

1 Jason M. Ingber Esq. (SBN: 318323)
2 **INGBER LAW GROUP**
3 3580 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1260
4 Los Angeles, California 90010
5 T: (310) 270-0089
6 ji@jasoningber.com

7 Attorney for Plaintiff Dimitri Kermani

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

10 Dimitri Kermani, individually and on)
11 behalf of himself and all others)
12 similarly situated,)

13 *Plaintiff,*)

14 v.)

15 Williams-Sonoma, Inc., a California)
16 corporation, Rejuvenation Inc., a)
17 subsidiary of Williams-Sonoma, Inc.,)
18 and DOES 1-10,)

19 *Defendants.*)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

CASE NO:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

(1) FRAUD

(2) FALSE ADVERTISING

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

INTRODUCTION

COMES NOW, Plaintiff Dimitri Kermani ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, brings this action against Defendants Williams-Sonoma, Inc., Rejuvenation (collectively, "Defendants"), and DOES 1-10, on information and belief, formed after reasonable inquiry under the circumstances:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This class action is brought pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.
2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Fraud and False Advertising (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500).
3. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles. The majority of the acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiff took place in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

///
///
///

PARTIES

1 4. Plaintiff Dimitri Kermani is, and at all times relevant to this action
2 was, a resident of Bozeman, Montana, residing at 324 N. 3rd Ave., #1, Bozeman, MT
3 59715.

4 5. Defendant Williams-Sonoma, Inc. is a corporation organized and
5 existing under the laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business
6 in San Francisco, California. Williams-Sonoma, Inc. owns and operates several retail
7 brands, including Rejuvenation, which engages in substantial business throughout the
8 United States, including within the Central District of California.

9 6. Defendant Rejuvenation is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Williams-
10 Sonoma, Inc., with its principal place of business in Portland, Oregon. Rejuvenation
11 sells furniture, home goods, and other household items through its retail stores and
12 online platform to consumers throughout the United States, including within the
13 Central District of California.

14 7. Plaintiff is currently unaware of the true names and capacities of
15 Defendants DOES 1 through 10 and therefore sues them under such fictitious names.
16 Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege their true names and capacities when
17 they are ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges,
18 that each of the fictitiously named designated as a DOE is legally responsible for the
19 events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and unlawfully caused the
20 injuries and damages to Plaintiff and the other class members as alleged in this
21 Complaint. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true
22 names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

23
24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27

28

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

1
2
3 8. On or about August 30, 2024, Plaintiff visited the Rejuvenation
4 website, owned and operated by Defendants, in search of a Steele-branded laundry
5 hamper.

6 9. Defendants prominently advertised "Free Shipping Site-Wide" on
7 their website, and Plaintiff, relying on this representation, proceeded to select the
8 product and size he intended to purchase. At all stages of this process, the website
9 continued to display the "Free Shipping Site-Wide" promotion with no visible or
10 readily accessible exclusions.

11 10. Plaintiff added the selected item to his shopping cart and applied
12 the promo code "freeship" as instructed. Despite Defendants' express representation
13 of free shipping, a shipping fee of \$159 was still being charged in the shopping cart.

14 11. Plaintiff immediately contacted Rejuvenation's customer service
15 department. The customer service representative, upon confirming the details of the
16 item and the promotion, agreed that the item should indeed qualify for free shipping,
17 per the promotional terms displayed online.

18 12. The representative assured Plaintiff that if he proceeded with the
19 purchase, he could subsequently obtain a refund for the shipping fee by contacting
20 their business line. In reliance on this assurance, Plaintiff completed the purchase.

21 13. Upon contacting the business line as instructed, Plaintiff was
22 transferred multiple times between representatives. He was finally informed that the
23 initial customer service representative had made a mistake and that the item was not
24 eligible for free shipping due to its weight—a restriction that was not disclosed on the
25 product page or any easily accessible section of the website.

26 14. Plaintiff then reviewed Defendants' "Exclusions" page as directed
27 by the representative. This page contained no mention of any exclusions for heavy
28 items, and in fact, the exclusions were limited to items ending in "\$.97" or "\$.99" as

1 being non-returnable. There was no mention of weight restrictions or shipping
2 limitations for the Steele-branded laundry hampers or any similar products.

3 15. Plaintiff attempted to resolve the matter with a supervisor,
4 providing photographic evidence and a video demonstrating that the website did not
5 include any relevant exclusions. Despite these efforts, Defendants refused to honor
6 their promotional terms, instead offering a discount on the shipping fee, which
7 Plaintiff declined.

8 16. Defendants' conduct demonstrates a deliberate scheme to mislead
9 consumers into making purchases based on promises of "Free Shipping" that they did
10 not intend to honor, thereby deceiving consumers and unjustly enriching themselves
11 at the expense of consumers.

