Doc.

in and for King County to the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington. This Notice of Removal is filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332, 1441, 1446 and 1453, and Western District of Washington Civil Rule 101.

In support of its removal of this action, the defendants state as follows:

Timeliness of Removal and Venue in This Court

- 1. On or about February 16, 2011, plaintiff John Doe filed this lawsuit in the Superior Court of the State of Washington in and for King County, Case No. 11-2-06859-5 SEA. A copy of plaintiff's state court complaint (the "Complaint") is attached to this Notice as **Exhibit A**.
- The Complaint named as defendants Project Fair Bid and the Investor
 Defendants. The Complaint also identifies "Does 1-20" as unnamed defendants.
 - 3. Plaintiff purported to serve process on Project Fair Bid on April 13, 2011.
- 4. Plaintiff purported to serve process on each of the Investor Defendants on April 13, 2011.
- 5. This Notice of Removal is filed within thirty days of service of process² on all defendants and within 1 year of the filing of the Complaint. It therefore is timely under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).
- 6. The Superior Court of the State of Washington in and for King County is located within the Western District of Washington. Venue for the removed action is therefore proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a).
 - 7. All named defendants consent to this removal.

NOTICE OF REMOVAL - 2

K:\0815621\00001\21446_TJA\21446P25Z4

22

23

24

25

26

17

18

19

20

21

¹ In removing this case, defendants do not waive any defenses, including but not limited to defenses previously available under Washington Civil Rule 12 and now available under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12.

² Defendants are removing this case now, in an abundance of caution, to ensure that there is no issue regarding timeliness. At least one defendant, however, appears not to have been served properly. The 30-day deadline for any such defendant to remove this case has not yet begun to run. *Murphy Bros., Inc. v. Michetti Pipe Stringing, Inc.*, 526 U.S. 344, 119 S.Ct. 1322 (1999).

Removal Is Proper Based on Federal Question Jurisdiction

- 8. This lawsuit is properly removable under 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a)-(c) because this Court has original jurisdiction over the subject matter of this lawsuit. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 9. The Court has original jurisdiction over the lawsuit, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, because the Complaint alleges a violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act ("RICO"), 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c). *See* Complaint ¶¶ 119-205.

Removal Is Proper Pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act

- 10. This lawsuit is subject to removal pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(d), 1453 ("CAFA").
- 11. CAFA grants federal courts original jurisdiction over, and permits removal of, class actions in which: (1) the aggregate number of proposed plaintiffs is 100 or more; (2) any member of a class of plaintiffs is a citizen of a state different from any defendant, thus establishing the so-called "minimal diversity;" (3) the primary defendants are not states, state officials, or other governmental entities; and (4) the aggregate amount in controversy of all of the putative class members' claims exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(d)(2)(A), (d)(5)(A)-(B), and (d)(6). Those jurisdictional requirements are satisfied by the allegations contained in plaintiff's Complaint:
- A. Plaintiff Seeks Relief on Behalf of a Class Consisting of More Than 100 Members. In the Complaint, plaintiff claims to seek relief on behalf of a class of "[a]ll persons who in the United States, from the date six years prior to the filing of this complaint to the date of judgment in this case, [allegedly] suffered damages" based on the allegations in the complaint. Complaint ¶ 87. Plaintiff alleges that the number of putative class members is "in the tens of thousands." *Id.* ¶ 89. Based on those allegations, the aggregate number of class members that plaintiff claims to represent is greater than 100 and thus satisfies 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(5)(B).

- b. Plaintiff Is A Citizen Of A Different State Than Project Fair Bid. Plaintiff alleges that he is a citizen of the state of Washington. Complaint ¶ 7. Plaintiff alleges that Project Fair Bid is a Delaware corporation whose principal place of business is California. Id. ¶ 6. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1), Project Fair Bid is a citizen of Delaware and California. Hertz Corp. v. Friend, 130 S. Ct. 1181, 1186 (2010). The minimal diversity required by CAFA is present because plaintiff and Project Fair Bid are citizens of different states. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A)
- Defendants Are Not States, State Officials, or Other Government c. Entities. Plaintiff alleges that defendants are private entities, which are not states, state officials, or government entities. Complaint ¶ 6. The requirement of 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(5)(A) is therefore satisfied.
- d. The \$5,000,000 Amount-in-Controversy Is Satisfied. Plaintiff alleges that members of the purported class have suffered actual damages that include, but are not limited to, "millions of dollars" in fees paid to Project Fair Bid. See, e.g., Complaint ¶ 195. Plaintiff also alleges that the purported class is entitled to treble any actual damages. *Id.* ¶¶ 201, 213, 256. Plaintiff also alleges that the purported class is entitled to disgorgement of "all monetary benefits" paid by any purported class member, which necessarily exceed the "millions of dollars" in fees allegedly paid. *Id.* ¶ 100. In sum, the defendants believe in good faith that the aggregate amount of the class members' claims exceeds \$5,000,000, and the amount-in-controversy requirement of 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(6) is satisfied.

Removal Has Been Effected Properly and All Defenses Are Preserved

11. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), Defendants have promptly provided notice of this Notice of Removal to the Superior Court of the State of Washington in and for King County.

CERTIFICATE OF ECF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that on May 12, 2011, I arranged for electronic filing of the foregoing document and

2

1

3

4

5

67

8

9

10

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

attached Exhibits with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, and I hereby certify that I have arranged for service of the same by personal delivery/messenger, to the following:

William Houck Houck Law Firm P.S. 4045 262nd Ave. SE Issaquah, WA 98029 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

s/ Theodore J. Angelis

Theodore J. Angelis K&L Gates LLP 925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98104 Phone: (206) 623-7580

Fax: (206) 623-7022

E-mail: theo.angelis@klgates.com