10/11/2019 3:19 PM 19CV44447

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

2526

27

28

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE STATE OF OREGON

FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY

ELLIOTT YOUNG

individually and on behalf of others similarly situated

Plaintiff

vs

AT&T MOBILITY LLC

Defendant

Case No.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR EQUITABLE RELIEF

Unlawful Trade Practices Unjust Enrichment

Jury Trial Requested Filing Fee Authority: ORS 21.135 Not Subject to Mandatory Arbitration

1.

INTRODUCTION

In an effort to profit and to obtain an unfair advantage over its competitors, AT&T misled thousands of Oregon customers into paying unlawful five cent surcharges that AT&T was not permitted to collect. AT&T only said it would refund the money it wrongfully collected from Oregon customers after AT&T got caught. AT&T still has not agreed to pay its customers the \$200 penalties and interest they are entitled to under Oregon law as result of AT&T's unlawful trade practices.

2.

Any Oregon customer affected by AT&T's unlawful surcharge may contact underdoglawyer.com or call 503-222-2000 to file a claim for \$200 compensation.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT – Page 1 of 9

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

3.

The Circuit Court for the County of Multnomah in Oregon has jurisdiction because the behavior alleged in this complaint took place in and around Multnomah County and because plaintiff's claim arises under the Oregon Unlawful Trade Practices Act, ORS 646.638.

4.

This complaint's allegations are based on personal knowledge as to plaintiff's own behavior and are made on information and belief as to the behavior of others.

.

Plaintiff is a college professor living in Portland, Oregon.

6.

Plaintiff is a "person" as that term is defined at ORS 646.605(4).

7.

Defendant is a Delaware limited liability company.

8.

Defendant is a "person" as that term is defined at ORS 646.605(4).

9.

Defendant regularly advertises and sells wireless goods and services in Oregon in the course of defendant's business.

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2425

26

2728

10.

In September 2019 defendant advertised and provided wireless goods and services to plaintiff and other class members in Oregon.

11.

The wireless goods and services defendant advertised and provided to plaintiff and other class members were obtained primarily for their personal, family or household purposes.

12.

As alleged in this complaint, in the course of defendant's advertisement and provision of wireless goods and services to plaintiff and other class members, defendant caused likelihood of confusion or misunderstanding as to the source of defendant's alleged five cent surcharge labeled "Portland Clean Energy Srchg".

Surcharges & fees

- 3. Federal Universal Service Charge
- 4. Portland Clean Energy Srchg

\$0.05

\$0.33

13.

As alleged in this complaint, defendant misrepresented (through affirmative misrepresentation and by omission) the characteristics of its wireless goods and services by falsely representing to plaintiff and other class members that its wireless goods and services were subject to a Portland Clean Energy surcharge when in fact defendant knew and should have known that its wireless goods and services were not subject to a Portland Clean Energy surcharge.

14.

As alleged in this complaint, defendant made false or misleading representations concerning the nature of the alleged Portland Clean Energy surcharge and the obligation allegedly incurred by plaintiff and other class members to pay defendant the surcharge.

15.

As alleged in this complaint, defendant made false or misleading representations of fact concerning plaintiff and other class members' cost for its wireless goods and services by falsely telling plaintiff and other class members that they were subject to pay a Portland Clean Energy surcharge.

16.

As alleged in this complaint, defendant's behavior as alleged above violated ORS 646.608(1)(b), (e), (k), (s), and (u) and applicable Oregon Administrative Rules, causing plaintiff and other class members ascertainable loss of a surcharges they should never have been assessed, and loss of use of money and interest on surcharges they never should have been assessed.

17.

Defendant's violation of ORS 646.608 as alleged in this complaint was willful because defendant knew or should have known that its behavior as alleged in this complaint was an unlawful trade practice, and defendant knew or should have known that its representations to plaintiff and other class members pertaining to the applicability of the Portland Clean Energy surcharge were inaccurate.

18.

Defendant knew or should have known that Oregon law protects customers from unfair and deceptive surcharges.

19.

Defendant's violation of ORS 646.608 was reckless because the unfair and deceptive surcharges as alleged in this complaint were in pursuit of profit and stood to give defendant an unfair advantage over its competitors in the billion-dollar wireless goods and services market that chose to follow Oregon law.

.

Defendant is a multi-billion-dollar limited liability company and a whollyowned subsidiary of AT&T Inc., which has a market cap of over \$274 billion as of October 11, 2019.

21.

Defendant's behavior as alleged in this complaint was reprehensible, and violated the common standards required of corporations by the people of Oregon.

CAUSES OF ACTION

Claim One - Unlawful Trade Practices

This claim is not a request for damages at this time, only equitable and injunctive relief. Plaintiff and the other class members intend to request damages in an amended complaint. As alleged in this complaint, defendant's behavior willfully violated ORS 646.608, causing plaintiff and the other class members an ascertainable loss of money or property. Under ORS 646.638 plaintiff requests an order that defendant's behavior violated ORS 646.608, entitling plaintiff to relief under ORS 646.638, reasonable attorney fees, costs and disbursements, an order prohibiting defendant from continuing to violate ORS 646.608, an order requiring defendant to provide an accounting of the unlawful surcharges it collected in violation of ORS 646.608 in the past year, and an order requiring defendant to preserve all documents and information (and electronically stored information) pertaining to this case.

Claim Two - Unjust Enrichment

This claim is not a request for damages at this time, only equitable and injunctive relief. As alleged in this complaint, defendant operated a common scheme to profit from the collection of misleading surcharges that were not allowed by law. As a matter of justice and equity, defendant should not be able to retain the unlawful surcharges it collected from plaintiff and the other class members. Under a theory of unjust enrichment, plaintiff requests an order that defendant's behavior violated Oregon law, entitling plaintiff to reasonable attorney fees, costs and disbursements, an order prohibiting defendant from continuing to violate Oregon law, an order requiring defendant to provide an accounting of the unlawful surcharges it collected in violation of Oregon law in the past year, and an order requiring defendant to preserve all documents and information (and electronically stored information) pertaining to this case.

24.

REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff respectfully requests a trial by a jury.

Plaintiff respectfully requests relief against defendant as sought in

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

paragraphs 22 and 23, and any other relief the Court may deem appropriate, and an

2

1

3

4

5

7

•

8

9

October 11, 2019

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

order appointing class counsel and an order certifying this case as a class action.

RESPECTFULLY FILED,

/s/ Michael Fuller

Michael Fuller, OSB No. 09357

Lead Attorney for Plaintiff

OlsenDaines

US Bancorp Tower

111 SW 5th Ave., Suite 3150

Portland, Oregon 97204

michael@underdoglawyer.com

Direct 503-222-2000

Kelly Jones, OSB No. 074217

Of Attorneys for Plaintiff The Law Office of Kelly Jones

kellydonovanjones@gmail.com

-1	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I caused this document and all attachments to be served on:

State of Oregon c/o Oregon Department of Justice 1162 Court St. NE Salem, Oregon 97301-4096

October 11, 2019

/s/ Michael Fuller

Michael Fuller, OSB No. 09357

Lead Attorney for Plaintiff

OlsenDaines

US Bancorp Tower

111 SW 5th Ave., Suite 3150

Portland, Oregon 97204

michael@underdoglawyer.com

Direct 503-222-2000