

EXHIBIT A

1 THE WESTON FIRM
GREGORY S. WESTON (239944)
2 JACK FITZGERALD (257370)
888 Turquoise Street
3 San Diego, CA 92109
4 Telephone: (858) 488-1672
Facsimile: (480) 247-4553
5 greg@westonfirm.com
jack@westonfirm.com
6

7 BECK & LEE BUSINESS TRIAL LAWYERS
JARED H. BECK (233743)
8 ELIZABETH LEE BECK (233742)
Courthouse Plaza Building
9 28 West Flagler Street, Suite 555
Miami, FL 33130
10 Telephone: (305) 789-0072
Facsimile: (786) 664-3334
11 jared@beckandlee.com
12 elizabeth@beckandlee.com

13 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 CATS AND DOGS ANIMAL HOSPITAL,
INC.; ASTRO APPLIANCE SERVICE;
17 BLEEDING HEART, LLC d/b/a
BLEEDING HEART BAKERY;
18 CALIFORNIA FURNISHINGS, INC. d/b/a
SOFA OUTLET; CELIBRÉ, INC.; J.L.
19 FERRI ENTERTAINMENT, INC. d/b/a
ADULT SOCIALS; LE PETITE
20 RETREAT DAY SPA, LLC; SAN
FRANCISCO BAY BOAT CRUISES, LLC
21 d/b/a MERMAIDS CRUISE; WAG MY
22 TAIL, INC.; and ZODIAC RESTAURANT
GROUP, INC. d/b/a SCION
23 RESTAURANT, on behalf of themselves
24 and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

25 v.

26 YELP! INC.,

Defendant.
27

Case No: 2:10-cv-01340-VBF-SS
Pleading Type: Class Action

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR:

EXTORTION;
ATTEMPTED EXTORTION;
INTENTIONAL INTERFERENCE
WITH PROSPECTIVE BUSINESS
ADVANTAGE; AND
VIOLATIONS OF THE UNFAIR
COMPETITION LAW, CAL. BUS &
PROF. CODE § 17200.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

FILED
2010 MAR 16 PM 1:54
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

1 Plaintiffs Cats and Dogs Animal Hospital, Inc., Astro Appliance Service,
2 Bleeding Heart, LLC d/b/a Bleeding Heart Bakery, California Furnishings, Inc.
3 d/b/a Sofa Outlet, CeliBré, Inc., J.L. Ferri Entertainment, Inc. d/b/a Adult Socials,
4 Le Petite Retreat Day Spa, LLC; San Francisco Bay Boat Cruises, LLC d/b/a
5 Mermaids Cruise, Wag My Tail, Inc. and Zodiac Restaurant Group, Inc. d/b/a
6 Scion Restaurant, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, by and
7 through undersigned counsel, hereby sue Defendant Yelp! Inc. and, upon
8 information and belief and investigation of counsel, allege as follows:

9 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

10 1. This Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) (The
11 Class Action Fairness Act) because the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or
12 value of \$5,000,000 exclusive of interest and costs and more than two-thirds of the
13 members of the Class reside in states other than that state of which Defendant is a
14 citizen.

15 2. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because at
16 least one Plaintiff resides in and suffered injuries as a result of Defendant's acts in
17 this district, many of the acts and transactions giving rise to this action occurred in
18 this district, and Defendant (1) is authorized to conduct business in this district and
19 has intentionally availed itself of the laws and markets of this district through the
20 promotion, marketing, and sale of advertising in this district; (2) resides in this
21 district, and (3) is subject to personal jurisdiction in this district.

22 **PARTIES**

23 **The Non-Sponsor Plaintiffs**

24 3. Plaintiff Cats and Dogs Animal Hospital, Inc. ("Cats and Dogs") is a
25 California corporation with its principal place of business in Long Beach,
26 California.

27

1 **Defendant**

2 13. Defendant Yelp! Inc. (“Yelp”) is a Delaware corporation with its
3 principal place of business in San Francisco, California. Yelp owns and operates
4 Yelp.com, a popular online business directory and user-ratings website.

5 **INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

6 14. The term “Web 2.0” describes internet websites and applications that
7 revolve around information sharing and user-centered design. Examples of Web
8 2.0 websites include social networking sites (e.g., Facebook.com), video sharing
9 sites (e.g., YouTube.com), wikis (e.g., Wikipedia.com), blogs, and many other
10 sites that allow users to create, upload, or modify content. Web 2.0 websites thus
11 allow internet users to do much more than simply retrieve information—the users
12 choose what information to interact with, how they interact with it, and how to
13 modify or add to pre-existing content.

14 15. Online review applications are an increasingly popular form of Web
15 2.0. Companies such as Amazon.com, Best Buy, and TripAdvisor.com embed Web
16 2.0 applications within their websites, which allow users to rate products and
17 services and share their experiences.

18 16. Yelp.com, a website owned and operated by Defendant Yelp, is a
19 website that utilizes Web 2.0 user-website interaction.

20 17. Yelp.com consists of an online directory of businesses in multiple
21 categories, much like an online Yellow Pages. Each business listed on Yelp.com
22 has a unique Yelp.com listing page, which provides basic business information
23 (such as address, phone number and hours of operation), and user-generated ratings
24 and reviews.

25 18. To rate and review businesses, internet users simply register on the
26 Yelp.com website. Any internet user (whether registered or not) can browse
27 Yelp.com to find ratings and reviews of businesses.

1 (c) a limited ability to send messages directly to a reviewer
2 (for example, responding to a review), although
3 reviewers can choose to disable this feature.

4 25. Once a business listing is created, individuals registered on Yelp may
5 rate and review the business.

6 26. Individuals register on the Yelp.com website by creating an individual
7 profile, much like a profile on popular social networking sites like Facebook.com.
8 The profile allows individuals to choose a screen name and upload photos,
9 including a profile photo. The individual's reviews are listed within his profile, and
10 the profile has other functions and information such as "Friends" and
11 "Compliments."

12 27. Individuals who create profiles may do so anonymously by using a
13 nickname or "handle," and by not including photos of themselves in their profiles.
14 Anonymous users have the same rights to post ratings and reviews of businesses as
15 named users.

16 28. Any individual internet users, whether registered on the Yelp.com
17 website or not, may search the Yelp.com directory, view ratings, and read reviews.

18 29. Business ratings are made on a one- to five-star scale, with one star
19 being the lowest rating, and five stars the highest.

20 30. In addition to ratings, reviewers must provide a written review of the
21 business.

22 31. Business owners may not publicly (i.e., on their Yelp.com listing
23 page) respond to reviews.

24 32. Registered Yelp users may, but are not required to, vote on written
25 reviews, rating them as either "Useful," "Funny," or "Cool." There is no
26 negatively-spun voting criterion, such as "Not Useful," or "Thumbs Down."
27

1 33. Yelp purports to restrict ratings and reviews which constitute or
2 contain (a) conflicts of interest, (b) second-hand experiences or hearsay, (c)
3 personal attacks, (d) irrelevant material, (d) plagiarism, or (e) which are left blank.

4 34. Yelp also purports to “suppress” “a very small number” of reviews
5 which its “automated software” determines are likely to be “fake.”

6 35. Yelp refers to this “automated software” as its “algorithm.”

7 36. “Suppressed” reviews remain within Yelp’s system and are listed in a
8 registered user’s profile. Those reviews are not, however, displayed on the
9 reviewed business’s Yelp.com listing page, *except that* when a registered user is
10 logged-in to Yelp and navigates to the Yelp.com listing page of a business that the
11 user reviewed, the review appears *for that user only*. Thus logged-in users are
12 unable to determine when their reviews have been “suppressed.” While the public
13 sees one version of the business listing (the version with the review suppressed),
14 the reviewer sees a different version (the version where the review appears to
15 remain intact).

16 37. The Yelp.com website draws internet users with the promise that, by
17 conglomerating reviews of individuals with first-hand experiences of local
18 businesses, the site offers an objective ranking of competing businesses through
19 which users can determine the relative quality of a business when deciding where
20 to spend money. Yelp’s mantra embodying this promise is “Real people. Real
21 reviews.”

22 38. A business’s ranking on Yelp.com has immense power to direct
23 customers either to or away from the business. While Yelp’s readership has been
24 climbing, the website currently enjoys as least 29 million hits per month, and
25 includes at least 8 million reviews.

26 39. Yelp’s only stream of revenue is through the sale of advertisements on
27 the Yelp.com website.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

- (c) Ads for the Sponsor appear on competitors’ listing pages, while competitors’ ads do not appear on the Sponsor’s listing page;
- (d) The ability to post a photo slideshow;
- (e) The ability to add a “personal message” about their business;
- (f) The ability to update information on special offers and events; and
- (g) Access to an account manager who will help “maximize” the Sponsor’s experience with Yelp.

49. Yelp provides Sponsors with additional favors including:

- (a) Removing or relocating negative reviews, thereby affecting the perception of the business’s quality relative to its competitors;
- (b) Creating and posting positive reviews, thereby affecting the perception of the business’s quality relative to its competitors;
- (c) Allowing the business owner to determine the order in which reviews will appear;
- (d) Allowing the business owner to choose a “tagline” to be displayed on the business’s Yelp listing page; and
- (e) Ensuring negative reviews will not appear in Google or other search engine results.

50. Because these favors are designed at increasing a business’s rating, they do not strongly incentivize businesses which already enjoy a four- or five-star rating.

- 1 (c) Having a real photo of oneself on one's profile;
- 2 (d) Using one's real name to write reviews;
- 3 (e) Personal pizzazz!, or what Yelp calls "Yelptitude"; and
- 4 (f) Being of legal drinking age.

5 77. If individuals think they meet these criteria, they must send an email
6 to Yelp explaining why they should be admitted into the Yelp Elite Squad.

7 78. The primary benefit of becoming a Yelp Elite Squad member is
8 receiving frequent invitations to free Yelp Sponsored Events.

9 79. Yelp uses the Yelp Elite Squad as an agent of coercion, promising
10 businesses positive reviews from Elite Squad members, or threatening negative
11 reviews from Elite Squad members, depending upon whether a business agrees to
12 host a free Sponsored Event and/or become a Yelp Sponsor.

13 80. For example, a Yelp Elite Squad member systematically went through
14 businesses located in an arts district in Columbus, Ohio, giving negative reviews to
15 galleries and other businesses in the district, which he visited briefly—but did not
16 patronize—in order to review the businesses. When asked why he was doing this,
17 his response was "you need to contact your customers and have them put up good
18 reviews. My goal is to get you to use Yelp."

