

1 SHANNON LISS-RIORDAN, *pro hac vice*  
(sliss@llrlaw.com)

2 LICHTEN & LISS-RIORDAN, P.C.

3 100 Cambridge Street, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor

Boston, MA 02114

4 Telephone: (617) 994-5800

5 Facsimile: (617) 994-5801

6 MONIQUE OLIVIER (SBN 190385)

(monique@dplolaw.com)

7 DUCKWORKTH, PETERS, LEBOWITZ, OLIVIER LLP

8 100 Bush Street, Suite 1800

San Francisco, CA 94104

9 Telephone: (415) 433-0333

10 Facsimile: (415) 449-6556

11  
12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
13 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

14 DOUGLAS O'CONNOR, THOMAS  
15 COLOPY, DAVID KHAN, MATTHEW  
16 MANAHAN, WILSON ROLLE, JR., and  
17 WILLIAM ANDERSON, individually and on  
18 behalf of all others similarly situated,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC,

22 Defendant.

Case No. CV 13-3826-EMC

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION  
COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND**

CASE FILED: AUGUST 16, 2013

BEFORE THE HON. EDWARD M. CHEN

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**<sup>1</sup>

2 1. This case is brought on behalf of individuals who have worked as Uber drivers  
3 anywhere in the United States (other than Massachusetts). Uber is a car service that provides  
4 drivers who can be hailed and dispatched through a mobile phone application. As set forth  
5 below, Uber advertises to customers that gratuity is included in the cost of its car service.  
6 However, Uber drivers do not receive the total proceeds of any such gratuity. Instead, they  
7 receive only a portion of such gratuity, if any is charged to the customer. Furthermore, based on  
8 Uber's communication to customers that gratuity is included in the price of its service and so  
9 they do not need to tip, few if any customers leave tips for the drivers. Thus, drivers do not  
10 receive the tips that are customary in the car service industry and that they would otherwise  
11 receive were it not for Uber's communication to customers that they do not need to tip.  
12  
13

14 2. Plaintiffs bring this action on their own behalf, and on behalf of all Uber drivers  
15 across the country (except in Massachusetts), for tortious interference with prospective economic  
16 advantage, breach of contract with customers (for which drivers are third party beneficiaries),  
17 violation of the California Gratuities Law, California Labor Code Section 351 (enforced through  
18 the UCL), and the California Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 *et seq.*  
19  
20

21  
22  
23 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs file this First Amended Complaint pursuant to the Court's Order of April 18,  
24 2014. Plaintiffs have removed from the complaint the portions of claims that the Court  
25 dismissed in its Order of December 5, 2013 (Doc. 58). However, in so doing, Plaintiffs do not  
26 waive their rights to the claims that have been dismissed, for appellate purposes, and Plaintiffs  
27 do not waive their rights to reinstitute claims against Travis Kalanick and Ryan Graves,  
individually, if appropriate. Plaintiffs have conferred with Defendant, who does not object to the  
filing of this amended complaint (while reserving the right to challenge the complaint) and who  
has acknowledged that Plaintiffs have not waived their rights for appellate purposes to the claims  
that have been dismissed.

1 (“UCL”), based upon Uber’s failure to remit to drivers the entire gratuity paid by customers, or  
2 alternatively for Uber’s causing the drivers not to receive tips they would otherwise receive  
3 based on Uber’s communications to customers that the gratuity is already included in the price of  
4 the car service and that there is no need to tip the drivers.  
5

6 3. In addition, Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of Uber drivers who have been  
7 misclassified as independent contractors and thereby required to pay business expenses (such as  
8 for their vehicles, gas, and maintenance) in violation of California Labor Code Section 2802.  
9

## 10 **II. PARTIES**

11 4. Plaintiff Douglas O’Connor is an adult resident of South San Francisco,  
12 California, where he works as an Uber driver.

13 5. Plaintiff Thomas Colopy is an adult resident of San Francisco, California, where  
14 he works as an Uber driver.

15 6. Plaintiff David Khan is an adult resident of San Francisco, California, where he  
16 has worked as an Uber driver.  
17

18 7. Plaintiff Matthew Manahan is an adult resident of Los Angeles, California, where  
19 he works as an Uber driver.

20 8. Plaintiff Wilson Rolle, Jr. is an adult resident of Atlanta, Georgia, where he  
21 works as an Uber driver.  
22

23 9. Plaintiff William Anderson is an adult resident of Seattle, Washington, where he  
24 works as an Uber driver.  
25  
26  
27







1 gratuities exist as to all members of the class and predominate over any questions affecting  
2 solely any individual members of the class. Among the questions of law and fact common to the  
3 class are:

- 4 a. Whether Defendant has charged customers a gratuity for class members' services;
- 5 b. Whether Defendant has failed to distribute the total proceeds of those gratuities to  
6 the class members;
- 7 c. Whether Defendant has informed customers that gratuity is included in the price  
8 of the Uber service and so there is no need to tip their drivers;
- 9 d. Whether class members had a reasonable expectation of receiving tips were it not  
10 for this representation Uber made to customers;
- 11 e. Whether class members have suffered damages based upon Uber's representation  
12 to customers that there is no need to tip the drivers.

13 32. Common questions of law and fact also exist as to members of the class who have  
14 been misclassified as independent contractors. Among the questions of law and fact that are  
15 common to these drivers are:

- 16 a. Whether class members have been required to follow uniform procedures and  
17 policies regarding their work for Uber;
- 18 b. Whether the work performed by class members—providing car service to  
19 customers—is within Uber's usual course of business, and whether such service is  
20 fully integrated into Uber's business;
- 21 c. Whether these class members have been required to bear the expenses of their  
22 employment, such as expenses for their vehicles, gas, and other expenses.

