.

1 2 3	Paul L. Stritmatter, WSBA #4532 Kevin Coluccio, WSBA #16245 STRITMATTER KESSLER WHELAN COLUC 200 Second Avenue West Seattle, Washington 98119	CIO
5 4	Telephone: (206) 448-1777 Facsimile: (206) 728-2131 Email: pauls@skwwc.com	
5	Bruce L. Simon	
6	Esther L. Klisura	
7	COTCHETT, PITRE, SIMON & McCARTHY 840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200	
8	Burlingame, California 94010 Telephone: (650) 697-6000	
9	Facsimile: (650) 697-0577 Email: bsimon@cpsmlaw.com	· · · · ·
10	Harvey Rosenfield	
11	Pamela Pressley FOUNDATION FOR TAXPAYER AND	
12	CONSUMER RIGHTS 1750 Ocean Park Boulevard, Suite 200	
13	Santa Monica, California 90405 Telephone: (310) 392-0522	
14	Facsimile: (310) 392-8875 Email: harvey@consumerwatchdog.org	
15	Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class	
16	[Additional attorneys listed on signature page]	
17	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
18		T OF WASHINGTON
19	AT SE	ATTLE
20	MARYGRACE CONEFF, et al.) Master File No. C06-0944 RSM
21	Plaintiffs,	CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
22	. v.) DEMANÐ FOR JURY TRIAL
23	AT&T CORP., et al.,	
24	Defendants	{ }
25		<pre>{</pre>
26	·	·
27		
28		
	CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Mastor File No. C06-0944 RSM	STRITMATTER KESSLER WHELAN COLUCCIO 200 Second Avenue West, Seattle, WA 98119 Telephone; (206) 448-1777

TABLE OF CONTENTS

7			Page							
2										
3	. I.	INTRODUCTION								
4	II.	II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE								
5	.Ш.	PARTIES	2							
6		A. <u>Plaintiffs</u>								
7	-	B. <u>Defendants</u>	5							
8		C. <u>Agency / Joint Venture</u>	6							
9	IV.	FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS	6							
10		A. Cingular's Acquisition of AT&T Wireless	6							
11		B. <u>Cingular's False Representations and False Advertising</u>	7							
12		C. <u>Cingular's Dismantling of the AT&T Wireless Network</u>								
13	· .	D. Cingulat's Implementation of a Mandatory \$4.99 Monthly Fee	8							
14		E. <u>No Enforceable Agreement to Arbitrate</u>	9							
15	v.	CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS								
16	COUN	Dreach of Contract and Dreach of Invaliant								
17		Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing	13							
18	COUN	NT II Unjust Enrichment/Common Law Restitution	. 14							
19	COUN	NT III	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
20	0001	Violations of the Washington Consumer Protection Act and Similar Consumer Protection Laws in Other States	15							
21	VI.	PRAYER FOR RELIEF								
22	VII.	DEMAND FOR HIRY TRIAL	23							
23	1 11									
24										
25		-								
26										
27										
28										
	CLASS A	DLIDATED AMENDED STRITMATTER KESSLER WHELA S ACTION COMPLAINT 200 Second Avenue West, Se File No. C06-0944 RSM 1								

Plaintiffs Marygrace Coneff, Christine Aschero, Joanne Aschero, Alex Aschero, Jennie
 Bragg, Gina Franks, Amy Frerker, Addie Christine Lowry, Jeff Haymes, Harold Melendez,
 Michelle Johns, Kelly Petersen, Steven Knott, Liesa Krausse, Steven Shulman, and S. Leonard
 Shulman, on their own behalf and as representatives of a class of similarly situated parties,
 complain and allege on information and belief as follows:

6

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs bring this class action to challenge conduct related to Defendant 1. 7 8 Cingular Wireless LLC's ("Cingular") acquisition of Defendant AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. 9 ("AT&T Wireless") in 2004, Although Cingular publicly represented that the acquisition would be seamless for AT&T Wireless customers, those statements were far from true. In reality, after 10 11 the acquisition, Cingular deliberately dismantled the AT&T Wireless network so as to diminish and degrade the service provided to AT&T Wireless customers. Cingular did so in an effort to 12 13 induce AT&T Wireless customers into transferring their AT&T plans to Cingular plans, which 14 are more expensive and less favorable to consumers, and to charge AT&T Wireless customers 15 with various fees and costs in connection with those new plans.

In July 2006, Cingular began charging a \$4.99 monthly fee to AT&T Wireless
 subscribers who are on a TDMA/ Analog network just to continue use of that network. The
 imposition of this mandatory fee illustrates Cingular's strategy to force AT&T Wireless
 subscribers to either upgrade to a more expensive Cingular plan or to pay an early termination fee
 to get out of their AT&T service plan.

3. AT&T Wireless subscribers have been injured by, and continue to suffer injury as
 a result of, diminished service in the form of dropped calls and poor, or no reception, in areas
 where they previously received adequate reception. Additionally, former AT&T customers who
 have transferred to Cingular phone plans have been injured by the loss of their AT&T Wireless
 service plans, and the fees and costs associated with establishing new plans.

4. Plaintiffs hereby assert claims for breach of contract and breach of implied
covenant of good faith and fair dealing, and unjust enrichment/common law restitution. They
also assert claims under various States' consumer protection laws.

CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Master File No. C06-0944 RSM

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d). This is a class action involving more than 100 class members, a member of the class is a citizen of a state different from Defendants, and the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

6 6. Each Defendant has conducted business in this District. During the relevant time
7 period, Defendant AT&T Wireless had its principal place of business within this District, and
8 many of the acts alleged herein occurred in this District. Accordingly, venue in this District is
9 proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c).

III. PARTIES

11 A. <u>Plaintiffs</u>

1

2

3

4

5

10

12 7. Plaintiff MARYGRACE CONEFF is a resident of California. She was an AT&T
13 Wireless subscriber who experienced degraded service as a result of Cingular's dismantling of
14 the AT&T Wireless network. In order to obtain better phone serve, Ms. Coneff transferred to
15 Cingular, was charged an \$18 "transfer" or "upgrade" fee, purchased a Cingular phone, and was
16 required to agree to a new service contract with Cingular on terms that were less favorable than
17 her prior contract with AT&T Wireless,

8. Plaintiff CHRISTINE ASCHERO is a resident of California. She was an AT&T
 Wireless subscriber who experienced degraded service as a result of Cingular's dismantling of
 the AT&T Wireless network. Because of the poor service following Cingular's acquisition of
 AT&T Wireless, Ms. Aschero was induced to pay an early termination fee to cancel service
 before the expiration of her contract term.

9. Plaintiffs JOANNE ASCHERO and ALEX ASCHERO are residents of
 California. They are AT&T Wireless subscribers who experienced degraded service as a result
 of Cingular's dismantling of the AT&T Wireless network. Notwithstanding their degraded
 service, they have remained AT&T Wireless subscribers under their preexisting AT&T contract
 terms in order to avoid payment of an early termination fee.

28 ///

CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Master Filo No, C06-0944 RSM Plaintiff JENNIE BRAGG is a resident of California. She was an AT&T Wireless
 subscriber who experienced degraded service as a result of Cingular's dismantling of the AT&T
 Wireless network. In order to obtain better phone service, Ms. Bragg purchased a Cingular
 phone and agreed to a new service contract with Cingular on less favorable terms which included
 charges for additional services she did not request.

6 11. Plaintiff GINA FRANKS is a resident of Washington. She was an AT&T
7 Wireless subscriber who experienced degraded serve as a result of Cingular's dismantling of the
8 AT&T Wireless network. In an effort to obtain better phone service, Ms. Franks entered into a
9 new service contract with Cingular on terms less favorable that her previous contract with AT&T
10 Wireless.

11 12. Plaintiff AMY FRERKER is a resident of Washington. She was an AT&T
 12 Wireless subscriber who experienced degraded service as a result of Cingular's dismantling of
 13 the AT&T Wireless network. She suffered dropped calls, "system busy" signals, and other
 14 significant reduction of her telephone service.

15 13. Plaintiff ADDIE CHRISTINE LOWRY is a resident of Florida. She was an 16 AT&T Wireless subscriber with multiple phone lines who experienced degraded service as a result of Cingular's dismantling of the AT&T Wireless network. The service she received was 17 so poor that one of her four phone lines became completely unusable. When Ms. Lowry 18 19 complained to Defendants about the poor service, she was informed she could either upgrade to a 20 more expensive plan, or pay a termination fee to cancel service. Ms. Lowry chose to wait out the 21 contract for three lines and pay the termination fee to cancel a fourth line that was rendered 22 unusable. Since September 2006, Cingular has been charging Ms, Lowry an extra \$4.99 a month 23 just to remain on the TDMA/Analog network,

14. Plaintiff JEFF HAYMES is a resident of Arizona. He was an AT&T Wireless
customer for many years and experienced degraded service as a result of Cingular's dismantling
of the AT&T Wireless network, including dropped calls, "system busy" signals, and other
significant reduction in the quality of his service. In an effort to get better service, Mr. Haymes
paid an \$18 to upgrade to a Cingular phone plan on terms less favorable than his previous AT&T

3

CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Master File No. C06-0944 RSM 1 Wireless plan.

15. Plaintiff HAROLD MELENDEZ is a resident of Arizona. He was an AT&T
 Wireless customer who experienced degraded service as a result of Cingular's dismantling of the
 AT&T Wireless network. After complaining to Defendants about the poor service, Mr.
 Melendez upgraded to a less favorable Cingular service plan and purchased a new phone and
 SIM card.