19 81. Yelp compensates Yelp Elite Squad members for their frequent
20 reviews through the provision of free parties, goods, services and other items.
21 Thus, Elite Squad members act as an agent of Yelp. When Elite Squad members
22 review Yelp Sponsors, Yelp is endorsing paid advertisers.

23 82. Individuals employed by Yelp also review Yelp Sponsors.

24 83. Yelp does not disclose that, through Yelp employees and the Yelp
25 Elite Squad writing reviews of Yelp Sponsors, Yelp endorses paid advertisers.

26
27

1 Allegations of Misconduct

2 84. A February 18, 2009 article in the East Bay Express, titled *Yelp and*
3 *the Business of Extortion 2.0*,¹ describes Yelp’s unlawful business practices.
4 According to the article:

5
6 • Yelp sales representatives contact business owners saying, “**[Y]ou have a**
7 **few bad [reviews] at the top. I could do something about those. . . . We**
8 **can move them. Well, for \$299 a month.**”

9
10 • Almost all the time when Yelp calls business owners, negative reviews
11 are at the top of the business’s Yelp.com listing page.

12
13 • Mary Seaton, the owner of a furniture store in San Mateo, **took Yelp up**
14 **on an offer to remove her negative reviews if she advertised at a cost of**
15 **\$350 per month for six months. During that time, her negative reviews**
16 **were removed and old positive ones showed up. After her contract was**
17 **up, a negative review appeared**, which Seaton said contained lies.

18
19 • Greg Quinn, the owner of a San Francisco bar and bistro, said **a Yelp**
20 **sales representative moved negative reviews further down his page in an**
21 **effort to entice him to advertise**. The sales rep called Mr. Quinn and said,
22 **“Did you notice what I did? Well, we can keep doing that for you.”**

23
24 • An East Bay business owner said **Yelp offered to move one- or two-star**
25 **reviews of his business if he advertised**.

26
27 ¹ Available at <http://www.eastbayexpress.com/eastbay/yelp-and-the-business-of-extortion-20/Content?oid=1176635>.

1 • Six people told the East Bay Express that **Yelp sales representatives**
2 **promised to move or remove negative reviews if their businesses would**
3 **advertise.**

4
5 • Six other people told the East Bay Express that **positive reviews**
6 **disappeared, or negative reviews appeared, after owners declined to**
7 **advertise.**

8
9 • Yelp pays its employees to write reviews of businesses; in one
10 documented instance, **a business owner who declined to advertise**
11 **subsequently received a negative review from a Yelp employee.** In other
12 cases, businesses that receive negative reviews from paid Yelp employees
13 are subsequently asked to advertise.

14
15 • Yelp's Chief Operating Officer, Geoff Donaker, said advertisers and
16 sales representatives do not have the ability to move or remove negative
17 reviews. Donaker's denials are challenged both by local business owners,
18 and by **a former Yelp employee, who said that several sales reps told him**
19 **they promised to move reviews to get businesses to advertise.**

20
21 85. As of February 8, 2010, there are 140 comments on the East Bay
22 Express website following the Yelp article, many from business owners describing
23 experiences similar to those discussed in the article.

24 86. A follow-up East Bay Express article provides further evidence of
25 Yelp's unlawful sales practices. The March 18, 2009 article, *Yelp Extortion*
26 *Allegations Stack Up: More business owners come forward with tales of unethical*
27

1 *behavior by the popular San Francisco-based web site*² states that since the
2 publication of the first article:

3 [M]any business owners from around the country have come
4 forward—via emails or comments on the *Express*' web site—alleging
5 similar tales of extortionist tactics by Yelp sales reps. . . . Business
6 owners contend that they just want [an] opportunity to respond to
7 negative, false, or damaging information about their businesses.
8 Instead, the only way for them to salvage their businesses' reputation
9 is by paying Yelp—regardless of whether the reviews are true or false.
10 . . . [S]everal [interviewees] said that the reps would offer to move
11 negative reviews if they advertised; and in some cases positive
12 reviews disappeared when they refused, or negative ones appeared. In
13 one case, a nightclub owner said Yelp offered positive reviews of his
14 business in exchange for free drinks.

15 87. The article tells the stories of six California business owners'
16 experiences with Yelp:

- 17
- 18 • After Barry³ Hyde, owner of M&M Auto Werkes in Campbell, received a
19 negative rating from a customer's boyfriend, violating Yelp's Terms of
20 Service (prohibiting third parties from posting reviews), he contacted Yelp
21 sales representative Jacqueline Fitzhugh to complain. She told him, "**We**
22 **can't control that, but if you advertise you can control the order that**
23 **they're in.**" **After declining, Mr. Hyde noticed some of his five-star posts**
24 **were disappearing.** Yelp told him the website has a spam filter, like
25

26 ²Available at [http://www.eastbayexpress.com/eastbay/yelp-extortion-allegations-
27 stack-up/Content?oid=1176984](http://www.eastbayexpress.com/eastbay/yelp-extortion-allegations-stack-up/Content?oid=1176984).

³ The Article incorrectly identifies him as "Bob" Hyde.

1 Google. Hyde tracked his reviews, printing them daily to monitor which
2 ones would disappear. Some five-star reviews stayed up for as short as 31
3 days and as long as 131 days. **Yelp told Hyde that if he advertised, some**
4 **of those five-star reviews would come back.**

5
6 • Calvin Gee of Haight Street Dental in San Francisco saw his rating drop
7 from five-stars to 3.5-stars following his declining to buy advertising. **Yelp**
8 **reps told Gee that if he advertised, they would let him choose his**
9 **favorite review and would move the negative reviews to the bottom of**
10 **the page.** Gee noticed that one of his competitors, CitiDent, had two
11 separate listings on Yelp.com. The business had more positive reviews and a
12 higher star rating on the page that was marked a Yelp sponsor, and more
13 negative reviews and a lower star rating on the harder to find non-sponsored
14 page.

15
16 • Larry Trujillo owns the Uptown Nightclub in Oakland. Shortly after
17 opening the club, a Yelp sales rep began calling him “almost daily” about
18 advertising. The sales rep would say “**I notice you have a lot of positive**
19 **reviews. We could make sure that those reviews stay positive.**” Sarah
20 Lippman, a Sales Manager at Yelp, separately **asked Mr. Trujillo for free**
21 **use of his club with Yelp staff and alcohol expenses paid by the club in**
22 **exchange for positive reviews on the club’s Yelp.com listing page.**

23
24 • Debbie Leonardo, director of membership at the Ruby Hill Golf Club in
25 Pleasanton, received a phone call from a **Yelp sales representative who**
26 **told her that the business could get rid of its worst review if it purchased**
27 **advertising.**

1 • Bob Kurtz, owner of Collectors Real 3 in Oakland, was contacted by a
2 Yelp sales person after receiving a negative review. In an email, **Yelp told**
3 **him that, as a paid advertiser, the negative review could be dealt with.**
4

5 • Nicholas Paul, an instructor at a Chicago art studio, declined to purchase
6 advertising and shortly thereafter three positive reviews disappeared from
7 and two negative ones were added to the studio’s Yelp.com listing page. **A**
8 **Yelp sales rep told Mr. Paul he could control that.**
9

10 88. An August 13, 2008 article in The Register, a news website, titled
11 *Yelp “pay to play” pitch makes shops scream for help: User generated discontent*⁴
12 notes that:

13 At least some of Yelp’s sales staff hope to make money by offering to
14 hide what you and I have to say. Over the last year, five San Francisco
15 Bay Area business have told *The Register* that **the company has**
16 **offered to “push bad reviews to the bottom” of their yelp pages if**
17 **they paid to advertise on the site.** One restaurant owner was
18 contacted “five or six” times, and each time, the Yelp sales rep
19 insisted that if he forked over \$6,000 a year for “sponsored link”
20 status, the site would suppress user posts that put his restaurant in a
21 less-than-positive light. “They told me I had 60 reviews on my [Yelp]
22 page,” said the owner “They told me ‘No one is going to read all
23 60. They’re only going to read the first few.’”

24 89. A March 9, 2009 Chicago Tribune article, titled *Questions arise over*
25 *Yelp’s ads, reviews; Businesses say site rearranges opinions for price; CEO*
26 *denies,*⁵ reported:

27 _____
⁴ Available at http://www.theregister.co.uk/2008/08/13/yelp_sales_pitch/print.html

1 • Ina Pinkney of Ina’s restaurant in the West Loop said that last
2 summer **a Yelp salesperson offered “to move up my good reviews**
3 **if I sponsored one of their events. They called it rearranging my**
4 **reviews.”**

5
6 • Jason Luross, an attorney at Hudson & Luross in Napa, California,
7 stated “one of our reviews mysteriously disappeared, so I contacted
8 Yelp and was given the usual canned response about how no humans
9 control the reviews. But **when I said I would consider advertising if**
10 **they restored the review, it mysteriously reappeared.”**

11
12 90. An April 3, 2009 article in the Santa Monica Daily Press titled *Yelp*
13 *Sales Tactics Cause Concern Among Businesses*,⁶ reported:

14 After declining to advertise, the [Los Angeles area] business owner checked
15 the Yelp page again and noticed that at least 10 positive reviews had
16 disappeared while a few negative ones had been posted. . . . They estimate
17 that at least 20 positive reviews had been deleted from the site since the
18 conversation with Yelp about three weeks ago.

19 **A Summary of Yelp’s Misconduct**

20 91. Yelp sales people represent to businesses that Yelp has the power to
21 manipulate Yelp.com business listing pages, and that Yelp will yield that power in
22 favor of the business if it becomes a Yelp Sponsor, and against the business if it
23 declines to become a Yelp Sponsor.

24
25
26 ⁵ No longer available online.

27 ⁶ Available at http://www.smdp.com/Articles-c-2009-04-02-52021.113116_Yelp_sales_tactics_cause_for_concern_among_businesses.html

1 92. The mere representation of the ability to manipulate page content is
2 sufficient to instill in businesses the fear that, through such manipulation, the
3 business will suffer if it elects not to become a Yelp Sponsor. Businesses
4 frequently become Sponsors, not based on a cost-benefit analysis of the
5 advertising, but simply because they fear the consequences of declining a
6 Sponsorship.

7 93. Yelp in fact manipulates Yelp.com business listing pages in favor of
8 Yelp Sponsors and detrimentally to Yelp Non-Sponsors, including by (a)
9 relocating or removing negative reviews of Sponsors; (b) posting positive reviews
10 of Sponsors and urging others, such as Yelp Elite Squad members, to do the same;
11 (c) allowing Sponsors to choose the order in which reviews appear on their
12 Yelp.com listing pages; (d) removing positive reviews of Non-Sponsors; (e)
13 posting negative reviews of Non-Sponsors and urging others, such as Yelp Elite
14 Squad members, to do the same; and (f) enforcing Yelp's Terms of Service for
15 Sponsors, but refusing to enforce Yelp's Terms of Service for Non-Sponsors.

