

BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.

L. Timothy Fisher (State Bar No. 191626)
 Sean L. Litteral (State Bar No. 331985)
 1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940
 Walnut Creek, CA 94596
 Telephone: (925) 300-4455
 Facsimile: (925) 407-2700
 Email: ltfisher@bursor.com
 slitteral@bursor.com

MIGLIACCIO & RATHOD LLP

Nicholas A. Migliaccio (*pro hac vice*)
 Jason S. Rathod (*pro hac vice*)
 412 H St., NE
 Washington, D.C. 20002
 Telephone: (202) 470-3520
 Facsimile: (202) 800-2730
 E-Mail: nmigliaccio@classlawdc.com
 jrathod@classlawdc.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

DANIEL FRIEND, DAPHNE PAREAS, SCOTT
 SEVELAND, PATRICE SHERMAN, NESTOR
 ALMEIDA, ADELINA LAVECCHIA, DAN
 HENDERSON, MARITZA ANGELES, TIM
 INSELMANN, WILLIAM WEST-DAVIS,
 PATRICIA MEDBERRY, and HANDY
 COLINDREZ, individually and on behalf of all
 others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:21-cv-07109-VC

**FIRST AMENDED CONSOLIDATED
 CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Hon. Vince Chhabria

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE(S)

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	JURISDICTION AND VENUE	2
III.	PARTIES	2
A.	Plaintiffs	2
1.	California Plaintiffs	2
2.	Florida Plaintiff	5
3.	Massachusetts Plaintiff	6
4.	New Jersey Plaintiffs	7
5.	New York Plaintiffs	10
6.	North Carolina Plaintiff	12
7.	Rhode Island Plaintiff	13
8.	Virginia Plaintiff	14
B.	Defendant	15
IV.	FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS	16
A.	Apple Debuts the M1 MacBooks	16
B.	The Clearance Defect	16
C.	The Clearance Defect is Material to Reasonable Consumers	20
D.	Apple's Knowledge of the Clearance Defect	22
E.	Apple Omits the Clearance Defect from its Marketing and Packaging	33
1.	Apple's Product Pages and Disclosures Failed to Disclose the Clearance Defect	33
2.	MacBook Packaging and Accompanying Materials Failed to Disclose the Clearance Defect	36
V.	CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS	45
VI.	CAUSES OF ACTION	48
	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION – Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, <i>et seq.</i>	48

1	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – Violation of California’s Consumers	
2	Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1750, <i>et seq.</i>	51
3	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION – Violation of California’s False Advertising	
4	Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500, <i>et seq.</i>	53
5	FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Violation of the Florida Deceptive and	
6	Unfair Trade Practices Act, Fla. Stat. § 501.201, <i>et seq.</i> (“FDUTPA”).....	55
7	FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Violation of the Massachusetts Consumer	
8	Protection Act, Mass. Gen. Laws Ann. Ch. 93A, §§ 1, <i>et seq.</i>	57
9	SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Violation of the New Jersey Consumer	
10	Fraud Act, N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-1, <i>et seq.</i> (“NJFCA”)	59
11	SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Violation of the New York General	
12	Business Law § 349, N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 349	60
13	EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Violation of the New York General	
14	Business Law § 350, N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350	62
15	NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Violation of the North Carolina Consumer	
16	Protection Act,, N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-1.1, <i>et. seq.</i>	63
17	TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Violation of the Rhode Island Deceptive	
18	Trade Practices Act, R.I. Gen. Laws §§ 6-13.1, <i>et. seq.</i>	64
19	ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Violation of the Virginia Consumer	
20	Protection Act, Va. Code Ann. §§ 59.1-196, <i>et. seq.</i> (“VCPA”).....	66
21	TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION - Fraud	68
22	THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Constructive Fraud	69
23	FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Fraudulent Inducement	70
24	FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Fraudulent Concealment	71
25	SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Negligent Misrepresentation	73
26	SEVENTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Quasi-Contract / Unjust	
27	Enrichment	74
28	PRAYER FOR RELIEF	75
	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	76

