

Francis J. "Casey" Flynn, Jr.  
CA State Bar No. 304712  
Law Office of Francis J. Flynn, Jr.  
6220 W 3rd St # 115  
Los Angeles, CA 90036  
Telephone: (323) 424-4194  
Email: francisflynn@gmail.com

Kevin S. Hannon (Pro Hac Vice to be filed)  
Colo. Bar No. 16015  
**THE HANNON LAW FIRM, LLC.**  
1641 Downing Street  
Denver, CO 80218  
303-861-8800 Telephone  
303-861-8855 Facsimile  
Email: khannon@hannonlaw.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class*

*Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

LELAND TRACY, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

FACEBOOK, INC.,

Defendant.

**CASE NO. 3:18-cv-2128**

PLAINTIFF'S CLASS ACTION  
COMPLAINT FOR

- (1) Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") – Unlawful Business Practice - (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*);
- (2) Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") – Unfair Business Practice (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*);
- (3) Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") – Fraudulent Business Practice (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*);
- (4) Negligence;
- (5) Intentional Misrepresentation;
- (6) Unjust Enrichment;
- (7) Invasion of Right of Privacy;
- (8) Violations of the Stored Communications Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2701, *et seq.*;
- (9) Invasion of Privacy (Intrusion to Seclusion)
- (10) Conversion

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

CLASS ACTION

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Plaintiff Leland Tracy, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  
6 (“Plaintiff”), alleges the following against Defendant Facebook, Inc. (“Facebook” or  
7 “Defendant”):

8 **SUMMARY OF THE CASE**

9 1. Facebook operates a social networking website through which owners of  
10 Facebook accounts can communicate with family, friends, and coworkers that they choose and  
11 can access services promoted and allowed by Facebook. Facebook develops technologies for  
12 the sharing of information, photographs, website links, and videos and allows others to  
13 promote services on Facebook with restrictions that Facebook determines. By the end of 2017,  
14 Facebook had more than 2.2 billion active users.

15 2. Defendant Facebook provides multiple mechanisms through which users may  
16 access its social media product. These include but are not limited to a website accessed through  
17 a computer’s web browser, Facebook mobile device applications available on various  
18 operating systems (e.g. Android, iOS), and auxiliary applications such as Facebook Messenger  
19 and Facebook Lite. Facebook’s marketing of its mobile device applications has led many  
20 Facebook users to install its applications on their cell phones, including phones with the  
21 Android operating system.

22 3. When installing such applications, Facebook users are not advised that using  
23 the application on an Android cell phone will result in the logging of all the user’s call and text  
24 communications (including recipients, dates of communication, length of communication, and  
25 mode of communication) on Facebook’s servers for Facebook’s own use, even when not using  
26 the Facebook application.

27 4. In the Android versions of Facebook’s mobile application, Facebook has

1 collected and stored information in a scope and manner beyond that which users knowingly  
2 authorized, and the practice is ongoing. This activity includes accessing users' call and text  
3 histories, including, but not limited to, metadata such as the names and numbers of persons  
4 contacted, the times of such contacts, and the lengths of such contacts, hereafter referred to as  
5 "Android Users Personal Communications Information."

6 5. Android Users' Personal Communications Information has been and continues  
7 to be stored to Facebook's own servers.

8 6. Facebook's Terms of Service state properly that the Facebook user is the owner  
9 of all of their data.

10 7. The Android operating system for mobile devices allowed and allows Facebook  
11 applications to obtain Android Users' Personal Communications Information without fully  
12 disclosing that Facebook applications would access all of the Android Users' Personal  
13 Communications Information and send it to Facebook's private servers for storage and use.

14 8. Facebook took advantage of this technical structure of the Android operating  
15 system to obtain Android Users' Personal Communications Information with insufficient  
16 notice such that ordinary Facebook users do not understand that they were allowing Facebook  
17 the ability to download, save, and utilize Android Users' Personal Communications  
18 Information through the use of Facebook applications.

