

1 Todd M. Friedman, Cal. Bar No. 216752  
2 tfriedman@attorneysforconsumers.com  
3 Suren N. Weerasuriya, Cal. Bar No. 278521  
4 sweerasuriya@attorneysforconsumers.com  
5 Adrian R. Bacon, Cal. Bar No. 280332  
6 **LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.**  
7 324 S. Beverly Drive, #725  
8 Beverly Hills, California 90212  
9 Telephone: (877) 206-4741  
10 Facsimile: (866) 633-0228

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 Susan Harvey,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 Google Inc. , and Does 1-20, inclusive,

17 Defendant(s).

) **Case No.**

) **COMPLAINT**

) **1. Violation of Electronic Funds  
2. Transfer Act**

) **3. Violation of California Unfair  
4. Competition Law (Cal. Bus. &  
5. Prof. Code §§17200)**

) **3. Negligence**

) **4. Negligence Per Se**

) **5. Invasion of Privacy**

) **6. Violation of California Data  
7. Breach Act**

) **Demand for Jury Trial**

**INTRODUCTION**

1  
2 1. Susan Harvey (“Plaintiff”) brings this action for damages, injunctive relief, and  
3 any other available legal or equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal  
4 actions of Google Inc. (“Google”) and its related entities, subsidiaries and  
5 agents, in failing to secure and her personal information (“Information”)   
6 provided to Google, which encompasses her e-mail address, password, debit  
7 card number, expiration date, and mailing and billing addresses, in accordance  
8 with industry security standards. Plaintiff alleges as follows upon personal  
9 knowledge as to herself and her own acts and experiences, and, as to all other  
10 matters, upon information and belief, including investigation conducted by her  
11 attorneys.  
12  
13  
14

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15  
16  
17 2. The Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claim under the Electronic Funds  
18 Transfer Act (“EFTA”) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331, and supplemental  
19 jurisdiction over the other state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367,  
20 because those other California state law claims arise from the same case and  
21 controversy as the EFTA Claim.  
22  
23 3. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of  
24 California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and 1441(a) because the events  
25 giving rise to Plaintiff’s causes of action against Google occurred within the  
26  
27  
28

1 State of California and the County of Fresno, as Plaintiff resides in Madera,  
2 California and within this judicial district.

3 **PARTIES**

- 4
- 5 4. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, an individual citizen and  
6 resident of the County of Orange, State of California.
- 7
- 8 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Google is, and at all  
9 times mentioned herein was, a corporation incorporated in the State of  
10 Delaware, with its principal place of business in the Mountain View, California.
- 11
- 12 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times relevant  
13 Google conducted business in the State of California.

14 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 15
- 16 7. On or about March 20, 2013, Plaintiff activated her new Smartphone supported  
17 by an Android software operating system. After powering on her phone,  
18 Plaintiff was asked to provide a Google e-mail address or sign on using a  
19 Google e-mail address; she signed on using her prior Google e-mail address.  
20 Subsequently, the Android operating system prompted Plaintiff to provide  
21 payment information in order for her to receive updates regarding her phone.  
22 Plaintiff complied by providing the debit/banking information for her checking  
23 account with Bank of America.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 8. Shortly thereafter, upon attempting to upgrade a trial version game she had  
2 downloaded on Playstore to a full version, Plaintiff opened the game on her  
3 Smartphone and pressed the appropriate button to upgrade the game. At no  
4 point prior to or during the upgrade was Plaintiff asked to provide her  
5 Information; nor did she. Further, nor had Plaintiff previously provided her  
6 Information to the Playstore.  
7

8  
9 9. In or around August of 2014, upon attempting to recover another application  
10 she had purchased in 2013, for downloading onto a second phone, Plaintiff  
11 logged on to her Google account through her computer, and was notified  
12 through her Google dashboard that there were one-hundred and nine (109)  
13 transactions on her account. Upon clicking on the appropriate tab on Google's  
14 website, Plaintiff was shocked to find approximately six-hundred and fifty  
15 (650) listed transactions, the majority of which were unrecognizable to Plaintiff,  
16 and certainly not transactions conducted by Plaintiff.  
17

