

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHELE ARENA, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
INTUIT INC., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [19-cv-02546-CRB](#)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
COMPEL ARBITRATION**

Andrew Dohrman, Joseph Brougher, and Monica Chandler (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) have brought a putative class action against Intuit Inc., alleging that Intuit fooled a class of consumers into paying for its tax preparation services when they were entitled to use its free filing option. Intuit thinks Plaintiffs are bound by the arbitration agreement in the Intuit Terms of Service for TurboTax Online Tax Preparation Services – Tax Year 2018 (“the Terms”), which Plaintiffs ostensibly agreed to every time they signed in to use Intuit’s tax preparation software. Because the Terms were too inconspicuous to give Plaintiffs constructive notice that they were agreeing to be bound by the arbitration agreement when they signed in to TurboTax, the Court finds that Plaintiffs did not agree to the arbitration provision. The Court therefore need not decide whether questions of arbitrability or claims for equitable relief were delegated to the arbitrator. The Motion to Compel Arbitration is denied, and so is Intuit’s request for a stay pending its appeal to the Ninth Circuit.

I. BACKGROUND

Intuit owns TurboTax, an online tax preparation service. Compl. (dkt. 1) ¶ 1. In 2002, Intuit and other tax preparation services entered an agreement with the Internal Revenue Service to

1 provide low-income taxpayers and active military members the option to file their taxes for free.
2 Id. ¶¶ 15–17, 20. But, Plaintiffs allege, Intuit violated that agreement by misleadingly channeling
3 such taxpayers to its paid services instead. Id. ¶ 2. According to the Complaint, Intuit lured
4 consumers in with promises of free filing, only to direct them to paid offerings while hiding the
5 actual free filing option. Id. ¶ 3–4.

6 From January to March 2019, consumers accessing TurboTax Online as returning users
7 would have seen this sign-in page:

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
United States District Court
Northern District of California

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

intuit

turbotax quickbooks mint

Sign In

One account. Everything Intuit.
Sign in to your Intuit account to access all our products including TurboTax.
[Learn more](#)

User ID

Please enter a valid user ID.

Password

Remember me

[Sign In](#)

By clicking [Sign In](#), you agree to the [Turbo Terms of Use](#), [TurboTax Terms of Use](#) and have read and acknowledge our [Privacy Statement](#).

[I forgot my user ID or password](#)

New to Intuit? [Create an account.](#)

Invisible reCAPTCHA by Google [Privacy Policy](#) and [Terms of Use](#).

Legal Privacy Security

1 Sun Decl. (dkt. 97-2) ¶ 5. The parties do not dispute that each of the Plaintiffs would have seen
 2 the sign-in page depicted above, or a substantially similar version.¹ Mot. (dkt. 97) at 2–3, 5–6;
 3 Opp’n (dkt. 112) at 2; see also Davis Decl. (dkt. 97-1) ¶ 7.

4 The phrase “TurboTax Terms of Use” is a hyperlink to the Terms. Sun Decl. ¶ 6. A
 5 consumer who clicked on the link and read the Terms would have eventually arrived at the
 6 following arbitration provision:

7 14. DISPUTES. ANY DISPUTE OR CLAIM RELATING IN ANY
 8 WAY TO THE SERVICES OR THIS AGREEMENT WILL BE
 9 RESOLVED BY BINDING ARBITRATION, RATHER THAN IN
 10 COURT, except that you may assert claims in small claims court if
 11 your claims qualify. The Federal Arbitration Act governs the
 12 interpretation and enforcement of this provision; the arbitrator shall
 13 apply California law to all other matters. Notwithstanding anything
 14 to the contrary, any party to the arbitration may at any time seek
 15 injunctions or other forms of equitable relief from any court of
 16 competent jurisdiction. . . Arbitration will be conducted by the
 17 American Arbitration Association (AAA) before a single AAA
 18 arbitrator under the AAA’s rules, which are available at
 19 www.adr.org or by calling 1-800-778-7879.

20 Sun Decl. Ex. 1 (“Terms”) at 4.

21 Plaintiffs’ suit “seek[s] equitable and injunctive relief on behalf of themselves and all
 22 others who are similarly situated.” Opp’n at 1. Intuit has moved to compel arbitration. See
 23 generally Mot.

24 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

25 The Federal Arbitration Act provides that an agreement to submit commercial disputes to
 26 arbitration shall be “valid, irrevocable, and enforceable, save upon such grounds as exist at law or
 27 in equity for the revocation of any contract.” 9 U.S.C. § 2. “[P]rivate agreements to arbitrate are
 28 enforced according to their terms.” Volt Info. Scis., Inc. v. Bd. of Trs. of Leland Stanford Junior
 29 Univ., 489 U.S. 468, 479 (1989). A party may therefore petition a United States district court “for
 30 an order directing that . . . arbitration proceed in the manner provided for in such agreement.” 9
 31 U.S.C. § 4. “[A] party cannot be required to submit to arbitration any dispute which he has not

¹ It appears Dohrmann accessed TurboTax through the “Account Recovery” page. Davis Decl. ¶ 7a. For purposes of this Order, that page’s relevant features are identical to the standard sign-in

1 agreed so to submit.” AT&T Techs., Inc. v. Commc’ns Workers of Am., 475 U.S. 643, 648
2 (1986).

3 **III. DISCUSSION**

4 The dispositive question is whether there was a valid agreement to arbitrate. If Plaintiffs
5 did not assent to the Terms, they cannot be bound by the arbitration provision contained therein.
6 “In determining whether a valid arbitration agreement exists, federal courts apply ordinary state-
7 law principles that govern the formation of contracts.” Nguyen v. Barnes & Noble Inc., 763 F.3d
8 1171, 1175 (9th Cir. 2014) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). The parties agree that
9 California law governs here. Mot. at 7; Opp’n at 3. Under California contract law, a valid
10 agreement requires the parties’ “mutual manifestation of assent” to be bound by the terms of the
11 contract. Nguyen, 763 F.3d at 1175 (internal alterations omitted). “[A]n offeree, knowing that an
12 offer has been made to him but not knowing all of its terms, may be held to have accepted, by his
13 conduct, whatever terms the offer contains.” Windsor Mills, Inc. v. Collins & Aikman Corp., 101
14 Cal. Rptr. 347, 350 (Cal. Ct. App. 1972). However, an offeree cannot be bound by the terms of a
15 contract if he “does not know that a proposal has been made to him.” Id. at 351. These basic
16 principles apply to contracting on the Internet. Nguyen, 763 F.3d at 1175.

17 Courts have categorized the various contracts of adhesion employed by online service
18 providers like Intuit. “‘Clickwrap’ (or ‘click-through’) agreements require website users to click
19 on an ‘I agree’ box after being presented with a list of terms and conditions of use.” Colgate v.
20 JUUL Labs, Inc., 402 F. Supp. 3d 728, 763 (N.D. Cal. 2019). “‘Browsewrap’ agreements exist
21 where a website’s terms and conditions of use are generally posted on the website via a hyperlink
22 at the bottom of the screen.” Id. Intuit employs a more recent innovation somewhere between
23 these two classic forms of Internet contracting. “‘Sign-in wrap’ agreements are those in which a
24 user signs up to use an internet product or service, and the signup screen states that acceptance of a
25 separate agreement is required before the use can access the service.” Id.

26 Sign-in wrap agreements are valid and enforceable when “the existence of the terms was
27 reasonably communicated to the user.” Id. at 764. In other words, if Plaintiffs “were on inquiry
28

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.