CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 1

ISSAQUAH, WASHINGTON 98029-5713

(425) 392-7118

. 1	and the class do not live in a municipality, AWS has crammed wireless phone features		
2	(charging for features that the plaintiffs and the class did not order) and AWS charged		
3	for long distance, roaming and family calling plan charges that were supposed to be		
4	free under their billing plan. Plaintiffs and the class allege that AWS actions violated		
5	the Consumer Protection Act and breached their contract. AWS previously entered into		
6	binding settlement agreements regarding improperly collecting municipal taxes.		
7	However, AWS has breached this contract and continues to collect improperly collect		
8	municipal taxes from class members who live outside city limits.		
9	II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE		
10	2.1 Plaintiff Kenneth Udlinek is a resident of Grant County, in the state of		
11	Washington.		
12	2.2 Plaintiff Joseph LaBarge is a resident of Will County, in the state of		
13	Illinois.		
14	2.3 Defendant AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. ("AWS") is a Delaware		
15	corporation with its principle place of business in King County, in the state of		
16	Washington. AWS provides wireless phone service throughout the United States.		
17	2.4 This court has jurisdiction and venue over this matter.		
18	III. PLAINTIFF'S ALLEGATIONS		
19	3.1 AWS has collected fees from thousands of people like the Plaintiffs tha		
20	were not owed, in violation of the CPA and their contract.		
21	3.2 AWS has failed to refund money improperly collected from Plaintiffs		
22	and other similarly situated.		
23	3.3 Plaintiffs and the putative class seek monetary and injunctive relief		
24	against AWS, including (a) an order enjoining AWS from collecting city taxes from		

- 4.3 CR 23(a) establishes four threshold requirements for class certification:
 - a. The class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable;
 - b. There are questions of law or fact common to the class;
 - The claims or defenses of the representative parties are typical of the claims or defenses of the class; and
 - d. The representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interest of the class.
- 4.4 Class certification under CR 23(b)(3) requires two findings: that common questions of law and fact predominate and that a class action is superior to other forms available for fair and efficient adjudication.

Numerosity

- 4.5 The putative class of consumers similarly situated is so numerous that joinder of all members is impractical because there are thousands of members of the class. Members of the class are geographically dispersed throughout the United States. The exact number of members of the class is presently unknown to plaintiffs but may be determined from records maintained by AWS.
- 4.6 The putative class of consumers similarly situated is unable to sue for judicial relief because their individual claims are so small it would be economically unfeasible to pursue litigation on an individual by individual basis.

Common Questions of Fact

Class A – Municipal Taxes

- a. All members of the class reside outside of the geographic boundaries of the municipality that charge a Municipal Tax.
- b. All members of the class have been improperly charged and paid a
 Municipal Tax.
- c. All members of the class have not been fully reimbursed for the improperly charged Municipal Taxes and the artificially increased state and federal taxes collected by defendant.
- d. All members of the class should not have been charged a Municipal Tax because the class member did not reside within city geographic boundaries.
- e. All members of the class are entitled to a refund of the municipal taxes, state and federal taxes and such other relief as the court deems just including prejudgment interest.
- f. All members of the class were determined by defendant to be subject to a "Municipal Tax" charge based upon the defendant' improper corporate policies, practices and procedures, irrespective of any differences in the wording of the applicable municipal ordinance or state law.
- g. All members of the class were subjected to the same corporate policies, practices and procedures used by the defendant for determining when and how a class member would receive a refund of improperly charged municipal taxes, irrespective of the wording of the applicable municipal ordinance or state law.

HOUCK LAW FIRM, P.S. 4045 262ND AVE SE ISSAQUAH, WASHINGTON 98029-5713 (425) 392-7118

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 6

ISSAQUAH, WASHINGTON 98029-5713

(425) 392-7118

charges submitted to them on their bills. Failure to pay in full would result in a breach of contract and discontinuance of wireless phone service, accrued interest and a cancellation fee.