18  
19 10. Plaintiff questioned Google about the issue, and advised them that there were  
20 many transactions posted on her account that did not belong to her, only to be  
21 redundantly advised that the transactions at issue belong to her. Unfortunately,  
22 Plaintiff was able to cross-reference her bank records and determine that said  
23 transactions had been posted to her account from approximately April 15, 2013  
24 through May of 2014, with thousands of dollars of her money being debited.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 11.Both Bank of America and Google asked that Plaintiff submit to them, police  
2 reports, which she did. Yet, neither entity initially responded by agreeing to  
3 refund the monies fraudulently taken from Plaintiff.  
4

5 12.Plaintiff investigated the issue herself, by speaking with the vendors listed on  
6 the transactions that she purportedly entered into. Almost everyone vendor that  
7 cooperated with Plaintiff advised her the same thing: they could not identify the  
8 transaction numbers as part of their billing and the transactions cited by  
9 Plaintiff are Google transactions under which Google is receiving monies.  
10

11 13.Plaintiff relayed her findings to Google, at which point, Google finally  
12 acknowledged that she clearly did not effectuate the transactions. Even at that  
13 point, however, Google refused to reimburse Plaintiff the monies taken from  
14 her.  
15

16 14.After Plaintiff repeatedly complained and advised Google of her findings,  
17 Google's legal department contacted Plaintiff and advised her that all  
18 transactions would be reimbursed.  
19  
20

21 15.To date, all transactions unauthorized by Plaintiff have not been reimbursed and  
22 notably, some transactions previously identified as fraudulent have been erased  
23 from Plaintiff's account.  
24

25 ///

26 ///

1 16.Plaintiff did not publish or otherwise publicly disclose her Information; nor did  
2 she authorize the hundreds of transactions conducted through Google Playstore  
3 that resulted in thousands of dollars being taken from her bank account.  
4

5 17.Plaintiff is informed and believes that security vulnerability in Playstore  
6 allowed hackers to obtain her Information and subsequently post fraudulent  
7 transactions on Plaintiff's account.  
8

9 18.Hackers could not have accessed the Information but for Google's negligence.

10 19.Google failed to implement and maintain reasonable security procedures and  
11 practices appropriate to the nature and scope of the information compromised in  
12 the data breach.  
13

14 20.Google knew or should have known that its systems for processing and/or  
15 Plaintiff's debit card information were not secure and left the Information of  
16 Plaintiff vulnerable to theft.  
17

18 21.Google recklessly, or as a matter of gross negligence, failed to provide  
19 reasonable and adequate security measures to ensure that Plaintiff's Information  
20 not be compromised.  
21

22 22.Additionally, Google failed to timely notify Plaintiff of the security breach, as  
23 required by law.  
24

25 ///

26 ///

1 23.Plaintiff and has all suffered irreparable harm and monetary damages as a result  
2 of Google's unlawful and wrongful conduct heretofore described.

3 24.The compromised Information, is "as good as gold" to identity thieves, per the  
4 view of the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC").<sup>1</sup> According to the FTC,  
5 identity theft occurs when someone uses another's personal identifying  
6 information, such as that person's name, address, credit card number, credit card  
7 expiration dates, and other information, without permission, to commit fraud or  
8 other crimes.<sup>2</sup> The FTC estimates that as many as 9 million Americans have  
9 their identities stolen each year.<sup>3</sup>

10 25.Identity thieves can use identifying data to open new financial accounts and  
11 incur charges in another person's name, take out loans in another person's name,  
12 incur charges on existing accounts, or clone ATM, debit, or credit cards.<sup>4</sup>

13 26.Identity thieves can use personal information such as that pertaining to Plaintiff,  
14 which Google failed to keep secure, to perpetrate a variety of crimes that do not  
15 cause financial loss but nonetheless harm the victims.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

---

24  
25 <sup>1</sup> FTC, *About Identity Theft*, available at  
26 <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/edu/microsites/idtheft/consumers/about-identitytheft.html> (last accessed  
27 Jan. 6, 2014).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