7 16. Plaintiff MICHELLE JOHNS is a resident of Virginia. She had been an AT&T
8 Wireless subscriber for several years before Cingular dismantled the AT&T network. Thereafter,
9 Ms. Johns' service became so degraded and unreliable that she had no choice but to purchase a
10 Cingular phone and transfer to a Cingular service plan that is less favorable than the plan she had
11 with AT&T Wireless.

17. Plaintiff KELLY PETERSEN is a resident of California. She was an AT&T
Wireless subscriber who experienced degraded service as a result of Cingular's dismantling of
the AT&T Wireless network, including having dropped calls, "system not available" messages,
and other significant reduction in the quality of her wireless service. In an effort to get better
service, she was forced to purchase a new phone, pay \$18 for a new SIM card, and upgrade to a
Cingular plan on terms that were less favorable than her prior contract with AT&T Wireless,

Plaintiff STEVEN KNOTT is a resident of Alabama. He was an AT&T Wireless
 subscriber who experienced degraded service as a result of Cingular's dismantling of the AT&T
 Wireless network. When Mr. Knott complained about the degraded service to Defendants, he
 was advised that he should "upgrade" and purchase new phones, or pay an early termination fee
 of \$175. Mr. Knott upgraded to a Cingular plan that cost almost twice as much as his AT&T
 plan, was forced to purchase two Cingular phones, and was charged an \$18 upgrade fee.

19. Plaintiff LIESA KRAUSSE is a resident of New Jersey. She was an AT&T
Wireless subscriber who experienced degraded service as a result of Cingular's dismantling of
the AT&T Wireless network. After numerous dropped phone calls, including one during a phone
call from her mother reporting a medical emergency, Ms. Krausse complained to Defendants.
She was informed that her options were to drive 20 miles to be closer to a network tower, to

upgrade to a new phone, or to cancel her AT&T plan and incur an early termination fee. Because
 Ms. Krausse believed she was not being provided adequate service under her AT&T service plan,
 she cancelled the contract and asked that the termination fee be waived. Cingular assessed a
 \$175 early termination fee anyways and sent the fee to collections thereby affecting Ms.
 Krausse's credit score.

6 20. Plaintiffs STEVEN SHULMAN and S. LEONARD SHULMAN are residents of
7 Washington. They were AT&T Wireless subscribers who experienced degraded service as a
8 result of Cingular's dismantling of the AT&T Wireless network. In particular, they experienced
9 an increase in the number of dropped calls and increased static. In an effort to obtain better
10 service, they upgraded to a more expensive Cingular service plan, purchased a new phone, and
11 paid \$18 for a new SIM card.

12 B, <u>Defendants</u>

13 21. Defendant CINGULAR WIRELESS LLC is a Delaware limited liability company
 14 with its principal place of business in Atlanta, Georgia. Cingular Wireless LLC was formed in
 15 April 2000 as a joint venture between SBC Communications Inc. and Bell South Corporation and
 16 provides wireless phone services.

17 22. Defendant CINGULAR WIRELESS CORPORATION is a Delaware corporation 18 with its principal place of business in Atlanta, Georgia, Cingular Wireless Corporation is a 19 holding company for Defendant Cingular Wireless LLC and has no material assets other than 20Cingular Wireless LLC. Like Cingular Wireless LLC, Cingular Wireless Corporation is jointly 21 controlled by SBC Communications, Inc. and Bell South Corporation. As used herein, 22 "Cingular" refers to Cingular Wireless Corporation and its alter ego, Cingular Wireless LLC, 23 23. Defendant AT&T WIRELESS SERVICES, INC. ("AT&T Wireless") was formed

in July 2001 as a Delaware corporation. At all relevant times, AT&T Wireless had its principal
place of business in Redmond, Washington. In October 2004, AT&T Wireless was acquired by
Cingular and renamed New Cingular Wireless Services, Inc.

- 27
- 28

24. Defendant NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS SERVICES, INC. ("New Cingular") is a New York corporation with its principal place of business in Atlanta, Georgia. New Cingular

5

CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Master File No. C06-0944 RSM was formed in October 2004 as the successor-in-interest to Defendant AT&T Wireless. New
 Cingular is a wholly owned subsidiary of Defendant Cingular Wireless LLC.

C. <u>Agency / Joint Venture</u>

At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were agents or joint
venturers of each of the other Defendants, and in doing the acts alleged herein were acting within
the course and scope of such agency. Each Defendant had actual and/or constructive knowledge
of the acts of each of the other Defendants, and ratified, approved, joined in, acquiesced in,
and/or authorized the wrongful acts of each co-defendant, and/or retained the benefits of said
wrongful acts.

10

11

3

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. <u>Cingular's Acquisition of AT&T Wireless</u>

At the end of 2003, Cingular was the second largest provider of wireless 12 26. communications services in the United States in terms of subscribership. Cingular had 24 13 million customers as of December 31, 2003, and reported \$15.5 billion in revenues for 2003. 14 Cingular provided its customers wireless voice and data service over a nationwide wireless 15 16 network which it maintained. The Cingular network provided extensive coverage throughout the United States. In addition, Cingular entered into network access agreements with other network 17 operators in the United States to provide additional network coverage for Cingular subscribers. 18 At the end of 2003, AT&T Wireless was the third largest provider of wireless 19 27. communications services in the United States based on subscribership. AT&T Wireless had 22 20 21 million customers as of December 31, 2003, and reported \$16.7 billion in revenues for 2003. 22 AT&T Wireless provided wireless voice and data service over a nationwide wireless network. The network operated and maintained by AT&T Wireless provided extensive coverage 23 throughout the United States. In addition, AT&T Wireless entered into network access 24agreements with other network operators in the United States to provide additional network 25 26coverage for AT&T Wireless subscribers.

27



28. On February 17, 2004, Cingular and AT&T Wireless entered into an agreement whereby Cingular would acquire AT&T Wireless for \$41 billion. Upon completion of the

CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Mastor File No. C06-0944 RSM

	•								
1	acquisition, AT&T Wireless would be renamed New Cingular Wireless Services, Inc. and would								
2	operate as a solely-owned subsidiary of Cingular.								
3	29. Cingular's acquisition of AT&T Wireless was completed on October 26, 2004.								
4	B. Cingular's False Representations and False Advertising								
5.	30. Cingular publicly represented that its acquisition of AT&T Wireless would result								
6	in "increased network and spectrum capacity in areas where Cingular and AT&T Wireless are								
7	already providing service," and would "greatly improve service quality and coverage." See								
8	Memorandum Opinion & Order, FCC 04-255, ¶29 (Oct. 26, 2004), attached hereto as Exhibit A.								
9	31. On October 26, 2004, Cingular issued a press release stating that Cingular would								
10	"allow customers of both companies to use the new, combined network without roaming								
11	charges," and that "Customers of both companies will continue to enjoy the benefits of their								
12	current phones, rate plans and features, without any service interruption." Stan Sigman,								
13	Cingular's President and Chief Executive Officer, stated that the company was "working to make								
14	this transition as seamless as possible for customers of AT&T Wireless." Sigman assured AT&T								
15	Wireless customers that they would be able to "continue using their existing phones and rate								
16	plans B but now have access to the largest digital voice and data network in the country."								
17	32. On October 29, 2004, Cingular issued a press release to unveil its new "Raising								
18	the Bar" advertising campaign. The press release stated:								
19	"Raising the Bar" is more than a tagline, it's about providing the type of service that customers expect from their wireless company The most								
20	tangible example of how Cingular is "Raising the Bar" is the newly combined network, the largest digital voice and data network in the United								
21	States. Cingular is calling it the "Allover" network, People will quickly begin to see more bars in more places Our "Raising the Bar" tagline								
22	and "ALLOVER" network branding campaign allows us to clearly communicate a real improvement in network and service quality.								
23	communicate a rear improvement in network and service quanty,								
24	C. <u>Cingular's Dismantling of the AT&T Wireless Network</u>								
25	33. Contrary to Cingular's assurances that AT&T Wireless customers would have								
26	access to a "combined network," Cingular instead implemented a deliberate scheme to dismantle								
27	the AT&T Wireless network in order to degrade the service provided to AT&T Wireless								
28	customers and induce them to transfer to the Cingular network.								

:

34. 1 As part of its scheme, Cingular ceased maintaining the AT&T Wireless network 2 facilities. According to published reports, Cingular "has been spending next to nothing to maintain the [AT&T Wireless] network, leaving customers who don't upgrade [to the Cingular 3 network] in the lurch." Why You Still Can't Hear Me Now, The Wall Street Journal, May 25, 4 5 2005, at D1. It has also been reported that "industry analysts believe that Cingular is investing close to nothing" to maintain the AT&T Wireless network. How Cellular Services Rank On 6 7 Complaints: Cingular Tops FCC List With Most Gripes Per Customer, Dropped Calls, Billing 8 Errors, The Wall Street Journal, March 29, 2005, at D1, D5.

9 35. As part of its scheme, Cingular encouraged AT&T Wireless customers suffering from degraded service to "upgrade" to Cingular. These upgrades, however, require consumers 1011 to: (i) pay an \$18 "transfer" fee to Cingular; (ii) purchase a new phone from Cingular; (iii) pay 12 \$18 for the SIM chip which enables the phone to operate; and (iv) enter into a new service 13 contract with Cingular that is usually less favorable to the customer than the customer's existing 14 contract with AT&T Wireless. AT&T Wireless customers who do not agree to such an "upgrade" are left with the choice of fulfilling their contract term with AT&T Wireless despite .15 16 degraded or non-existent service, or paying an early termination fee of \$175 to cancel service 17 before the expiration of the 12 or 24-month contract term.

