# FILED



1

3

5

6 7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

I/S 19

LIN

2223

24

20

21

2526

2728

3636 Fourth Avenue, Ste. 202
San Diego, CA 92103
Telephone: 619-696-9006
Facsimile: 619-564-6665
Attorneys for the Plaintiff and the Putative Class

LAW OFFICES OF RONALD A. MARRON, APLC

RONALD A. MARRON [SBN 175650]

GEORGIY B. LYUDYNŌ [SBN 268380]

2010 MAR - 3 AM ID: 54

DIERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST, OF CALIF. LOS ANGELES

6 Y \_\_\_\_\_

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTINE LaPAUSKY d/b/a D'AMES DAY SPA, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

YELP! INC.,

Defendant.

CV10 1578 7 (Ex

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Christine LaPausky doing business as D'ames Day Spa ("Plaintiff," or "D'ames Day Spa," or "LaPausky"), on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated, by and through undersigned counsel, hereby sues Defendant YELP! INC. ("Defendant" or "Yelp") and, upon information and belief and investigation of counsel, alleges as follow:

# **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 1. This Court has original jurisdiction under 28 United States Code section 1332, subdivision (d)(2) (The Class Action Fairness Act) because the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$5,000,000 exclusive of interest and costs and more than two-thirds of the members of the class reside in states other than that state of which Defendant is a citizen.
- 2. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 United States Code section 1391 because Plaintiffs reside in and suffered injuries as a result of Defendant's acts in this district, many of the acts and transactions giving rise to this action occurred in this district, and Defendants (1) are

Page 1

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

authorized to conduct business in this district and have intentionally availed themselves of the laws markets of this district through the promotion, marketing, and sale of advertising in this district; (2) reside in this district, and (3) are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district.

#### **PARTIES**

- 3. Plaintiff Christine LaPausky does business as D'ames Day Spa with her principal place of business in Imperial Beach, County of San Diego, California.
- 4. Defendant Yelp is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in San Francisco, California. Yelp owns and operates Yelp.com, a popular online directory and user-rating website.

### **INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

- 5. The term "Web 2.0" describes internet websites and applications that revolve around information sharing and user-centered design. Examples of Web 2.0 websites include social networking sites (e.g., Facebook.com), video sharing sites (e.g., YouTube.com), wikis (e.g., Wikipedia.com), blogs, and many other sites that allow users to create, upload, or modify content. Web 2.0 websites thus allow internet users to do much more than simply retrieve information—the users choose what information to interact with, how they interact with it, and how to modify or add to pre-existing content.
- 6. Online review applications are an increasingly popular form of Web 2.0. Companies such as Amazon.com, Best Buy, and TripAdvisor.com, embed services and share their experiences.
- 7. Yelp.com, a website owned and operated by Yelp, utilizes Web 2.0 user-website interaction.
- 8. Yelp.com consists of an online directory of businesses in multiple categories, much life an online Yellow Pages. Each business listed on Yelp.com has a unique Yelp.com listing page,

which provides basic business information (such as address, phone number and hours of operation), and user-generated ratings and reviews.

- 9. To rate businesses, internet users simply register on the Yelp.com website. Any internet user (whether registered or not) can browse Yelp.com to find reviews of businesses.
- 10. Ratings-based websites, including Yelp.com, are highly popular, and have great power to direct the flow of commerce in a given area. Users frequently read ratings and reviews for all of the businesses in a particular category and locale and then decide where to spend their money based on those ratings and reviews.
- 11. Yelp, however, regularly manipulates the content on Yelp.com listing pages, despite Yelp's mantra of "Real people. Real reviews."
- 12. One method Yelp uses to control content (and thereby raise or lower a business's rating), is to promise to remove a business's negative reviews or relocate them to the bottom of a listing page where fewer searchers will read them if the business agrees to purchase a costly monthly advertising subscription from Yelp. Yelp thus capitalizes on the presumed integrity of the Yelp.com ratings system to extort business owners to purchase advertising.
- 13. As a result, business listings on Yelp.com, contrary to the website's "Real people. Real reviews." mantra, are in fact biased in favor of businesses that buy Yelp advertising.

## **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

14. In or around August, 2009, LaPausky contacted GROUPON to promote her business, D'ames Day Spa, through a mass email marketing campaign. A GROUPON representative informed LaPausky that her business needed more on-line reviews and/or comments to be featured in a GROUPON marketing campaign.