**VIOLATIONS OF THE ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER ACT (15**

**U.S.C. §1693 ET SEQ.)**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 27. Section 907(a) of the EFTA, 15 U.S.C. §1693e(a), provides that a  
6 “preauthorized electronic fund transfer from a consumer’s account may be  
7 authorized by the consumer only in writing, and a copy of such authorization  
8 shall be provided to the consumer when made.”  
9

10 28. Section 903(9) of the EFTA, 15 U.S.C. § 1693a(9), provides that the term  
11 “preauthorized electronic fund transfer” means “an electronic fund transfer  
12 authorized in advance to recur at substantially regular intervals.”  
13

14 29. Section 205.10(b) of Regulation E, 12 C.F.R. § 205.10(b), provides that “[p  
15 ]reauthorized electronic fund transfers from a consumer’s account may be  
16 authorized only by a writing signed or similarly authenticated by the consumer.  
17 The person that obtains the authorization shall provide a copy to the consumer.”  
18

19 30. Section 205.10(b) of the Federal Reserve Board's Official Staff Commentary to  
20 Regulation E, 12 C.F.R. § 205.10(b), Supp. I, provides that “[t]he authorization  
21 process should evidence the consumer’s identity and assent to the  
22 authorization.” *Id.* at ¶10(b), comment 5. The Official Staff Commentary  
23 further provides that “[a]n authorization is valid if it is readily identifiable as  
24  
25  
26

---

27 <sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*



1 such and the terms of the preauthorized transfer are clear and readily  
2 understandable.” *Id.* at ¶10(b), comment 6.

3 31. In multiple instances, purportedly on behalf of merchants, debited Plaintiff’s  
4 bank account on a recurring basis without obtaining a written authorization  
5 signed or similarly authenticated for preauthorized electronic fund transfers  
6 from Plaintiff’s accounts, thereby violating Section 907(a) of the EFTA, 15  
7 U.S.C. § 1693e(a), and Section 205.10(b) of Regulation E, 12 C.F.R. §  
8 205.10(b).  
9

10  
11 32. In multiple instances, Defendant has debited Plaintiff’s bank account on a  
12 recurring basis without providing a copy of a written authorization signed or  
13 similarly authenticated by Plaintiff for preauthorized electronic fund transfers,  
14 thereby violating Section 907(a) of the EFTA, 15 U.S.C. § 1693e (a), and  
15 Section 205.10(b) of Regulation E, 12 C.F.R. § 205.10(b).  
16  
17

18 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW**

20 **CALIFORNIA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200, et seq.**

21  
22 33. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint  
23 as though fully stated herein.  
24

25 ///

26 ///

1 34. Google's failure to timely disclose information concerning the security breach  
2 directly and promptly impacted Plaintiff and constitutes a fraudulent act or  
3 practice in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200  
4  
5 *et seq.*

6 35. Google's acts, practices, and omissions detailed above constitute unlawful,  
7 unfair and/or fraudulent business practices and acts, within the meaning of  
8 California Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*  
9

10 36. Google's acts, practices, and omissions detailed above constitute fraudulent  
11 practices because are likely to deceive a reasonable consumer such as Plaintiff  
12 into believing that Google will take proper measures to secure Plaintiff's  
13 Information. ,  
14

15 37. Google's acts, practices, and omissions detailed above, constitute unlawful  
16 practices and/or acts as they constitute violations of numerous provisions of  
17 California law, including but not limited to Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.80 *et seq.* and  
18 the Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1750 *et seq.*  
19  
20

21 38. Google has committed all of the aforesaid acts of infringement deliberately,  
22 willfully, maliciously and oppressively, without regard to Plaintiff's legal  
23 rights. As a direct and proximate result of Google's unlawful, unfair and  
24 fraudulent business practices as alleged herein, Plaintiff and has suffered injury  
25 in fact and lost money and property, including but not limited to unreimbursed  
26  
27  
28

1 losses stemming from identity theft as well as unreimbursed expenses and/or  
2 time spent on credit-monitoring and identity theft insurance; time spent  
3 scrutinizing bank statements, credit-card statements, and credit reports; missed  
4 wages; late payments on bills;; expenses and/or time spent initiating fraud  
5 alerts; and the diminished value of the services she received. Plaintiff has e  
6 suffered and will continue to suffer other forms of injury and/or harm including,  
7 but not limited to, anxiety, emotional distress, loss of privacy, and other  
8 economic and non-economic losses.  
9