16 **PLAINTIFF-SPECIFIC FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

17 **THE NON-SPONSOR PLAINTIFFS**

18 **Plaintiff Cats and Dogs**

19 94. On September 12, 2009, Dr. Perrault, a veterinarian and the owner of
20 Cats and Dogs, became aware of a negative review posted by "Chris R." on the
21 Cats and Dogs Yelp.com listing page.

22 95. Concerned about the review's defamatory language, possible falsity,
23 and the adverse impact it could have on his business, Dr. Perrault cross-referenced
24 the factual information alleged in the review with his client history.

25 96. Upon finding that the review of Chris R. referenced a visit that
26 occurred over 18 months prior to its posting (6 months outside of Yelp's 12-month
27 policy), Javier Vargas, the Hospital Manager at Cats and Dogs, called Yelp, on or

1 around September 15, 2009, to request that the review be removed from the
2 Yelp.com website for violating Yelp’s review guidelines. The review was
3 subsequently removed from the Cats and Dogs Yelp.com listing page.

4 97. A second defamatory review, from “Kay K.,” appeared on the Cats
5 and Dogs Yelp.com listing page within five days of the “Chris R.” review’s
6 removal. The review read:

7 *The only reason I am even giving one star is because it wouldn’t*
8 *allow me to continue without it . . . otherwise, I would have given*
9 *them no stars. Dr. Perrault is the rudest vet I’ve ever been to . . .*
10 *probably one of the rudest people I’ve had the displeasure of meeting.*
11 *I agree with the previous reviews about making you feel like an unfit*
12 *mom. My pup had been sick and I had a theory on what the problem*
13 *may have been and he wouldn’t even entertain the idea, but instead,*
14 *made me feel bad because my dog got sick. And, my poor dog was*
15 *terrified of him! He made me feel like I was 2 inches tall and*
16 *repeatedly looked down his nose at me. Oh, and OVER PRICED!*
17 *OMG! Who does he think he is??? I did not feel welcomed by him nor*
18 *his staff. I paid you for a service! No need to treat me so bad!*

19 98. Soon after the appearance of these negative reviews, Dr. Perrault and
20 Mr. Vargas began receiving frequent, high-pressure calls from Yelp sales
21 representatives, who promised to manipulate Cats and Dogs’ Yelp.com listing page
22 in exchange for Cats and Dogs purchasing an advertising subscription.

23 99. For example, on or about January 5, 2010, Cats and Dogs received a
24 Yelp sales call from “Kevin.” Kevin said that Cats and Dogs could advertise with
25 Yelp for a minimum payment of \$300 per month, with a minimum 12-month
26 commitment. Kevin stated that if Cats and Dogs purchased a one-year advertising
27 subscription from Yelp:

- 1 a. Yelp would hide negative reviews on the Cats and Dogs Yelp.com
2 listing page, or place them lower on the listing page so internet users
3 “won’t see” them;
- 4 b. Yelp would ensure negative reviews will not appear in Google and
5 other search engine results;
- 6 c. Yelp would allow Cats and Dogs to decide the order that its reviews
7 appear in on its Yelp.com listing page; and
- 8 d. Cats and Dogs could choose its “tagline,” i.e., the first few lines of a
9 single review shown on every search result page in which Cats and
10 Dogs appears (for instance, “Veterinarian in Long Beach”).

11 100. Dr. Perrault declined the offer, saying that he wanted to track referrals
12 from Yelp for three months without ads, but might thereafter be willing to test
13 Yelp’s advertising potential.

14 101. Within a week of declining Kevin’s advertising offer, the negative
15 review from Chris R. reappeared on the Cats and Dogs Yelp.com listing page.

16 102. Soon after, “Kay K.” posted a second negative review. This review
17 was added on January 6, 2010, one day after Kevin’s sales call:

18 *I’ve already left one review about how bad a vet Dr. Perrault is, but I*
19 *wanted to add something. I’ve been reading other people’s reviews*
20 *and I must have gone to a different Cats and Dogs Animal Hospital*
21 *with a vet named Dr. Perrault. Oh wait, no . . . he’s the only one.*
22 *Maybe it’s a Dr. Jeckyl / Mr. Hyde thing?! I don’t know. But the guy’s*
23 *an @\$\$. No other way around it. He’s a jerk, a D-Bag, And so*
24 *arrogant. I ran in to him in a neighborhood store right after he saw*
25 *my poor sick dog at his clinic and he looked right at me, recognized*
26 *me, rolled his eyes and looked away!!!! Seriously, someone needs to*
27 *knock this guy down to the size he really is. He needs to drop his*

1 *Napolean complex and be a professional. After my horrible*
2 *experience with him, I took my sick dog to Bixby Animal Clinic and I*
3 *have never had a more pleasant vet experience! Go there instead! My*
4 *dog loved everyone there! Sorry to rant, but I just wanted to get the*
5 *word out there. Don't spend the money on this overpriced arrogant*
6 *vet. It's not worth it!*

7 103. On or about January 12, 2010, Mr. Vargas contacted Yelp to protest
8 the reappearance of the "Chris R." review and the highly negative, inflammatory
9 "Kay K." reviews.

10 104. On January 13, 2010, Mr. Vargas received via email the following
11 response from Yelp:

12 We wanted to let you know that we've taken a close look at the
13 reviews by Chris R and Kay K, and after careful evaluation, we have
14 decided to leave both intact. Because we don't have firsthand
15 knowledge of a reviewer's identity or personal experience, we are not
16 in a position to verify your claims that these reviewers are the same
17 person, or that they are connected to the recent vandalism at your
18 hospital. If a review appears to reflect the personal opinion and
19 experiences of the reviewer while adhering to our review guidelines
20 [link], it is our policy to allow the reviewer to stand behind his or her
21 review.

22 105. As of January 18, 2010 Cats and Dogs enjoyed a 4-star rating (out of a
23 possible 5) on its Yelp.com listing page. Sixteen out of 26 reviews (over 60%)
24 gave Cats and Dogs a perfect 5-star rating. Despite this, as of January 18, 2010, a
25 Yelp.com search for "veterinarian in Long Beach" displayed the following tagline
26 for Dogs and Cats:

1 functions, Yelp has inexplicably divided the business into two separate listings,
2 one for the salon and one for the mobile service.

3 138. The Yelp sales representative who contacted Wag My Tail told the
4 company that if it advertised at a rate of \$135 per month for the Wag My Tail
5 salon, and \$270 per month for the mobile service, the representative's "assistant"
6 could help to manage the issues Wag My Tail was complaining about, and would
7 help the company better its rating. Wag My Tail has declined to become a Sponsor.

8 139. Potential customers have told Wag My Tail that they have chosen not
9 to patronize the business based on Yelp reviews.

10 140. Wag My Tail was damaged as a result of Yelp's actions, including
11 through lost patronage and prospective business.

12 141. Wag My Tail's experience with Yelp was not unique, but rather
13 typical of Yelp's advertisement sales tactics.

14 **Plaintiff Scion**

15 142. Scion opened in Washington, D.C., in June 2009. In August, 2009,
16 Julie Liu, Scion's owner and operator, signed up for a free Yelp Business Owner
17 Account. Two weeks later, Ms. Liu began receiving calls from Yelp sales
18 representatives, offering Scion advertising packages. The calls were from different
19 Yelp sales representatives and occurred approximately bi-weekly.

20 143. A Yelp sales representative told Ms. Liu that negative reviews could
21 be removed with the payment of fees. Concerned that if she agreed, negative
22 reviews could be continuously added to Scion's Yelp.com listing page in order to
23 solicit more fees—a process which might be never-ending and completely out of
24 her control—Ms. Liu questioned the sales representative as to how she could be
25 sure that Yelp would not post negative reviews itself in order to request more fees
26 from Scion. The sales representative hung up on Ms. Liu. When Ms. Liu attempted
27 to call the sales representative back, there was no answer.

1 144. After two months of receiving sales calls and discussing the
2 possibility of becoming a Sponsor, Ms. Liu unequivocally declined to do so. The
3 following day, approximately five 5-star reviews disappeared from Scion's
4 Yelp.com listing page, and three negative reviews were posted to the page.

5 145. Two of the new negative reviews were demonstrably false. The
6 reviews commented on a menu that was still posted on Scion's website, but that
7 Scion was no longer actually using at the time the experiences described in the
8 reviews supposedly took place.

9 146. Scion was damaged as a result of Yelp's actions, including through
10 lost patronage and prospective business.

11 147. Scion's experience with Yelp was not unique, but rather typical of
12 Yelp's advertisement sales tactics.

13 **THE SPONSOR PLAINTIFFS**

14 **Plaintiff Bleeding Heart Bakery**

15 148. Bleeding Heart Bakery has two locations in Chicago. Each location
16 has a separate Yelp.com listing page.

17 149. Beginning in 2007, Yelp began calling Michelle Garcia, Bleeding
18 Heart Bakery's owner and operator, including on her personal cell phone, trying to
19 get Ms. Garcia to purchase a Yelp advertising subscription on behalf of the
20 Bleeding Heart Bakery.

21 150. On one or more occasions on these phone calls, Ms. Garcia pointed
22 out that some reviews of the Bleeding Heart Bakery were demonstrably "bogus,"
23 for example, purporting to describe an experience that occurred on a day that
24 Bleeding Heart Bakery was closed.

25 151. A Yelp sales person calling Ms. Garcia promised that, if she agreed to
26 purchase an advertising subscription, Yelp would push bad reviews to the very end
27 of Bleeding Heart Bakery's Yelp.com listing pages, and that the sales

1 representative would personally remove the “bogus” reviews Ms. Garcia
2 complained of.

3 152. Yelp further promised Ms. Garcia that, as a Yelp Sponsor, she would
4 be allowed to choose her favorite ten reviews, which would always appear at the
5 top of Bleeding Heart Bakery’s Yelp.com listing pages.

6 153. Yelp further promised Ms. Garcia that, as a Yelp Sponsor, she could
7 choose which pictures uploaded by reviewers would appear on Bleeding Heart
8 Bakery’s Yelp.com listing pages, and which would be removed.