21 22

20

23 24

25 26

27

- LaPausky began asking her customers to leave feedback regarding their D'ames Day 15. Spa experience on Yelp.com. In a short while, D'ames Day Spa's reviews on Yelp.com totaled approximately fourteen, many of them very positive and very detailed.
- LaPausky enjoyed a larger influx of customers to D'ames Day Spa as the number of 16. reviews posted on Yelp.com climbed.
- However, at point, LaPausky noticed that the number of reviews went down from 17. fourteen to eleven. Three reviews simply disappeared from the Yelp.com.
- 18. LaPausky called Yelp.com's marketing department to find out why some of reviews disappeared. She was told that Yelp's "automatic system" picks out reviews containing "certain" words and all such reviews are then analyzed for fraud, and, if warranted, are removed. LaPausky received no explanation of the criteria the "automatic system" uses to find suspect comments. Nor did LaPausky receive any explanation as to why three comments were adjudged fraudulent and thus removed. The Yelp representative simply said that Yelp has no control over which comments are flagged and/or removed.
- During the same conversation, the Yelp representative pushed LaPausky to purchase 19. advertisements from D'ames Day Spa on Yelp.com. LaPausky refused. A few days later LaPausky received a phone call from Yelp, once again cajoling her to purchase advertisement on yelp.com. Once again, LaPausky refused.
- 20. Shortly following the marketing phone call from Yelp, LaPausky noticed that all but one of reviews of D'ames Day Spa on yelp.com disappeared. As of the date of this Complaint, thirteen of the original fourteen comments are absent from D'ames Day Spa review page on yelp.com
- D'ames Day Spa' experience with Yelp was not unique, but rather typical of Yelp's 21. advertisement sales tactics.

- 22. A February 18, 2009 article in the East Bay Express titled *Yelp and the Business of Extortion 2.0*, describes Yelp's unlawful business practices. According to the article:
  - a. Yelp sales representatives contact business owners saying "[Y]ou have a few bad [reviews] at the top. I could do something about those.... We can move them. Well, for \$299 a month."
  - b. Almost all the time when Yelp calls business owners, negative reviews are at the top of the business's Yelp.com listing page.
  - c. Mary Seaton, the owner of a furniture store in San Mateo, took Yelp up on an offer to remove her negative reviews if she advertised at a cost of \$350 per month for six months. During that time, her negative reviews were removed and old positive ones showed up. After her contract was up, a negative review appeared which Seaton said contained lies.
  - d. Greg Quinn, the owner of a San Francisco bar and bistro, said <u>a Yelp sales</u>

    representative moved negative reviews further down his page in an effort to

    entice him to advertise. The sales rep called Mr. Quinn and said, "<u>Did you</u>

    notice what I did? Well, we can keep doing that for you."
  - e. An East Bay business owner said <u>Yelp offered to move one- or two-star</u>

    <u>reviews of his business if he advertised.</u>
  - f. Six people told the East Bay Express that <u>Yelp sales representatives promised</u>
    to move or remove negative reviews if their businesses would advertise.
  - g. Six other people told the East Bay Express that <u>positive reviews disappeared</u>, <u>or negative reviews appeared</u>, <u>after owners declined to advertise</u>.

Available at http://www.eastbayexpress.com/eastbay/yelp-and-the-business-of-extortion-20/Content?oid=1176635.

- h. Yelp pays its employees to write reviews of businesses; in one documented instance, a business owner who declined to advertise subsequently received negative review from a Yelp employee. In other cases, businesses that receive negative reviews from paid Yelp employees are subsequently asked to advertise.
- Yelp's Chief Operating Officer, Geoff Donaker, said advertisers and sales representatives do not have the ability to more or remove negative reviews.
   Donaker's denials are challenged both by local business owners, and by <u>a form</u>
   Yelp employee, who said that several reps told him they promised to move reviews to get businesses to advertise.
- 23. As of February 8, 2010, there are 140 comments on the East Bay Express website following the Yelp article, many from business owners describing experiences similar to those discussed in the article.
- 24. A follow-up East Bay Express article provides further evidence of Yelp's unlawful sales practices. The March 18, 2009, Yelp Extortion Allegations Stack Up: More business owners come forward with tales of unethical behavior by the popular San Francisco-based web site<sup>2</sup> states that since the publication of the first article:

[M]any business owners from around the country have come forward---via emails or comments on the *Express* web site---alleging similar tales of extortionist tactics by Yelp sales reps.... Business owners contended that they just wan [an] opportunity to respond to negative, false, or damaging information about their businesses. Instead, the only way for them to salvage their businesses' reputation is by paying Yelp-- regardless of whether the reviews are true or false..... [S]everal [interviewees] said that the reps would offer to move negative reviews if they advertised; and in some cases positive reviews disappeared when they refused, or negative ones appeared. In

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Available at http://www.eastbayexpress.com/eastbay/yelp-extortion-allegations-stack-up/Content? oid=1176984.

one case, a nightclub owner said Yelp offered positive reviews of his business in exchange for free drinks.