10  
11 39. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiff seeks an  
12 order of this Court prohibiting Google from engaging in the unlawful, unfair, or  
13 fraudulent business acts or practices set forth in this Complaint and/or ordering  
14 Google to perform its obligations under the law.  
15

16  
17 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **NEGLIGENCE**

19 40. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint  
20 as though fully stated herein.  
21

22 41. Google came into possession of the Information and thus had a duty to exercise  
23 reasonable care in safeguarding and protecting the Information from being  
24 compromised, lost, stolen, misused, and/or disclosed to unauthorized parties.  
25

26 42. Moreover, Google had a duty to timely disclose that Information within its  
27  
28

1 possession had been compromised.

2 43. Google had a duty to have procedures in place to detect and prevent the loss or  
3 unauthorized dissemination of Information.

4  
5 44. Google, through its actions and/or omissions, unlawfully breached its duty to  
6 Plaintiff by failing to exercise reasonable care in protecting and safeguarding  
7 said the Information, which in fact was within its possession.

8  
9 45. Google, through its actions and/or omissions, unlawfully breached its duty to  
10 Plaintiff to exercise reasonable care by failing to have appropriate procedures in  
11 place to detect and prevent dissemination of Plaintiff's Information.

12  
13 46. Google, through its actions and/or omissions, unlawfully breached its duty to  
14 timely disclose to Plaintiff that her Information had been compromised.

15  
16 47. Google's negligent and wrongful breach of its duties owed to Plaintiff  
17 proximately caused Plaintiff's Information to be compromised.

18  
19 48. As a direct and proximate cause of Google's failure to exercise reasonable care  
20 and use commercially reasonable security measures its databases were accessed  
21 without authorization and the Information was compromised and exposed to  
22 unauthorized access.

23  
24 49. As a further direct and proximate cause of Google's failure to exercise  
25 reasonable care as described herein, Plaintiff has suffered economic and non-  
26 economic damages as described above and prayed for below in an amount  
27

1 according to proof at trial. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based  
2 thereupon alleges that Google will continue to negligently fail to adequately  
3 protect her Information. As a result of Google's conduct, Plaintiff seeks  
4 declaratory and injunctive relief, restitution, and compensatory and punitive  
5 damages.  
6

7 50. In failing to secure Plaintiff's Information and promptly notify her of a data  
8 breach or loss, as alleged above, Google was guilty of oppression, fraud, or  
9 malice, in that Google acted or failed to act with a willful and conscious  
10 disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Plaintiff therefore seeks an award of damages,  
11 including punitive damages, in an amount to be proven at trial, on behalf of  
12 herself.  
13  
14

15 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **NEGLIGENCE PER SE**

17  
18 51. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint  
19 as though fully stated herein.  
20

21 52. As herein, Google violated various statutes, including EFTA, which requires  
22 written pre-authorization prior to an electronics funds transfer.  
23

24 ///

25 ///

1 53. This statute was intended to protect consumers' finances against unauthorized  
2 withdrawals and other transactions.

3 54. As a direct and proximate cause of Google's violation of the foregoing statutes,  
4 Plaintiff has suffered injury, including actual identity theft. Moreover, Plaintiff  
5 suffered and will continue to suffer actual damages including, but not limited  
6 to, expenses and/or time spent on credit-monitoring and identity theft insurance;  
7 time spent scrutinizing bank statements, credit-card statements, and credit  
8 reports; missed wages; late payments on bills; overdraft charges; expenses  
9 and/or time spent initiating fraud alerts; and the diminished value of the  
10 services she received. Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer other  
11 forms of injury and/or harm including, but not limited to, anxiety, emotional  
12 distress, loss of privacy, and other economic and non-economic losses.  
13

