

1 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
 2 THEANE EVANGELIS, SBN 243570
 TEvangelis@gibsondunn.com
 3 BLAINE H. EVANSON, SBN 254338
 BEvanson@gibsondunn.com
 4 HEATHER L. RICHARDSON, SBN 246517
 HRichardson@gibsondunn.com
 DHANANJAY S. MANTHRIPRAGADA,
 5 SBN 254433
 DManthripragada@gibsondunn.com
 6 333 South Grand Avenue
 Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197
 7 Tel.: 213.229.7000
 Fax: 213.229.7520

8
 9 JOSHUA S. LIPSHUTZ, SBN 242557
 JLipshutz@gibsondunn.com
 555 Mission Street, Suite 3000
 10 San Francisco, CA 94105-0921
 Tel.: 415.393.8200
 11 Fax: 415.393.8306

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Lydia Olson,
 Miguel Perez, Postmates Inc., and
 13 Uber Technologies, Inc.

14
 15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 16 WESTERN DIVISION

17 LYDIA OLSON; MIGUEL PEREZ;
 18 POSTMATES INC.; and UBER
 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 STATE OF CALIFORNIA; XAVIER
 22 BECERRA, in his capacity as Attorney
 General of the State of California; and
 23 "JOHN DOE," in his official capacity,

24 Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:19-cv-10956

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF
 FEDERAL AND CALIFORNIA
 CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS,
 DECLARATORY, INJUNCTIVE,
 AND OTHER RELIEF**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

25 Plaintiffs Lydia Olson and Miguel Perez (together, "Individual Plaintiffs"), and
 26 Postmates Inc. ("Postmates") and Uber Technologies, Inc. ("Uber") (together,
 27 "Company Plaintiffs") file this Complaint for declaratory, injunctive, and other relief
 28 determining that California Assembly Bill 5 ("AB 5")—a recently enacted statute that

1 becomes effective on January 1, 2020—is unconstitutional. AB 5 violates the Equal
2 Protection and Due Process Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States
3 Constitution, the Ninth Amendment to the United States Constitution, and the Contracts
4 Clause of Article I of the United States Constitution, as well as the Equal Protection
5 Clause, Inalienable Rights Clause, Due Process Clause, Baby Ninth Amendment, and
6 Contracts Clause of the California Constitution.

7 INTRODUCTION

8 1. Plaintiffs bring this lawsuit to protect their constitutional rights and defend
9 their fundamental liberty to pursue their chosen work as independent service providers
10 and technology companies in the on-demand economy.

11 2. AB 5 is an irrational and unconstitutional statute designed to target and
12 stifle workers and companies in the on-demand economy.

13 3. The on-demand economy is a free-market system in which Plaintiffs Lydia
14 Olson and Miguel Perez, along with other independent service providers like them, have
15 enjoyed opportunities to earn money when and where they want, with unprecedented
16 independence and flexibility. These opportunities have been made possible by mobile
17 applications (“apps”) operated by network companies that connect consumers requesting
18 certain services with independent providers of those services. Network companies that
19 operate these apps, like Company Plaintiffs, are sometimes referred to as “app-based
20 platforms,” “network companies,” or “platform companies.” Those independent service
21 providers who find their customers using the network companies’ mobile apps may be
22 referred to as “app-based independent service providers,” performing “on-demand
23 work.”

24 4. Plaintiffs Olson and Perez choose to work as independent service providers
25 in the modern app-based on-demand economy as a means of earning a substantial or
26 supplementary income while maintaining the right to decide when, where, and how they
27 work. In fact, hundreds of thousands of Californians choose to provide these services—
28 such as providing transportation to a passenger or delivering food, groceries, and other

1 goods—and enjoy an unprecedented level of flexibility and freedom without the
2 restrictions, limitations, and burdens of traditional employment.

3 5. Such independent service providers like Individual Plaintiffs are able “to
4 integrate work into their existing lifestyles, to manage it along with other work, and to
5 assemble what amounts to a form of income insurance,” thereby gaining the ability “to
6 create their own financial stability.”¹ For example, Plaintiff Olson uses on-demand work
7 to supplement her primary income while still ensuring that she can always care for her
8 husband, who has multiple sclerosis, whenever he needs her. Plaintiff Perez uses on-
9 demand work more regularly to earn a more substantial income than he previously did
10 as a trucker, while still making it to all of his son’s little league games. Other fathers
11 too choose app-based on-demand referrals for the flexibility to work around children’s
12 soccer games or ballet performances. An aspiring comedian might choose to perform
13 transportation services referred through an app so that she can attend an audition without
14 checking with her boss. A student might choose to use a delivery platform for referrals
15 to earn money between classes. A retiree might use an app’s referrals to supplement
16 fixed income and for social interaction. A military spouse might choose to work in the
17 on-demand economy to help ease the burdens of frequent relocation. Others might
18 choose it as a way to supplement “traditional” full-time work or to bridge the gap
19 between salaried positions.² In short, these independent workers can work as much, or
20 as little, as they want in order to accommodate family, social, professional, academic,
21 and other commitments.³

22
23 ¹ Intuit and Emergent Research, *Dispatches from the New Economy: The On-Demand*
24 *Economy Worker Study*, at 4-5, June 2017, [https://fddocuments.us/document/
dispatches-from-the-new-economy-the-on-the-underlying-dynamics-affecting-
the.html](https://fddocuments.us/document/dispatches-from-the-new-economy-the-on-the-underlying-dynamics-affecting-the.html).

