

1 PACIFIC TRIAL ATTORNEYS  
A Professional Corporation  
2 Scott J. Ferrell, Bar No. 202091  
sferrell@pacifictrialattorneys.com  
3 4100 Newport Place Drive, Ste. 800  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
4 Tel: (949) 706-6464  
Fax: (949) 706-6469

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
6  
7

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10  
11 JOSE LICEA, individually and on behalf  
of all others similarly situated,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 UNIQLO USA LLC, a Delaware limited  
15 liability company; and DOES 1 through  
25, inclusive,

16 Defendants.  
17

Case No. '22CV1489 BEN MSB

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 **Defendant (1) secretly wiretaps the private conversations of everyone who**  
3 **communicates through the chat feature at [www.uniqlo.com](http://www.uniqlo.com) (the “Website”); and**  
4 **(2) allows at least one third party to eavesdrop on such communications in real**  
5 **time to harvest data for financial gain.**

6 **Defendant does not obtain visitors’ consent to either the wiretapping or the**  
7 **eavesdropping. As a result, Defendant has violated the California Invasion of**  
8 **Privacy Act (“CIPA”) in numerous ways.**

9 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

10 1. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 28  
11 U.S.C. Section 1332 of the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 because: (i) there are 100  
12 or more class members, (ii) there is an aggregate amount in controversy exceeding  
13 \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and (iii) there is at least minimal diversity  
14 because at least one Plaintiff and Defendant are citizens of different states.

15 2. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1391, venue is proper because a substantial  
16 part of the acts and events giving rise to the claims occurred in this District.

17 3. Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction because it has sufficient  
18 minimum contacts with California and it does business with California residents.

19 **PARTIES**

20 4. Plaintiff is a resident and citizen of California.

21 5. Defendant is a Delaware limited liability company that owns, operates,  
22 and/or controls the above-referenced website.

23 6. The above-named Defendant, along with its affiliates and agents, are  
24 collectively referred to as “Defendants.” The true names and capacities of the  
25 Defendants sued herein as DOE DEFENDANTS 1 through 25, inclusive, are currently  
26 unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues such Defendants by fictitious names. Each of  
27 the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible for the unlawful acts  
28

1 alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend the Complaint to reflect the  
2 true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when such identities become known.

3 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all relevant times, every  
4 Defendant was acting as an agent and/or employee of each of the other Defendants and  
5 was acting within the course and scope of said agency and/or employment with the full  
6 knowledge and consent of each of the other Defendants, and that each of the acts and/or  
7 omissions complained of herein was ratified by each of the other Defendants.

### 8 FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

9 8. The California Invasion of Privacy Act (“CIPA”) prohibits both  
10 wiretapping and eavesdropping of electronic communications without the consent of all  
11 parties to the communication. Compliance with CIPA is easy, and the vast majority of  
12 website operators comply by conspicuously warning visitors if their conversations are  
13 being recorded or if third parties are eavesdropping on them. See [www.Leechtishman.com/insights/blog](http://www.Leechtishman.com/insights/blog) (“*CIPA Compliance is not difficult. A business must*  
14 *take certain steps. . .with a chat feature. . .to ensure that it obtains valid consent*  
15 *consistent with the holdings and determinations of the courts interpreting CIPA.*”) (last  
16 downloaded October 2022).

17 9. Unlike most companies, Defendant *ignores* CIPA. Instead, Defendant both  
18 **wiretaps** the conversations of all website visitors and allows a third party to **eavesdrop**  
19 on the conversations. Why? Because, as one industry expert notes, “*Live chat*  
20 *transcripts are the gold mines of customer service. At your fingertips, you have*  
21 *valuable customer insight to make informed business decisions. . .When people are*  
22 *chatting, you have direct access to their exact pain points.*”). See  
23 <https://www.ravience.co/post/improve-marketing-roi-live-chat-transcripts> (last  
24 downloaded  
25 October 2022).

26 10. Defendant’s actions are not incidental to the act of facilitating e-commerce,  
27 nor are they undertaken in the ordinary course of business. To the contrary, as noted  
28

1 above, Defendant’s actions are contrary to industry norms and the legitimate  
2 expectations of consumers.

3 11. To enable the *wiretapping*, Defendant has covertly embedded code into its  
4 chat feature that automatically records and creates transcripts of all such conversations.  
5 To enable the *eavesdropping*, Defendant allows at least one independent third-party (on  
6 information and belief, “Salesforce Live Chat” and/or “LivePerson LiveChat”) to  
7 secretly intercept in real time, eavesdrop upon, and store transcripts of Defendant’s chat  
8 communications with unsuspecting website visitors – even when such conversations are  
9 private and deeply personal.