1           33.     The named plaintiffs are members of the class, who suffered damages as a result  
2 of Defendants' conduct and actions alleged herein.

3           34.     The named plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the class, and the named  
4 plaintiffs have the same interests as the other members of the class and subclass.

5           35.     The named plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests  
6 of the class. The named plaintiffs have retained able counsel experienced in class action  
7 litigation. The interests of the named plaintiffs are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the  
8 interests of the other class members.

9           36.     The questions of law and fact common to the members of the class predominate  
10 over any questions affecting only individual members, including legal and factual issues relating  
11 to liability and damages.

12           37.     A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient  
13 adjudication of this controversy because joinder of all class members is impractical. Moreover,  
14 since the damages suffered by individual members of the class may be relatively small, the  
15 expense and burden of individual litigation makes it practically impossible for the members of  
16 the class individually to redress the wrongs done to them. The class is readily definable and  
17 prosecution of this action as a class action will eliminate the possibility of repetitive litigation.  
18 There will be no difficulty in the management of this action as a class action.



1 **COUNT I**

2 **Tortious Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage**

3 38. Defendant's conduct, as set forth above, in failing to remit the total proceeds of  
4 gratuities to the drivers, constitutes unlawful tortious interference with the prospective economic  
5 advantageous relationship that exists between the drivers and the customers, under state common  
6 law. Furthermore, Defendant's conduct in informing Uber customers that there is no need to tip  
7 their drivers also constitutes unlawful tortious interference with the prospective economic  
8 advantageous relationship that exists between the drivers and the customers, under state common  
9 law.  
10  
11

12 **COUNT II**

13 **Breach of Contract**

14 39. Through its conduct, as set forth above, Defendant has an implied-in-fact  
15 contractual relationship with customers, pursuant to which the customers pay gratuity for the  
16 benefit of the drivers. Defendant has breached that contract by failing to remit to the drivers the  
17 total proceeds of all such gratuities. The drivers have suffered from this breach, as they are  
18 third-party beneficiaries of the contractual relationship between Defendants and the customers.  
19  
20

21 **COUNT III**

22 **Statutory Gratuity Violation (Enforced Through UCL)**

23 40. Defendant's conduct, as set forth above, in failing to remit all gratuities to the Uber  
24 drivers constitutes a violation of California Labor Code Section 351. This violation is  
25 enforceable pursuant to UCL § 17200.  
26  
27

1 **COUNT IV**

2 **Independent Contractor Misclassification and Expense Reimbursement Violation**

3 41. Defendant's conduct, as set forth above, in misclassifying Uber drivers as  
4 independent contractors, and failing to reimburse them for expenses they paid that  
5 should have been borne by their employer, constitutes a violation of California Labor Code  
6 Section 2802.

7 **COUNT V**

8 **Unfair Competition in Violation of California Business and Professions Code**  
9 **§ 17200 *et seq.***

10 42. Defendant's conduct, as set forth above, violates the California Unfair  
11 Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 *et seq.* ("UCL"). Defendant's conduct  
12 constitutes unlawful or fraudulent business acts or practices, in that Defendant has committed the  
13 tort of tortious interference with prospective economic advantage, breached implied-in-fact  
14 contracts with customers for whom the drivers are third party beneficiaries, and have violated  
15 California Labor Code Sections 351 and 2802. As a result of Defendant's unlawful and  
16 fraudulent conduct, Plaintiffs and class members suffered injury in fact and lost money and  
17 property, including, but not limited to loss of gratuities to which they were entitled and  
18 customers expected them to receive, loss of tips that customers did not pay to the drivers due to  
19 Defendant's deceptive representations, and business expenses that drivers were required to pay.  
20 Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiffs and class members  
21 seek declaratory and injunctive relief for Defendant's unlawful and fraudulent conduct and to  
22 recover restitution. Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, Plaintiffs and class  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

1 members are entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses incurred in  
2 bringing this action.

3  
4 **JURY DEMAND**

5 Plaintiffs request a trial by jury on all their claims.

6 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request that this Court certify this case as a class action,  
7 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23; award restitution for all charged gratuities which were not  
8 remitted to the drivers; award damages for Defendant's interference with drivers' receiving tips  
9 from customers; award reimbursement that the drivers who were misclassified as independent  
10 contractors were required to bear; award pre- and post-judgment interest; award reasonable  
11 attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses; and award any other relief to which the plaintiffs may be  
12 entitled.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Respectfully submitted,

2 DOUGLAS O'CONNOR, THOMAS COLOPY,  
3 DAVID KHAN, MATTHEW MANAHAN,  
4 WILSON ROLLE, JR., and WILLIAM  
ANDERSON, individually and on behalf of all  
5 others similarly situated,

6 By their attorneys,

7 /s/ Shannon Liss-Riordan  
8 Shannon Liss-Riordan, *pro hac vice*  
9 LICHTEN & LISS-RIORDAN, P.C.  
10 100 Cambridge Street, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
11 Boston, MA 02114  
12 (617) 994-5800  
13 Email: [sliss@lrlaw.com](mailto:sliss@lrlaw.com)

14 Monique Olivier, SBN 190385  
15 DUCKWORTH, PETERS,  
16 LEBOWITZ, OLIVIER, LLP  
17 100 Bush Street, Suite 1800  
18 San Francisco, CA 04104  
19 (415) 433-0333  
20 E-mail: [monique@dplolaw.com](mailto:monique@dplolaw.com)

21 Dated: May 30, 2014

22 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

23 I hereby certify that a copy of this motion was served by electronic filing on May 30,  
24 2014, on all counsel of record.

25 /s/ Shannon Liss-Riordan  
26 Shannon Liss-Riordan, Esq.