12 17. As a direct result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff and other
13 consumers have suffered economic damages and emotional distress, as they were
14 induced to make purchases under false pretenses and had their complaints and
15 requests for rectification disregarded.

16 18. Plaintiff has time-stamped photos, screenshots, and video
17 evidence showing that Defendants misrepresented the availability of free shipping
18 and that the exclusion information provided was insufficient, vague, and misleading.

19 19. On information and belief, Defendants have engaged in similar
20 conduct with numerous other consumers across the United States, systematically
21 charging shipping fees despite advertising "Free Shipping Site-Wide" without
22 disclosing the true terms of the promotion.

23
24 ///
25 ///
26 ///
27 ///
28

1 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

2
3 20. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself, and all others
4 similarly situated pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or as
5 otherwise appropriate under California law. The Class is defined as:

6
7 **All individuals in California who, within the last four years, purchased**
8 **products from Rejuvenation under the representation of "Free Shipping Site-**
9 **Wide" and were subsequently charged for shipping.**

10
11 21. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class, and he will
12 fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class.

13 22. The class is ascertainable, and there is a well-defined community
14 of interest in the litigation:

- 15 a. **Numerosity:** The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class
16 members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is unknown
17 to Plaintiff at this time; however, the class is estimated to be greater than
18 fifty (50) individuals, and the identity individuals who were charged
19 shipping fees despite Defendants advertising "Free Shipping Site-Wide" is
20 readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' records.
- 21 b. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other class members' claims
22 as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the
23 interests of the other class members with whom Plaintiff has a well-defined
24 community of interest.
- 25 c. **Adequacy:** Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each
26 class member, with whom Plaintiff has a well-defined community of
27 interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no
28 interest that is antagonistic to the other class members. Plaintiff's attorneys,

1 the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action
2 discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and during
3 the pendency of this action will continue to incur, costs and fees that have
4 been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this
5 action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

- 6 d. **Superiority:** A class action is superior to other available methods for the
7 fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder of
8 all class members is impractical.
- 9 e. **Public Policy Consideration:** A class action will serve the public interest
10 by holding Drop Technologies Inc. accountable for widespread unlawful
11 practices and ensuring that all affected consumers receive appropriate
12 remedies. It will also deter similar conduct by Williams-Sonoma, Inc.,
13 Rejuvenation (collectively, "Defendants"), and DOES 1-10 and other
14 companies in the future.
- 15 f. **Commonality:** Common questions of law and fact exist, including:
16 a. Whether Defendants falsely advertised "Free Shipping Site-Wide"
17 without disclosing material exclusions;
18 b. Whether Defendants' actions constitute fraud;
19 c. Whether Plaintiff and the class members are entitled to damages,
20 restitution, and/or injunctive relief.

21
22 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **FRAUD**

25 **(Against Williams-Sonoma, Inc., Rejuvenation and DOES 1-10)**

26 23. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference each and every
27 allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs.
28

1 24. Defendants knowingly and intentionally misrepresented that the
2 product Plaintiff purchased was eligible for free shipping.

3 25. Defendants intended to induce Plaintiff and class members to rely
4 on these misrepresentations and make purchases they otherwise might not have made.

5 26. Plaintiff and the Class reasonably relied on Defendants'
6 misrepresentations, believing that they would receive free shipping as advertised.

7 27. As a result of Defendants' fraudulent conduct, Plaintiff and the
8 Class members have suffered damages, including payment of unexpected shipping
9 fees and related losses.

10 28. Defendants' conduct was malicious, willful, and oppressive,
11 entitling Plaintiff and the Class to punitive damages.

12
13 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **FALSE ADVERTISING**

15 **(Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500)**

16 **(Against Williams-Sonoma, Inc., Rejuvenation and DOES 1-10)**

17 29. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference each and every
18 allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

19 30. Defendants engaged in false advertising by promoting "Free
20 Shipping Site-Wide" without disclosing relevant exclusions that materially affected
21 the terms of the promotion.

22 31. Defendants knew or should have known that their advertising was
23 false or misleading, as their customer service representatives confirmed the
24 applicability of free shipping multiple times before ultimately refusing to honor it.

25 32. Defendants' false advertising was intended to deceive the public
26 and induce consumers to make purchases they might not have otherwise made.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 11. Attorneys' fees and costs of suit as provided by law, including under the Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500;
- 12. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate permitted by law;
- 13. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, requests a trial by jury.

DATED: October 18, 2024

Jason Ingber
Jason M. Ingber, Esq.
INGBER LAW GROUP
Attorney for Plaintiff