,	V D. II		
1	KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California	ENDORSED	
2	Mark J. Breckler Chief Assistant Attorney General	Superior Court of California	
3	NICKLAS A AKERS Acting Senior Assistant Attorney General	OCT 08 2014	
4	SARAH E. KURTZ Deputy Attorney General	CLERK OF THE COURT BY: PAUL FIOL	
5	State Bar No. 99881 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000	Deputy Clerk	
6	San Francisco, CA 94102-7004		
7	Telephone: (415) 703-5562 Fax: (415) 703-5480		
8	E-mail: Sarah.Kurtz@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for People of the State of California		
9			
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO		
12		CAC - 14 - 542089	
13	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF	Case No.	
14	CALIFORNIA,	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND	
15	Plaintiff,	OTHER RELIEF	
16	v.	(BUS. & PROF. CODE, § 17200 et seq.)	
17	AT&T MOBILITY, LLC, a limited liability corporation,		
18	Defendant.	[EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE	
19		SECTION 6103]	
20			
21	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND OTHER RELIEF		
22	1. Plaintiff, the PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, by Kamala D. Harris,		
23	Attorney General of the State of California, ("Plaintiff" or "the People") brings this action against		
24	Defendant AT&T MOBILITY, LLC, ("AT&T," "Defendant" or "Carrier") for violating the		
25	California Unfair Competition Law (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.), and alleges the		
26	following on information and belief.		
27			
28			
- 1		1	

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. Defendant has transacted business within the State of California, including in the County of San Francisco, at all times relevant to this complaint. The violations of law described herein occurred in the County of San Francisco and elsewhere in the State of California.

DEFENDANT

3. Defendant AT&T is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal place of business located at 1025 Lenox Park Boulevard, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia.

BACKGROUND

- 4. AT&T is a leading provider of mobile telephone services. In addition to charging for phone services offered by AT&T, AT&T also charges many consumers for other services offered by third-party merchants. Until at least January 2014, these purported services have included monthly subscriptions for content such as ringtones, wallpaper, and text messages providing horoscopes, celebrity gossip, and similar information. AT&T typically has charged consumers \$9.99 per month for such subscriptions ("Third-Party Subscriptions").
- 5. In numerous instances, AT&T has charged consumers for Third-Party Subscriptions that the consumers did not order or authorize, a practice known as cramming.
- 6. Cramming is a national problem; many consumers are not aware that their mobile telephones can be used to make payments for such Third-Party Subscriptions and often pay for the unauthorized charges without even realizing the charges have been placed on their mobile telephone bills.
- 7. AT&T has continued to charge consumers for Third-Party Subscriptions even after large numbers of consumers complained about unauthorized charges. Refund rates for the subscriptions were high in some cases as high as 40%. Further, AT&T has continued to charge consumers for Third-Party Subscriptions even after industry auditor alerts, law enforcement and other legal actions, and news articles indicated that the third-party merchants were not obtaining valid authorization from consumers for the charges.

8. AT&T has retained a portion of each charge for Third-Party Subscriptions paid by consumers, in some cases as high as a third or more of the amount paid. AT&T's practices have caused consumers millions of dollars of injury.

AT&T'S UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE ACTS AND PRACTICES

- 9. AT&T participated in deceptive and unfair acts or practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code Section 17200, by including unauthorized charges on the telephone bills of its mobile phone customers.
- 10. AT&T markets its telephone and data services to consumers. AT&T's sales representatives often discuss these services only, and not purported third-party services, with consumers. AT&T's contracts make clear and prominent representations about the services it provides, whereas information about third-party services is buried in lengthy terms and conditions of its service contract.
- 11. AT&T has not obtained authorization from consumers before charging them for Third-Party Subscriptions. Instead, the third-party merchants or billing intermediaries purportedly have obtained authorization. In many cases, however, these third parties have failed to obtain authorization from consumers.
- 12. AT&T's bills include charges for its own services and third-party services, and AT&T has not conspicuously disclosed the third-party charges to consumers.
- 13. The third-party charges are not broken out separately in the bill summary, but have been lumped together under a generic descriptor, which may include both third-party charges and other charges, such as for phone service, with the total transferred to the total amount due in full by a specific date. Many consumers believe they are obligated to pay AT&T for all charges appearing on their phone bills.
- 14. Bills have not provided detailed information to the consumer about the nature of recurring Third-Party Subscriptions that the consumer purportedly authorized. In some cases, even in detailed sections of the bill, the third-party subscriptions have been listed under the category "AT&T Monthly Subscriptions."