1 Plaintiffs Daniel Friend, Daphne Pareas, Scott Seveland, Patrice Sherman, Nestor Almeida,
2 Adelina LaVecchia, Dan Henderson, Maritza Angeles, Tim Inselmann, William West-Davis, Patricia
3 Medberry, and Handy Colindrez (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) bring this action on behalf of themselves
4 and all others similarly situated against Defendant Apple, Inc. (“Apple” or “Defendant”) for the
5 manufacture, marketing, detailing, distribution, and sale of the defective Apple 13.3-inch M1
6 MacBook Air and 13.3-inch M1 MacBook Pro (“M1 MacBook(s)” or “MacBook(s)”). Plaintiffs
7 make the following allegations pursuant to the investigation of counsel and based upon information
8 and belief, except as to the allegations specifically pertaining to themselves, which are based on
9 personal knowledge.

10 I. INTRODUCTION

11 1. Plaintiffs bring this action, individually and on behalf of a class of similarly situated
12 owners of Apple’s 13.3-inch M1 MacBook Air and 13.3-inch M1 MacBook Pro. This action arises
13 from Apple’s concealment of a material defect stemming from the thin display and the low clearance
14 between the top case and thin display that is central to the operation of the MacBooks, and which
15 ultimately causes the display to crack and to blotch during regular use free of user interference (the
16 “Clearance Defect” or the “Defect”).

17 2. Apple has long been aware of the defective MacBooks. Yet, notwithstanding its
18 longstanding knowledge of the Clearance Defect, Apple routinely has refused to repair the
19 MacBooks without charge when the Defect manifests.

20 3. Many other MacBook owners have communicated with Apple’s employees and
21 agents to request that Apple remedy and/or address the Clearance Defect and/or resultant damage at
22 no expense. Apple has failed and/or refused to do so.

23 4. As a result of Apple’s unfair, deceptive, and fraudulent business practices, owners of
24 the MacBooks, including Plaintiffs, have suffered an ascertainable loss of money and/or property
25 and/or value. The unfair and deceptive trade practices committed by Apple were conducted in a
26 manner giving rise to substantial aggravating factors.

27 5. Had Plaintiffs and Class members known about the Clearance Defect at the time of
28 purchase, they would not have bought the MacBooks, or would have paid substantially less for them.

6. As a result of the Clearance Defect and the monetary costs associated with attempting to repair the damage stemming from the Clearance Defect, Plaintiffs and Class members have suffered injury in fact, incurred damages, and otherwise have been harmed by Apple's conduct.

7. Accordingly, Plaintiffs bring this action to redress Apple's violations of the various states' consumer fraud statutes, fraud, negligent misrepresentation, and unjust enrichment.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d), because the proposed classes consist of 100 or more members; the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000.00, exclusive of costs and interest; and at least one plaintiff is a citizen of a state different from the defendant, which is a California corporation.

9. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Apple because its principal place of business is located within this District and it has sufficient minimum contacts in California to render the exercise of jurisdiction by this Court proper and necessary.

10. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs' claims occurred in this judicial district.

11. The practices described herein were conceived, reviewed, approved, and otherwise controlled from Apple's nerve center, its headquarters in Cupertino, California. Employees at Apple's headquarters directed the production and assembly of the MacBook's hardware and software, and would have had pre-sale knowledge of the Clearance Defect. As Apple admitted in its Form 10-K for the fiscal period that ended on October 28, 2021, "most of the Company's personnel" are in Silicon Valley. Apple's breach of duty to Plaintiffs and the Class emanated from California.

III. PARTIES

A. Plaintiffs

1. California Plaintiffs

12. Plaintiff Daniel Friend is, and at all times relevant to this action has been, a citizen of Fullerton, California. In or around May 2021, Plaintiff Friend purchased his M1 MacBook Pro directly from Apple at its Apple Brea Mall store location. Prior to his purchase, Mr. Friend reviewed the M1 MacBook Pro product page directly on Apple's website. At the point of purchase, Mr. Friend

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.