

ANN RAVEL (62139)  
aravel@mcm manislaw.com  
McMANIS FAULKNER  
a Professional Corporation  
50 West San Fernando Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone: (408) 279-8700  
Facsimile: (408) 279-3244

GEORGE A. ZELCS  
MARC A. WALLENSTEIN  
ROBERT E. LITAN  
RYAN Z. CORTAZAR  
KOREIN TILLERY LLC  
205 North Michigan Avenue  
Suite 1950  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
Telephone: (312) 641-9750  
Facsimile: (312) 641-9751

GLEN E. SUMMERS (176402)  
glen.summers@bartlitbeck.com  
KARMA M. GIULIANELLI (184175)  
karma.giulanelli@bartlitbeck.com  
ALISON G. WHEELER (180748)  
alison.wheeler@bartlitbeck.com  
BARTLIT BECK LLP  
1801 Wewatta Street, Suite 1200  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
Telephone: (303) 592-3100  
Facsimile: (303) 592-3140

MICHAEL E. KLENOV (277028)  
CAROL O'KEEFE  
KOREIN TILLERY LLC  
505 North Seventh Street  
Suite 3600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63101-1625  
Telephone: (314) 241-4844  
Facsimile: (314) 241-3525

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs,  
Joseph Taylor, Edward Mlakar, Mick  
Cleary, Eugene Alvis, and Jennifer Nelson*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

JOSEPH TAYLOR, EDWARD MLAKAR,  
MICK CLEARY, EUGENE ALVIS, and  
JENNIFER NELSON individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No.: 5:20-CV-07956-VKD

**FIRST AMENDED  
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

## INTRODUCTION

1  
2 1. Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) designed the Android operating system to  
3 collect vast amounts of information about its users, which Google uses to generate billions of  
4 dollars in profit annually by selling targeted digital advertisements and improving products like  
5 Google Maps. There are privacy implications for an operating system specifically designed to  
6 surveil mobile device users in order to refine Google’s targeted advertising business. But there is  
7 also an unlawful free-riding problem because Google collects this information by consuming the  
8 cellular data that its Android users purchase from their cellular providers every month. Google  
9 effectively forces these users to subsidize its surveillance by secretly programming Android  
10 devices to constantly transmit user information to Google in real time, thus appropriating the  
11 valuable cellular data users have purchased. Google does this, in large measure, for its own  
12 financial benefit, and without informing users or seeking their consent.

13 2. This case involves the application of long-standing common law principles to seek  
14 redress for Google’s secret appropriation of Android users’ cellular data. Pursuing separate claims  
15 under both quantum meruit and conversion, Plaintiffs seek to represent a nationwide class of  
16 consumers (excluding California residents) who own Android mobile devices that secretly use  
17 their costly cellular data to enable Google’s surveillance activities.

18 3. Consumers pay mobile carriers for cellular data, and they consume that data  
19 through their mobile devices. Cellular data is property subject to conversion. But even if cellular  
20 data were a service rather than property, Google’s misappropriation of that service gives rise to a  
21 quantum meruit claim—a claim that does not depend on cellular data being property.

22 4. Cellular data is property subject to conversion because, just like electricity or water,  
23 cellular data is capable of exclusive possession. Just like electricity or water passing through a  
24 meter attached to a home, every singly byte of cellular data transmitted by a wireless device is  
25 metered by the carrier. Just like the use of electricity or water, the amount of data transmitted by a  
26 wireless device has ramifications for the consumer, who can be charged for the additional use or  
27 suffer restrictions on further use. And just as electricity and water are provided by utilities, it

1 makes no difference that cellular data is transmitted by a wireless carrier. Just like electricity  
2 delivered through a wire into a home is property, and just as the water passing through a pipe into  
3 a home is property, so too is the cellular data transported over a wireless carrier's network to and  
4 from a user's cellular device.

5         5. Even if cellular data is not property subject to conversion, and is instead a  
6 contractual right of access to a service, it is still a valuable right that Google has misappropriated,  
7 and the misappropriation of a service is precisely the sort of wrong that quantum meruit is meant  
8 to redress. ***The quantum meruit claim pleaded in this Amended Complaint is not a common***  
9 ***count derivative of the conversion claim.*** It is a separate cause of action, with a separate theory  
10 of recovery that the consumer class has a right to pursue regardless of whether cellular data is or  
11 is not property. The quantum meruit claim does not rise and fall with the conversion claim—quite  
12 the opposite. Either cellular data is property subject to conversion, or it is a contractual right of  
13 access to a service subject to quantum meruit. It may even be both—but it must at least be one or  
14 the other.