18

D. <u>Cingular's Implementation of a Mandatory \$4.99 Monthly Fee</u>

19 36. In October of 2004, the Federal Communication Commission approved Cingular's

20 acquisition of AT&T Wireless on the condition that Cingular keep AT&T Wireless'

21 TDMA/Analog system in place until at least February of 2008.

22

26

27

28

37. Approximately 4.7 million current AT&T Wireless customers rely on the

23 TDMA/Analog network.

38. In July 2006, Defendants included the following statement in its billing statements
to Cingular and AT&T Wireless customers;

The rates for your service on Cingular's TDMA/Analog network are increasing. As early as September, a TDMA/Analog network charge of \$4,99 per line will appear on your bill each month. Alternatively, you have the option to upgrade to a handset and rate plan on our new and improved GSM network, the largest voice and data network in America, with the fewest dropped calls of any national wireless carrier.

CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Master File No, C06-0944 RSM 1 See Exhibit B.

2 39. Cingular also issued a press release stating it would start charging customers with
3 TDMA and Analog cellphones an extra \$4.99 monthly fee as early as September 2006 unless, as
4 the language expresses above, current AT&T customers purchase a new phone and commits to a
5 2-year "upgraded" Cingular service contract on Cingular's GSM network.

.

40. Because most current AT&T Wireless subscribers use phones that operate on the
TDMA/Analog network, Cingular is effectively targeting current AT&T Wireless subscribers
and using the \$4.99 monthly charge to make it economically disadvantageous to keep their
current service. What Cingular has omitted from the \$4.99 fee statement is the fact that they will
charge an early termination fee to AT&T subscribers who do not wish to incur the \$4.99 charge,
or who do not wish to pay for a new phone and get locked into a 2-year Cingular plan.

Cingular's implementation of the mandatory \$4.99 monthly fee is a pretextual tactic to compel
current AT&T subscribers to forfeit their existing AT&T calling plans and to purchase new
telephones and accessories for a more expensive Cingular plan. This leaves AT&T Wireless
subscribers with no meaningful alternative. Similar to its dismantling of the AT&T Wireless
network, Cingular's imposition of the \$4.99 monthly charge is designed to wrongfully induce
migration to Cingular.

18

Е.

No Enforceable Agreement to Arbitrate

19 41, Defendants have inserted clauses into customer contracts that purport to impose 20mandatory arbitration and a waiver of the right to participate in class actions. However, these 21 contracts are contracts of adhesion drafted entirely by the Defendants on a take-it-or-leave-it 22 basis in a setting in which disputes between the contracting parties predictably involve small 23 amounts of damages. Plaintiffs had neither the bargaining power, nor the ability, to change the 24 contractual terms. Defendants rely on the mandatory arbitration and class action waiver 25 provisions to shield themselves against consumers' use of the civil justice system to redress 26 Defendants' misconduct. In practice, the waiver virtually immunizes the Defendants from 27 responsibility for their own wrongful conduct. Such waivers are unconscionable under State and 28 Federal law and should not be enforced.

CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Master File No. C06-0944 RSM

42. 1 The mandatory arbitration provision and, particularly, the class action waiver 2 provision in these contracts have repeatedly been held unenforceable. See, e.g., Ting v. AT&T 3 Corp., 319 F.3d 1126 (9th Cir. 2002), cert. denied, 540 U.S. 811 (2003); Discover Bank v. Superior Court (Boehr), 36 Cal.4th 148 (2005); Ball v. Cingular Wireless, LLC, Case No. 4 5 04CC06353, Order Denying Motion of Defendant Cingular Wireless, LLC To Compel 6 Arbitration And Stay Action (Cal. Superior Court Feb. 7, 2005) (Cingular's arbitration clause found unconscionable); In re Cellphone Termination Fee Cases, J.C.C.P. 4332, Order Denying 7 Motions of AT&T and Cingular To Compel Arbitration (Cal. Superior Court Jan. 20, 2004) 8 9 (holding AT&T's arbitration clause and three different forms of Cingular's arbitration clauses 10 found unconscionable); affirmed by Parrish v, Cingular Wireless LLC, 129 Cal. App,4th 601 11 (2005); Tamayo v. Brainstorm, USA, 154 Fed Appx, 564 (9th Cir, 2005) (class action waiver in an arbitration clause contained in Cingular's adhesive contract found unconscionable and not 12 13 valid under California law).

14 43. Both AT&T Wireless and Cingular have recently and extensively litigated the
15 enforceability of their purported arbitration clauses, including appeals, petitions for review, and
16 petitions for certiorari to the California Court of Appeals, the California Supreme Court, the
17 United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and the United States Supreme Court.

44. Despite suffering defeats in each of these courts, Defendants remain obstinate. As
part of a deliberate scheme to delay meritorious litigation, Defendants continue to bring frivolous
motions to compel arbitration so that Cingular can continue to benefit and derive millions of
dollars in revenue from its wrongful conduct. Such a delay imposes unnecessary and
burdensome costs on customers who assert meritorious claims and ultimately discourages
customers from pursuing their legal rights. See, e.g., Ting v. AT&T Corp., 319 F.3d 1126 (9th
Cir, 2002).

45. Plaintiffs believe that the purported arbitration agreements of AT&T Wireless and
Cingular are entirely pretextual. Neither AT&T Wireless nor Cingular has ever used arbitration
to resolve its own claims against a customer. Instead, both have resolved millions of claims
against customers by assigning them to collection agencies who then pursue a variety of means to

resolve them, including filing lawsuits, but not arbitration. Plaintiffs are aware of no customer 1 2 who has ever been awarded any relief by an arbitrator pursuant to any AT&T Wireless or 3 Cingular arbitration agreement. Moreover, despite the fact that AT&T Wireless included an arbitration clause in its terms and conditions beginning in July 1999, no dispute between AT&T 4 5 Wireless and a customer has ever been arbitrated. ٧. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS 6 Plaintiffs bring this action as a class action for equitable, injunctive and 7 46. declaratory relief as well as monetary relief pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil 8 9 Procedure on behalf of the following Class and Sub-Class: The "Class" is defined as all subscribers of AT&T Wireless in the United 10 States as of October 26, 2004. 11 The "Sub-Class" is defined as all subscribers of AT&T Wireless in the United States who have been advised that they will incur an 12 additional \$4.99 monthly fee for access to the TDMA/Analog network. 13 14 47. Plaintiffs Marygrace Coneff, Christine Aschero, Joanne Aschero, Alex Aschero, Jennie Bragg, Gina Franks, Amy Frerker, Addie Christine Lowry, Jeff Haymes, Harold 15 Melendez, Michelle Johns, Kelly Petersen, Steven Knott, Liesa Krausse, Steven Shulman, and S. 16 17 Leonard Shulman are members of the Class. Plaintiffs Addie Christine Lowry, Joanne Aschero, 18 and Alex Aschero are also members of the Sub-Class. 19 The members of the Class are readily ascertainable but are so numerous that 48. joinder is impracticable. The exact number and names of the members of the Class are presently 20 21 unknown to Plaintiffs, but can be ascertained readily through appropriate discovery. Plaintiffs believe that there are hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of members of the Class, whose 22 23 names and addresses can be readily discovered upon examination of the records in the custody 24 and control of Defendants. There are questions of law and fact common to the Class. Defendants pursued a 25 49. 26common course of conduct toward the class as alleged. This action arises out of a common nucleus of operative facts, Common questions include, but are not limited to, the following; 27 28 whether Cingular has maintained the AT&T Wireless network since its a.

1			acquisition of AT&T Wireless;				
2		b.	whether Defendants fulfilled their service obligations to Plaintiffs and the				
3			Class pursuant to the AT&T Wireless Contracts;				
4		c.	whether Defendants charged Plaintiffs and the Class fees in violation of				
5			the AT&T Wireless Contracts;				
6		d.	whether Defendants misrepresented to Plaintiffs and the Class that they				
7			would have access to a higher network quality,				
8		e,	whether Defendants intended to induce AT&T Wireless customers to				
9			migrate to Cingular;				
10		f.	whether Plaintiffs and the Class were wrongfully induced to cancel their				
11	•		AT&T Wireless plans thereby incurring termination fees;				
12		g.	whether Plaintiffs and the Class were wrongfully induced to enter into				
13		-	service contracts with Cingular thereby incurring the fees and costs				
14			associated with new service plans; and				
15		h.	whether Defendants violated the Washington Consumer Protection Act,				
16			RCW 19.86.010, et seq., and similar consumer protection laws of other				
17			States.				
18	50.	The c	laims of the named Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Class. Each of				
19	the named Pla	untiffs	suffered from degraded service due to Cingular's dismantling of the AT&T				
20	Wireless netw	vork, ar	nd were harmed thereby.				
21	51.	Plaint	tiffs will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class,				
22	and common	issues o	of law and fact predominate.				
23	52, Plaintiffs have retained counsel competent and experienced in prosecuting						
24	complex nationwide consumer class actions.						
25	53.	Notio	e of this class action can be provided to Class members by techniques and				
26.	forms similar	to thos	e customarily used in consumer class actions, such as direct notice,				
27	published not	ice, Int	ernet notice, a combination thereof, or by other methods suitable to this				
28	Class.						