- 15. Some consumers who become aware of unauthorized charges have complained to AT&T that they did not authorize the charges. Despite knowing about these complaints of unauthorized charges, AT&T did not take sufficient steps to determine whether consumers actually authorized the charges for Third-Party Subscriptions purportedly offered by problematic third-party merchants.
- 16. When consumers have sought refunds for unauthorized charges from AT&T, AT&T frequently has refused to provide them. In some instances, AT&T has told consumers that there is nothing it can do about the unauthorized charges.
- 17. In other instances, AT&T's customer service representatives have instructed consumers to seek a refund directly from the third-party merchant, while failing consistently to provide accurate contact information for the third-party merchant.
- 18. AT&T has often asserted that consumers authorized the charge, despite the fact that AT&T did not have records of the purported authorization. AT&T has even told consumers who called to complain about unauthorized charges that the consumers had authorized the charges by not responding to text messages sent by the third-party merchants.
- 19. Even when some refund is provided, AT&T has refused to grant a full refund, but has granted a partial refund. AT&T has frequently charged consumers for at least a year for third-party subscription services, yet only offered a two month refund.
- 20. After receiving complaints that consumers did not authorize particular subscriptions, AT&T continued to charge other consumers for such subscriptions.
- 21. Industry auditors have monitored the online advertising of third-party merchants that purportedly offer Third-Party Subscriptions, and AT&T has received audits and "alerts" from these industry auditors. These auditors' alerts have provided examples of deceptive marketing by third-party merchants to obtain consumers' phone numbers and purportedly enroll them in a monthly subscription. Yet AT&T has continued to charge consumers for the recurring Third-Party Subscriptions offered by those merchants identified by the auditors, including subscriptions the alerts specifically identified as failing to obtain valid authorization from the consumers.

1	22. AT&T has also continued to charge consumers for Third-Party Subscriptions		
2	purportedly offered by third-party merchants that were the subject of law enforcement actions		
3	regarding cramming practices.		
4	VIOLATIONS OF LAW		
5	CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW		
6	23. The People reallege and incorporate each and every allegation contained in the		
7	preceding paragraphs 1 through 22.		
8	24. AT&T, in the course of providing mobile telephone services, has engaged in business		
9	acts or practices that were unlawful, unfair, deceptive, or misleading, and therefore violated		
0	section 17200 of the California Unfair Competition Law (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200) by		
1	including unauthorized third-party charges on the telephone bills of its mobile phone customers.		
2	AT&T has represented, expressly or by implication, that the charges appearing on AT&T's phon		
3	bills were for AT&T's services authorized by the consumer, even when the charges were		
4	unauthorized charges for Third-Party Subscriptions.		
5	PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
6	WHEREFORE, the People of the State of California respectfully request that this		
7	honorable Court enter an order:		
8	A. Issuing a permanent injunction prohibiting AT&T, its agents, employees, and all		
9	other persons and entities, corporate or otherwise, in active concert or participation with any of		
20	them, from engaging in unfair, deceptive or misleading conduct;		
21	B. Ordering AT&T to disgorge all revenues, profits, and gains achieved in whole or in		
22	part though the unfair acts or practices complained of herein;		
23	C. Assessing a civil penalty against defendant for each violation of Business and		
24	Professions Code section 17200.		
25	D. Ordering AT&T to pay Plaintiff's costs of suit, including but not limited to all costs		
26	of prosecution and investigation;		
27			

1	E. Granting such other and further relief as the C	ourt deems equitable and proper.
2	Dated: October 7, 2014	Respectfully Submitted,
3		KAMALA D. HARRIS
4		Attorney General of California MARK J. BRECKLER Chief Assistant Attorney General
5		NICKLAS A. AKERS Acting Senior Assistant Attorney General
6		
7		Marah & Kurt
8		SARAH E. KURTZ
9		Deputy Attorney General
10		Attorneys for People of the State of California
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		*
24		
25	v	
26		
27		
28		