9 154. Based on these promises, in November, 2008 Ms. Garcia agreed to
10 purchase an advertising subscription from Yelp. Although Yelp had urged her to
11 purchase a sponsorship for just one of the Bleeding Heart Bakery’s Yelp.com
12 listing pages for \$500 per month, Ms. Garcia eventually negotiated a deal that
13 would cover both of the Bleeding Heart Bakery’s Yelp.com listing pages for \$600
14 per month. The term of the contract was one year. Ms. Garcia paid the first
15 month’s charge by credit card, and Yelp automatically charged subsequent months
16 to her credit card on a monthly basis.

17 155. At the time Bleeding Heart Bakery became a Yelp Sponsor, the
18 company enjoyed a 4-star Yelp rating.

19 156. During the same month that Bleeding Heart Bakery became a Yelp
20 Sponsor, six negative reviews of the business were posted by Yelp Elite Squad
21 members. Some of the reviews contained personal attacks. During the same time,
22 several 4-star reviews disappeared from Bleeding Heart Bakery’s Yelp.com listing
23 page.

24 157. As a result of the new negative reviews and disappearing positive
25 reviews, Bleeding Heart Bakery’s rating dropped to 3.5-stars.

26 158. As a result of these negative reviews, Bleeding Heart Bakery’s
27 business suffered. For example, during a week following the posting of these

1 negative reviews by Yelp Elite Squad members, Bleeding Heart Bakery went from
2 typical sales of 300 cupcakes per week, to just 24 cupcakes, and was forced to
3 throw out the remainder of its inventory.

4 159. When Ms. Garcia called Yelp to complain about the reviews,
5 including the personal attacks, Yelp told her that if she became a “premier”
6 advertiser—at a higher cost—Yelp would talk to the Yelp Elite Squad and “ask
7 them to give the business another shot.”

8 160. Yelp further told Ms. Garcia said that if Bleeding Heart Bakery
9 increased the amount of its advertising subscription to become a “premier”
10 advertiser, Yelp would bring Bleeding Heart Bakery’s star rating back up.

11 161. Bleeding Heart Bakery’s experience with Yelp was not unique, but
12 rather typical of Yelp’s advertisement sales tactics.

13 **Plaintiff Sofa Outlet**

14 162. Mary Seaton, Sofa Outlet’s owner, received a call from a Yelp sales
15 representative, who told her that, if Sofa Outlet agreed to purchase an advertising
16 subscription, Sofa Outlet’s positive reviews would be made more prominent while
17 Sofa Outlet’s negative reviews would be made less prominent and, eventually,
18 removed altogether.

19 163. On January 25, 2008, Mary Seaton entered into a \$350 per month
20 advertising subscription with Yelp on behalf of Sofa Outlet.

21 164. Sofa Outlet cancelled its advertising subscription on June 17, 2008,
22 which was officially terminated June 20, 2008.

23 165. Within approximately two weeks of Sofa Outlet’s termination date,
24 many positive reviews that Sofa Outlet had received, especially those written
25 during the subscription period, disappeared from the Sofa Outlet Listing Page,
26 while negative reviews that had been previously removed reappeared.

27

1 166. Sofa Outlet's experience with Yelp was not unique, but rather typical
2 of Yelp's advertisement sales tactics.

3 **Plaintiff Celibré**

4 167. Celibré is currently a Yelp Sponsor, having purchased an advertising
5 subscription in January, 2010 at a cost of \$300 per month.

6 168. Celibré became a Yelp Sponsor because a Yelp sales representative
7 promised Kevin DiCerbo, Celibré's owner, that Yelp would allow Celibré to
8 choose the order of reviews on its Yelp.com listing page in exchange for becoming
9 a Sponsor.

10 169. Yelp has in fact moved reviews on Celibré's Yelp.com listing page
11 according to Celibré's wishes.

12 170. Celibré's experience with Yelp was not unique, but rather typical of
13 Yelp's advertisement sales tactics.

14 **CLASS REPRESENTATION ALLEGATIONS**

15 171. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and the following
16 Classes:

17 **The Sponsor Class**

18 All persons and entities (excluding officers, directors, and employees
19 of Yelp) in the United States who, from October 1, 2004 to the
20 present, as a result of Yelp offering or threatening to manipulate a
21 Yelp.com listing page in exchange for purchasing or declining to
purchase advertising services, purchased advertising services from
Yelp.

22 **The Non-Sponsor Class**

23 All persons and entities (excluding officers, directors, and employees
24 of Yelp) in the United States to whom, from October 1, 2004 to the
25 present, Yelp offered or threatened to manipulate a Yelp.com listing
26 page in exchange for purchasing or declining to purchase advertising,
and who declined to purchase advertising.

27 172. Like Plaintiffs, all members of the Non-Sponsor and Sponsor Classes
have a Yelp.com listing page.

1 173. Like Plaintiffs, all members of the Non-Sponsor and Sponsor Classes
2 were contacted by Yelp sales representatives and asked to buy advertising
3 subscriptions from Yelp.

4 174. Like Plaintiffs, all members of the Non-Sponsor and Sponsor Classes
5 were promised that, if they purchased advertising from Yelp, negative reviews
6 would be removed or relocated from their Yelp.com listing pages, or those pages
7 would otherwise be favorably manipulated, including through their own input or
8 control.

9 175. Like Plaintiffs, all members of the Non-Sponsor and Sponsor Classes
10 were threatened, implicitly or expressly, that if they did not purchase advertising
11 from Yelp, their Yelp.com listing pages would be detrimentally manipulated,
12 including for example, by removing positive reviews and posting new, negative
13 reviews.

14 176. Like Non-Sponsor Plaintiffs Cats and Dogs, Astro, Adult Socials, Le
15 Petite Retreat, Mermaids Cruise, Wag My Tail, and Scion, all members of the
16 Non-Sponsor Class declined to become a Yelp Sponsor.

17 177. Like Non-Sponsor Plaintiffs Cats and Dogs, Astro, Adult Socials, Le
18 Petite Retreat, Mermaids Cruise, Wag My Tail, and Scion, all members of the
19 Non-Sponsor Class saw their Yelp.com listing pages detrimentally modified after
20 declining to become a Yelp Sponsor.

21 178. Like Non-Sponsor Plaintiffs Cats and Dogs, Astro, Adult Socials, Le
22 Petite Retreat, Mermaids Cruise, Wag My Tail, and Scion, all members of the
23 Non-Sponsor Class were damaged as a result of Yelp's actions.

24 179. Like Sponsor Plaintiffs Bleeding Heart Bakery, Sofa Outlet and
25 Celi-bré, all members of the Sponsor Class purchased advertising subscriptions
26 from Yelp based on Yelp's promises and threats, express or implicit.

27

1 180. Like Sponsor Plaintiffs Bleeding Heart Bakery, Sofa Outlet and
2 Celibré, all members of the Sponsor Class would not have purchased advertising
3 subscriptions with Yelp absent Yelp’s promises and threats, express or implicit.

4 181. Plaintiffs’ claims on behalf of the Class are maintainable under Rules
5 23(b)(2) and 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

6 182. The questions of law and fact common to Plaintiffs and the Classes
7 include:

- 8 a. Whether Yelp extorted the Sponsor Plaintiffs and members of
9 the Sponsor Class;
- 10 b. Whether Yelp attempted to extort Plaintiffs and members of the
11 Classes;
- 12 c. Whether Yelp intentionally interfered with the prospective
13 economic advantage of Plaintiffs and members of the Classes;
- 14 d. Whether Yelp violated the “unlawful” prong of California’s
15 Unfair Competition Law, including by:
 - 16 i. Committing Extortion in violation of Cal. Pen. Code
17 §§518-19;
 - 18 ii. Committing Attempted Extortion in violation of Cal. Pen.
19 Code §524;
 - 20 iii. Intentionally interfering with the Non-Sponsor Plaintiffs’
21 and Non-Sponsor Class Members’ Prospective Economic
22 Advantages; and
 - 23 iv. Violating 16 C.F.R. Part 255 by failing to disclose that
24 Yelp provides endorsed reviews of paid advertisers;
- 25 e. Whether Yelp violated the “unfair” prong of California’s Unfair
26 Competition Law;
- 27 f. Whether Yelp violated the “fraudulent” prong of California’s
Unfair Competition Law;
- g. Whether Plaintiffs and the Classes were injured by the conduct
complained of herein;
- h. Whether the conduct described herein is ongoing;
- i. Whether Plaintiffs and members of the Classes are entitled to
damages;

- 1 j. Whether Plaintiffs and members of the Classes are entitled to
2 injunctive relief; and
3 k. Whether Plaintiffs and members of the Classes are entitled to
4 restitution.

5 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

6 **COUNT I**

7 **Extortion**

8 **Cal. Pen. Code §§ 518-19**

9 **(With Respect to the Sponsor Plaintiffs and Sponsor Class)**

10 183. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate the allegations elsewhere in the
11 Complaint as if set forth in full herein.

12 184. By the advertising and reviewing practices of Yelp as alleged herein,
13 Yelp obtained the property of the Sponsor Plaintiffs and members of the Sponsor
14 Class, with their consent, through the threat to do an unlawful injury to the person
15 or property of the Sponsor Plaintiffs and members of the Sponsor Class threatened.

16 185. Yelp's conduct constitutes a violation of Cal. Pen. Code §§ 518-19.

17 **COUNT II**

18 **Attempted Extortion**

19 **Cal. Pen. Code § 524**

20 **(With respect to All Plaintiffs and All Classes)**

21 186. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate the allegations elsewhere in the
22 Complaint as if set forth in full herein.

23 187. By the advertising and review practices of Yelp as alleged herein,
24 Yelp attempted to obtain the property of Non-Sponsor Plaintiffs and members of
25 the Non-Sponsor class, with their consent, through the threat to do an unlawful
26 injury to the person or property of the Non-Sponsor Plaintiffs and members of the
27 Non-Sponsor Class.

1 188. Yelp had a specific intent to commit Extortion, in violation of Cal.
2 Pen. Code §§ 518-19, against the Non-Sponsor Plaintiffs and Non-Sponsor Class.

3 189. Yelp engaged in one or more direct ineffectual acts towards the
4 commission of Extortion against the Non-Sponsor Plaintiffs and members of the
5 Non-Sponsor Class.

6 190. The Non-Sponsor Plaintiffs and members of the Non-Sponsor Class
7 were harmed as a result of Yelp's actions.

8 191. The foregoing constitutes Attempted Extortion in violation of Cal.
9 Pen. Code § 524.

10 **COUNT III**

11 **Intentional Interference With Prospective Economic Advantage**
12 **(With Respect to All Plaintiffs and All Classes)**

13 192. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate the allegations elsewhere in the
14 Complaint as if set forth in full herein.