`

54. Class certification is appropriate because Cingular has acted, or refused to act, on
 grounds generally applicable to the Class, making class-wide equitable, injunctive, declaratory,
 and monetary relief appropriate. In addition, the prosecution of separate actions by or against
 individual members of the Class would create a risk of incompatible standards of conduct for
 Defendants and inconsistent or varying adjudications for all parties. A class action is superior to
 other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this action.

COUNT I

Breach of Contract and Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing

10 55. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all allegations of all prior paragraphs as though
11 fully set forth herein.

12

7

8

9

56. This Count I is brought on behalf of the Class and Sub-Class.

57. Each member of the Class entered into a contract with AT&T Wireless under
which AT&T agreed to provide wireless service to that Class member ("AT&T Wireless
Contracts"). Although the AT&T Wireless Contracts are form contracts that were revised by
AT&T Wireless from time to time, each of them is substantially in the form of the AT&T
Wireless Terms and Conditions attached hereto as Exhibit C.

18 58. Every contract, including each of the AT&T Wireless Contracts, imposes upon
19 each party a duty of good faith and fair dealing in its performance and enforcement.

20 59. The AT&T Wireless Contracts govern the relationship between the subscriber and
21 "the entity licensed to provide service in the area associated with [the subscriber's] assigned
22 telephone, data, and/or messaging number(s)." See Exhibit C. Thus, as a result of Cingular's
23 acquisition of AT&T Wireless, it is a party to the AT&T Wireless Contracts.

60. By dismantling the AT&T Wireless network in order to degrade the service
provided, by charging an \$18 fee to "upgrade" or "transfer" to a Cingular plan, and by inducing
AT&T Wireless customers to incur additional expenses (new phone, SIM chip, and additional
services), Cingular and AT&T Wireless have breached the AT&T Wireless Contracts and have
substantially diminished the utility and value of AT&T Wireless plans/phones for the remainder

of the contract term.

2 61. By unilaterally assessing AT&T Wireless subscribers an additional \$4.99 monthly
3 fee, Cingular and AT&T Wireless have breached the AT&T Wireless Contracts and have
4 substantially diminished the value of AT&T Wireless plans/phones for the remainder of the
5 contract terms.

6 62. Plaintiffs and the Class have suffered monetary damages in the form of such fees
7 and charges described above.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs and the Class pray for relief as set forth below.

9 10

13

8

1

<u>COUNT II</u>

Unjust Enrichment/Common Law Restitution

11 63. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all allegations of all prior paragraphs as though
12 fully set forth herein.

64. This Count II is brought on behalf of the Class and Sub-Class.

14 65. Through the scheme described above, Defendants have charged Class members
15 fees in violation of their contractual rights, and statutory and common law, including but not
16 limited to the charge of an \$18 "transfer" or "upgrade" fee, and other fees and charges described
17 above.

18 66. By stating its intent to charge AT&T Wireless customers with TDMA /Analog
19 phones an additional \$4.99 per month on top of their contractually agreed monthly rates,
20 Cingular has been unjustly enriched by any amounts paid by AT&T customers to "upgrade" to a
21 new Cingular service plan, purchase new Cingular phones, or pay an early termination fee.

67. Defendants have reaped substantial profit from the aggressive marketing and sales
of "upgraded" Cingular service plans, as well as the sale of new phones. Ultimately, this resulted
in Defendants' wrongful receipt of profits and injury to Plaintiffs and the Class. As a direct and
proximate result of Defendants' misconduct as set forth above, Defendants have been unjustly
enriched.

27

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs and the Class pray for relief as set forth below.

14

28 ///

CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Master File No. C06-0944 RSM

2

3

6

COUNT III

Violations of the Washington Consumer Protection Act and Similar Consumer Protection Laws in Other States

4 68. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all allegations of all prior paragraphs as though
5 fully set forth herein.

69. This Count III is brought on behalf of the Class and Sub-Class.

7 70. The Defendants, by their conduct alleged herein, violated the Consumer Protection Act of the State of Washington, RCW 19,86, Specifically, Defendants' conduct 8 9 constitutes deceptive and unfair acts or practices in the conduct of trade or commerce in violation 10 of RCW 19,86.020. Defendants' acts adversely affected the public interest and are a proximate 11 cause of injury and monetary damages to Plaintiffs and the Class in an amount to be proven at 12 trial. Defendants are liable to Plaintiffs and the Class for damages. In addition to actual 13 damages, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to recover treble damages up to \$10,000 per 14 Plainfiff and Class member, costs, and attorneys' fees pursuant to RCW 19.86.090. 15 71. Similarly, Defendants' conduct as alleged herein violates the unfair and deceptive 16 acts and practices laws of each of the following jurisdictions: Alaska: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Alaska's Unfair 17 a. 18 Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Act, Alaska Stat. § 45,50,471, et 19 seq. Arkansas: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Arkansas 20 b. 21Code Ann. § 4-88-101, et seq. 22 с California: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of 23 California's Unfair Competition Law, Business and Professions Code § 24 17200, et seq., California's False Advertising Act, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code 25§ 17500, et seq., and the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Cal. 26 Civ. Code § 1750, et seq. 27 d. Colorado: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of the -

Colorado Consumer Protection Act, Colo. Rev. Stat. § 6-1-101, et seg.

CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Master File No, C06-0944 RSM

	•	
1	ę.	Connecticut: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of
2		Connecticut's Gen. Stat. § 42-110a, et seq.
3	f.	Delaware: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Delaware's
4		Consumer Fraud Act, Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2511, et seq.; and the
5	-	Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2531, et seq.
6	g.	District of Columbia: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of
7		the District of Columbia's Consumer Protection Act, D.C. Code §
8		28-3901, et seq.
9	h.	Florida: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Florida's
10		Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act, Fla. Stat. § 501,201, et seq.
11	i.	Georgia: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Georgia's
12		Fair Business Practices Act, Ga. Code Ann. § 10-1-390, et seq.
13		Hawaii: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Hawaii's
14		Unfair Practices Act, Haw. Rev. Stat. § 481-1, et seq.
15.	k.	Idaho: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Idaho's
16		Consumer Protection Act, Idaho Code Ann. § 48-601, et seq.
17	l. ,	Illinois: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Illinois'
18		Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act, 815 Ill. Comp.
19		Stat. 505/1; and the Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act, 815 Ill.
20		Comp. Stat. 510/1.
21	m,	Iowa: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Iowa's
22		Consumer Fraud Act, Iowa Code § 714.16
23	n,	Kansas: Defendants' practices were and are in violation Kansas' Unfair
24		Trade and Consumer Protection Act, Kan. Stat. Ann. § 50-101, et seq.
25	0.	Kentucky: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Kentucky's
26		Consumer Protection Act, Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 367.110, et seq.
27	p.	Maine: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Maine's Unfair
28		Trade Practices Act, Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. tit. 5, § 205-A, et seq.

CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Master File No, CO6-0944 RSM

·.'

1	q,	Maryland: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Maryland's
2	-	Consumer Protection Act, Md. Com. Law Code § 13-101, et seq.
3	r,	Massachusetts: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of
4		Massachusetts' Consumer Protection Act, Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 93A, et
5		seq.
6	· S,	Minnesota: Defendants' practices were and are in violation Minnesota's
7		Prevention of Consumer Fraud Act, Minn. Stat. § 325F.68, et seq.; and the
8		Unlawful Trade Practices Law, Minn. Stat. § 325D.09, et seq.
9	t.	Missouri: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Missouri's
10		Merchandising Practices Act, Mo. Rev. Stat. § 407.010, et seq.
11	u.	Montana: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of the
12		Montana's Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Act, Mont.
13		Code Ann. § 30-14-101, et seq.
14	v.	Nebraska: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Nebraska's
15		Consumer Protection Act, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59-1601, et seq.; and the
16 <u></u>		Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act, § 87-302, et seq.
17	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	New Hampshire: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of New
18		Hampshire's Rev. Stat. Ann. § 358-A:1, et seq.
19	x.	New Jersey: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of New
20	-	Jersey's Consumer Fraud Act, N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-1, et seq.
21	. у,	New Mexico: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of New
22		Mexico's Unfair Practices Act, N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-12-3, et seq.
23	Z,	New York: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of New
24		York's Gen. Bus. Law § 349, et seq.
25	aa.	North Carolina: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of North
26	, .	Carolina's Unfair Deceptive Trade Practices Act, N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-1,
27		et seq.
28	bb,	North Dakota: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of North
	CONSOLIDATED AMEND	ED STRFTMATTER KESSLER WHELAN COLUCCIO

CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Master File No. C06-0944 RSM

l

.