19 9. Facebook's unauthorized taking and use of Android Users' Personal Communications  
20 Information constitutes wrongful taking and storage of Plaintiff's and Class Members'  
21 personal data, and constitutes a consumer bait-and-switch, an invasion of privacy, wrongful  
22 monitoring of minors, and an attack on privileged communications in the context of Facebook  
23 users who use their cell phones (but not Facebook) to communicate in the context of protected  
24 relationships including but not limited to that of attorney/client and doctor/patient.  
25

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

10. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act (“CAFA”), 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d), because the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interests and costs, there are more than 100 class members, and at least one class member is a citizen of a state different from Defendant. The Court also has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

11. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c) because Defendant is a corporation that does business in and is subject to personal jurisdiction in this District. Venue is also proper because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims in this action occurred in or emanated from this District, including the decisions made by Facebook to permit the information aggregation and collection of Android Users’ Personal Communications Information.

**PARTIES**

**A. Plaintiff and Class Representatives**

12. Plaintiff Leland Tracy is a U.S. citizen and resident of Pinson, Alabama. Plaintiff Tracy has owned a Facebook account since approximately 2009.

**B. Defendant**

13. Facebook, Inc. is incorporated in Delaware, and the Company’ s principal place of business and executive offices are located at 1601 Willow Road, Menlo Park, California 94025. Facebook’ s securities trade on the NASDAQ under the ticker symbol “ FB.”

**FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

14. On March 24, 2018, ArsTechnica.com, a respected online source for technology news, published an article detailing that Facebook “scraped call, text message data for years from Android phones.”<sup>1</sup> As set forth in the article, Facebook’s Android-based application for

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2018/03/facebook-scraped-call-text->

1 accessing its services included functions that would collect the phone numbers to which a  
2 user's phone connected, whether via voice call or text. The Facebook phone application then  
3 transmitted to Facebook's corporate servers information about each such communication on  
4 the subject phone, including but not necessarily limited to: the phone numbers and identities  
5 of the persons taking part in communications, the date and time of communications, and the  
6 length of communications. Facebook could also access metadata about text and multimedia  
7 messages sent via SMS.

8 15. In other words, the Facebook application on Android mobile phones allows  
9 Facebook to collect data from the operation of the phone that is generated outside of Facebook  
10 applications.

11 16. Collection of Android Users' Personal Communications Information was set as  
12 part of the default installation of the Facebook application. Facebook did not provide notice  
13 of such monitoring and reporting in a way users would understand. This has resulted in a vast  
14 number of users of Facebook on Android devices being duped into participating in a  
15 monitoring system that they would not have agreed to had they first been told in plain language  
16 what data was being collected, and what was being done with it.

17 17. By utilizing such data collection methods, Facebook has been able to amass a  
18 set of data matching people to their phone numbers, but also matching people to one another.  
19 By matching the phone numbers to other information, knowable by Facebook.com posts and  
20 other available information, Facebook can map relationships and, to a degree, the nature and  
21 type of relationships between affected Android users. Facebook users, including Plaintiff and  
22 Class Members, were not given enough information to knowingly opt into such a data  
23 collection program, and would not have allowed the collection and use of this data if they had  
24 first been informed of the data collection in ordinary language.

25 18. Millions of individuals use Facebook through their Android-based phones.

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 [message-data-for-years-from-android-phones/ \(Last visited April 9, 2018\).](#)

1           19.     On many Android phones, Facebook is installed as a default application, and  
2 cannot be removed by individuals who purchased the phone, even if they would not otherwise  
3 choose to opt into the Facebook’s system of collecting and storing Android Users’ Personal  
4 Communications Information.

5           20.     Facebook represents to its users that: “you have control over who sees what you  
6 share on Facebook.”<sup>2</sup> Facebook represents to its users that: “We have top-rate security  
7 measures in place to help protect you and your data when you use Facebook.”<sup>3</sup> Facebook  
8 represents to its users that: “Your activity (ex: posting a status or sending a message) is  
9 encrypted, which means it’s turned into code so people can’t access it without your  
10 permission.”<sup>4</sup> Facebook represents to its users that: “When it comes to your personal  
11 information, we don’t share it without your permission (unless required by law).”<sup>5</sup> Facebook  
12 represents to its users that: “Facebook gives people control over what they share, who they  
13 share it with, the content they see and experience, and who can contact them.”<sup>6</sup>

14           21.     Facebook’s storage and use of Android Users’ Personal Communications  
15 Information violated Facebook’s Data Use Policy on its website.<sup>7</sup>

16           22.     Those who use Facebook applications on Android phones, including Plaintiff  
17 and the Class Members, reasonably relied on Facebook’s representations for the security of  
18 their Android Users’ Personal Information in using Facebook applications.