15 193. There existed economic relationships between the Non-Sponsor
16 Plaintiffs and Non-Sponsor Class members, and third parties, with the probability
17 of future economic benefit to the Non-Sponsor Plaintiffs and Non-Sponsor Class
18 Members.

19 194. Yelp knew of these relationships.

20 195. Yelp intentionally committed wrongful acts designed to disrupt those
21 relationships.

22 196. Those relationships were actually disrupted.

23 197. The Non-Sponsor Plaintiffs and Non-Sponsor Class members suffered
24 economic harm proximately caused by Yelp's acts.

25
26
27

1 **COUNT IV**

2 **Violations of the Unfair Competition Law**
3 **Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200**
4 **(With Respect to All Plaintiffs and All Classes)**

5 198. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate the allegations elsewhere in the
6 Complaint as if set forth in full herein.

7 **“Unlawful”**

8 199. Yelp violated Cal. Pen. Code §§ 518-19.

9 200. Yelp violated Cal. Pen. Code § 524.

10 201. Yelp intentionally interfered with prospective economic advantages
11 held by the Non-Sponsor Plaintiffs and members of the Non-Sponsor Class.

12 202. Yelp violated 16 C.F.R. Part 255 by failing to disclose that the
13 Yelp.com website provides endorsed reviews of Sponsors.

14 203. The practices of Yelp complained of herein therefore violated the
15 “unlawful” prong of the California Unfair Competition Law.

16 **“Unfair”**

17 204. The practices of Yelp complained of herein are immoral,
18 unscrupulous, and offend public policy.

19 205. The practices of Yelp complained of herein had no countervailing
20 benefit to consumers or competition when weighed against the harm caused by
21 such practices.

22 206. The practices of Yelp complained of herein therefore violated the
23 “unfair” prong of the California Unfair Competition Law.

24 **“Fraudulent”**

25 207. Yelp’s conduct constitutes “fraudulent” business acts and practices
26 because the conduct has a tendency to deceive the Plaintiffs and the Classes, and
27 the general public.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury.

DATED: March 17, 2010

Respectfully Submitted,



Gregory S. Weston

THE WESTON FIRM
Gregory S. Weston
Jack Fitzgerald
888 Turquoise Street
San Diego, CA 92109
Telephone: (858) 488-1672
Facsimile: (480) 247-4553

BECK & LEE BUSINESS TRIAL
LAWYERS
Jared H. Beck
Elizabeth Lee Beck
Courthouse Plaza Building
28 West Flagler Street, Suite 555
Miami, FL 33130
Telephone: (305) 789-0072
Facsimile: (786) 664-3334

**Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the
Proposed Classes**

EXHIBIT B

FILED

2010 FEB 23 PM 2: 06

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIF.
SANTA ANA

BY _____

1 THE WESTON FIRM
 2 GREGORY S. WESTON (239944)
 3 JACK FITZGERALD (257370)
 4 888 Turquoise Street
 5 San Diego, CA 92109
 6 Telephone: 858 488 1672
 7 Facsimile: 480 247 4553
 8 greg@westonfirm.com
 9 jack@westonfirm.com

10 BECK & LEE BUSINESS TRIAL LAWYERS
 11 JARED H. BECK (233743)
 12 ELIZABETH LEE BECK (233742)
 13 Courthouse Plaza Building
 14 28 West Flagler Street, Suite 555
 15 Miami, FL 33130
 16 Telephone: 305 789 0072
 17 Facsimile: 786 664 3334
 18 jared@beckandlee.com
 19 elizabeth@beckandlee.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CATS AND DOGS ANIMAL
 HOSPITAL, INC., on behalf of itself
 and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

YELP! INC.,

Defendant.

Case No: **CV10 -1340 VBF (SSx)**

Pleading Type: Class Action

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS
OF THE UNFAIR
COMPETITION LAW**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Cats and Dogs Animal Hospital, Inc. (“Plaintiff” or “Cats and
2 Dogs”), on behalf of itself and all others similarly situated, by and through
3 undersigned counsel, hereby sues Defendant Yelp! Inc. (“Defendant” or “Yelp”)
4 and, upon information and belief and investigation of counsel, alleges as follows:
5

6 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

7 1. This Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) (The
8 Class Action Fairness Act) because the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or
9 value of \$5,000,000 exclusive of interest and costs and more than two-thirds of the
10 members of the Class reside in states other than that state of which Defendant is a
11 citizen.

12 2. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because
13 Plaintiff resides in and suffered injuries as a result of Defendant’s acts in this
14 district, many of the acts and transactions giving rise to this action occurred in this
15 district, and Defendants (1) are authorized to conduct business in this district and
16 have intentionally availed themselves of the laws and markets of this district
17 through the promotion, marketing, and sale of advertising in this district; (2) reside
18 in this district, and (3) are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district.
19

20 **PARTIES**

21 3. Plaintiff Cats and Dogs is a California corporation with its principal
22 place of business in Long Beach. Cats and Dogs is owned and operated by Gregory
23 Perrault (“Dr. Perrault”), a veterinarian.

24 4. Defendant Yelp is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of
25 business in San Francisco, California. Yelp owns and operates Yelp.com, a popular
26 online directory and user-ratings website.
27

1 **INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

2 5. The term “Web 2.0” describes internet websites and applications that
3 revolve around information sharing and user-centered design. Examples of Web
4 2.0 websites include social networking sites (e.g., Facebook.com), video sharing
5 sites (e.g., YouTube.com), wikis (e.g., Wikipedia.com), blogs, and many other
6 sites that allow users to create, upload, or modify content. Web 2.0 websites thus
7 allow internet users to do much more than simply retrieve information—the users
8 choose what information to interact with, how they interact with it, and how to
9 modify or add to pre-existing content.

10 6. Online review applications are an increasingly popular form of Web
11 2.0. Companies such as Amazon.com, Best Buy, and TripAdvisor.com, embed
12 Web 2.0 applications within their websites, which allow users to rate products and
13 services and share their experiences.

14 7. Yelp.com, a website owned and operated by Defendant Yelp, is a
15 website that utilizes Web 2.0 user-website interaction.

16 8. Yelp.com consists of an online directory of businesses in multiple
17 categories, much like an online Yellow Pages. Each business listed on Yelp.com
18 has a unique Yelp.com listing page, which provides basic business information
19 (such as address, phone number and hours of operation), and user-generated ratings
20 and reviews.

21 9. To rate businesses, internet users simply register on the Yelp.com
22 website. Any internet user (whether registered or not) can browse Yelp.com to find
23 reviews of businesses.

24 10. Ratings-based websites, including Yelp.com, are highly popular, and
25 have great power to direct the flow of commerce in a given area. Users frequently
26 read ratings and reviews for all of the businesses in a particular category and locale
27 and then decide where to spend their money based on those ratings and reviews.

1 *The only reason I am even giving one star is because it wouldn't*
2 *allow me to continue without it . . . otherwise, I would have given*
3 *them no stars. Dr. Perrault is the rudest vet I've ever been to . . .*
4 *probably one of the rudest people I've had the displeasure of meeting.*
5 *I agree with the previous reviews about making you feel like an unfit*
6 *mom. My pup had been sick and I had a theory on what the problem*
7 *may have been and he wouldn't even entertain the idea, but instead,*
8 *made me feel bad because my dog got sick. And, my poor dog was*
9 *terrified of him! He made me feel like I was 2 inches tall and*
10 *repeatedly looked down his nose at me. Oh, and OVER PRICED!*
11 *OMG! Who does he think he is??? I did not feel welcomed by him nor*
12 *his staff. I paid you for a service! No need to treat me so bad!*

13 18. Soon after the appearance of these negative reviews, Dr. Perrault and
14 Mr. Vargas began receiving frequent, high-pressure calls from Yelp advertising
15 employees, who promised to manipulate Cats and Dogs' Yelp.com listing page in
16 exchange for Cats and Dogs purchasing an advertising subscription.

17 19. For example, on or about January 5, 2010, Cats and Dogs received a
18 Yelp sales call from "Kevin." Kevin said that Cats and Dogs could advertise with
19 Yelp for a minimum payment of \$300 per month, with a minimum 12-month
20 commitment. Kevin stated that if Cats and Dogs purchased a one-year advertising
21 subscription from Yelp:

- 22 a. Yelp would hide negative reviews on the Cats and Dogs Yelp.com
23 listing page, or place them lower on the listing page so internet users
24 "won't see" them;
- 25 b. Yelp would ensure negative reviews will not appear in Google and
26 other search engine results;

- 1 c. Yelp would allow Cats and Dogs to decide the order that its reviews
2 appear in on its Yelp.com listing page; and
3 d. Cats and Dogs could choose its “tagline,” i.e., the first few lines of a
4 single review shown on every search result page in which Cats and
5 Dogs appears (for instance, “Veterinarian in Long Beach”).

6 20. Dr. Perrault declined the offer, saying that he wanted to track referrals
7 from Yelp for three months without ads, but might thereafter be willing to test
8 Yelp’s advertising potential.

9 21. Within a week of denying Kevin’s advertising offer, the negative
10 review from Chris R. reappeared on the Cats and Dogs Yelp.com listing page.

11 22. Soon after, “Kay K.” posted a second negative review. This review
12 was added on January 6, 2010, one day after Kevin’s sales call:

13 *I’ve already left one review about how bad a vet Dr. Perrault is, but I*
14 *wanted to add something. I’ve been reading other people’s reviews*
15 *and I must have gone to a different Cats and Dogs Animal Hospital*
16 *with a vet named Dr. Perrault. Oh wait, no . . . he’s the only one.*
17 *Maybe it’s a Dr. Jeckyl / Mr. Hyde thing?! I don’t know. But the guy’s*
18 *an @\$\$. No other way around it. He’s a jerk, a D-Bag, And so*
19 *arrogant. I ran in to him in a neighborhood store right after he saw*
20 *my poor sick dog at his clinic and he looked right at me, recognized*
21 *me, rolled his eyes and looked away!!!! Seriously, someone needs to*
22 *knock this guy down to the size he really is. He needs to drop his*
23 *Napolean complex and be a professional. After my horrible*
24 *experience with him, I took my sick dog to Bixby Animal Clinic and I*
25 *have never had a more pleasant vet experience! Go there instead! My*
26 *dog loved everyone there!*

27

1 *Sorry to rant, but I just wanted to get the word out there. Don't spend*
2 *the money on this overpriced arrogant vet. It's not worth it!*

3 23. On or about January 12, 2010, Mr. Vargas contacted Yelp to protest
4 the reappearance of the "Chris R." review and the highly negative, inflammatory
5 "Kay K." reviews.

