check only one) ✓ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract) Business Fort (07) (1) 3. Non-Personal Injuryl Property Damagel Wrongful Death Tort Civil Rights (08) □ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination 1., 2., 3. Delamation (13) ☐ A6010 Defamation (stander/libel) 1., 2., 3. Fraud (16) ☐ A6013 Fraud (no contract) 1., 2., 3. □ A6017 Legal Malpractice 1., 2., 3. Professional Negligence (25) ☐ A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal) 1., 2., 3. D A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort Other (35) 2.,3. Employment Wrongful Termination (36) ☐ A6037 Wrongful Termination 1., 2., 3. □ A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case 1., 2., 3. Other Employment (15) □ A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals 10. ☐ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful 2., 5. Breach of Contract/ Warranty 2., 5. ☐ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Pfaintiff (no fraud/negligence) (06)1., 2., 5. (not insurance) A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) 1., 2., 5. ☼ A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence) Contract □ A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff 2., 5., 6. Collections (09) ☐ A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case 2., 5. ☐ A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex) 1., 2., 5., 8. Insurance Coverage (18) ☐ A6009 Contractual Fraud 1., 2., 3., 5. Other Contract (37) A6031 Tortious Interference 1., 2., 3., 5. A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence) 1., 2., 3., 8. Eminent Domain/Inverse A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels_ Condemnation (14) Real Property Wrongful Eviction (33) □ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case 2., 6. □ A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure 2., 6. D A6032 Quiet Title 2., 6. Other Real Property (26) ☐ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure) 2., 6. Unlawful Detainer-Commercial ☐ A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction) 2., 6. (31)Unlawful Detainer Unlawful Detainer-Residential ☐ A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction) 2., 6. (32)Unlawful Detainer-A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure 2., 6. Post-Foreclosure (34)

□ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs

2., 6.

Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)

Smith v. Microsoft

CASE NUMBER

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons See Step 3 Above
	Asset Forteiture (05)	☐ A6108 Assel Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
Judicial Review	Petition re Arbitration (11)	☐ A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
	Wnt of Mandate (02)	☐ A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus ☐ A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter	2., 8.
		☐ A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2.
	Other Judicial Review (39)	☐ A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Antitrust/frade Regulation (03)	☐ A6003 Antitrust/Frade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
	Construction Defect (10)	☐ A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	☐ A6006 Claims Involving Mass Torl	1., 2., 8.
lly Co	Securities Liligation (28)	☐ A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
Provisiona	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	☐ A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	□ A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Enforcement of Judgment	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	 □ A5141 Sister State Judgment □ A6160 Abstract of Judgment □ A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) □ A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) □ A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax □ A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case 	2., 9. 2., 6. 2., 9. 2., 8. 2., 8. 2., 8.
s Es	RICO (27)	☐ A6033 Rackeleering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Complaints	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	 □ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only □ A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) □ A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) □ A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex) 	1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.
	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	☐ A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	□ A6121 Civil Harassment □ A6123 Workplace Harassment □ A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case □ A6190 Election Contest □ A6110 Petition for Change of Name □ A6170 Petition for Reflef from Late Claim Law	2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2. 2., 7. 2., 3., 4., 8.
		□ A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 9.

ft		CASE NUMBER	
tion: Enter the add Item II., Step 3 o	fress of the acc in Page 1, as l	cident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or othe the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.	
of action that you have	ve selected for	ADDRESS: 340 N. Hayworth Ave. #103	
STATE:	zin dobe: 90048		
r	tion: Enter the add Item II., Step 3 o late boxes for the nu of action that you had 5. [.]6. [.]7. [.]8. [tion: Enter the address of the accidem II., Step 3 on Page 1, as to late boxes for the numbers shown of action that you have selected for 5. E.16. E.17. I.18. E.19. E.110.	

_ District of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local

Dated: 1-9-12

Rule 2.0, subds. (b), (c) and (d)].

(SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY)

PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY COMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE:

- 1. Original Complaint or Petition.
- 2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form CM-010.
- Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement of Location form, LACIV 109, LASC Approved 03-04 (Rev. 03/11).
- 5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- A signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, Judicial Council form CIV-010, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age will be required by Court in order to issue a summons.
- 7. Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.