10 12. Defendant neither informs visitors of this conduct nor obtains their consent  
11 to these intrusions. By contrast, LivePerson boasts that it harvests data from the chat  
12 transcripts it intercepts, eavesdrops upon, and stores. See  
13 [www.knowledge.liveperson.com](http://www.knowledge.liveperson.com) “(Liveperson Insights is a powerful text analytics tool  
14 that allows you to join the structured data and the text in your conversation transcripts  
15 to identify correlations between what is being said and done in the conversations and  
16 your KPIs. Conversations from the prior day are copied overnight from the LivePerson  
17 database, transformed and stored in the Insights database, and ready for reporting the  
18 next day.”) (last October 2022).

19 13. Given the nature of Defendant’s business, visitors often share highly  
20 sensitive personal data with Defendant via the website chat feature. Visitors would be  
21 shocked and appalled to know that Defendant secretly records those conversations and  
22 allows a third party to eavesdrop on them in real time under the guise of “data  
23 analytics.”

24 14. Defendant’s conduct is illegal, offensive, and contrary to visitor  
25 expectations: indeed, a recent study conducted by the Electronic Privacy Information  
26 Center, a respected thought leader regarding digital privacy, found that: (1) nearly 9 in  
27 10 adults are “very concerned” about data privacy, and (2) 75% of adults are unaware of  
28 the extent to which companies gather, store, and exploit their personal data.

1 15. Within the statute of limitations period, Plaintiff visited Defendant’s  
2 Website. Plaintiff and the class members used smart phones (cellular telephones with  
3 integrated computers to enable web browsing) and/or wifi-enabled tablets and laptops  
4 that use a combination of cellular and landline telephony. As such, class member  
5 conversations with Defendant were transmitted from “cellular radio telephones” and/or  
6 “landline telephones” as defined by CIPA.

7 16. By definition, Defendant’s chat communications from its website are  
8 transmitted to website visitors by either cellular telephony or landline telephony. *See*  
9 <https://www.britannica.com/technology/Internet> (“*The Internet works through a series*  
10 *of networks that connect devices around the world through telephone lines.*”) (last  
11 downloaded October 2022).

12 17. Defendant did not inform Class Members that Defendant was secretly  
13 recording their conversations or allowing, aiding, and abetting a third party to intercept  
14 and eavesdrop on them in real time.

15 18. Defendant did not obtain Class Members’ express or implied consent to  
16 wiretap or allow third parties to eavesdrop on visitor conversations, nor did Class  
17 Members know at the time of the conversations that Defendant was secretly wiretapping  
18 them and allowing third parties to eavesdrop on them.

19 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

20 19. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others similarly  
21 situated (the “Class”) defined as follows:

22 **All persons within California who within the statute of**  
23 **limitations period: (1) communicated with Defendant via the**  
24 **chat feature on Defendant’s Website using telephony subject to**  
25 **Penal Code Section 632.7, and (2) whose communications were**  
26 **recorded and/or eavesdropped upon without prior consent.**

1           20.    NUMEROSITY: Plaintiff does not know the number of Class Members  
2 but believes the number to be in the thousands, if not more. The exact identities of Class  
3 Members may be ascertained by the records maintained by Defendant.

4           21.    COMMONALITY: Common questions of fact and law exist as to all Class  
5 Members, and predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the  
6 Class. Such common legal and factual questions, which do not vary between Class  
7 members, and which may be determined without reference to the individual  
8 circumstances of any Class Member, include but are not limited to the following:

9           a.     Whether Defendant caused electronic communications from class members  
10 with the Website to be recorded, intercepted, and/or monitored;

11           b.     Whether Defendant aided and abetted a third party in eavesdropping on  
12 such communications;

13           c.     Whether Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to statutory penalties;  
14 and

15           d.     Whether Class Members are entitled to injunctive relief.

16           22.    TYPICALITY: As a person who visited Defendant's Website and whose  
17 electronic communication was recorded, intercepted and eavesdropped upon, Plaintiff is  
18 asserting claims that are typical of the Class.

19           23.    ADEQUACY: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of  
20 the members of The Class. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the class  
21 action litigation. All individuals with interests that are actually or potentially adverse to  
22 or in conflict with the class or whose inclusion would otherwise be improper are  
23 excluded.