-		
1		Dakota's Unlawful Sales or Advertising Practices law, N.D. Cent. Code §
2		51-15-02, et seq.
3	cc.	Ohio: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Ohio's
4		Consumer Sales Practices Act, Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 1345.01, et seq.;
5		and Ohio's Deceptive Sales Practices law, Ohio Rev. Code Ann. §
6		4165.01, et seq.
7	dd.	Oregon: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Oregon's
8		Unlawful Trade Practices law, Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.605, et seq.
9	66.	Pennsylvania: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of
10		Pennsylvania's Unfair Trade Practice and Consumer Protection law, 73 Pa.
11		Stat. Ann. § 201-1, et seq.
12	ff.	Rhode Island: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Rhode
13		Island's Deceptive Trade Practices Act, R.I. Gen. Laws § 6-13.1-1, et seq.
14	gg.	South Carolina: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of South
15		Carolina's Unfair Trade Practices Act, S.C. Code Ann. § 39-5-10, et seq.
16	hh.	Tennessee: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of
17		Tennessee's Consumer Protection Act of 1977, Tenn. Code Ann. §
18		47-18-101, et seq.
19	ii.	Texas: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Texas'
20		Deceptive Trade Practices-Consumer Protection Act, Tex. Bus. & Com.
21		Code Ann. § 17.41, et seq.
22	jj.	Utah: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Utah's Truth in
23		Advertising Law, Utah Code Ann. § 13-11a-1, et seq.;
24	kk.	Vermont: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Vermont's
25		Consumer Fraud law, Vermont Stat. Ann. tit. 9, § 2451, et seq.
26	11.	Virginia: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of Virginia's
27		Consumer Protection Act, Va. Code Ann. § 59.1-198, et seq.
28	mm.	West Virginia: Defendants' practices were and are in violation of West

CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Master File No. C06-0944 RSM

•

Virginia's Consumer Credit Protection Act, W.Va. Code § 46A-1-101, et seq.

72. Defendants violated the aforementioned State consumer protection laws by
dismantling the AT&T Wireless network in order to degrade the services provided to AT&T
Wireless customers and by charging Class members fees in violation of their contractual rights
and statutory and common law, including the \$18 "transfer fee," and other fees and charges
described above.

8 73. As a result of these violations, Defendants have been unjustly enriched to the 9 extent that they have collected funds from Plaintiffs and members of the Class, including the \$18 10 "transfer fee," phone charges, SIM chip fees, and higher costing service plans. Further, plaintiffs 11 and the members of the Class have suffered monetary damages in the form of such fees and 12 charges described above.

74. As a result of Defendants' violations of the aforementioned States' consumer
protection laws, Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to recover compensatory damages,
restitution, punitive and special damages including but not limited to treble damages, reasonable
attorneys' fees and costs, and other injunctive or declaratory relief as deemed appropriate.

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs and the Class pray for relief as set forth below.

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs and the Class pray for relief as follows:

 For an Order certifying this action as a class action on behalf of the Class and Sub-Class described above;

For restitution and/or disgorgement of all amounts wrongfully charged to
 Plaintiffs and members of the Class;

3. For damages according to proof;

For a judicial declaration that Defendants have breached the AT&T Wireless
 Contracts and, by reason of such breach, members of the Class may terminate
 those contracts without incurring a penalty in the form of an early termination fee;

5. For costs of suit herein incurred;

Case 2:06-cv-00944-RSM Document 27

Filed 09/15/2006 Page 22 of 26

	б.	For both pre and post-judgment interest on any amounts awarded;
	7.	For an award of treble or punitive damages under applicable law;
	8.	For an award of attorneys' fees as appropriate pursuant to the provisions of the
		Consumer Protection Act of Washington, and other similar provisions;
-	9,	For declaratory judgment and injunctive relief declaring the mandatory arbitratio
		clauses and class action waiver of rights to participation as unconstitutional,
-	-	unconscionable and unenforceable and enjoining enforcement thereof;
1 .	10.	For declaratory judgment and injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants from
-		charging the \$4.99 monthly fee to TDMA/Anolog users, declaring said fee to be
	· .	unenforceable, a violation of the contract, and enjoining enforcement thereof,
		including any efforts to collect;
P	11.	For corrective advertising to ameliorate consumers' mistaken impressions create
		by Defendants' prior advertising; and
	12.	For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.
	DAT	ED this 15th day of September, 2006
		Paul L. Stritmatter, WSBA #4532
		Kevin Coluccio, WSBA #16245 STRITMATTER KESSLER WHELAN
		COLUCCIO. 200 Second Avenue West
		Seattle, Washington 98119 Telephone: (206) 448-1777
		Facsimile: (206) 728-2131 Email: pauls@skwwc.com
		Bruce L. Simon
		Esther L. Klisura COTCHETT, PITRE, SIMON & McCARTHY
		840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200 Burlingame, California 94010 Telephone: (650) 697-6000 Facsimile: (650) 697-0577
		Email: bsimon@cpsmlaw.com
CLAS	S ACTION	D AMENDED STRITMATTER KESSLER WHELAN COLUC COMPLAINT 200 Second Avenue West, Scattle, WA 9 b6-0944 RSM 20 Telephone: (206) 448.

Harvey Rosenfield 1 Pamela Pressley FOUNDATION FOR TAXPAYER AND 2 CONSUMER RIGHTS 3 1750 Ocean Park Boulevard, Suite 200 Santa Monica, California 90405 Telephone: (310) 392-0522 Facsimile: (310) 392-8875 4 5 Email: harvey@consumerwatchdog.org Attorneys for Plaintiffs Marygrace Coneff, Christine Aschero, Joanne Aschero, Alex Aschero, 6 7 Jennie Bragg, Gina Franks, Amy Frerker, Addie Christine Lowry, Jeff Haymes, and Harold Melendez and the Class 8 9 John W. Hathaway, WSBA #8443 JOHN W. HATHAWAY, PLLC 10 701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4600 Seattle, Washington 98104 11 Telephone: (206) 624-7100 Facsimile: (206) 624-9292 12 Email: jhathaway@seanet.com 13 Joseph E. Levi 14 Eduard Korsinsky ZIMMERMAN, LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP 15 39 Broadway, Suite 1601 New York, New York 10006 Telephone: (212) 363-7500 Facsimile: (212) 363-7171 16 Email: jlevi@zlk.com 17 Attorneys for Plaintiff Michelle Johns and the Class 18 19 Stephen L. Bulzomi, WSBA #15187 MESSINA BALZOMI CHRISTENSEN 20 5316 Orchard Street West 21 Tacoma, Washington 98467 Telephone: (253) 472-6000 Facsimile: (253) 475-7886 22 Email: sbulzomi@messinalaw.com 23 Stephen M. Garcia 24 Sarina M. Hinson THE GARCIA LAW FIRM One World Trade Center, Suite 1950 25 Long Beach, California 90831 Telephone: (562) 216-5270 Facsimile: (562) 216-5271 2627 Email: sgarcia@lawgarcia.com 28 Attorneys for Plaintiff Kelly Peterson and the Class CONSOLIDATED AMENDED STRITMATTER KESSLER WHELAN COLUCCIO

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Master File No. C06-0944 RSM

21

ITMATTER KESSLER WHELAN COLUCCIO 200 Second Avenue West, Scattle, WA 98119 Telephone: (206) 448-1777

John R. Connelly, Jr., WSBA #12183 Lincoln C. Beauregard, WSBA #32878 LAW OFFICES OF JOHN R. CONNELLY, JR. 2301 North 30th Tacoma, Washington 98403 Telephone: (253) 593-5100 Email: jconnelly@connelly-law.com Attorneys for Plaintiff Steven Knott and the Class Jeffrey P. Foote Ronald F. Webster FOOTE WEBSTER, P.C. 1515 SW Fifth Avenue Portland, Oregon 97201 Telephone: (503) 228-1133 Facsimile: (503) 228-1556 Email: jfoote@footelaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff Liesa Krausse and the Class Deborah Nelson Willis, WSBA #23087 DEBORAH NELSON WILLIS, P.S. 603 E. 8th Street, Suite B Port Angeles, Washington 98362 Telephone: (360) 417-9081 Facsimile: (360) 417-9126 Email: dnwlaw@olypen.com Attorney for Plaintiffs Steven Shulman and S. Leonard Shulman and the Class CONSOLIDATED AMENDED STRITMATTER KESSLER WHELAN COLUCCIO 200 Second Avenue West, Seattle, WA 98119 Tolophone: (206) 448-1777 CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT Master File No. C06-0944 RSM

1	VII. <u>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</u>
2	Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, request a jury trial on
3	the claims so triable.
4	
5	DATED this 15th day of September, 2006.
6	
7	(P())
8	
9	Faul L. Stritmatter, WSBA #4532 Kevin Coluccio, WSBA #16245
10	STRITMATTER KESSLER WHELAN COLUCCIO
11	200 Second Avenue West Seattle, Washington 98119
12	Telephone: (206) 448-1777 Facsimile: (206) 728-2131
13	Email: pauls@skwwc.com
14	Bruce L. Simon Esther L. Klisura
15	COTCHETT, PITRE, SIMON & McCARTHY 840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200
16	Burlingame, California 94010 Telephone: (650) 697-6000
17	Facsimile: (650) 697-0577 Email: bsimon@cpsmlaw.com
18	
19	Harvey Rosenfield Pamela Pressley
20	FOUNDATION FOR TAXPAYER AND CONSUMER RIGHTS
21	1750 Ocean Park Boulevard, Suite 200 Santa Monica, California 90405
22	Telephone: (310) 392-0522 Facsimile: (310) 392-8875
23	Email: harvey@consumerwatchdog.org
24	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Marygrace Coneff, Christine Aschero, Joanne Aschero, Alex Aschero,
25	Jennie Bragg, Gina Franks, Amy Frerker, Addie Christine Lowry, Jeff Haymes, and Harold
26	Melendez and the Class
27	
28	
	· · ·
	CONSOLIDATED AMENDED STRITMATTER KESSLER WHELAN COLUCCIO CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT 200 Second Avenue West, Seattle, WA 98119 Master File No. C06-0944 RSM 23