15         6. Much of the information-gathering by Google takes place without any action at all  
16 by Android device owners. While Plaintiffs' Android devices are in their purses and pockets, and  
17 even while sitting seemingly idle on Plaintiffs' nightstands as they sleep, Google's Android  
18 operating system secretly appropriates cellular data paid for by Plaintiffs to perform "passive"  
19 information transfers which are not initiated by any action of the user and are performed without  
20 their knowledge. The transmission of this data to and from Google is not time-sensitive and could  
21 be delayed until Plaintiffs are on a Wi-Fi network, to avoid consuming Plaintiffs' cellular data.  
22 However, Google deliberately designed and coded its Android operating system and Google  
23 applications to indiscriminately consume Plaintiffs' cellular data and passively transfer  
24 information at all hours of the day—even after Plaintiffs move Google apps to the background,  
25 close the programs completely, or disable location-sharing.

26         7. Plaintiffs had no say in Google's continual misappropriation of their cellular data  
27 and remain largely powerless to stop it. Google designed its Android operating system and apps

1 to prevent users from changing the settings to disable these transfers completely or to restrict them  
2 to Wi-Fi networks. Because of Google's deliberate design decisions, these passive information  
3 transfers using cellular data purchased by Plaintiffs are mandatory and unavoidable burdens  
4 shouldered by Android device users for Google's financial benefit.

5 8. Plaintiffs at no time consented to these transfers, and were given no warning or  
6 option to disable them. Google has crafted its various terms of service and policies in ways that  
7 purport to create binding contracts with the users of its technologies. But Plaintiffs and other  
8 consumers purchased their Android devices with little choice but to accept Google's terms and  
9 policies, which are contracts of adhesion. Even if Google's policies and terms of service are valid  
10 contracts, they do not alert users that Android devices will needlessly consume their cellular data.  
11 While Google informs the users of certain transfers of personal information when they are actively  
12 engaged with their devices, its extensive "privacy" policies are silent on mandatory, passive  
13 information transfers and the means by which they occur.

14 9. These information transfers are not mere annoyances—they interfere with  
15 Plaintiffs' property interests, depriving them of data for which they, not Google, paid. Each month,  
16 mobile device users pay their mobile carriers for cellular data that enable them to transmit and  
17 receive information on the carriers' cellular data networks. Whether Plaintiffs pay for a specific  
18 number of gigabytes, pay a fixed price per GB, or pay for unlimited access subject to speed  
19 restrictions above a certain data usage threshold, the contracts between Plaintiffs and their mobile  
20 carriers create for Plaintiffs concrete property interests in their purchased cellular data. When it  
21 initiates passive transfers of information utilizing Plaintiffs' cellular allowances, Google  
22 wrongfully interferes with Plaintiffs' exclusive possession of this property and commits the  
23 longstanding tort of conversion.

24 10. If cellular data is viewed as a contractual right of access to a service instead of  
25 property, then Google has unjustly enriched itself by misappropriating Plaintiffs' right to transmit  
26 cellular data over their carriers' networks for its own purposes, without the knowledge or consent  
27 of the users whose right of access Google is coopting. If that misappropriation does not state a

1 claim for conversion, it must state a claim for quantum meruit. That is because the passive  
2 transfers of cellular data confer a valuable benefit to Google at Plaintiffs' expense. Google sends  
3 and receives information without bearing the cost of transferring that information between  
4 consumers and Google. Indeed, the information transmitted through this practice supports the  
5 company's product development and lucrative targeted advertising business. In the absence of  
6 contractual provisions disclosing and permitting Google to utilize Plaintiffs' cellular data, Google  
7 must compensate Plaintiffs for that use.

8 11. This case is not about privacy. In this Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs do not  
9 challenge Google's underlying practice of harvesting personal information about users from their  
10 interactions with mobile devices or apps. Rather, Plaintiffs challenge Google's practice of  
11 effectively making mobile device users *pay* for the *transfer* of that information from their mobile  
12 devices to Google. As used by the carriers, and as used in this Amended Complaint, the term  
13 "cellular data" does not describe the underlying personal information that Google secretly causes  
14 Android mobile devices to transmit to it; rather, "cellular data" describes the transmission of such  
15 information over cellular networks charged against consumers' cellular data plans. To avoid  
16 confusion, this Amended Complaint typically refers to cellular data as "data" and the underlying  
17 information transferred via the cellular network as "information."

#### 18 PARTIES

19 12. Plaintiff Joseph Taylor, who is a resident and domiciliary of Illinois, bought an  
20 Android mobile device that he uses with a monthly unlimited cellular data plan purchased from  
21 carrier Metro by T-Mobile. Plaintiff Taylor was injured in fact and has been deprived of his  
22 property as a result of Google's unlawful conversion of his cellular data.

23 13. Plaintiff Edward Mlakar, who is a resident and domiciliary of Illinois, bought an  
24 Android mobile device that he uses with a monthly unlimited cellular data plan purchased from  
25 carrier Sprint Solutions, Inc. Plaintiff Mlakar was injured in fact and has been deprived of his  
26 property as a result of Google's unlawful conversion of his cellular data.

# 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.