19           23.     Plaintiff Leland Tracy owns and is a user of a Facebook account on his Android  
20 phone.

21  
22 <sup>2</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/about/basics>. Last accessed March 31, 2018.

23 <sup>3</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/about/basics/stay-safe-and-secure/how-youre-protected>. Last  
accessed March 31, 2018.

24 <sup>4</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/about/basics/stay-safe-and-secure/how-youre-protected#2>. Last  
accessed March 31, 2018.

25 <sup>5</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/about/basics/stay-safe-and-secure/how-youre-protected#4>. Last  
accessed March 31, 2018.

26 <sup>6</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/safety>. Last accessed March 31, 2018.

27 <sup>7</sup> [https://www.facebook.com/full\\_data\\_use\\_policy](https://www.facebook.com/full_data_use_policy). Last accessed March 31, 2018.

1           24. Mr. Tracy's Facebook data documents Facebook's collection and storage of Mr.  
2 Tracy's phone calls and texts on his Android phone. Even within the last week, Facebook has  
3 collected data from text messages and telephone calls Mr. Tracy made on his Android phone,  
4 not using any aspect of any Facebook application, and stored that data on Facebook's servers.  
5 Plaintiff did not consent to the access and storage of his Android Users' Personal  
6 Communications Information by Defendant Facebook. Plaintiff has suffered annoyance and  
7 interference by the manipulation of his Facebook account by Defendant, is concerned about  
8 the privacy of his Facebook data and phone call and text data which Facebook illegally  
9 harvests, of which he is the owner, and has suffered injuries, damages, and losses by the  
10 unauthorized taking of his private data.

11                                   **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

12           25. Pursuant to Rule 23(b)(2), (b)(3) and (c)(4) of the Federal Rules of Civil  
13 Procedure, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, bring this  
14 lawsuit on behalf of themselves and as a class action on behalf of the following class:

15                   All citizens of the United States who own Facebook accounts and whose  
16                   Android Users' Personal Communications Information was obtained by  
17                   Defendant Facebook through their Facebook, Facebook Lite, or Facebook  
18                   Messenger applications on their Android cell phones.

18 (referred herein as "Class Members.")

19           26. Excluded from the Class are (i) any judge presiding over this action, his or her  
20 spouse, and persons within the third degree of relationship to them; (ii) Defendant, Defendant's  
21 subsidiaries, parents, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which Defendant or its parents  
22 have a controlling interest and their current or former employees, officers, and directors; (iii)  
23 any officers or directors of Defendant; (iv) persons who properly execute and file a timely  
24 request for exclusion from the Class; and (v) the legal representatives, successors, or assigns  
25 of any such excluded persons.  
26

1           27.    **Numerosity:** The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all  
2 members of the Class would be impracticable. Plaintiff reasonably believes that Class  
3 members number in the thousands. The names and addresses of Class Members are  
4 identifiable through documents maintained by Defendant.

5           28.    **Commonality and Predominance:** This action involves common questions of  
6 law or fact, which predominate over any questions affecting individual Class Members,  
7 including, but not limited to:

- 8           i.    Whether Facebook represented that it would safeguard Plaintiff's and  
9           Class Members' Android Users' Personal Communications Information  
10           and not disclose it without consent;
- 11           ii.   Whether Facebook improperly obtained Plaintiff's and Class members'  
12           Android Users' Personal Communications Information without  
13           authorization or in excess of any authorization;
- 14           iii.   Whether Defendant breached a legal duty to Plaintiff and the Class  
15           Members to exercise due care in collecting, storing, safeguarding, and/or  
16           obtaining their Android Users' Personal Communications Information;
- 17           iv.   Whether Defendant's conduct violated Cal. Civ. Code § 1750, *et seq.*;
- 18           v.    Whether Defendant's conduct was an unlawful or unfair business practice  
19           under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*;
- 20           vi.   Whether Defendant's conduct violated § 5 of the Federal Trade  
21           Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45, *et seq.*;
- 22           vii.   Whether Defendant's conduct violated Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 22575, *et*  
23           *seq.*;
- 24           viii.   Whether Defendant failed to adhere to their posted privacy policy  
25           concerning the care they would take to safeguard Plaintiff's and Class  
26