6 24. On January 13, 2010, Mr. Vargas received via email the following
7 response from Yelp:

8 We wanted to let you know that we've taken a close look at the
9 reviews by Chris R and Kay K, and after careful evaluation, we have
10 decided to leave both intact. Because we don't have firsthand
11 knowledge of a reviewer's identity or personal experience, we are not
12 in a position to verify your claims that these reviewers are the same
13 person, or that they are connected to the recent vandalism at your
14 hospital. If a review appears to reflect the personal opinion and
15 experiences of the reviewer while adhering to our review guidelines
16 [link], it is our policy to allow the reviewer to stand behind his or her
17 review.

18 25. As of January 18, 2010 Cats and Dogs enjoyed a 4-star rating (out of a
19 possible 5) on its Yelp.com listing page. Sixteen out of 26 reviews (over 60%)
20 gave Cats and Dogs a perfect 5-star rating. Despite this, as of January 18, 2010, a
21 Yelp.com search for "veterinarian in Long Beach" displayed the following tagline
22 for Dogs and Cats:

23 *"Dr. Perrault is the most inept/rude veterinarian I have ever met. He*
24 *had my rescue dog cowering and barking in the corner of the exam*
25 *room within seconds of meeting him. He berated me for 20 . . ."*

26 26. Compare Cats and Dogs' tagline to the tagline (as of January 18,
27 2010) of Bixby Animal Clinic, a Long Beach veterinary business that is a Yelp

1 advertiser (and the same company the mysterious Kay K. referred users to in her
2 second Cats and Dogs review):

3 *“This place IS awesome. I brought my little man (Bruin) to Dr. A. as a*
4 *puppy for the puppy package. They have great hours and were able to*
5 *acommodate me AFTER work so I never had to take extra time . . . ”*

6 27. Yelp frequently exercises its control over the Yelp.com listing
7 application to modify business listing pages to the advantage of businesses that
8 purchase Yelp advertising subscriptions, and the disadvantage of those that
9 decline.

10 28. Dr. Perrault's experience with Yelp was not unique, but rather typical
11 of Yelp's advertisement sales tactics.

12 29. A February 18, 2009 article in the East Bay Express, titled *Yelp and*
13 *the Business of Extortion 2.0*,¹ describes Yelp's unlawful business practices.
14 According to the article:

15 • Yelp sales representatives contact business owners saying, “**[Y]ou have a**
16 **few bad [reviews] at the top. I could do something about those. . . . We**
17 **can move them. Well, for \$299 a month.**”

18 • Almost all the time when Yelp calls business owners, negative reviews
19 are at the top of the business's Yelp.com listing page.

20 • Mary Seaton, the owner of a furniture store in San Mateo, **took Yelp up**
21 **on an offer to remove her negative reviews if she advertised at a cost of**
22 **\$350 per month for six months. During that time, her negative reviews**
23 **were removed and old positive ones showed up. After her contract was**
24 **up, a negative review appeared**, which Seaton said contained lies.
25
26

27 ¹ Available at <http://www.eastbayexpress.com/eastbay/yelp-and-the-business-of-extortion-20/Content?oid=1176635>.

1 • Greg Quinn, the owner of a San Francisco bar and bistro, said **a Yelp**
2 **sales representative moved negative reviews further down his page in an**
3 **effort to entice him to advertise.** The sales rep called Mr. Quinn and said,
4 **“Did you notice what I did? Well, we can keep doing that for you.”**

5
6 • An East Bay business owner said **Yelp offered to move one- or two-star**
7 **reviews of his business if he advertised.**

8
9 • Six people told the East Bay Express that **Yelp sales representatives**
10 **promised to move or remove negative reviews if their businesses would**
11 **advertise.**

12 • Six other people told the East Bay Express that **positive reviews**
13 **disappeared, or negative reviews appeared, after owners declined to**
14 **advertise.**

15
16 • Yelp pays its employees to write reviews of businesses; in one
17 documented instance, **a business owner who declined to advertise**
18 **subsequently received a negative review from a Yelp employee.** In other
19 cases, businesses that receive negative reviews from paid Yelp employees
20 are subsequently asked to advertise.

21
22 • Yelp’s Chief Operating Officer, Geoff Donaker, said advertisers and
23 sales representatives do not have the ability to move or remove negative
24 reviews. Donaker’s denials are challenged both by local business owners,
25 and by **a former Yelp employee, who said that several sales reps told him**
26 **they promised to move reviews to get businesses to advertise.**

1 30. As of February 8, 2010, there are 140 comments on the East Bay
2 Express website following the Yelp article, many from business owners describing
3 experiences similar to those discussed in the article.

4 31. A follow-up East Bay Express article provides further evidence of
5 Yelp's unlawful sales practices. The March 18, 2009 article, *Yelp Extortion*
6 *Allegations Stack Up: More business owners come forward with tales of unethical*
7 *behavior by the popular San Francisco-based web site*² states that since the
8 publication of the first article:

9 [M]any business owners from around the country have come
10 forward—via emails or comments on the *Express*' web site—alleging
11 similar tales of extortionist tactics by Yelp sales reps. . . . Business
12 owners contend that they just want [an] opportunity to respond to
13 negative, false, or damaging information about their businesses.
14 Instead, the only way for them to salvage their businesses' reputation
15 is by paying Yelp—regardless of whether the reviews are true or false.
16 . . . [S]everal [interviewees] said that the reps would offer to move
17 negative reviews if they advertised; and in some cases positive
18 reviews disappeared when they refused, or negative ones appeared. In
19 one case, a nightclub owner said Yelp offered positive reviews of his
20 business in exchange for free drinks.

21 32. The article tells the stories of six California business owners'
22 experiences with Yelp:

- 23 • After Bob Hyde, owner of M&M Auto Werkes in Campbell, received a
24 negative rating from a customer's boyfriend, violating Yelp's Terms of
25 Service (prohibiting third parties from posting reviews), he contacted Yelp

26 _____
27 ²Available at <http://www.eastbayexpress.com/eastbay/yelp-extortion-allegations-stack-up/Content?oid=1176984>.

1 sales representative Jacqueline Fitzhugh to complain. She told him, **“We**
2 **can't control that, but if you advertise you can control the order that**
3 **they're in.”** After declining, Mr. Hyde noticed some of his five-star posts
4 **were disappearing.** Yelp told him the website has a spam filter, like
5 Google. Hyde tracked his reviews, printing them daily to monitor which
6 ones would disappear. Some five-star reviews stayed up for as short as 31
7 days and as long as 131 days. **Yelp told Hyde that if he advertised, some**
8 **of those five-star reviews would come back.**

9
10 • Calvin Gee of Haight Street Dental in San Francisco saw his rating drop
11 from five-stars to 3.5-stars following his declining to buy advertising. **Yelp**
12 **reps told Gee that if he advertised, they would let him choose his**
13 **favorite review and would move the negative reviews to the bottom of**
14 **the page.** Gee noticed that one of his competitors, CitiDent, had two
15 separate listings on Yelp.com. The business had more positive reviews and a
16 higher star rating on the page that was marked a Yelp sponsor, and more
17 negative reviews and a lower star rating on the harder to find non-sponsored
18 page.

19
20 • Larry Trujillo owns the Uptown Nightclub in Oakland. Shortly after
21 opening the club, a Yelp sales rep began calling him “almost daily” about
22 advertising. The sales rep would say **“I notice you have a lot of positive**
23 **reviews. We could make sure that those reviews stay positive.”** Sarah
24 Lippman, a Sales Manager at Yelp, separately asked Mr. Trujillo for free use
25 of his club with Yelp staff and alcohol expenses paid by the club in
26 exchange for positive reviews on the club’s Yelp.com listing page.

27

1 • Debbie Leonardo, director of membership at the Ruby Hill Golf Club in
2 Pleasanton, received a phone call from a **Yelp sales representative who**
3 **told her that the business could get rid of its worst review if it purchased**
4 **advertising.**

5
6 • Bob Kurtz, owner of Collectors Real 3 in Oakland, was contacted by a
7 Yelp sales person after receiving a negative review. In an email, **Yelp told**
8 **him that, as a paid advertiser, the negative review could be dealt with.**

9
10 • Nicholas Paul, an instructor at a Chicago art studio, declined to purchase
11 advertising and shortly thereafter three positive reviews disappeared from
12 and two negative ones were added to the studio's Yelp.com listing page. **A**
13 **Yelp sales rep told Mr. Paul he could control that.**

14
15 33. An August 13, 2008 article in The Register, a news website, titled
16 *Yelp "pay to play" pitch makes shops scream for help: User generated discontent*³
17 notes that:

18 At least some of Yelp's sales staff hope to make money by offering to
19 hide what you and I have to say. Over the last year, five San Francisco
20 Bay Area business have told *The Register* that **the company has**
21 **offered to "push bad reviews to the bottom" of their yelp pages if**
22 **they paid to advertise on the site.** One restaurant owner was
23 contacted "five or six" times, and each time, the Yelp sales rep
24 insisted that if he forked over \$6,000 a year for "sponsored link"
25 status, the site would suppress user posts that put his restaurant in a
26 less-than-positive light. "They told me I had 60 reviews on my [Yelp]

27
³ Available at http://www.theregister.co.uk/2008/08/13/yelp_sales_pitch/print.html

1 page,” said the owner “They told me ‘No one is going to read all
2 60. They’re only going to read the first few.’”

3 34. A March 9, 2009 Chicago Tribune article, titled *Questions arise over*
4 *Yelp’s ads, reviews; Businesses say site rearranges opinions for price; CEO*
5 *denies,*⁴ reported:

6 • Ina Pinkney of Ina’s restaurant in the West Loop said that last
7 summer **a Yelp salesperson offered “to move up my good reviews**
8 **if I sponsored one of their events. They called it rearranging my**
9 **reviews.”**

10
11 • Jason Luros, an attorney at Hudson & Luros in Napa, California,
12 stated “one of our reviews mysteriously disappeared, so I contacted
13 Yelp and was given the usual canned response about how no humans
14 control the reviews. But **when I said I would consider advertising if**
15 **they restored the review, it mysteriously reappeared.”**

16
17 35. An April 3, 2009 article in the Santa Monica Daily Press titled *Yelp*
18 *Sales Tactics Cause Concern Among Businesses,*⁵ reported:

19 After declining to advertise, the [Los Angeles area] business owner
20 checked the Yelp page again and noticed that at least 10 positive
21 reviews had disappeared while a few negative ones had been posted. .
22 . . They estimate that at least 20 positive reviews had been deleted
23 from the site since the conversation with Yelp about three weeks ago.
24
25

26 ⁴ No longer available online.