	•
	John W. Hathaway, WSBA #8443 JOHN W. HATHAWAY, PLLC
	701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4600 Seattle, Washington 98104
	Telephone: (206) 624-7100 Facsimile: (206) 624-9292
	Email: jhathaway@seanet.com
	Joseph B. Levi Eduard Korsinsky
	ZIMMERMAN, ĽEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP
	39 Broadway, Suite 1601 New York, New York 10006 Telephones (212) 263 7500
	Telephone: (212) 363-7500 Facsimile: (212) 363-7171 Email: ilavi@rits.com
	Email: jlevi@zlk.com
	Attorneys for Plaintiff Michelle Johns and the Clas
	Stephen L. Bulzomi, WSBA #15187 MESSINA BALZOMI CHRISTENSEN
· · ·	5316 Orchard Street West Tacoma, Washington 98467
	Telephone: (253) 472-6000
· · · · ·	Facsimile: (253) 475-7886 Email: sbulzomi@messinalaw.com
	Stephen M. Garcia
	Sarina M. Hinson THE GARCIA LAW FIRM
	One World Trade Center, Suite 1950 Long Beach, California 90831
	Telephone: (562) 216-5270 Facsimile: (562) 216-5271
	Email: sgarcia@lawgarcia.com
	Attorneys for Plaintiff Kelly Peterson and the Class
	John R. Connelly, Jr., WSBA #12183
	Lincoln C. Beauregard, WSBA #32878 LAW OFFICES OF JOHN R. CONNELLY, JR.
	2301 North 30 th Tacoma, Washington 98403
	Telephone: (253) 593-5100 Email: jconnelly@connelly-law.com
	Attorneys for Plaintiff Steven Knott and the Class
CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT	STRITMATTER KESSLER WHELAN COLUCCE 200 Second Avenue West, Sentile, WA 9811
Master File No. C06-0944 RSM	24. Telephone: (206) 448-177

EXHIBIT A

Federal Communications Commission

Document 27

FCC 04-255

Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554 In the matter of Applications of AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. and Cingular Wireless Corporation For Consent to Transfer Control of Licenses and WT Docket No. 04-70 Authorizations File Nos. 0001656065, et al. ដាd Applications of Subsidiarles of T-Mobile USA, Inc. and Subsidiaries of Cingular Wireless Corporation For Consent to Assignment and Long-Term De WT Docket No. 04-254 Facto Lease of Licenses File Nos. 0001771442, 0001757186, and 0001757204 and Applications of Triton PCS License Company, LLC, AT&T Wireless PCS, LLC, and Lafayette Communications Company, LLC For Consent to Assignment of Licenses WT Docket No. 04-323 File Nos. 0001808915, 0001810164, 0001810683,

MEMORANDUM OPINION & ORDER

Adopted: October 22, 2004

and \$0013CWAA04

Released: October 26, 2004

By the Commission: Chairman Powell and Commissioners Abernathy and Martin issuing separate statements; Commissioners Copps and Adelstein approving in part, dissenting in part, and issuing separate statements.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Paragraph

alo

Federal Communications Commission

FCC 04-255

28. Upon consummation of the proposed transaction, the merged company will be internally reorganized.¹⁰⁵ This reorganization will be effectuated by post-merger Cingular transferring control of AT&T Wireless, along with its subsidiaries and interests, to Cingular Wireless LLC.¹⁰⁶ A new subsidiary ("Newco"), which will be directly owned by AT&T Wireless and Cingular Wireless LLC, will be created. AT&T Wireless's and Cingular Wireless LLC's operating subsidiaries will be directly held by Newco.¹⁰⁷ The controlling and non-controlling interests that AT&T Wireless holds in other Commission-regulated businessesses will remain with AT&T Wireless and will not be contributed to Newco.¹⁰⁸ During this reorganization, Cingular will redeem the non-voting preferred stock given to SBC and BellSouth at the consummation of the transfer of control of AT&T Wireless to Cingular.¹⁰⁹ As a result, post-reorganization, SBC and BellSouth will each hold a 50 percent voting and equity interest in Cingular.¹¹⁰

29. The Applicants assert that approval of the proposed transaction is in the public interest, stating that the increased network and spectrum capacity in areas where Cingular and AT&T Wireless are already providing service will greatly improve service quality and coverage¹¹¹ and allow for the rapid deployment of advanced wireless services, including in rural areas.¹¹² Specifically, the Applicants claim that post-transaction Cingular will require 80 MHz of spectrum to provide a full menu of competitive voice and data services.¹¹³ They also state that the transaction will allow Cingular to expand its facilities-based footprint to 49 of the top 50 markets and 97 of the top 100 metropolitan areas (excluding only Richmond, Norfolk, and Newport News, VA).¹¹⁴ Further, the Applicants estimate that the combined entity's licenses will cover 284 million POPs,¹¹⁵ and its GSM network will cover 250 million POPs.¹¹⁶

⁾⁰⁶ See id.

¹⁰⁷ See id.

108 See id.

¹⁰⁹ See id.; see also supra note 95 and accompanying text.

119 See, e.g., Application, File No. 0001874690, Exhibit 1, at 2.

¹¹¹ Application, Exhibit 1, at 9, 10-15. The Applicants state that this increased capacity is needed in order to ensure service quality (*i.e.*, a reduction in blocked and dropped calls), because both Cingular and AT&T Wireless divide their spectrum in order to operate separate analog, TDMA, and GSM networks. See Application, Exhibit 1, at 11, 12.

¹¹² *Id.* at 9, 15-19. The Applicants claim that the combined spectrum of Cingular and AT&T Wireless is necessary in order to upgrade their systems to permit high-speed data transmissions, because they will have to set aside a minimum of 10 MHz of spectrum, separate from the analog, TDMA, and GSM spectrum, to introduce Universal Mobile Telecommunications Systems ("UMTS") service. *Set id.* at 18.

¹¹³ *Id.* at 19. The Applicants further state that in areas where, upon consummation of the proposed transaction, Cingular "would hold an attributable interest in more than 80 MHz throughout a BTA," Cingular will reduce the amount of spectrum it holds "to no more than 80 MHz." *Id.* at 19 n.82; *see also* Cingular Opposition at 9.

¹¹⁴ Application, Exhibit 1, at 9, 20-22; Cingular 10-K at 2; February 17, 2004 News Release at 1,

¹¹³ See October 5 Letter at Attachment A. The Applicants state that "[1]his figure may not accurately reflect the actual total licensed population coverage after consummation of the merger, as this figure is not adjusted for transactions that may occur closely after or may be required as conditions to such consummation, and may not reconcile back to pre-combination numbers due to difference in methods of calculating licensed population coverage between [AT&T Wireless] and [Cingular]." See *id*, at 2-3. The Applicants explain that "[1]icense coverage figures of a carrier vary, depending on (i) the data sources of and methods used to calculate U.S. population, (ii) the estimated propagation characteristics of its network transmitters and the related measurement methodologies and (iii) the counting of proportionate license interests," See *id*, at 1-2.

¹⁰⁵ See, e.g., Application, Flie No. 0001874690, Exhibit 1, at 1 (filed Sept. 21, 2004),

EXHIBIT B

÷.,

	Gase 2406rcv-6	0944-	RSM	D	ocument	uazk cifilad	LQ9(15/2006	Page 2 of 2	١ <u>م</u>	004/005	
	REDACTED - ADDRE C LOWRY MONTHALY SERVICE CHARGES STATE Through TRAFF WATTIN SERVICE - LOOM PUNISHESS HALL WATTNEE HALL BUS FREMANTEE SALLER D MIL THROUGH STATE STATE - SUBJECT FOR SUC AREA SO SOUTH STATE - SUBJECT FOR SUC AREA SO SOUTH STATE - SUBJECT FOR SUC AREA		DETAIL OF PAYMENTS	PAYMENTS AND ADJUSTMENTS	LAJE PAYMENT CHARGE: A 1.5% Late Payment Charge per month may be applied for amounts unpaid 20 days after the date of invoice (AK 0.875%, AR 0.860%, NE 1.33%, WI 1.00%).	Driving Wiseless Safety: Your wireless shone gives you the freedom and flexibility to stay in touch when you travel, but don't let a pixone cell distract you from driving safety. Use a hands free device if allowed or required by tax. Call Carefully, Annye Safety.	411 Fee Change Effective August 11, 2006. Cingular 411 cells will be \$1.79 per cell, plus alithme charges if applicable. For your safety and convenience, take advantage of our cell completion feeture at no additional charge. Cingular 411 offers local and national numbers along with movie show times and driving directions.	The rates to your service on Cingular's IDMAWhatog network are Boreasing. As early as September, a TDMAWhatog network charge of 54.95° per fine will appear on your bill each month. Alternatively, you have the option to upgrade to a handsst and rate plan on our new and improved CSM network, like langest write and data network in America, with the farvest dropped calls of any national wireless carrier. To learn more, visit a Cingular store near you.	TUMAJAnalog Network Charge		X CINQUIAF
•		USAGE FOR 839-293-3	HOME ANTINE AND LONG DISTANCE CHARGES	A THE ALL CONTRACTS IN THE ALL AND A THE ALL	COLIMITY TAX STATE TAXEOURARYITOTHER STATE CAMA SERVICE TAX LOCAL COMM SERVICE TAX RI SERVICE FEE	OTHER CHARGES AND CREDRS FEDERAL UNIVERSIL GERICE FUND SURCHARGE VOIDL-OTHER CHARGES AND CREMITS GOVERNMENT FEES AND TAXES	Carryon UNITED RECT. 7. MAND CALENDED ROTT & MAND AND ADDITIONAL MENTICES	-ADDIE C LOWRY REDACTED \$1305 Through /#208 -LOCAL FLAN SIE28	SUMMARY OF CHARGES (CONTINUED)	Account Number 7018688	Account Name Addre C LOWRY
	REFERENCE FOR STREET		HAROE								
	55656666666666666666666666666666666666		67		 f¤	- a		the second s			
		A Long		a	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	5 5 7	2 2 2 2 2 2	325 2		Page	ute of invoice ormaics
	55555555555555555555555555555555555555				4 \$	2	8	586.72 ,		e a ofte	ernae
	1007615 000017800										*

.