1 Members' Android Users' Personal Communications Information in  
2 violation of California Business and Professions Code § 22576; and

3 ix. Whether Defendant negligently and materially failed to adhere to their  
4 posted privacy policy with respect to the extent of their disclosure of users'  
5 data, in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 22576;

6 x. Whether Facebook's representations that they would secure and not  
7 disclose without consent the Android Users' Personal Communications  
8 Information of Plaintiff and members of the Class were facts that  
9 reasonable persons could be expected to rely upon when deciding whether  
10 to use Facebook's services;

11 xi. Whether Facebook misrepresented the safety of its many systems and  
12 services, specifically the security thereof, and their ability to safely store  
13 Plaintiff's and Class Members' Android Users' Personal Communications  
14 Information;

15 xii. Whether Facebook failed to comply with its own policies and applicable  
16 laws, regulations, and industry standards relating to data security;

17 xiii. Whether Defendant's acts, omissions, misrepresentations, and practices  
18 were and are likely to deceive consumers;

19 xiv. Whether Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered annoyance and  
20 interference in the use of their Android Users' Personal Communications  
21 Information.

22 xv. Whether Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to equitable relief,  
23 including, but not limited to, injunctive relief and restitution;

24 xvi. Whether Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to actual, statutory,  
25 or other forms of damages, and other monetary relief; and  
26



1 presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefits of single adjudication,  
2 economies of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court.

3 33. Further, Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable  
4 to the Class and, accordingly, final injunctive or corresponding declaratory relief with regard  
5 to the members of the Class as a whole is appropriate under Rule 23(b)(2) of the Federal Rules  
6 of Civil Procedure.

7 34. Likewise, particular issues under Rule 23(c)(4) are appropriate for certification,  
8 because such claims present only particular common issues, the resolution of which would  
9 advance the disposition of this matter and the parties' interests therein. Such particular issues  
10 include, but are not limited to:

- 11 a. Whether (and when) Facebook knew about the improper collection of Android  
12 Users' Personal Communications Information;
- 13 b. Whether Defendant's conduct was an unlawful or unfair business practice under  
14 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*;
- 15 c. Whether Defendant's conduct violated § 5 of the Federal Trade Commission  
16 Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45, *et seq.*;
- 17 d. Whether Facebook's representations that they would secure and not disclose  
18 without consent the Android Users' Personal Communications Information of  
19 Plaintiff and members of the Class were facts that reasonable persons could be  
20 expected to rely upon when deciding whether to use Facebook's services;
- 21 e. Whether Facebook misrepresented the safety of its many systems and services,  
22 specifically the security thereof, and their ability to safely store Plaintiff's and  
23 Class Members' Android Users' Personal Communications Information;
- 24 f. Whether Facebook failed to comply with its own policies and applicable laws,  
25 regulations, and industry standards relating to data security;

- 1           g.       Whether Defendant’s acts, omissions, misrepresentations, and practices were  
2                     and are likely to deceive consumers;
- 3           h.       Whether Defendant’s conduct violated Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 22575, *et seq.*;
- 4           i.       Whether Defendant failed to adhere to their posted privacy policy concerning  
5                     the care they would take to safeguard Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ Android  
6                     Users’ Personal Communications Information in violation of California  
7                     Business and Professions Code § 22576; and
- 8           j.       Whether Defendant negligently and materially failed to adhere to their posted  
9                     privacy policy with respect to the extent of their disclosure of users’ data, in  
10                    violation of California Business and Professions Code § 22576.

11                    **CLAIMS ALLEGED ON BEHALF OF ALL CLASS MEMBERS**

12                                   **First Claim for Relief**

13                    **Violation of California’s Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”) – Unlawful Business  
14                                   Practice - (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*)**

15           35.       Plaintiff incorporates the substantive allegations above as if fully set forth  
16                    herein.