- 25. The article tells the stories of six California business owners' experiences with Yelp:
  - a. After Bob Hyde, owner of M&M Auto Werkes in Campbell, received a negative rating from a customer's boyfriend, violating Yelp's Terms of Service (prohibiting third parties from posting reviews), he contacted Yelp sales representative Jacqueline Fitzhugh to complain. She told him "We can't control that, but if you advertise you can control the order that they're in." After declining, Mr. Hyde noticed some of his five-star posts were disappearing. Yelp told him the website has a spam filter, like Google. Hyde tracked his reviews, printing them daily to monitor which days as long as 131 days. Yelp told Hyde that if he advertised, some of those five-star reviews could come back.
  - b. Calvin Gee of Haight Street Dental in San Francisco saw his rating drop from five-stars to 3.5-stars following his declining to buy advertising. Yelp reps told Gee that if he advertised, they would let him choose his favorite review and move negative reviews to the bottom of the page. Gee noticed that one of his competitors, CitiDent, had two separate listings on Yelp.com. The business had more positive reviews and a higher star rating on the page that was marked a Yelp sponsor, and more negative reviews and a lower star rating on the harder to find non-sponsored page.
  - c. Larry Trujillo owns the Uptown Nightclub in Oakland. Shortly after opening the club, a Yelp sales rep began calling him "almost daily" about advertising. The rep would say "I notice you have a lot of positive reviews. We could make

sure that those reviews stay positive." Sarah Lippman, a Sales Manager at Yelp, separately asked Mr. Trujillo for free use of his club with Yelp staff and alcohol expenses paid by the club in exchange for positive reviews on the club's Yelp.com listing page.

- d. Debbie Leonardo, director of membership at the Ruby Hill Golf Club in Pleasanton, received a phone call from a <u>Yelp sales representative who told her</u> <u>that the business could get rid of its worst review if it purchased advertising.</u>
- e. Bob Kurtz, owner of Collectors Real 3 in Oakland, was contacted by a Yelp sales person after receiving a negative review. In an email, <u>Yelp told him that, as a paid advertiser, the negative review could be dealt with.</u>
- f. Nicholas Paul, an instructor at a Chicago art studio, declined to purchase advertising and shortly thereafter three positive reviews disappeared from and two negative ones were added to the studio's Yelp.com listing page. A Yelp sales rep told Mr. Paul he could control that.
- 26. An August 13, 2008 articles in The Register, a news website, titled Yelp "pay to play" pitch makes shops scream for help: User generated discontent<sup>3</sup> notes that:

At least some of Yelp's sales staff hope to make money by offering to hide what you and I have to say. Over the last year, five San Francisco Bay Area business have told *The Register* that the company has offered to "push bad reviews to the bottom" of their yelp pages if they paid to advertise on the site. One restaurant owner was contacted "five or six" times, and each time, the Yelp sales rep insisted that if he forked over \$6,000 a year for "sponsored link" status, the site would suppress user posts that put his restaurant in a less-than-positive light. "They told me I had

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Available at http:www.theregister.co.uk/2008/08/13/yelp\_sales\_pitch/print.html

52021.113116 Yelp sales tactics cause for concern-among-bussinesses.html.

Page 9
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

has offered or threatened to manipulate a Yelp.com listing page in exchange for purchasing or declining to purchase advertising.

- 30. Like D'ames Day Spa, all members of the Class have a Yelp.com listing page.
- 31. Like D'ames Day Spa, all members of the Class were contacted by Yelp sales representatives.
- 32. Like D'ames Day Spa, all members of the Class were promised that, if they purchased advertising from Yelp, negative reviews would be removed or relocated from their Yelp.com listing pages, or those pages would otherwise be favorably manipulated, including through their own input or control.
- 33. Like D'ames Day Spa, all members of the Class were threatened, implicitly or expressly, that if they did not purchase advertising from Yelp, their Yelp.com listing pages would be detrimentally manipulated, including for example, by removing positive reviews and posting new, negative reviews.
- 34. Plaintiff's claims on behalf of the Class are maintainable under Rules 23(b)(2) and 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
  - 35. The questions of law and fact common to Plaintiff and the Class include:
    - a. Whether Yelp violated the Unfair Competition Law;
    - b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class were injured by the conduct complained herein;
    - c. Whether the conduct described herein is ongoing; and
    - d. Whether members of the class are entitled to injunctive relief.