24           24.    SUPERIORITY: A class action is superior to other available methods of  
25 adjudication because individual litigation of the claims of all Class Members is  
26 impracticable and inefficient. Even if every Class Member could afford individual  
27 litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome to the courts in  
28 which individual litigation of numerous cases would proceed.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

**Violations of the California Invasion of Privacy Act**

**Cal. Penal Code § 631**

1  
2  
3  
4       25. Section 631(a) of California’s Penal Code imposes liability upon any entity  
5 that “by means of any machine, instrument, contrivance, or in any other manner,” (1)  
6 “intentionally taps, or makes any unauthorized connection, whether physically,  
7 electrically, acoustically, inductively, or otherwise, with any telegraph or telephone  
8 wire, line, cable, or instrument, including the wire, line, cable, or instrument of any  
9 internal telephonic communication system,” or (2) “willfully and without the consent of  
10 all parties to the communication, or in any unauthorized manner, reads, or attempts to  
11 read, or to learn the contents or meaning of any message, report, or communication  
12 while the same is in transit or passing over any wire, line, or cable, or is being sent  
13 from, or received at any place within this state” or (3) “uses, or attempts to use, in any  
14 manner, or for any purpose, or to communicate in any way, any information so  
15 obtained, or who aids, agrees with, employs, or conspires with any person or persons to  
16 unlawfully do, or permit, or cause to be done any of the acts or things mentioned above  
17 in this section”. Here, Defendant does all three.

18       26. Section 631 of the California Penal Code applies to internet  
19 communications and thus applies to Plaintiff’s and the Class’s electronic  
20 communications with Defendant’s Website. “Though written in terms of wiretapping,  
21 Section 631(a) applies to Internet communications. It makes liable anyone who ‘reads,  
22 or attempts to read, or to learn the contents’ of a communication ‘without the consent of  
23 all parties to the communication.’ Cal. Penal Code § 631(a).” *Javier v. Assurance IQ,*  
24 *LLC*, No. 21-16351, 2022 WL 1744107, at \*1 (9th Cir. May 31, 2022).

25       27. The software embedded on Defendant’s Website to record and eavesdrop  
26 upon the Class’s communications qualifies as a “machine, instrument, contrivance, or  
27 ... other manner” used to engage in the prohibited conduct alleged herein.

1 28. At all relevant times, Defendant intentionally caused the internet  
2 communication between Plaintiff and Class Members with Defendant’s Website to be  
3 recorded. Defendant also aided, abetted at least one third party to eavesdrop upon such  
4 conversations.

5 29. Plaintiff and Class Members did not expressly or impliedly consent to any  
6 of Defendant’s actions.

7 30. Defendant’s conduct constitutes numerous independent and discreet  
8 violations of Cal. Penal Code § 631(a), entitling Plaintiff and Class Members to  
9 injunctive relief and statutory damages.

10 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **Violations of the California Invasion of Privacy Act**

12 **Cal. Penal Code § 632.7**

13 31. Section 632.7 of California’s Penal Code imposes liability upon anyone  
14 “who, without the consent of all parties to a communication, intercepts or receives and  
15 intentionally records, or assists in the interception or reception and intentional  
16 recordation of, a communication transmitted between two cellular radio telephones, a  
17 cellular radio telephone and a landline telephone, two cordless telephones, a cordless  
18 telephone and a landline telephone, or a cordless telephone and a cellular radio  
19 telephone.”

20 32. Plaintiff and the class members communicated with Defendant using  
21 telephony subject to the mandates and prohibitions of Section 632.7.

22 33. Defendant’s communication from the chat feature on its website is  
23 transmitted via telephony subject to the mandates and prohibitions of Section 632.7.

24 34. As set forth above, Defendant recorded telephony communication without  
25 the consent of all parties to the communication in violation of Section 632.7.

26 35. As set forth above, Defendant also aided and abetted a third party in the  
27 interception, reception, and/or intentional recordation of telephony communication in  
28 violation of Section 632.7.



1 36. Defendant’s conduct constitutes numerous independent and discreet  
2 violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7, entitling Plaintiff and Class Members to  
3 injunctive relief and statutory damages.

4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief against Defendant:

- 6 1. An order certifying the Class, naming Plaintiff as the representative of the
- 7 Class and Plaintiff’s attorneys as Class counsel;
- 8 2. An order declaring Defendant’s conduct violates CIPA;
- 9 3. An order of judgment in favor of Plaintiff and the Class and against
- 10 Defendant on the causes of action asserted herein;
- 11 4. An order enjoining Defendant’s conduct as alleged herein and any other
- 12 injunctive relief that the Court finds proper;
- 13 5. Statutory damages pursuant to CIPA;
- 14 6. Punitive damages;
- 15 7. Prejudgment interest;
- 16 8. Reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs; and
- 17 9. All other relief that would be just and proper as a matter of law or equity,
- 18 as determined by the Court.

19  
20 Dated: October 2, 2022

PACIFIC TRIAL ATTORNEYS, APC

21  
22 By:   
23 Scott. J. Ferrell  
24 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
25  
26  
27  
28