17           36.       By reason of the conduct alleged herein, Defendant engaged in unlawful  
18                    practices within the meaning of the UCL. The conduct alleged herein is a “business practice”  
19                    within the meaning of the UCL.

20           37.       Facebook did not disclose to users of phones with the Android operating system  
21                    that their Android Users’ Personal Communications Information generated when they were  
22                    not using the Facebook app would be collected and stored on Facebook’s servers for  
23                    Facebook’s use.

24           38.       Facebook improperly collected and stored Plaintiff’s and Class Members’  
25                    Android Users’ Personal Communications Information.





1 practices by representing that their Android Users' Personal Communications Information  
2 would remain private.

3 55. There is no benefit to consumers or competition from unfairly collecting  
4 Plaintiff's and Class members' Android Users' Personal Communications Information.

5 56. Plaintiff and the other Class members had no way of reasonably knowing that  
6 Defendant was collecting their Android Users' Personal Communications Information without  
7 authorization. Thus, they could not have reasonably avoided the injury each of them suffered.

8 57. The gravity of the consequences of Defendant's conduct as described above  
9 outweighs any justification, motive, or reason therefore, particularly considering the available  
10 legal alternatives which exist in the marketplace, and such conduct is immoral, unethical,  
11 unscrupulous, offends established public policy, or is substantially injurious to Plaintiff and  
12 other Class members.

13 58. Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered injury-in-fact and lost money or  
14 property as the result of Defendant's unfair business practices. In particular, Plaintiff's and  
15 Class Members' Android Users' Personal Communications Information was taken by  
16 Defendant for its own use and profit and so is of tangible value.

17 59. There is no benefit to consumers or competition from deceptively collecting  
18 Plaintiff's and the Class Members' Android Users' Personal Communications Information.

19 60. Plaintiff and the other Class members had no way of reasonably knowing that  
20 Defendant was collecting Plaintiff's and the Class Members' Android Users' Personal  
21 Communications Information without authorization. Thus, they could not have reasonably  
22 avoided the injury each of them suffered.

23 61. The gravity of the consequences of Defendant's conduct as described above  
24 outweighs any justification, motive, or reason therefore, particularly considering the available  
25 legal alternatives which exist in the marketplace, and such conduct is immoral, unethical,  
26

1 unscrupulous, offends established public policy, or is substantially injurious to Plaintiff and  
2 other Class members.

3 62. As a result of Defendant's unfair business practices, Defendant violated the  
4 UCL and Plaintiff and the Class Members are, therefore, entitled to restitution, disgorgement  
5 of wrongfully obtained profits and injunctive relief.

6 **Third Claim for Relief**

7 **Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") –  
8 Fraudulent Business Practice (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*)**

9 63. Plaintiff incorporates the substantive allegations above as if fully set forth  
10 herein.

11 64. By reason of the conduct alleged herein, Defendant engaged in "fraudulent"  
12 business practices within the meaning of the UCL.

13 65. Facebook stored Android Users' Personal Communications Information on its  
14 electronic and consumer information databases. Facebook falsely and knowingly represented  
15 to Plaintiff and the Class Members that their personal information would remain private.  
16 Facebook engaged in fraudulent business practices by representing that they would not use  
17 Plaintiff's and Class Members' personal information without authorization, and/or by  
18 obtaining their Android Users' Personal Communications Information without authorization.

19 66. Facebook's statements that it would maintain the confidentiality of Plaintiff's  
20 and Class Members' private information were false because Facebook knowingly and  
21 intentionally accessed, stored and used that information, which it used for its own advantage  
22 for commercial profit, without any permission or sufficient permission from Plaintiff and Class  
23 Members.

24 67. As more fully described above, Defendant's statements and omissions about its  
25 collection of Android Users' Personal Communications Information was likely to deceive  
26 reasonable consumers. Indeed, while Defendant led Plaintiff and members of the Class to  
27 believe that Defendant was not collecting Android Users' Personal Communications



1 Information, Defendant was in fact collecting such data. Said acts are fraudulent business  
2 practices.

3 68. Plaintiff and Class Members suffered injury-in-fact and lost money or property  
4 as the proximate result of Defendant's unfair business practices. In particular, Plaintiff's and  
5 Class Members' Android Users' Personal Communications Information was taken and it is in  
6 the possession of Facebook which has uses it for its own advantage, including financial  
7 advantage, making it clear that the stolen information has tangible value.