#### COUNT ONE

(Violations of the Unfair Competition Law, Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq.)

36. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the allegations elsewhere in the Complaint as if set forth in full herein.

- 37. Commencing in or about 2004 and continuing to the present, Yelp has engaged in, is engaged in, and proposed to engage in unfair competition, as defined in the California Unfair Competition Law, California Business and Professions Code §17200, et seq.
- 38. As used in this Complaint and in Section17200, "unfair competition" means (1) an unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice, (2) unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising; and/or (3) an act prohibited by Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 17200) of Part 3 of Division 7 of the Business and Professions Code. This conduct is actionable pursuant to UCS §§ 17200, 17203.
- 39. An Unfair Competition Law civil action may be predicated on unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising and/or any act prohibited by Ca. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500-17581.
- 40. Defendant had engaged in unfair, unlawful and fraudulent business practices, as alleged herein and thereby deprived plaintiff and the class of rights and privileges and statutory rights and protections. If not enjoined by this Court, plaintiff and the class will continue to suffer irreparable harm as consequence of defendant's actions.
- 41. As a direct and indirect result of defendant's violations, plaintiff and the class have been injured and suffered damages.
- 42. The advertising sales and employee reviewing practices of Yelp as alleged herein constitute unfair business acts and practices because they are immoral, unscrupulous, and offend public policy.
- 43. Defendant unlawful practices, committed through the acts and/or omissions alleged above, include, among others,
  - a. Violation of California Penal Code Section 518 (extortion),

- b. Violation of 18 United States Code Section 1961, et seq. (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act), and
- c. Violations of, 18 United States Code Section1030 et seq. (Computer Fraud and Abuse Act).
- 44. The practices of Yelp complained of herein had no countervailing benefit to consumers or competition when weighed against the harm caused by such practices.
- 45. Among other relief, plaintiff seeks to enjoin defendant from continuing to use the unfair and deceptive practices set forth herein. Plaintiff further seeks damages, plus interest and attorney's fees pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5.

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of itself, all others similarly situated, and the general public, prays for judgment and relief against Yelp Inc. as follows:

- A. Declaring this action to be a proper class action.
- B. An order permanently enjoining Yelp from engaging in the practices complained herein.
- C. An order compelling Yelp to disgorge all monies, revenues, and profits obtained by means of its wrongful acts and practices.
- D. An order requiring Yelp to pay restitution to restore all funds acquired by means of any act or practice declared by this Court to be unlawful, plus pre- and post-judgment interest thereon.
- E. Costs, expenses, and reasonable attorneys' fees.
- F. Any other and further relief the Court deems necessary, just, or proper.

#### **JURY DEMAND**

DATED: March 3, 2010

LAW OFFICES OF RONALD A. MARRON RONALD A. MARRON, ESQ.