27 ⁵ Available at http://www.smdp.com/Articles-c-2009-04-02-52021.113116_Yelp_sales_tactics_cause_for_concern_among_businesses.html

1 **CLASS REPRESENTATION ALLEGATIONS**

2 36. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of itself and the following Class:

3 All persons and entities (excluding officers, directors, and employees
4 of Yelp) in the United States for which Yelp has offered or threatened
5 to manipulate a Yelp.com listing page in exchange for purchasing or
6 declining to purchase advertising.

7 37. Like Cats and Dogs, all members of the Class have a Yelp.com listing
8 page.

9 38. Like Cats and Dogs, all members of the Class were contacted by Yelp
10 sales representatives.

11 39. Like Cats and Dogs, all members of the Class were promised that, if
12 they purchased advertising from Yelp, negative reviews would be removed or
13 relocated from their Yelp.com listing pages, or those pages would otherwise be
14 favorably manipulated, including through their own input or control.

15 40. Like Cats and Dogs, all members of the Class were threatened,
16 implicitly or expressly, that if they did not purchase advertising from Yelp, their
17 Yelp.com listing pages would be detrimentally manipulated, including for
18 example, by removing positive reviews and posting new, negative reviews.

19 41. Plaintiff's claims on behalf of the Class are maintainable under Rules
20 23(b)(2) and 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

21 42. The questions of law and fact common to Plaintiff and the Class
22 include:

- 23 a. Whether Yelp violated the Unfair Competition Law;
- 24 b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class were injured by the conduct
25 complained of herein;
- 26 c. Whether the conduct described herein is ongoing; and
- 27 d. Whether members of the class are entitled to injunctive
relief.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violations of the Unfair Competition Law, Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200

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

44. 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.

45. The practices of Yelp complained of herein had no countervailing benefit to consumers or competition when weighed against the harm caused by such practices.

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 of 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.


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury.

DATED: February 22, 2010

Respectfully Submitted,



Gregory S. Weston

THE WESTON FIRM
Gregory S. Weston
Jack Fitzgerald
888 Turquoise Street
San Diego, CA 92109
Telephone: 858 488 1672
Facsimile: 480 247 4553

BECK & LEE BUSINESS TRIAL
LAWYERS
Jared H. Beck
Elizabeth Lee Beck
Courthouse Plaza Building
28 West Flagler Street, Suite 555
Miami, FL 33130
Telephone: 305 789 0072
Facsimile: 786 664 3334

EXHIBIT C

FILED

1 RONALD A. MARRON [SBN 175650]
2 GEORGIY B. LYUDYNO [SBN 268380]
3 LAW OFFICES OF RONALD A. MARRON, APLC
4 3636 Fourth Avenue, Ste. 202
5 San Diego, CA 92103
6 Telephone: 619-696-9006
7 Facsimile: 619-564-6665

2010 MAR -3 AM 10: 54

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

BY _____

Attorneys for the Plaintiff and the Putative Class

6 THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 CENTRAL DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA

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

Case No: **CV10 1578 R (Ex)**

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

11 Plaintiffs,

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

12 vs.

13 YELP! INC.,

14 Defendant.

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

19 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

20 1. This Court has original jurisdiction under 28 United States Code section 1332,
21 subdivision (d)(2) (The Class Action Fairness Act) because the matter in controversy exceeds the
22 sum or value of \$5,000,000 exclusive of interest and costs and more than two-thirds of the members
23 of the class reside in states other than that state of which Defendant is a citizen.

24 2. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 United States Code section 1391 because
25 Plaintiffs reside in and suffered injuries as a result of Defendant's acts in this district, many of the
26 acts and transactions giving rise to this action occurred in this district, and Defendants (1) are
27
28

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

4 PARTIES

5 3. Plaintiff Christine LaPausky does business as D'ames Day Spa with her principal
6 place of business in Imperial Beach, County of San Diego, California.

7 4. Defendant Yelp is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in San
8 Francisco, California. Yelp owns and operates Yelp.com, a popular online directory and user-rating
9 website.
10

11 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

12 5. The term "Web 2.0" describes internet websites and applications that revolve around
13 information sharing and user-centered design. Examples of Web 2.0 websites include social
14 networking sites (e.g., Facebook.com), video sharing sites (e.g., YouTube.com), wikis (e.g.,
15 Wikipedia.com), blogs, and many other sites that allow users to create, upload, or modify content.
16 Web 2.0 websites thus allow internet users to do much more than simply retrieve information-- the
17 users choose what information to interact with, how they interact with it, and how to modify or add
18 to pre-existing content.
19

20 6. Online review applications are an increasingly popular form of Web 2.0. Companies
21 such as Amazon.com, Best Buy, and TripAdvisor.com, embed services and share their experiences.
22

23 7. Yelp.com, a website owned and operated by Yelp, utilizes Web 2.0 user-website
24 interaction.

25 8. Yelp.com consists of an online directory of businesses in multiple categories, much
26 like an online Yellow Pages. Each business listed on Yelp.com has a unique Yelp.com listing page,
27
28

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

3 9. To rate businesses, internet users simply register on the Yelp.com website. Any
4 internet user (whether registered or not) can browse Yelp.com to find reviews of businesses.

5 10. Ratings-based websites, including Yelp.com, are highly popular, and have great
6 power to direct the flow of commerce in a given area. Users frequently read ratings and reviews for
7 all of the businesses in a particular category and locale and then decide where to spend their money
8 based on those ratings and reviews.

9
10 11. Yelp, however, regularly manipulates the content on Yelp.com listing pages, despite
11 Yelp's mantra of "Real people. Real reviews."

12 12. One method Yelp uses to control content (and thereby raise or lower a business's
13 rating), is to promise to remove a business's negative reviews or relocate them to the bottom of a
14 listing page where fewer searchers will read them if the business agrees to purchase a costly
15 monthly advertising subscription from Yelp. Yelp thus capitalizes on the presumed integrity of the
16 Yelp.com ratings system to extort business owners to purchase advertising.

17
18 13. As a result, business listings on Yelp.com, contrary to the website's "Real people.
19 Real reviews." mantra, are in fact biased in favor of businesses that buy Yelp advertising.

20 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

21 14. In or around August, 2009, LaPausky contacted GROUPON to promote her
22 business, D'ames Day Spa, through a mass email marketing campaign. A GROUPON
23 representative informed LaPausky that her business needed more on-line reviews and/or comments
24 to be featured in a GROUPON marketing campaign.
25
26
27
28

1 15. LaPausky began asking her customers to leave feedback regarding their D'ames Day
2 Spa experience on Yelp.com. In a short while, D'ames Day Spa's reviews on Yelp.com totaled
3 approximately fourteen, many of them very positive and very detailed.

4 16. LaPausky enjoyed a larger influx of customers to D'ames Day Spa as the number of
5 reviews posted on Yelp.com climbed.

6 17. However, at point, LaPausky noticed that the number of reviews went down from
7 fourteen to eleven. Three reviews simply disappeared from the Yelp.com.
8

9 18. LaPausky called Yelp.com's marketing department to find out why some of reviews
10 disappeared. She was told that Yelp's "automatic system" picks out reviews containing "certain"
11 words and all such reviews are then analyzed for fraud, and, if warranted, are removed. LaPausky
12 received no explanation of the criteria the "automatic system" uses to find suspect comments. Nor
13 did LaPausky receive any explanation as to why three comments were adjudged fraudulent and thus
14 removed. The Yelp representative simply said that Yelp has no control over which comments are
15 flagged and/or removed.
16

17 19. During the same conversation, the Yelp representative pushed LaPausky to purchase
18 advertisements from D'ames Day Spa on Yelp.com. LaPausky refused. A few days later LaPausky
19 received a phone call from Yelp, once again cajoling her to purchase advertisement on yelp.com.
20 Once again, LaPausky refused.

21 20. Shortly following the marketing phone call from Yelp, LaPausky noticed that all but
22 one of reviews of D'ames Day Spa on yelp.com disappeared. As of the date of this Complaint,
23 thirteen of the original fourteen comments are absent from D'ames Day Spa review page on
24 yelp.com
25

26 21. D'ames Day Spa' experience with Yelp was not unique, but rather typical of Yelp's
27 advertisement sales tactics.
28

1 22. A February 18, 2009 article in the East Bay Express titled *Yelp and the Business of*
2 *Extortion 2.0*,¹ describes Yelp's unlawful business practices. According to the article:

- 3 a. Yelp sales representatives contact business owners saying "**[Y]ou have a few**
4 **bad [reviews] at the top. I could do something about those.... We can move**
5 **them. Well, for \$299 a month.**"
- 6 b. Almost all the time when Yelp calls business owners, negative reviews are at the
7 top of the business's Yelp.com listing page.
- 8 c. Mary Seaton, the owner of a furniture store in San Mateo, **took Yelp up on an**
9 **offer to remove her negative reviews if she advertised at a cost of \$350 per**
10 **month for six months. During that time, her negative reviews were removed**
11 **and old positive ones showed up. After her contract was up, a negative**
12 **review appeared** which Seaton said contained lies.
- 13 d. Greg Quinn, the owner of a San Francisco bar and bistro, said **a Yelp sales**
14 **representative moved negative reviews further down his page in an effort to**
15 **entice him to advertise.** The sales rep called Mr. Quinn and said, "**Did you**
16 **notice what I did? Well, we can keep doing that for you.**"
- 17 e. An East Bay business owner said **Yelp offered to move one- or two-star**
18 **reviews of his business if he advertised.**
- 19 f. Six people told the East Bay Express that **Yelp sales representatives promised**
20 **to move or remove negative reviews if their businesses would advertise.**
- 21 g. Six other people told the East Bay Express that **positive reviews disappeared,**
22 **or negative reviews appeared, after owners declined to advertise.**
23
24
25
26

27
28 ¹ Available at <http://www.eastbayexpress.com/eastbay/yelp-and-the-business-of-extortion-20/Content?oid=1176635>.