8 69. Plaintiff and the Class Members justifiably relied on the representations  
9 Facebook made in its privacy policies.

10 70. There is no benefit to consumers or competition from fraudulently collecting  
11 Android Users' Personal Communications Information.

12 71. Plaintiff and the other Class members had no way of reasonably knowing that  
13 Defendant was collecting their call logs and text data without authorization. Thus, they could  
14 not have reasonably avoided the injury each of them suffered.

15 72. The gravity of the consequences of Defendant's conduct as described above  
16 outweighs any justification, motive, or reason therefore, particularly considering the available  
17 legal alternatives which exist in the marketplace, and such conduct is immoral, unethical,  
18 unscrupulous, offends established public policy, or is substantially injurious to Plaintiff and  
19 other Class members.

20 73. As a result of Defendant's fraudulent business practices and violations of the  
21 UCL, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to restitution, disgorgement of profits and  
22 injunctive relief.

23 **Fourth Claim for Relief**  
24 **Negligence**

25 74. Plaintiff incorporates the substantive allegations above as if fully set forth  
26 herein.

1           75. Defendant owed a duty to Plaintiff and Class Members to exercise reasonable  
2 care in the operation of its applications, including the privacy of Android Users' Personal  
3 Communications Information.

4           76. Defendant knew that the Plaintiff's and Class Members' Android Users'  
5 Personal Communications Information was valuable personal and sensitive information.

6           77. By being entrusted by Plaintiff and the Class Members to safeguard their  
7 Personal Information, Facebook had a special relationship with Plaintiff and the Class  
8 Members. Plaintiff and Class Members signed up for Facebook's services with the  
9 understanding that Facebook would take appropriate measures to protect it, and would not  
10 collect, store, and use private information for which they did not give explicit permission to  
11 collect. Facebook did not. Facebook has collected, stored and used Android Users' Personal  
12 Communications Information without their permission for its own use.

13           78. Defendant breached its duty by failing to adopt, implement, and maintain  
14 adequate security measures to safeguard the Plaintiff's and the Class Members' Android Users'  
15 Personal Communications Information, and by obtaining that Personal Information without  
16 authorization.

17           79. Facebook also breached its duty to timely disclose that Plaintiff and Class  
18 Members' Android Users' Personal Communications Information has been collected, stored,  
19 and used by Facebook for its advantage.

20           80. But for Defendant's wrongful and negligent breach of its duties owed to  
21 Plaintiff and Class Members, their Android Users' Personal Communications Information  
22 would not have been improperly obtained. Defendant's negligence was a direct and legal cause  
23 of the collection, storage, and use of the Android Users' Personal Communications Information  
24 of Plaintiff and the Class Members and all damages resulting therefrom.







1 103. Defendant’s intrusive conduct was and is highly objectionable to reasonable  
2 persons and constitutes an egregious intrusion on Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ rights to  
3 privacy.

4 104. Plaintiff and Class Members were harmed by Defendant’s invasion of their  
5 rights to privacy.

6 105. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s invasion of Plaintiff’s and Class  
7 Members’ privacy, Plaintiff and Class Members suffered injuries, damages, losses or harm,  
8 including but not limited to annoyance, interference, concern, lost time, and the loss of personal  
9 property, justifying an award of compensatory and punitive damages.

10  
11 **Eighth Claim for Relief**  
12 **Violations of the Stored Communications Act**  
13 **18 U.S.C. §§ 2701, et seq.**

14 106. Plaintiff incorporates the substantive allegations above as if fully set forth  
15 herein.

16 107. By unlawfully accessing, storing and using, and/or divulging the content of  
17 Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ Android Users’ Personal Communications Information,  
18 Defendant violated the Stored Communications Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2701 *et seq.*

19 108. The Stored Communications Act (“SCA”) defines electronic storage as “any  
20 temporary, intermediate storage of a wire or electronic communication incidental to the  
21 electronic transmission thereof; and any storage of such communication by an electronic  
22 communication service for purposes of backup protection of such communication.”