Ronald A. Marron Georgiy B. Lyudyno Attorneys for Plaintiff

If yes, list case number(s): <u>CV - 1340 VBF (SSx)</u>		•		

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

						-					1 7	7
I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □)  CHRISTINE LaPAUSKY d/b/a D'AMES DAY SPA  on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated					DEFENDANTS YELP! INC.							
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, A yourself, provide same.)  Law Offices of Ronald A Ste. 202, San Diego, CA	. Marron	n, APLC, Ronald A. Marn			Attorneys	(If Known)	_					
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTIO	ON (Place	e an X in one box only.)	_	III. CITIZENS	HIP OF I	PRINCIPAL PA	ARTI	ES -	For Diversity Case	es Only		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			Citizen of This State			PŢF				<b>PTF</b> □ 4	DEF □ 4	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant			Citizen of Another State			⊒2	□2	Incorporated and Principal Place 5 of Business in Another State			□ 5	
By ODION OIL TO				Citizen or Subje	ct of a For	eign Country [	3_	□ 3	Foreign Nation		□6	□6
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in or	red from Court	☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court	Re	einstated or 5					Dist	rict Judg	eal to I ge from gistrate	1
CLASS ACTION under F.R.(			ies 🗆									
						EMANDED IN						
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cit Complaint for Violations	ie the U.S of the Un	S. Civil Statute under white fair Competition Law C	ich you a al Bus	are filing and writ	e a brief st	tatement of caus	e. Do	not c	cite jurisdictional st	atutes unless div	ersity.)	ļ
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place			ui. Dus.	ac i foi. code s i i	200		_					
OTHER STATUTES					- <sub>1</sub>		Т					
□ 400 State Reapportionment	□ 110	CONTRACT Insurance	PER	TORTS SONAL INJURY		TORTS PERSONAL			PRISONER	LAB		
☐ 410 Antitrust	□ 120	Marine	□ 310	Airplane	- 1	PROPERTY	lo		PETITIONS  Motions to	☐ 710 Fair Lal	bor Sta	ndards
☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce/ICC		Miller Act	□ 315	Airplane Product	□ 370	Other Fraud	ı		Vacate Sentence	☐ 720 Labor/N	∕lgmt.	
Rates/etc.	□ 150	Negotiable Instrument Recovery of	□ 320	Liability Assault, Libel &		Truth in Lendi Other Persona		1.520	Habeas Corpus	Relation	ns	
☐ 460 Deportation		Overpayment &	ľ	Slander	10 360			1 530 1 535	General Death Penalty	□ 730 Labor/N Reporti		
☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced		Enforcement of	□ 330	Fed. Employers'	□ 385	Property Dama	age 🗆	540	Mandamus/	Disclos	_	ŧ
and Corrupt Organizations		Judgment Medicare Act	□ 340	Liability Marine	_	Product Liabil	, I		Other	□ 740 Railway	/ Labor	
☐ 480 Consumer Credit		Recovery of Defaulted	□ 345	Marine Product		ANKRUPTCY Appeal 28 US			Civil Rights Prison Condition	□ 790 Other L		
☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV		Student Loan (Excl.	□ 350	Liability Motor Vehicle		158			ORFEITURE /	Litigatio ☐ 791 Empl. R		
☐ 810 Selective Service ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/	□ 153	Veterans)		Motor Vehicle	□ 423	Withdrawal 28			PENALTY	Security	Act	
Exchange		Overpayment of	☐ 360	Product Liability		USC 157 IVIL RIGHTS			Agriculture Other Food &	PROPERTY  ☐ 820 Copyrig		its
□ 875 Customer Challenge 12		Veteran's Benefits	12 360	Other Personal Injury		Voting	Г	020	Drug	□ 830 Patent	nus	
USC 3410  M 890 Other Statutory Actions		Stockholders' Suits Other Contract	□ 362	Personal Injury-		Employment		625	Drug Related	□ 840 Tradema		
☐ 891 Agricultural Act		Contract Product	□ 365	Med Malpractice Personal Injury-	L1 443	Housing/Acco mmodations	٠		Seizure of	SOCIAL SE		ΓY
☐ 892 Economic Stabilization		Liability		Product Liability		Welfare			Property 21 USC 881	□ 861 HIA (13 □ 862 Black L		23)
Act □ 893 Environmental Matters		Franchise EAL PROPERTY	□ 368	Asbestos Persona	1 □ 445	American with			Liquor Laws	□ 863 DIWC/I		,
□ 894 Energy Allocation Act		Land Condemnation		Injury Product Liability		Disabilities - Employment			R.R. & Truck Airline Regs	(405(g))		т
□ 895 Freedom of Info. Act	□ 220 ∶	Foreclosure	IM.	IMIGRATION	□ 446	American with			Occupational	□ 864 SSID Ti □ 865 RSI (40:		1
☐ 900 Appeal of Fee Determi- nation Under Equal		Rent Lease & Ejectment Torts to Land	LJ 462	Naturalization Application	1	Disabilities -			Safety /Health	FEDERAL T.	AX SU	
Access to Justice		Torts to Land Tort Product Liability	□ 463	Habeas Corpus-	C 440	Other Other Civil		690	Other	□ 870 Taxes (U		uintiff
☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		All Other Real Property	□ 465	Alien Detainee Other Immigration Actions		Rights				or Defer □ 871 IRS-Thi USC 760	rd Party	y <b>2</b> 6
					_ <u>_</u>	<u>PV 1 (</u>	<del> </del>	- -1	.57 <del>8</del>			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Case Nu	mber:				OAT	J	.1	. אוע.	· •		

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.