14 55. By engaging in the negligent conduct as alleged above, Google was guilty of  
15 oppression, fraud, or malice, in that Google acted or failed to act with a willful  
16 and conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Plaintiff therefore seeks an award  
17 of damages, including punitive damages, in an amount to be proven at trial, on  
18 behalf of herself.  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**INVASION OF PRIVACY**

1  
2  
3 56.Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint  
4 as though fully stated herein.  
5

6 57.The Information was and continues to be private information. Plaintiff had a  
7 legally protected informational privacy interest in the confidential and sensitive  
8 information that Google obtained and unlawfully disseminated.  
9

10 58.Plaintiff had a legally protected autonomy privacy interest regarding her  
11 Information without unwanted observation, intrusion, or interference.  
12

13 59.Plaintiff reasonably expected that her confidential and sensitive information  
14 would be kept private.  
15

16 60.Google’s failure to secure and protect Plaintiff’s Information resulted in the  
17 public disclosure and publication of such private information to third parties,  
18 including but not limited to hackers.  
19

20 61.Dissemination of Plaintiff’s Information is not of a legitimate public concern;  
21 publicity of her Information would be, is, and will continue to be offensive to  
22 Plaintiff.  
23

24 62.Google’s wrongful actions and/or inaction as described above constituted and  
25 continue to constitute a serious invasion of the privacy of Plaintiff.  
26

27 ///  
28

1 63. Plaintiff was and continues to be damaged as a direct and/or proximate result of  
2 Google's invasion of their privacy by publicly disclosing the Information, in the  
3 form of, *inter alia*, actual monetary losses, expenses for credit-monitoring and  
4 identity-theft insurance, out-of-pocket expenses, anxiety, emotional distress,  
5 loss of privacy, and other economic and non-economic harm, for which they are  
6 entitled to compensation.  
7

8  
9 64. In violating the privacy of Plaintiff as alleged above, Google was guilty of  
10 oppression, fraud, or malice, in that Google acted or failed to act with a willful  
11 and conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Plaintiff therefore seeks an award  
12 of damages, including punitive damages, in an amount to be proven at trial, on  
13 behalf of herself.  
14

15 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA DATA BREACH ACT, CAL**

17 **CIV. CODE § 1798.80, *et seq.***

18  
19 65. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint  
20 as though fully stated herein.  
21

22 66. The data breach constituted a "breach of the security system" of Google  
23 pursuant to California Civil Code § 1798.82(g).  
24

25 67. Google recklessly, or as a matter of gross negligence, failed to provide  
26 reasonable and adequate security measures.  
27



1 68. Google unreasonably delayed informing Plaintiff about the security breach of  
2 the Information after Google knew of the breach.

3 69. Google failed to disclose to Plaintiff, in the most expedient time possible, the  
4 breach of security of her Information after Google knew of the breach.  
5

6 70. As a result of Google's violation of California Civil Code § 1798.82, Plaintiff  
7 suffered economic and non-economic damages, as alleged above.  
8

9 71. Plaintiff seeks all remedies available under California Civil Code § 1798.84.

10 72. By violating California Civil Code § 1798.80 *et seq.* as alleged above, Google  
11 was guilty of oppression, fraud, or malice, in that Google acted or failed to act  
12 with a willful and conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Plaintiff therefore  
13 seeks an award of damages, including punitive damages, in an amount to be  
14 proven at trial, on behalf of herself.  
15  
16

17 PRAYER FOR RELIEF

18 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court grant Plaintiff  
19 the following relief against Google:  
20

- 21 a. Injunctive relief prohibiting Google from engaging in such conduct as  
22 alleged herein in the future;
- 23 b. Actual, statutory and/or punitive damages;
- 24 c. Restitution, or any other equitable relief the Court may deem just and  
25 proper;  
26  
27  
28

- 1 d. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;
- 2 e. Reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of the suit, including expert witness
- 3 fees; and
- 4
- 5 f. For prejudgment interest at the legal rate
- 6 g. Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

7 **TRIAL BY JURY**

8

9 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

10

11 Dated: April 15, 2015

12

13 Respectfully Submitted,

14 **LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C**

15 By: /s/Todd M. Friedman

16 Todd M. Friedman

17 Suren N. Weerasuriya

18 Adrian R. Bacon

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28