23 109. The servers Defendant used to provide electronic communications service to  
24 Plaintiff and Class Members are a “facility” within the meaning of the SCA.

25 110. Defendant is a “person” within the meaning of the SCA.

1 111. Defendant's collection, storage and use of Plaintiff's and Class Members'  
2 personal data with third parties exceeded authorization from any party to the personal data at  
3 issue.

4 112. Defendant's collection, storage and use of Android Users' Personal  
5 Communications Information resulted in and constitutes interstate data transmissions in  
6 violation of the SCA.

7 113. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violations of the SCA, pursuant  
8 to 18 U.S.C § 2707(c), Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to 1) minimum statutory  
9 damages of \$100 per person; 2) punitive damages, costs, and 3) reasonable attorney fees.

10 **Ninth Claim for Relief**  
11 **Conversion**

12 114. Plaintiff incorporates the substantive allegations above as if fully set forth  
13 herein.

14 115. As Facebook's terms of service demonstrate, Plaintiff and Class Members were  
15 the owners and possessors of private data in the form of their Android Users' Personal  
16 Communications Information. As a result of its wrongful conduct, Defendant has interfered  
17 with the Plaintiff's and Class Members' right of possession and control of their Android Users'  
18 Personal Communications Information and has taken that property for its own use, property to  
19 which Plaintiff and Class Members had a superior right of possession and control at the time  
20 of conversion.

21 116. In converting Plaintiff's and Class Members' Android Users' Personal  
22 Communications Information, Defendant acted with malice, oppression, and in conscious  
23 disregard of the rights of Plaintiff and Class Members.

24 117. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conversion of Plaintiff's and  
25 Class Members' property, Plaintiff and Class Members suffered injuries, damages, losses or  
26

1 harm, including but not limited to annoyance, interference, concern, lost time, and the loss of  
2 personal property, justifying an award of compensatory and punitive damages.

3  
4 **Tenth Claim for Relief**  
**Invasion of Privacy (Intrusion to Seclusion)**

5 118. Plaintiff incorporates the substantive allegations above as if fully set forth  
6 herein.

7 119. Plaintiff and the Class Members have reasonable expectations of privacy in  
8 their Android Users' Personal Communications Information.

9 120. The Plaintiff's private affairs include Android Users' Personal  
10 Communications Information. These are not matters of legitimate public concern.

11 121. By surreptitiously obtaining, improperly gaining knowledge, reviewing,  
12 retaining, storing, and/or using Plaintiff's and the Class Members' Android Users' Personal  
13 Communications Information, Defendant intentionally intruded on and into each respective  
14 Plaintiff's solitude, seclusion, or private affairs.

15 122. The Defendant's intrusions were highly offensive to a reasonable person. These  
16 intrusions were so highly offensive that myriad newspaper articles, blogs, op-eds, and  
17 investigative exposés were written complaining and objecting vehemently to Defendant's  
18 practices. The surreptitious manner in which Defendant conducted the intrusion confirms its  
19 outrageous nature.

20 123. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's actions, Plaintiff suffered  
21 harm and damages.

22 124. Defendant received substantial financial, economic, and advertising, public  
23 relations and other benefits from the business practices at issue.

24 125. Defendant knowingly and/or recklessly permitted the access, collection,  
25 storage, and use of Plaintiff's and the Class Members' Android Users' Personal  
26 Communications Information.





**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury of all claims in this Complaint so triable pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38.

Dated: April 8, 2018

By: /s/ Francis J. "Casey" Flynn, Jr.  
Francis J. "Casey" Flynn, Jr.  
CA State Bar No. 304712  
6220 W 3rd St # 115  
Los Angeles, CA 90036  
Telephone: 314-662-2836  
Email: [francisflynn@gmail.com](mailto:francisflynn@gmail.com)

Kevin S. Hannon (Pro Hac Vice to be filed)  
Colo. Bar No. 16015  
**THE HANNON LAW FIRM, LLC.**  
1641 Downing Street  
Denver, CO 80218  
303-861-8800 Telephone  
303-861-8855 Facsimile  
Email: [khannon@hannonlaw.com](mailto:khannon@hannonlaw.com)

*Attorney for Plaintiff and the Class*