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

3 25. The article tells the stories of six California business owners' experiences with Yelp:

4 a. After Bob Hyde, owner of M&M Auto Werkes in Campbell, received a negative
5 rating from a customer's boyfriend, violating Yelp's Terms of Service
6 (prohibiting third parties from posting reviews), he contacted Yelp sales
7 representative Jacqueline Fitzhugh to complain. She told him "**We can't control**
8 **that, but if you advertise you can control the order that they're in.**" After
9 **declining, Mr. Hyde noticed some of his five-star posts were disappearing.**
10
11 Yelp told him the website has a spam filter, like Google. Hyde tracked his
12 reviews, printing them daily to monitor which days as long as 131 days. **Yelp**
13 **told Hyde that if he advertised, some of those five-star reviews could come**
14 **back.**

15
16 b. Calvin Gee of Haight Street Dental in San Francisco saw his rating drop from
17 five-stars to 3.5-stars following his declining to buy advertising. **Yelp reps told**
18 **Gee that if he advertised, they would let him choose his favorite review and**
19 **move negative reviews to the bottom of the page.** Gee noticed that one of his
20 competitors, CitiDent, had two separate listings on Yelp.com. The business had
21 more positive reviews and a higher star rating on the page that was marked a
22 Yelp sponsor, and more negative reviews and a lower star rating on the harder to
23 **find non-sponsored page.**

24
25 c. Larry Trujillo owns the Uptown Nightclub in Oakland. Shortly after opening the
26 club, a Yelp sales rep began calling him "almost daily" about advertising. The
27 rep would say "**I notice you have a lot of positive reviews. We could make**
28

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

5 d. Debbie Leonardo, director of membership at the Ruby Hill Golf Club in
6 Pleasanton, received a phone call from a **Yelp sales representative who told her**
7 **that the business could get rid of its worst review if it purchased advertising.**

8
9 e. Bob Kurtz, owner of Collectors Real 3 in Oakland, was contacted by a Yelp sales
10 person after receiving a negative review. In an email, **Yelp told him that, as a**
11 **paid advertiser, the negative review could be dealt with.**

12 f. Nicholas Paul, an instructor at a Chicago art studio, declined to purchase
13 advertising and shortly thereafter three positive reviews disappeared from and
14 two negative ones were added to the studio's Yelp.com listing page. **A Yelp**
15 **sales rep told Mr. Paul he could control that.**

16
17 26. An August 13, 2008 article in The Register, a news website, titled *Yelp "pay to*
18 *play" pitch makes shops scream for help: User generated discontent*³ notes that:

19 At least some of Yelp's sales staff hope to make money by offering to hide what you and I
20 have to say. Over the last year, five San Francisco Bay Area businesses have told *The Register* that
21 **the company has offered to "push bad reviews to the bottom" of their yelp pages if they paid**
22 **to advertise on the site.** One restaurant owner was contacted "five or six" times, and each time, the
23 Yelp sales rep insisted that if he forked over \$6,000 a year for "sponsored link" status, the site
24 would suppress user posts that put his restaurant in a less-than-positive light. "They told me I had
25
26
27

28 ³ Available at http://www.theregister.co.uk/2008/08/13/yelp_sales_pitch/print.html

1 60 reviews on my [Yelp] page," said the owner.... "They told me 'No one is going to read all 60.
2 They're only going to read the first few."

3 27. A March 9, 2009 Chicago Tribune article, titled *Questions arise over Yelp's ads,*
4 *reviews; Business say site rearranges opinions for price; CEO denies,*⁴ reported:

5 a. Ina Pinkney of Ina's restaurant in the West Loop said that last summer **a Yelp**
6 **salesperson offered "to move up my good reviews if I sponsored one of their**
7 **events. They called it rearranging my reviews."**

8 b. Jason Luros, an attorney at Hudson & Luros in Napa, California, stated "one of
9 our reviews mysteriously disappeared, so I contacted Yelp and was given the
10 usual canned response about how no humans control the reviews. But **when I**
11 **said I would consider advertising if they restored the review, it mysteriously**
12 **reappeared."**

13 28. An April 3, 2009 article in the Santa Monica Daily Press titled *Yelp Sales Tactics*
14 *Cause Concern Among Businesses,*⁵ reported:

15 After declining to advertise, the [Los Angeles area] business owner checked the Yelp page
16 again and noticed that at least 10 positive reviews had disappeared while a few negative
17 ones had been posted.... They estimate that at least 20 positive reviews had been deleted
18 from the site since the conversation with Yelp about three weeks ago.
19
20
21

22 **CLASS REPRESENTATION ALLEGATIONS**

23 29. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of itself and the following Class: all persons and
24 entities (excluding officers, directors, and employees of Yelp) in the United States for which Yelp
25

26 ⁴ No longer available online.

27 ⁵ Available at [http://www.smdp.com/Articles-c-2009-04-02-](http://www.smdp.com/Articles-c-2009-04-02-52021.113116_Yelp_sales_tactics_cause_for_concern-among-bussinesses.html)
28 [52021.113116_Yelp_sales_tactics_cause_for_concern-among-bussinesses.html](http://www.smdp.com/Articles-c-2009-04-02-52021.113116_Yelp_sales_tactics_cause_for_concern-among-bussinesses.html).

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

3 30. Like D'ames Day Spa, all members of the Class have a Yelp.com listing page.

4 31. Like D'ames Day Spa, all members of the Class were contacted by Yelp sales
5 representatives.

6 32. Like D'ames Day Spa, all members of the Class were promised that, if they
7 purchased advertising from Yelp, negative reviews would be removed or relocated from their
8 Yelp.com listing pages, or those pages would otherwise be favorably manipulated, including
9 through their own input or control.

10 33. Like D'ames Day Spa, all members of the Class were threatened, implicitly or
11 expressly, that if they did not purchase advertising from Yelp, their Yelp.com listing pages would
12 be detrimentally manipulated, including for example, by removing positive reviews and posting
13 new, negative reviews.

14 34. Plaintiff's claims on behalf of the Class are maintainable under Rules 23(b)(2) and
15 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

16 35. The questions of law and fact common to Plaintiff and the Class include:

- 17
- 18 a. Whether Yelp violated the Unfair Competition Law;
 - 19 b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class were injured by the conduct complained herein;
 - 20 c. Whether the conduct described herein is ongoing; and
 - 21 d. Whether members of the class are entitled to injunctive relief.
- 22
23
24

25 **COUNT ONE**

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

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

1 37. Commencing in or about 2004 and continuing to the present, Yelp has engaged in, is
2 engaged in, and proposed to engage in unfair competition, as defined in the California Unfair
3 Competition Law, California Business and Professions Code §17200, *et seq.*

4 38. As used in this Complaint and in Section 17200, “unfair competition” means (1) an
5 unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice, (2) unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading
6 advertising; and/or (3) an act prohibited by Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 17200) of Part 3
7 of Division 7 of the Business and Professions Code. This conduct is actionable pursuant to UCS §§
8 17200, 17203.

9 39. An Unfair Competition Law civil action may be predicated on unfair, deceptive,
10 untrue or misleading advertising and/or any act prohibited by Ca. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500-
11 17581.

12 40. Defendant had engaged in unfair, unlawful and fraudulent business practices, as
13 alleged herein and thereby deprived plaintiff and the class of rights and privileges and statutory
14 rights and protections. If not enjoined by this Court, plaintiff and the class will continue to suffer
15 irreparable harm as consequence of defendant’s actions.

16 41. As a direct and indirect result of defendant’s violations, plaintiff and the class have
17 been injured and suffered damages.

18 42. The advertising sales and employee reviewing practices of Yelp as alleged herein
19 constitute unfair business acts and practices because they are immoral, unscrupulous, and offend
20 public policy.

21 43. Defendant unlawful practices, committed through the acts and/or omissions alleged
22 above, include, among others,

23 a. Violation of California Penal Code Section 518 (extortion),
24
25
26
27
28

1 b. Violation of 18 United States Code Section 1961, *et seq.* (Racketeer Influenced
2 and Corrupt Organizations Act), and

3 c. Violations of, 18 United States Code Section 1030 *et seq.* (Computer Fraud and
4 Abuse Act).

5 44. The practices of Yelp complained of herein had no countervailing benefit to
6 consumers or competition when weighed against the harm caused by such practices.

7 45. Among other relief, plaintiff seeks to enjoin defendant from continuing to use the
8 unfair and deceptive practices set forth herein. Plaintiff further seeks damages, plus interest and
9 attorney's fees pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5.
10

11 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

14 A. Declaring this action to be a proper class action.

15 B. An order permanently enjoining Yelp from engaging in the practices complained
16 herein.

17 C. An order compelling Yelp to disgorge all monies, revenues, and profits obtained by
18 means of its wrongful acts and practices.

19 D. An order requiring Yelp to pay restitution to restore all funds acquired by means of
20 any act or practice declared by this Court to be unlawful, plus pre- and post-
21 judgment interest thereon.

22 E. Costs, expenses, and reasonable attorneys' fees.


23 F. Any other and further relief the Court deems necessary, just, or proper.
24
25

26
27 **JURY DEMAND**

1 Plaintiff demands a trial by jury.

2
3 DATED: March 3, 2010

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

4
5 

6 Ronald A. Marron
7 Georgiy B. Lyudyno
8 Attorneys for Plaintiff
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT D

Gregory S. Weston

From: Gregory S. Weston [greg@westonfirm.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 2:55 PM
To: 'ron.marron@gmail.com'
Cc: 'elizabeth@beckandlee.com'
Subject: RE: YELP litigation

Ron we have an ex parte motion ready to go, but let's see if we can try for a stipulation one more time.

The terms Yelp will go with is that:

1. The two actions are consolidated
2. Cats and Dogs's Amended Complaint is deemed the consolidated lead action, Yelp has no obligation to respond to the LaPausky complaint or any later filed related action
3. Yelp's time to respond to Cats and Dogs is extended to April 8.

Please let me know by five

EXHIBIT E

1 Ronald A. Marron, Esq., SBN 175650
Georgiy B. Lyudyno, Esq., SBN 268380
2 Law Offices of Ronald A. Marron
3636 Fourth Ave., Suite 202
3 San Diego, California 92103
Telephone: (619) 696-9006
4 Facsimile: (619) 564-6665
5 ron.marron@gmail.com
glyudy1@gmail.com

6
7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

8
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11
12 CHRISTINE LaPAUSKY d/b/a D'AMES)
DAY SPA, on behalf of herself and all others)
13 similarly situated,)
14 Plaintiff,)
15 vs.)
16 YELP! INC.,)
Defendant.)

Case No. CV 10-1578-VBF(SSx)
**NOTICE OF UNAVAILABILITY
OF COUNSEL**

17
18 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs counsel, RONALD A. MARRON will be
19 unavailable for any purposes whatsoever due to trial preparation and trial, including but not limited
20 to receiving notices of any kind, responding to ex-parte applications, appearing in court or
21 appearing at depositions in this matter from March 24, 2010 through and including May 5, 2010.

22 Purposefully scheduling a conflicting proceeding without a good cause is sanctionable
23 conduct. Tenderloin Housing Clinic v. Sparks. (1992) Cal.App. 4th 299.

24 DATED: March 22, 2010

25
26 
27 RONALD A. MARRON,
Attorney for Plaintiffs