

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

PHILLIP R. CRUTCHFIELD,  
Individually and On Behalf of All Others  
Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

MATCH GROUP, INC., AMANDA W.  
GINSBERG, and GARY SWIDLER,

Defendants.

Case No.: 3:19-cv-02356

**SECOND AMENDED CLASS  
ACTION COMPLAINT FOR  
VIOLATIONS OF THE FEDERAL  
SECURITIES LAWS**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. NATURE OF THE ACTION ..... 1

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE ..... 5

III. PARTIES ..... 6

IV. NON-PARTY CONFIDENTIAL WITNESSES ..... 7

V. SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS ..... 12

    A. Match’s Business & Operations..... 12

    B. Match’s Strong and Growing Revenues Were Driven By Widespread Undisclosed Misconduct..... 15

        1. Undisclosed Facts and Risks Concerning Fraudulent Accountholders .... 16

            a. *Undisclosed Facts and Risks Due to Scammers* ..... 16

            b. *Undisclosed Facts and Risks Due to Bots*..... 28

            c. *Undisclosed Facts and Risks Due to Sex Offenders and Felons* .. 30

        2. Undisclosed Facts and Risks Concerning Match’s Use of Communications from Fraudulent Accounts to Generate Deceptive Marketing, Sell Subscriptions, And Increase Its User Base ..... 35

        3. Undisclosed Facts and Risks Concerning Match’s Use of Deceptive Guarantees and Confusing Billing and Cancellation Practices to Maintain Its Improperly Inflated User Base..... 37

            a. *Undisclosed Facts and Risks Concerning Match’s Use of Deceptive Guarantees* ..... 38

            b. *Undisclosed Facts and Risks Concerning Match’s Improper Billing and Cancellation Practices*..... 39

        4. Undisclosed Facts and Risks Concerning Match’s Retaliation Against Its Employees Who Tried To Protect Members ..... 45

    C. Materially False and Misleading Statements Issued During the Period ..... 46

        1. The Membership Integrity Fraud ..... 46

        2. The Reported Results Fraud..... 120

    D. PARTIAL CORRECTIVE DISCLOSURES INCREMENTALLY REVEALED THE FRAUDS ..... 124

    E. POST-CLASS PERIOD FACTS UNDERSCORE ONGOING RISKS FOR MATCH FROM THE UNDERLYING MISCONDUCT AT ISSUE..... 129

    F. ADDITIONAL FACTS PROBATIVE OF SCIENTER..... 130

        1. Defendants Ginsberg’s and Swidler’s Knowledge or Reckless Disregard of Red Flags Demonstrates Scienter ..... 130

2.	Defendants Ginsberg’s and Swidler’s Suspicious, Widespread Insider Trading During the Class Period Evidences Scienter .....	137
3.	Defendants Ginsberg And Swidler Failed To Disclose One SEC Investigation And Two FTC Investigations While Insider Trading .....	143
4.	Suspicious Resignations, Including By Defendant Ginsberg, Evidence Scienter .....	144
5.	The Fraud Implicated Core Operations.....	146
6.	Defendants Ginsberg and Swidler Signed, Were Quoted In, or Sox Certified the Alleged Misstatements .....	147
7.	The Fraud And Retaliation Against Employees Violated Match’s Corporate Code of Business Conduct and Ethics .....	148
VI.	NO SAFE HARBOR .....	150
VII.	LOSS CAUSATION/ECONOMIC LOSS .....	151
VIII.	PRESUMPTION OF RELIANCE .....	152
IX.	PLAINTIFFS’ CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS.....	153
X.	CLAIMS FOR RELIEF .....	155
	COUNT I .....	155
	COUNT II.....	159
XI.	PRAYER FOR RELIEF .....	160
XII.	DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY .....	160

Co-Lead Plaintiffs, Phillip R. Crutchfield and Samir Ali Cherif Benouis (“Plaintiffs”), individually and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated, by their undersigned attorneys, for their complaint against Defendants, allege the following based upon personal knowledge as to themselves and their own acts, and information and belief as to all other matters, based upon, *inter alia*, the investigation conducted by and through their attorneys, which included a review of Defendants’ public statements and publicly available documents, conference calls and announcements, SEC filings, wire and press releases published by and regarding Match Group, Inc. (“Match Group” or “Match”), analysts’ reports and advisories and other press coverage about Match, Match’s stock chart, Match’s corporate website, data obtained through news services such as Bloomberg and Yahoo! Finance, interviews with certain confidential witnesses (“CWs”) who were former employees of Match and the brands it owns, information obtained through Freedom of Information Act requests, and information readily obtainable through publicly available sources and on the Internet. Plaintiffs believe that substantial evidentiary support will exist for the allegations set forth herein after a reasonable opportunity for discovery.

## **I. NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. This is a federal securities class action brought on behalf of a class consisting of all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired the common stock of Match Group, Inc. (NASDAQ: MTCH) between November 6, 2018 and January 31, 2020, both dates inclusive (“Class Period”), seeking to pursue remedies against Match and certain of its officers and/or directors named as Defendants herein for violations of the federal securities laws under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”).

2. Match Group operates a suite of dating and matchmaking websites and applications (“apps”) accessed through computers and devices, including popular brands like Match.com,

Tinder, PlentyofFish. It derives substantially all its revenues from payments by a portion of its registered members, those it can convert from a free or trial membership to a premium or paid membership, like Tinder Gold. To gauge its success, Match tracks financial and performance metrics that are publicly reported to analysts and investors, including its “paid member count” or “PMC”, the conversion rate from unpaid to paid memberships, and the average revenue per user (or “ARPU”), in addition to more traditional reporting metrics like revenues and earnings.

3. Unbeknownst to investors, Match’s websites and apps suffered from rampant levels of scammers, “bots,” and other fraudulent accounts among its registered users, a “significant” percentage of whom paid premiums for access to enhanced features, both to avoid detection and as a prerequisite to accessing the features and functionalities necessary to carry out their scams. These nefarious actors sought to extract money or things of value from Match’s legitimate customers. Worse, most of Match’s brands also failed to screen for sex offenders and other dangerous users, leading to a high number being on those sites. These underlying, negative, undisclosed facts were described by numerous CWs, all former employees of Match Group or its branded websites and apps like Tinder and Match.com. They describe a 15% to 20% rate of fraudulent accounts on these Match websites/apps. They also describe how this percentage of fraudulent accounts, if stable, was simply assumed, such that company forecasts were not adjusted to exclude those accounts, even those that were paid subscriptions.

4. Investors also did not know the extent to which Match understaffed and impeded its own anti-fraud efforts. The CWs speak of small Fraud Department teams of just eight people tasked with manually identifying and making removal decisions on millions of potentially fraudulent accounts, in high volume and at high speed. The CWs described how the company failed to implement touted technological anti-fraud measures and how cost concerns dictated that

# 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.