1 2 3 4 5	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				
6	MIGLIACCIO & RATHOD LLP				
7	Nicholas A. Migliaccio (pro hac vice) Jason S. Rathod (pro hac vice)				
8	412 H St., NE Washington. D.C. 20002				
9	Telephone: (202) 470-3520 Facsimile: (202) 800-2730 E-Mail: nmigliaccio@classlawdc.com				
10	jrathod@classlawdc.com				
11	Attorneys for Plaintiffs				
12					
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
14	NORTHERN DISTRIC	CT OF CALIFORNIA			
14 15					
	DANIEL FRIEND, DAPHNE PAREAS, SCOTT SEVELAND, PATRICE SHERMAN, NESTOR	CT OF CALIFORNIA Case No. 3:21-cv-07109-VC			
15	DANIEL FRIEND, DAPHNE PAREAS, SCOTT	Case No. 3:21-cv-07109-VC FIRST AMENDED CONSOLIDATED			
15 16	DANIEL FRIEND, DAPHNE PAREAS, SCOTT SEVELAND, PATRICE SHERMAN, NESTOR ALMEIDA, ADELINA LAVECCHIA, DAN HENDERSON, MARITZA ANGELES, TIM INSELMANN, WILLIAM WEST-DAVIS,	Case No. 3:21-cv-07109-VC			
15 16 17	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	Case No. 3:21-cv-07109-VC FIRST AMENDED CONSOLIDATED			
15 16 17 18	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,	Case No. 3:21-cv-07109-VC FIRST AMENDED CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT			
15 16 17 18 19	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,	Case No. 3:21-cv-07109-VC FIRST AMENDED CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT			
15 16 17 18 19 20	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.	Case No. 3:21-cv-07109-VC FIRST AMENDED CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT JURY TRIAL DEMANDED			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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.,	Case No. 3:21-cv-07109-VC FIRST AMENDED CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT JURY TRIAL DEMANDED			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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.	Case No. 3:21-cv-07109-VC FIRST AMENDED CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT JURY TRIAL DEMANDED			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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.,	Case No. 3:21-cv-07109-VC FIRST AMENDED CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT JURY TRIAL DEMANDED			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	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.,	Case No. 3:21-cv-07109-VC FIRST AMENDED CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT JURY TRIAL DEMANDED			



L	TABLE OF CONTENTS		
$_{2}$			PAGE(S)
3	I.	INTRODUCTION	1
1	II.	JURISDICTION AND VENUE	2
5	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
		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, et seq	48



Case 3:21-cv-07109-VC Document 43 Filed 06/17/22 Page 3 of 80

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



Plaintiffs 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 (collectively, "Plaintiffs") bring this action on behalf of themselves

and all others similarly situated against Defendant Apple, Inc. ("Apple" or "Defendant") for the

manufacture, marketing, detailing, distribution, and sale of the defective Apple 13.3-inch M1

MacBook Air and 13.3-inch M1 MacBook Pro ("M1 MacBook(s)" or "MacBook(s)"). Plaintiffs

make the following allegations pursuant to the investigation of counsel and based upon information

and belief, except as to the allegations specifically pertaining to themselves, which are based on

personal knowledge.

I. INTRODUCTION

- 1. Plaintiffs bring this action, individually and on behalf of a class of similarly situated owners of Apple's 13.3-inch M1 MacBook Air and 13.3-inch M1 MacBook Pro. This action arises from Apple's concealment of a material defect stemming from the thin display and the low clearance between the top case and thin display that is central to the operation of the MacBooks, and which ultimately causes the display to crack and to blotch during regular use free of user interference (the "Clearance Defect" or the "Defect").
- 2. Apple has long been aware of the defective MacBooks. Yet, notwithstanding its longstanding knowledge of the Clearance Defect, Apple routinely has refused to repair the MacBooks without charge when the Defect manifests.
- 3. Many other MacBook owners have communicated with Apple's employees and agents to request that Apple remedy and/or address the Clearance Defect and/or resultant damage at no expense. Apple has failed and/or refused to do so.
- 4. As a result of Apple's unfair, deceptive, and fraudulent business practices, owners of the MacBooks, including Plaintiffs, have suffered an ascertainable loss of money and/or property and/or value. The unfair and deceptive trade practices committed by Apple were conducted in a manner giving rise to substantial aggravating factors.
- 5. Had Plaintiffs and Class members known about the Clearance Defect at the time of 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 of 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 in 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. <u>California Plaintiffs</u>

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



DOCKET

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.