Case 2/06-cv-00944-RSM Document/27 Eled/09/15/2006 Page 2 of 2 wood gues

EXHIBIT C

30

:.

TRAVELING WITH YOUR PHONE

When traveling outside your Home Calling Area, callers simply dial your local wireless number and the call will be delivered wherever there is wireless coverage across most of North America.

in most areas you can place calls the same way you do in your home area. You will be responsible for any applicable roaming and long distance charges. See your calling plan brochure for details,

When traveling outside your Home Calling Area you will have access to your standard features. However, for access to your Digital PCS features you must be within an AT&T Digital PCS service area; please refer to your calling plan brochure for details.

Traveling with Your Wireless Internet-Ready Phone

When traveling outside an AT&T Digital PocketNet® service area, you will not be able to access your wireless Internet-ready phone's DATA MODE, Data messages sent to your phone while outside an AT&T Olgital PocketNet. service area will remain in the mail inbox on the network. When you return to an AT&T Digital PocketNet service area and you access the DATA MODE on your phone, the phone will alert you of pending e-mali with a beeping alert. However, the maximum size for each individual e-mail message is limited to 2MB, with overall mailbox capacity limited to 50 e-mail messages. Once the 50 e-mail message capacity has been reached, even if e-mail messages have not been opened or read, additional incoming e-mail messages will cause old messages to be deleted to make room for the new messages. All e-mail messages in your inbox, both read and unread, will be deleted after 90 days. Messages that you wish to save must be moved to your Saved folder.

WITH DISABILITIES

AT&T Wireless is committed to making its services and products easier for everyone to access. Wireless phone manufacturers are also working to include access features in their phones; handsets, and accessories so that customers with disabilities can enjoy the benefits of wireless communications. Our sales associates and Customer Care representatives are trained and ready to help you explore some of the features, services." and accessories currently available, so you can select the products that will best meet your wireless communications needs. To learn more about the AT&T Wireless commitment to disabilities, visit our Web site at www.attwireless.com, select Our Company, and view the information under Disability Access at the right of your screen. Or you can pick up a copy of For Our Customers with Disabilities at any AT&T Wireless Store, Our AT&T Wireless Welcome Guide and Features Guide are available in alternate formats including Braille, large print audio cassette, and diskette, in addition, we on provide your billing in Braille or large print upon request Simply call Customer Care at 1'900 888-7600 (TTY users dial 1 866 4-AWS-TTY) to order the format you prefer.

I.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

feet the mail out-of your wireless service by knowing the parameters of your Agreement with vs. PLEASE READ THESE TERMS AND CONDITIONS CAREFULLY. They gamme by relationship between you and AT&T Worden and explain our numericity, legal rights concenting all aspends ol our mittionskip, literatings

- Billion and chairer.
- · itarting and ending service.
- Pelvacy and comfidentiative
- · Early termination (eps.
- · Unitation of Hiblity and warranty.

1

- · Usanges to this Agreement.

· Resolution of past or future disputes by substration instead of court bids and data actions.

IF YOU I) USE THE SERVICE ON THE WORLESS DEVICE, OR 2) IF YOU ACCEPT A BENETIT IN EXCHANGE FOR CONNECTIONS TO NEW TEAMS AND CONDITIONS, OR 31 IF YOU PAY US ANY ANCHINT FOR THE SERVICE, THESE TERMS AND CONDITIONS WILL GOVERN OUR RELATIONSHIP, IT YOU DO KNY ASNEE WITH THESE TERKS AND CONDITIONS, NO KUT USE THE SERVICE OR REWCE AND WORKY IN REPEDUTELY TO CARGE SERVICE.

20

This is an agreement ("Agreement") for wheless ravies telecommunications review and related services and/or leatons ("Service") between you and the entity-icensed in provide Service in the area associated with your subject before and another metabolic torolic fill ("Manual" that is along bounds as MRI Workey individually threas Markes Territor, the form "Derick" means the whereas metabolic and another endowment that we have autowher in the programmed with the Anther and any statistics.

I.SERVICE

PROHODORY III THE FUTURE

ł

:

ŧ

22

2. CHAAGES/PAYMENTS/DEFAULT

2. CHARGES/PAYMENTS/DEFAULT a. Generally, You ar expanible for paying 38 charge, bedeing but not kinked at airbine, ancest, keptice, data unge, Est metages, transfur, kag Aktarce, disciony and operator aukinone charge, the pite of Device and screassing, king Aktarce, disciony and operator aukinone charge, the pite of Device and screassing, king Aktarce, disciony and operator aukinone charge, the pite of Device and screassing, king Aktarce, disciony and operator aukinone charge, the pite of Device and screassing, king Aktarce, disciony and operator aukinone est of a Strike or the partness of goods. You will be blied at connexit, drive ne reaching rates autonomit, or recommist casocally determined by ut to be human of a duarge to the automati-and be king bound of us, you will be perspective propublic for all charges to your one behalt of an orbit be high bound by the generalized provide a striket Service on behalt of an orbit bar were unalthorized in du to, you will be perspective propublic for all charges to your one behalt. We rentre the right to deform some or all of your long distance cells to a long distance periods of our droke. For all interning and outgoing viole, Service, the length of the cub will be threating the low bound of the the trends of the state individual by the partial simple period or other low its individue an outgoing call to appress that the Device starts inging for knowing area on call is Aktar and when the Device the starts ingits for knowing and call area you will be that our with handles, the call for tals and the call will be the filler ball relates into the starts the truth partial simple distance cambed you will be the durat area you will be though the bar on more chards will have along there to have to due a tree you will be though to have no more chards will have along the fill to define the the durage how and the along the bar of the and the due to the state state of the state the state state of the and the month due to this of treatment. We will provide you will be a format

Page 3 of 5

month das to delayed reparting behaven camiers this service will be charged at II used in the mathibility of the order and a second. C. Late Paryments/Disputtees, lines is of the estence for payment fiberidee, you agree to put at lan payment for any neuronal unpath. Jo days akes the date of the intolet also the around the for amount unpath. Jo days akes the date of the intolet also the around the for the order and or account. C. Late Paryments/fiberputtees, lines is of the estence for payment fiberidee, you agree to put at a lan payment level for the order of the or particle and the payment form if marked that the the second termination of the units of the around termination of the units of the around the order of the another of the order of the or

7. Account information, Any-person able to provide your name, the hast fuer digits of your social reachy number, and the Newber is authorized by you to reache folormation about and make thanges to your account insideling adding new Service. If you are netering Service on a

business hate fran ulwayd, your unployer, you autionize us to shore your account adonnation with your employer, You control to diuchrinte of any information about you or your Service to an employer, You control to diuchrinte of any information with your Hunker calls an employer writer popular such as 911.

service perioder such as 91. p. CP211 Correspont, Under lederal-law, yok hare a sight, and we have a duty, to: protect the multidensity of information about the neuron, ope, and destination of your wireless service image (IP16), You consent to us alaring your OP11 which AGI Corp. AIGI Version and design strictle image (IP16), You consent to us alaring your OP11 which AGI Corp. AIGI Version and design affaints and iconstructs, to develop or bring to your attention any products and services. This consent an irves the temphasion of your Service and the and you remove it. To remeve this coverts at any time, notify us in writing at AIGI Version, Alter OP11, RD. Dox 97061, ledened WA 18071-97161, paragraph 24, block. 3. CHANNERS TO THIS AGMERIAMENT Version account in the interview of the provision of paragraph 24, block.

1

Server Access access a server provide create for and and point current server of the protocols of paragenial 24, blaze. 3. CHANGREE TO THIS AGREENEMENT is an intermediate intermeted by philing unaches if you do not market to the amendment, you will not be charged any notic concention then if you do not market to the amendment, you will not be charged any notic concention then if you do not market to the amendment you will not be charged any notic concention then if you do not the dire we notify you and you will not be charged any notic concention then if you do the dire we notify you and you will not be charged any notic concention then if you us the Service nove than 10 bays after we notify you of a charge, you agree to that charge-you us the Service nove than 10 bays after we notify you of a charge, you agree to that charge-ito have the optimum toriving or any nove the provided and you may nove index you appendix Bay Bay. You want set thing you may the have reprinted to the tender, inducing where appendix, calculate to a state that the previous hat you are allower your periods Bay Bay. You ray remain obligited for the larm of the previous hat they your periods Bay Bay. You ray remain obligited for the larm of the previous hat they your periods that have not any non-rear remain. 4. LIMITATIONIS, Some indication at the largenrary torgetoin. 4. LIMITATIONIS, Some Allower were being and the service of our non-warraniser or the singlation or exclusion of labbity for Beinglat or consequential damage. Managenet Halling of Hamilton, you allower on the transment in the labbity of the ANISOR OF ANITHER Status Factors or Labbity. We Beinglat are consequential damage. Managenet Halling of Hamilton, you allower on the service of a state of the seculation of contrain warraniser or the singlation or exclusion of labbity. We Beinglate Charles (BR ASTI CG ONISOR) OF ANITHER States Factors of Labbity. We Beinglate Charles (BR ASTI CG ONISOR) OF ANITHER States Factors of Labbity. We Beinglate Charles (B