- 5.4 Plaintiffs and the members of the class accepted the offer of services from AWS and performed their portion of the contract by paying their bills.
- 5.5 The express and implied terms of the contract were that AWS would only charge the contractually agreed upon monthly charges.
- 5.6 Each class was charged and paid an additional monthly fee, in the form of Municipal Taxes, cramming charges or contractually unjustified long distance, roaming and family plan charges.
- 5.7 AWS breached its contract with Plaintiffs and the class by collecting fees for municipal taxes that were not owed, fees for services that were not ordered and fees for long distance, roaming and family plan charges that were not owed, in direct violation of the express and implied terms of the contract.
- 5.8 AWS entered into a settlement agreement in the cases of Aguirre v.

 AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. and Hoffman v. AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. in which

 AWS agreed, on a nationwide basis, to various terms including that it would stop

 charging for municipal taxes to class members who reside outside city limits. AWS has

 breached the settlement agreement by continuing to charge class members for

 municipal taxes and failing to implement all of the terms of the agreement.
- 5.9 As a direct and proximate result of AWS's breach of contract Plaintiffs and the class have sustained damages in an amount to be proven at the time of trial.

HOUCK LAW FIRM, P.S. 4045 262ND AVE SE ISSAQUAH, WASHINGTON 98029-5713 (425) 392-7118

- f. Unfairly and deceptively failing to provide meaningful compensation to Plaintiffs and the class for their investments in hardware (such as the cost of the wireless phone, accessories and supplies), if Plaintiffs and the class chose to terminate the contract because of AWS's breach of contract;
- g. Unfairly and deceptively entering into settlement agreements regarding improperly charging municipal taxes and not honoring the agreements;
- h. In order to effectuate a settlement in prior lawsuits, unfairly and deceptively making promises to implement new billing procedures to prevent the improper charging of municipal taxes and failing to implement those changes.
- i. Failing to properly notify and advise Plaintiffs and the class of their right to reimbursement for improper charges;
- j. Failing to reimburse Plaintiffs and class members promptly for improper charges collected;
- k. Retaining money unlawfully collected from Plaintiffs and the class and thereby defrauding Plaintiffs and the class.
- 6.4 It was AWS's intent that the Plaintiffs and the class rely on its prior unfair and deceptive promises to implement new billing procedures to prevent the improper charging of municipal taxes.
- 6.5 It was AWS's intent that Plaintiffs and the class would rely on AWS's billing statement and pay the municipal taxes, unauthorized service fees, long distance roaming and family plan charges.

1	7.2	Incidental expenses including prejudgment interest.
2	7.3	Reasonable attorneys' fees and litigation expenses.
3	7.4	Treble, exemplary or punitive damages, by law, and prejudgment
4	interest as aut	thorized by law.
5		VIII. REQUEST FOR RELIEF
6	WHE	REFORE, Plaintiffs, on their behalf, and on behalf of all other members
7	of the class, r	espectfully request the following relief from this honorable court:
8	8.1	A judgment against AWS enjoining it from continuing to charge
9	plaintiffs and	the class for municipal taxes not owed, services not ordered and/or long
10	distance char	ges not owed;
11	8.2	A judgment in favor of plaintiffs and the putative class against AWS for
12	restitution an	d reimbursement of all improperly collected fees;
13	8.3	A judgment in favor of Plaintiffs and the putative class and against
14	AWS awardi	ng Plaintiffs and the plaintiffs class treble, exemplary and/or punitive
15	damages up t	to the maximum amount permitted by law;
16	8.4	A judgment in favor of Plaintiffs and the putative class and against
17	AWS awardi	ng Plaintiffs and the class prejudgment interest on wrongfully collected
18	fees and char	ges;
19	8.5	A judgment in favor of Plaintiffs and the putative class and against
20	AWS awardi	ng Plaintiffs and the putative class their reasonable attorneys' fees, expert
21	fees, disburse	ements and costs of suit;
22	//	
23	//	
24		

1	8.6 A judgment in favor of Plaintiffs and the putative class for any
2	additional, further equitable or legal relief, which the Court deems appropriate or just.
3	2 10
4	Dated this ZND day of March, 2004.
5	$\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{A}}$
6	By: William W. Houck, WSBA No. 13324
7	David Breskin, WSBA No. 10607
8	
9	David Breskin SHORT CRESSMAN & BURGESS, PLLC
10	999 Third Avenue, Suite 3000 Seattle, Washington 98104-4088
11	(206) 682-3333
12	Houck Law Firm, P.S. 4045 262nd Ave. SE
13	Issaquah, Washington 98029
14	(425)392-7118
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	