25 ² AB 5’s principal sponsor has indicated that the law was specifically designed to
26 address people who have a full-time job and choose to supplement their income with
27 side work. @LorenaSGonzalez, Twitter (Dec. 19, 2019, 6:29 AM), [https://twitter.
com/LorenaSGonzalez/status/1207669238481092610](https://twitter.com/LorenaSGonzalez/status/1207669238481092610) (AB 5 “was in response to
people who have a job but have to work side hustles”).

28 ³ For many other examples of the flexibility afforded by on-demand work, see
O’Connor v. Uber Techs. Inc., No. CV-13-03826-EMC (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2015)

1 6. Because app-based work empowers individuals to generate income on a
2 flexible schedule, “[m]any people choose this mode of work, even when they have other
3 options.”⁴ Even with record low levels of unemployment, hundreds of thousands of
4 Californians are flocking to on-demand work. Instead of a daily commute, an outdated
5 workplace hierarchy, and the daily grind of an inflexible 9-to-5 job, these workers enjoy
6 the freedom to be their own bosses, set their own hours, and earn income whenever they
7 want. Many such workers also choose to “multi-app”—i.e., simultaneously use the apps
8 of several app-based network companies. By using multiple apps at the same time—
9 e.g., Uber, Postmates, Grubhub, and DoorDash—independent service providers can
10 more easily find service requests to perform, including multiple service requests at the
11 same time, thereby maximizing their potential for earnings during the time period that
12 they choose to make themselves available. Plaintiffs Olson and Perez both regularly
13 multi-app to increase convenience and enhance their earnings.

14 7. Plaintiff Olson holds an MBA from the University of California, Davis, and
15 was employed in several management positions before becoming an independent
16 business owner in 2011. She runs a consulting firm that works with small businesses
17 and churches. Shortly after Ms. Olson started her consulting business, her husband was
18 diagnosed with multiple sclerosis, and she was grateful that, as an independent business
19 owner, she had the flexibility to take time off to care for him when needed. In addition
20 to her consulting work, Ms. Olson began using the Uber and Lyft apps for driving
21 referrals to supplement her primary income while still maintaining the flexibility to
22 support her husband. Given her husband’s illness and the fact that she has little or no
23 notice of when she will have to take time off to care for him, as well as her consulting
24 business, Ms. Olson could not give up the flexibility that she has as an independent
25 service provider in exchange for a more traditional work arrangement.

27 (Dkt. 307); Evangelis Declaration Exhibits 1–40, *O’Connor v. Uber Techs. Inc.*, No.
28 CV-13-03826-EMC (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2015) (Dkt. 299).

⁴ Intuit and Emergent Research, *supra* note 1, at 3.

1 8. Plaintiff Perez likewise has relied on the freedom and flexibility he has as
2 an independent contractor to support his family. He once drove a big rig as a
3 commercial, class A truck driver for FedEx on a regular graveyard shift. He disliked the
4 inflexible schedule and long hours because of how little time he got to spend with his
5 wife and children, and he found that he was constantly getting injured on the graveyard
6 shift. Mr. Perez's dissatisfaction led him to look for other work, and he decided to
7 experiment with running his own on-demand business on his own terms by accepting
8 referrals for consumers looking for rides or deliveries from several on-demand apps.
9 Now running his own delivery business, Mr. Perez gets to decide when he starts work
10 and when he stops. He is able to be his own boss and tailor his work to be present for
11 all the important life events for his children. And he has nearly doubled his earnings
12 from when he was a truck driver, allowing his wife to quit her job and spend more time
13 with their daughter.

14 9. Individual Plaintiffs experience these benefits from on-demand work as
15 tangible and central to their and their families' well-being and quality of life; these
16 benefits represent foundational and critical gains that they realize every day from being
17 their own bosses.

18 10. The app-based on-demand economy also has benefited consumers. The
19 advanced technologies of app-based network companies like Company Plaintiffs have
20 reduced the costs associated with finding and hiring independent service providers,
21 eliminated barriers to enter markets with high initial setup costs, increased convenience
22 for independent service providers and consumers, and lowered prices for numerous
23 services by making it easy to connect independent service providers directly with paying
24 consumers. As a result, consumers "have flocked to these networked services because
25 of the added convenience, lower prices, and higher quality services."⁵ Millions of
26

27 ⁵ Will Rinehart, *The Modern Online Gig Economy, Consumer Benefits, and the*
28 *Importance of Regulatory Humility*, American Action Forum (Nov. 19, 2015),
<https://www.americanactionforum.org/research/the-modern-online-gig-economy-consumer-benefit-and-the-importance-of-regula/>.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.