SULL SUMME TEXNIMINON OF THE MATERIAN. a. Binching Arthiteration, like pursion is breaded is be interpreted braidly to encompast-si-depute or chem analog out of ear relationship, by depute or chim mode by you agains to (or agains any of our subliding) parts or afficial comparise) among out is or relating to this ignorance or the inner are any reported in convertion will be territe (detailer band in contrat, tot, manner in during the subliding parts or afficial comparise) area or to be inner are any reported in convertion will be territe (detailer band in contrat, tot, manner in during the subliding parts of the data relation by binding adheding to the contrat, tot, in during the submitted of the sublicities of the data relation by binding adheding to or we not choose to posse chain it can if the data relation to check you and with both where any choirs for puncture dearanget and any right to pursue chains on a class or representation balls.

b. Artisitration: Proceedures, fou anyi first greatest any data-or dispute to as by ontacing Lustanz Car to allow it an exponently to neither the diputs (see also parampth 2/2 above, ngroing billing dispute). No may neglect arbitration if your claim as diquits index to be explored with 40 days. The arbitration of any depense of this mail be conducted in accordance with the American Arbitration and the AMA states the Wirkes Industry Arbitration Rules (YAA heles) as available upon request too be AM (call 1-000-TIG-TBFP) or order at two-accord by the Average. The WA heles and information about arbitration and fee are available upon request too the AM (call 1-000-TIG-TBFP) or order at two-accord by and we agree blait bid Agreement endered a standard with the federal Arbitration have a standard and the transmitter around the approximation of the transmitter and the arbitration will be histopreted and we agree above the large tool with the federal Arbitration have alphane to the You Hondrike and the federal Arbitration have a probable upon repose to the Agree to Your Hondrike the Large to the largest of the here to those to your Hondrike the Large tool at arbitration or physical and the agree to an arbitration or physical and the agree to an arbitration or physical and the agree to the agree to the largest of the here to the agree to an arbitration or physical and the agree to a state affect a thirty of the here to the agree to an arbitration or physical and the prevaling party arbitration trade of a party arbitration are a trade agree to the advect of a party and and a state affect a transmitter of the physical and the physical and the agree of a party arbitration are a trade agree to the advect of a party and and a state affect a strand and party arbitration are a strained by a constate to the agreed of the the agreed and an arbitration are arbitration and a strained and and agreed and and agreed and and agreed and and agreed and an arbitration are arbitration are arbitration and any arbitration are agreed and a

prevation or name a une autorated. Et Walvor of Punitivo Darnage Clubros anci Cluss Actions, by the presented had you and we are walving carala rights to highly digutes in court if for any material activities due to a walving carala rights or invitid you and net boll water, to the fallest entent discussion dues to canadicate the second public memory and and any right to pushe any duing on a class or canadicated tons or in a representative capacity. 6, MISCELLANEOUS

Conje on a club to terministic toria at a Ariptotentiative capacity.
6. MISCELLANEOUS
8. Privacy, in addition to the peatiest by randing our Privaty Delay at wewarninghestions. We are not about our general privacy particus by randing our Privaty Delay at wewarninghestions. We are not lastle ther any bits of privacy that may be appendent with regard to the fortice. You addition to our content to general privacy particles of our contentiable accounting your account on the Aristic fortiest of the fortice. You addition to not not addition of our content to general privacy in a definite our privacy base of the privacy base of the fortice. You addition to not not a lauteentile diffus performant to contact you We have the right or property. You content to generalized at the privacy part of the Aristica and the privacy base of the privacy base o

We use takened in our recerns, al. Entitive Agreements, these Terms and Conditions, exceptor with any other documents control or inderectly made a part of these Terms and Conditions, represent for more agreement between you and not which may only be starteded at described in this Agreement. This increases agreed a started in the control of this Agreement is found similar, the start of the Agreement records and become the start of this Agreement is found similar, the started of the Agreement records and started or additional products match to you by any of our representatives, agreement and additional the started of the Agreement is found similar, the balance of the Agreement records and started is a started of the Agreement is found similar, the balance of the Agreement Agreement are advected for all other than the started started by the started of this Agreement are advected for the Agreement is under the restriction of the started by the started of the Agreement of Construction the started in the Agreement is control to the started by the started of the Agreement of Construction theory of the Agreement is control to the started by the started of the Agreement is a started by the Agreement is an advected by the started of the Agreement is a started by the Agreement is a star

kpressent are admissible for all porports. E: Governing Laws. This Aprilment is subject to applicable follows laws, indexed or state trickly. If any sub-the world the state associated with the homber. Where our derive terms and conditions are regulated by a scale againty or the FIC, the regulations are available for your importion; if there is any inconsistency between this Aprenent and those regulations, this Agreement shall be detend amended as memory to conform to under ingulations, this Agreement shall be detend amended as memory to conform to make the dispersion, that you are over 18 years of a choice or resident of the light states and that you are not means of my doublity that world percent you from relieve into the Agreement.

24

å ,

.



AT&T Wireless 1 800 IMAGINE* www.attwireless.com www.attwireless.com/pocketnet*

©200 | AT&T Wireloss V2/070 | 797553348634

D CP-WG2 62]+0332 9359877 6809428A49 9A00033AIC LZT 123 3735 R#

: 4

Kerri Gettmann

From: ECF@wawd.uscourts.gov

Sent: Friday, September 15, 2006 4:25 PM

To: ECF@wawd.uscourts.gov

Subject: Activity in Case 2:06-cv-00944-RSM Coneff et al v. AT&T Corporation et al "Amended Complaint"

NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS You may view the filed documents once without charge. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing.

U.S. District Court

WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was received from Coluccio, Kevin entered on 9/15/2006 at 4:24 PM PDT and filed on 9/15/2006

Case Name:	Coneff et al v. AT&T Corporation et al			
Case Number:	<u>2:06-cv-944</u>			
Filer:	Marygrace A Coneff			
	Christine Aschero			
	Joanne Aschero			
	Alex Aschero			
	Jennie Bragg			
	Gina Franks			
	Amy Frerker			
	Michelle Johns			
	Kelly Petersen			
	Steven Knott			
	Liesa Krausse			
	Addie Christine Lowry			

Document Number: 27

Docket Text:

AMENDED COMPLAINT *Consolidated Class Action* against defendant(s) Cingular Wireless Corporation, New Cingular Wireless Services Inc with JURY DEMAND, filed by Michelle Johns, Kelly Petersen, Joanne Aschero, Steven Knott, Liesa Krausse, Alex Aschero, Jennie Bragg, Gina Franks, Amy Frerker, Marygrace A Coneff, Addie Christine Lowry, Christine Aschero. (Attachments: # (1) Exhibit A# (2) Exhibit B# (3) Exhibit C)(Coluccio, Kevin)

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document description:Main Document Original filename:n/a Electronic document Stamp: [STAMP dcecfStamp_ID=1035929271 [Date=9/15/2006] [FileNumber=1782319-0 $] \ [04db39c41627f3858e4ec0ce3cc09aa01d73246e648492b479908a766578e58253c88d686f28f257a43d6184f449a354c14dabd0bbb4626823af03413900a928]] \\$

Document description: Exhibit A

Original filename:n/a

Electronic document Stamp:

[STAMP dcecfStamp_ID=1035929271 [Date=9/15/2006] [FileNumber=1782319-1] [90b28df4758e184309cdffbb2372047aa123df1e858f74aa5d29611d40c2b4c6d6b f5c8e54dadbfdaa8af5d73016cacb5ffc3f9f9f924a147b5fd09847ed2051]]

Document description:Exhibit B

Original filename:n/a

Electronic document Stamp:

[STAMP dcecfStamp_ID=1035929271 [Date=9/15/2006] [FileNumber=1782319-2]] [370c9a42161fbf5f2c4e734e259e86e9fc7425e44afdd9358277f667b47f3423a4a 9be80dcf2b4119056303f73a40063dc5fd99ffa6b457a488e8cef7c3ab9ad]]

Document description:Exhibit C

Original filename:n/a

Electronic document Stamp:

[STAMP dcecfStamp_ID=1035929271 [Date=9/15/2006] [FileNumber=1782319-3] [700cea08ff426b38b55d6703f607332f23a3323c1b4881d12453bb460845ec45716 96d8056f4791195697578e7d6854a1f60ac6fff663bdeebf25f8533173d6f]]

2:06-cv-944 Notice will be electronically mailed to:

Karl Phillip Barth kbarth@lmbllp.com, shelby@lmbllp.com

Lincoln C Beauregard lincolnb@connelly-law.com, vshirer@connelly-law.com

Stephen L. Bulzomi SBulzomi@MessinaLaw.com

Kevin Coluccio kc@skwwc.com, kerrig@skwwc.com, wandal@skwwc.com

John R. Connelly, Jr jconnelly@connelly-law.com

William F Cronin wcronin@corrcronin.com, jabraham@corrcronin.com, reception@corrcronin.com

Jeffrey P Foote jfoote@footelaw.com

Stephen M Garcia sgarcia@lawgarcia.com

John W Hathaway ! jhathaway@seanet.com

Sarina M Hinson shinson@lawgarcia.com

Paul L Stritmatter pauls@skwwc.com, jodyh@skwwc.com

Ronald F Webster rwebster@footelaw.com

2:06-cv-944 Notice will be delivered by other means to: