Case 3:17-cv-06689 Document 1 Filed 11/20/17 Page 1 of 32

1 2 3	Donald K. Birner (admission pro hac vice sought) Attorney at Law (0213152) d.birner@comcast.net 2613 Mayflower Dr. Pekin, IL 61554
$\begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$	(309) 925-3037
5	Kaiser U. Kahn (SBN 139929) Law Offices of Kaiser U. Kahn kaiser khan @shaqlabal.nat
6	kaiser.khan@sbcglobal.net 1388 Sutter Street Suite 910 San Francisco, CA 94102
7	Attorneys for named Plaintiffs
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	DONALD E. POTTER, and PHILLIP NOVAK, individually and on behalf of all others similarly) Case No. 17-cv-
12	situated,) Class Action Complaint and) Jury Demand
13	Plaintiffs,)
14) V.
15	
16	CHEVRON PRODUCTS COMPANY, a division of Chevron U.S.A. Inc. d/b/a Havoline Xpress
17	Lube)
18	Defendants.
19	
20	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY
21	Plaintiffs, Donald Potter and Phillip Novak (together Plaintiffs), bring this
22	Class Action Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial (Complaint) against Defendants,
23	Chevron Products Company a division of Chevron U.S.A, d/b/a Havoline Xpress Lube
24	(together as "Chevron"), based upon the deceptive and unfair practices relative to,
25	add on charges in connection with its oil change services. Plaintiffs allege as

follows, upon their personal knowledge as to themselves, and as to all other matters,

 $upon\ information\ and\ belief, including\ investigation\ conducted\ by\ their\ attorneys.$

26

27

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Nationwide Practice

1. This putative nationwide class action consists of thousands of persons, that defendant Chevron repeatedly charged bogus oil recycling/disposal fees and/or shop supply fees at its Havoline Xpress Lube [HXL] Centers ("Centers"), throughout the country immediately after their vehicles' oil and filters were changed. This wrongful practice resulted in overcharging each customer for their oil change. This practice continues.

Illicit Add on Oil Recycling and Shop Supply Fees

- 2. For many years, Chevron by and through its Centers engaged in improper oil change practices requiring plaintiffs and other class members to pay fees associated with recycling or disposing used oil generically entitled environmental fees or environmental service fees or hazardous waste disposal fees or similar designation ["recycling or disposal fees"], as well as shop supply fees, at its Centers. Customers were not advised of the true nature of these charges.
- 3. Defendants' recycling or disposal fee purports to be a legitimate governmental and/or regulatory charge when, in fact, either there was no such lawful regulatory charge or at least not equal to the amount invoiced.
- 4. Alternatively, if there is any such governmental charge, the recycling or disposal fee charged by defendants bear no correlation or reasonable relationship to any legitimate governmental charge.
- 5. In fact, oil destined to be recycled according to the Petroleum Institute of America is not considered to be hazard waste by the federal government or 48 states and the used oil and used oil filter generated from an oil change is frequently sold, often at a profit, to oil recyclers for refinement and resale for various uses
- 6. These Centers also charge customers fictitious 'shop supply' fees, by labeling charges as unspecified 'shop supplies' the consumer is purposefully not

informed of the supplies purportedly provided and is therefore denied the information necessary to judge whether or not the charge is justified.

7. Indeed, there are no shop supplies consumed during the typical oil change, nor were any such supplies provided to any of the class members. In reality, so called supply items are items used in the business (for example rags or tools) that constitute overhead expense— as distinguished from items sold to the consumer, such as filters and oil.

Bogus Fees Implemented By Centers Operators With the Knowledge and Consent of Chevron Utilizing Standard Invoices Required by Chevron

8. Both the oil recycling or disposal fees and shop supply fees were charged with the knowledge, consent and active participation of Chevron. The Operators were at all times required to print and issue to customers an invoice identical to that depicted in the Guide. which features the HXL-Chevron logo in the upper left hand corner of the invoice. See§ 8 ¶ 2 of Ex. 2. In addition, Chevron regularly published coupons, that specifically reference and attempt to legitimize these deceptive charges, for use by participating Centers across the country. See HXL-Chevron logo below required on invoices and exemplar of coupons issued by HXL-Chevron as a part of its nationwide marketing campaign.



HXL-Chevron trademark in upper left corner of required invoice.

ESCO17 www.havelinequisidu.be.com/p

Please note that most offers cannot be combined.



Oil change includes up to 5 quarts of conventional motor oil and standard oil tiller. Additional disposal and shop supply fees may apply. Not valid with other coupons, specials or discount offers. Valid for retail customers at perficipating locations. Special oils and filters are available at an additional cost. Coupon must be presented at time of service. See center manager for complete details. No cash value, Vold where prohibited. Limited time offers.

Ptips//www.haricalining.dicklutous.com/printf

- 9. These Centers operate under the daily guidance and control of Chevron d/b/a Havoline Xpress Lube ("Chevron") as mandated by the *Standard Sales Program Agreement* between these Operators and Chevron, attached as *Exhibit 2*, as well as a comprehensive 'Guide to Operators' Exhibit 3 both contracts formed in the State of California. ["Contracts"]
- 10. The word mark "Havoline Xpress Lube Chevron" along with its mark drawing is a trademark wholly owned by Chevron, which was prominently displayed

on the exterior and interior of these Centers, as provided for by the Contracts. See
trademark below. Specifically, an unobstructed view of the HXL Chevron trade
mark was required by the "Guide to Operators" to be affixed to the lobby door, front
and side walls of the building exterior and on an interior menu of services and
prices, all as required by the <i>Guide to Operators</i> , <i>Exhibit 3</i> .

- 11. The purpose or reason for the recycling and shop supply fees were not provided to the customers, nor was the method of calculating the fees disclosed to its customers at the point-of-sale or at any time before or after the oil change. The sole motive behind both fees, was to enhance profits, disadvantage honest competitors and conceal the true nature of the charges.
- 12. The whole scheme and artifice practiced by Chevron was to charge phony add-on fees to its customers, thereby increasing the profits made by the Operators, who were better able to purchase contractually required Havoline branded products. The Operators's policy and practices of charging (all with the knowledge and consent of Chevron) illicit fees dramatically increased each Centers' profits on a nationwide scale by cheating numerous individual consumers, who compose this putative class.
- 13. Defendants and their affiliated entities or Operators, under common management control, conspired and acted in concert with one another to impose the charges asserted herein. Defendants are jointly and severally liable along with their affiliated Centers for these fees charged to their customers.

27

14. The combined terms and substance of these Contracts provided Chevron with daily control over virtually every nuance of the oil change enterprise at each Center, including such standards as: exterior and interior signage bearing the Chevron/HXL brand, logo and trademarks, and specified menu boards; paint, materials and furniture; building exterior and interior; driveway and grounds appearance, specifications and operations; service bay operations; method of driving into the service bays; employee standards; Chevron approved uniforms; echo system of communication; cash out procedures; costumer consultations; handling



complaints; customer retention; various checklists. All of which were compulsory. See Standards Checklist pgs 31-33 of Guide Exhibit 3.

15. The operational systems and signage required by Chevron led their oil change customers to reasonably believe that the Centers were owned and operated by Chevron.



Required exterior signage

16. Notably absent from the Contracts is any requirement that the individual Operators post any sign or notice stating the service center is owned or operated by an individual or entity separate from Chevron. Rather the Guide, *Exhibit 3*, requires extensive exterior and interior signage that exclusively highlights the HXL Chevron name and logo as illustrated above.

¹ "This guide describes and illustrates the appearance and service standards required of every authorized Havoline Xpress Lube facility. These standards are important to the success of each Havoline Xpress Lube facility because they meet the expectations of current and potential customers. Strictly enforced, they are the guidelines that enhance overall brand value, making every Havoline xpress lube facility more successful." [pg 1 of guide]

The contracts between the Operators and Chevron were artfully but

1 2 disingenuously drafted with the intent and design to give free rein to the Operators 3 to levy false charges against their customers while seeking to hold Chevron harmless, all the while knowing — that absent a class action such as this one — the 4 5 individual Operators were unlikely to suffer from \$4.00 lawsuits spread 6 countrywide. Contracts — Exhibits 2 & 3. Indeed, any reasonable interpretation 7 of the salient provisions of these Contracts leads a reasonable consumer to the

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Chevron.

17.

Charging Add on Oil Recycling and Shop Supply Fees a Known Unfair and Deceptive Practice Within the Lube Industry

inescapable conclusion that the Operators are apparent and in fact agents of HXL-

18. It is generally known, within the lube industry, that recycling and shop fees are unfair and deceptive. For instance, in a recent settlement with New York Attorney General's Office, Eric Schniderman Kost Tires Distributors stipulated to \$270,000 in penalties for charging its customers a phony \$2.00 recycling or disposal fee with each oil change. In court documents, Kost admitted it charged its' customers the bogus charges over a two year period, which directly violated New York's Environmental Conservation Law (ECL) §23-2307. Defendant further admitted that the so called oil and filter recycling or disposal fee misled consumers into believing there was a *separate mandatary* charge associated with recycling oil and filters for their vehicles, when if fact there was no mandatory charge, all in violation of the Executive Law §63(12) and New York's General Business Law (GBL) §349. See Exhibit 4 attached.

19. Over a decade ago, lube industry leader Jiffy Lube Inc. [JLI] stated by way of affidavit that: (1) JLI company owned stores do not charge customers "shop fees" or include any such charge on customers invoices; (2) JLI has never suggested to franchisees to charge shop fees (3) In April 2004, JLI's company owned

28

stores ceased charging an environmental surcharge. [¶11, 13 & 20 respectively of $Exhibit\ 5$]

20. Unlike defendant in this case, Walmart, a competitor of HXL and probably the largest retailer of oil change services in this country, does not charge consumers for sham 'oil recycling or disposal fees' or 'shop fees' nor does Valvoline Instant Oil Change Centers, which has over 1,000 shops nationwide.

A CLASS ACTION IS THE APPROPRIATE REMEDY

21. Rather than having an unmanageable number of plaintiffs unrealistically filing \$4.00 lawsuits, this class action empowers the individual consumer to contest the deplorable conduct of the mammoth corporate foe equipped with unlimited resources. And if plaintiffs prevail, this corporation will longer be able to lift \$4.00 from countless vulnerable consumers pockets.

PARTIES

- 22. Plaintiff, Donald E. Potter is a natural person and citizen in the State of Illinois.
- 23. Plaintiff, Phillip M. Novak is a natural person and citizen of the State of Illinois.
- 24. Defendant, Chevron Products Company, d/b/a Havoline Xpress Lube ("Chevron") is a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania with its headquarters and principal place of business located at 6001 Bollinger Canyon Road, San Ramon, California.
- 25. Defendant Chevron Products Company, a division of Chevron U.S.A does business throughout the United States and the state of California, including this District.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 26. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.
 - 27. This court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C

state than defendants, (ii) the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs and (iii) none of the exceptions under that subsection apply to this action.

28. This court has personal jurisdiction over defendant because it

§1332 (d)(2), because (i) at least one member of the class is a citizen of a different

- 28. This court has personal jurisdiction over defendant because it conducts business in this District, is headquartered and registered to do business in this District and the unlawful conduct alleged in the complaint occurred, was directed to, and/or emanated from this District at Defendants' California headquarters.
- 29. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) because defendant resides in this District. The events underlying this action occurred here.
- 30. The contracts entered into between the Operators and Chevron namely Exhibit 2 Havoline Xpress Lube Sales Program Agreement ("Agreement") and Exhibit 3 Havoline's Standard of Appearance and Guide to Operators ("standards" or Guide) were entered into in the State of California in this District and provides that "the courts in the state of California, USA, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to entertain actions relating to this agreement or the making thereof"... Exhibit 2 ¶29 of Agreement.
- 31. The bogus add on fees charged named plaintiffs and putative class members were permitted, authorized, encouraged, enabled and emanated from the terms and conditions of these Contracts. In fact, these Contracts gave Chevron the power and control to prohibit such billing practices, however, Chevron chose not to prohibit such charges, but rather allowed, aided and abetted such charges to take place throughout the U.S.A., as well as the State of California from its headquarters in Ramon, Ca.
- 32. The invoice used by the Operators to charge putative class members disputed fees was mandated by the dual Contracts formed in San Ramon, California, between the various Operators and Chevron. Agreement §8 ¶2 (invoice to

1011

12

1314

1516

17

18

1920

2122

2324

2526

2728

be printed to be identical to that depicted in the guide which invoice includes
Chevron and HXL names and logos in upper left hand corner of the invoice.) True
to form this standard invoice was given to both named Plaintiffs at Potter and
Novak at the point of sale.

- 33. The unlawful conduct that forms the basis of plaintiffs' claims (i.e deceptive or unfair add on charges that induced consumer transactions) were enabled by the terms of these contracts entered into in the State of California and justifies the application of California law to resolve these claims.
- 34. Chevron's computers in San Ramon, California on a daily basis captured all sales and consumer charges occurring nationwide at the point of sale at its Centers. The deceptive fee practices alleged herein were known, reviewed and otherwise controlled, encouraged, aided or abetted or emanated from Defendants' headquarters in San Ramon, California.
- 35. Moreover, scores of putative class members, who at all relevant times were residents of the State of California, were charged and injured by add on fees, which form the basis of this action.

Intradistrict Assignment

Civil L.R. 3-2 (a) provides that all civil actions that arise...in Contra Costa County be assigned to the San Francisco or Oakland Division. This action arose in said county where defendant's corporate headquarters is located.

COMMON ALLEGATIONS

The Substance of the Contracts Between Chevron and its Operators Afforded Chevron Complete Control Over Daily Business Activities

- 36. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate the foregoing allegations as if set forth herein.
- 37. Although, the pertinent contract are innocuously titled as a "program agreement" and a "guide" endeavoring to insulate Chevron from any liability arising from the acts of its Operators and further contains self serving boilerplate

clauses, which claim the Operators are independent contractors and were at liberty to set their own prices — the actual substance and terms of the contract are tailored to afford Chevron complete control and dominion over day to day conduct of the operations, yet ostensibly empower the Operators to charge consumer class members, without limitation, spurious and unjust oil recycling/disposal fees and shop supply fees for example:

Operator's Retail Automation System was Required to Be Interface with Chevron's System

- (a) The standard written agreement entered into between Chevron and its shops requires each shop to install, at its own expense, a retail automation system (RAS) acceptable to Chevron and is required to be interfaced with Chevron's system. In addition, the agreement provides that Chevron has the right to access the RAS capturing all of the sales and charges by each store on a daily basis. Consequently, Chevron has and had complete and total access, knowledge and control over all sales, revenue and fees charged by HXL Operators. See Exhibit 2 to sales agreement par. 1
- (b) The binding guide requires the operator to acknowledge that "any deviation from the standards of appearance and operations (the guide) will be considered a material breach of this agreement and grounds for termination of the agreement." *Exhibit 2 §2*

Operator's Non-Compliance with Quality Image Clause Grounds for Termination

(c) Further, the agreement between Chevron and its Operators require Operators to acknowledge that "Chevron has developed and maintained a quality image in conjunction with the operation of Xpress Lube facilities and to uphold its standards." ("Quality image clause") §3 Program agreement. Since Chevron has knowledge of all daily transactions, and by virtue of the agreement, has the right to enforce standards with termination as a sanction for noncompliance with its "quality image," Chevron has and at all times had, the

opportunity to control and monitor day to day charges and shield consumers from illegal charges to protect its 'quality image', yet purposefully chose not to do so.

(d) Certainly the Centers that routinely charge its customers for fictional recycling and shop supply fees are not consistent with anyone's conception of a quality image. And since Chevron reserved the power to enforce such high standards, it should have prohibited these fabricated charges presented under false pretenses rather then aiding and abetting such false charges with its nationwide marketing and promotions efforts.²

60 Item Checklist and Impromptu Inspections gives Chevron Control Over All Aspects of Centers Operations

- (e) The 60-item checklist published in San Ramon, Ca is mandatory and covers every conceivable aspect of the operations. *Exhibit 3, the Guide at pgs 31-33*.
- (f) The agreement provides that Chevron sets the price according to its schedule for each item purchased by the Operators. This necessarily affects the price the Operators must charge for their services to their customers. See Exhibit 2 Agreement §5 ¶1.
- (g) The standard agreement required that 100% of all bulk and drum motor oil purchased by the Operators must be Havoline and Chevron branded products. Agreement §4 ¶2.
- (h) In addition, by the terms of the standard written sales agreement, Chevron reserved the right at any time to enter the facilities, without notice, to exercise Chevron's rights under the RAS. Consequently, by virtue of the RAS and impromptu visits to the facilities exercising its rights under the RAS, Chevron, at all times had access to all sales and charges used on a daily basis, as

²Indeed HXL sales agreement ¶ 13(b) provides: "Customer recognizes that it is in the interest of the parties to this Agreement for Customer to affirmatively conduct its business to reflect favorably on the parties and to further promote public acceptance of Chevron's products and its identification." (emphasis supplied.)

well as any other information maintained in computer by each shop. Exhibit 2 to sales agreement Par. 5(a) Agreement §8, ¶3.

(i) Chevron reserved the right to settle consumer complaints directly without the intervention by the Operators.

HXL-Chevron Signage Exclusively Displayed at Centers

- (j) Only Chevron signs and logos may be displayed in the building exterior and interior in order to promote public acceptance of Chevron. In fact, the HXL Sale program agreement paragraph 13 provides: "Customer will be in breach of this Agreement if Customer (Operator) does not display the required identification of Chevron."
- (k) The guide required Operators to post exclusively Havoline Xpress Lube/Chevron signs in the building exterior and interior leading a reasonable person to believe that station was exclusively owned and operated by Chevron.
- (l) Conspicuous by its absence is the lack of any requirement that the Operators post any notice that they are independent Operators or contractors

Standard Invoice Prominently Bearing HX-Chevron trademark required

- (m) The Operators were required to use a standard invoice mandated by Chevron that included the name and logo of Havoline Xpress Lube and Chevron in the upper left hand corner of the invoice, which gave the customer the impression that they were dealing directly with Chevron.
- (n) As a part of joint marketing plan, Chevron disseminates coupons to potential customers bearing the Chevron trademark and Logo, which mentioned hazardous waste and shop supply fees. *Exhibit 1*
- (o) Operators were required to buy and resell Havoline and Chevron branded products almost exclusive.
- 38. These express and implied actions or manifestations of Chevron would lead a reasonable third party or person, such as its customers, to believe the

Operators has authority to act on behalf of Chevron. Chevron is liable for the actions of its Operators in the course of operating Chevron's lube centers across the nation.

- 39. The oil recycling or disposal fees and shop supply fees charged customers are profit enhancers unlawfully obtained by defendants at the expense of its customers and constituted a breach of contract. All customers who were charged and paid these fees were monetarily damaged in the amount of the add on fees paid by customers for which Chevron is responsible for restitution.
- 40. Each HXL outlet, including the outlet visited by the named plaintiffs has uniform extensive exterior and interior signage that brands the business as being owned and operated by defendants HXL and Chevron.
- 41. The required Chevron branded signage, coupled by the lack of any sign or notice stating that the facility is independently owned and operated, the sole use of Havoline branded products and other actions or manifestations mentioned above and in the attached sales agreement and 'Guide' led the consumer to reasonably believe that the Center were being operated by Chevron. The thrust of the Agreement and Guide was to promote public acceptance of the Chevron and its Havoline branded products at its Centers.
- 42. Chevron, pursuant to the terms of standard contracts with its
 Operators, exercised a high degree of control over its Operators' day to day
 practices and activities and had the means and reserved the right to curtail any
 deceptive or unfair acts or practices. Chevron clothed its Operators expressly or
 impliedly with actual and apparent authority to act as agents of Chevron regarding
 business practices that included rogue charges such as 'recycling and disposal fees'
 as well as shop supply fees.
- 43. These add-on charges allow Chevron and its dealers to advertise a base price lower than the competition while obtaining the same revenue or more.

- 44. Although these charges are relatively small, \$3-\$5 on each occasion and not of the magnitude for any one consumer to file suit, the return to Chevron and its dealers is huge. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that conservatively Chevron has approximately 300 locations in 33 states which are open an average of 307 days a year and service at least 30 cars a day.
- 45. Chevron, at the expense of its customers is unjustly enriched by the assessment of these fee and is obligated and class members are entitled to restitution.

FACTS SPECIFIC TO THE NAMED PLAINTIFFS

46. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate the foregoing allegations as if set forth herein.

Plaintiff Donald E. Potter

- 47. On June 16, 2017, Donald E. Potter had the oil and filter changed on his 2011 Nissan Rogue at the Havoline Xpress Lube located at 8717 Ogden Ave, Lyons, Illinois.
- 48. After the oil and filter were changed, he was presented with a standard invoice with the Havoline Xpress Lube-Chevron logo and trademark in the upper left hand corner, that itemizes charges for a hazardous waste disposal fee of \$4.14, which unbeknownst to Plaintiff Potter was unlawful. unfair or deceptive. He would have objected to paying the fees if advised of their nature and demanded a refund.

27

He paid the full amount of the above invoice which includes a phony ${\it HAZ}.$

Havelina xpress lube	RÁVOLINE XPRESS LI 8717 Ogden Ave Lyons, IL 60534 Phone - (708)442-53 WWW.CHICAGOLANGHX	2227 MAYFLOWE PEIGN, D. 61554 (309)303-1178		E	Involca 534595
License Year M	aka Model	Engine	Mileage	Date	Time
	schoard Total: 1	L-] 4 Cyl 2.5 L(-)	31641	6/20/17	10:40 AM
Ch Ch	sck List	Services Comp	lated	Qty	Total
checipolints Lubrication Points Fransmission Ruid Power Steering Ruid Residetor Ruid Wesher Fluid Bettery Air Ritter Beits Lights Fre Pressures Fransfer Case Front Differential Rear Differenti	Sealed Chacked & OK Chacked & OK Chacked & OK Addad Chacked & OK Nitro, not adjusted N/A	54/30syn Synthetic of Pop4622 Oil Filter	ii.		.90D 1.00D
SA; JOHN,G T: JOHN,G	LBT: DOHN,G UBT: JOHN,G	Subtotal Coupon: HAZ WASTE DISPOSAL: Subtotal:			\$64.99 \$10.00 4.14
g.m.t.	a Rangelo	Fax (10.000%)			\$1,00
ULL OIL LEVEL CHECKED AND YOU	VIED BY CUSTOMER, CUSTOMER	Amt Tendered; Cash 61.00		Change	\$60.13 \$61 \$0.87
IEW CILL MILTER INSTALLED TO VEH DOPED TO VEHICLE CLISTOMER W PYTON TO THACE WITH, DUR SERVO MUSES PLRASE CALL LAS IMMIDIAT MUSES WILL NOT BE HONORED. TH 900 MILES.	IN VEHICLE, CLETOMER WITNESSED NEW CIL CLE, CLISTOMER WITNESSED NEW CIL & SHOWN OLD PARTS AND GIVEN DE 15 GUMRANTEED, IF A PROBLEM ELY, HOMEVER, WORK DONE BLOS ANK YOU HAVE A MICE DAY SEE YOU IN	Next Service Dets 09/20/2 Next Service Mileage 3464 Signeture	1	ce	
	00 days or 3,000 miles whichever con				

WASTE DISPOSAL fee of \$4.14 also attached as $Exhibit\ 6$

Plaintiff Phillip Novak

- 49. On September 28, 2017, Plaintiff Philip Novak had his oil and filter changed at the Havoline Xpress Lube #159 located at 5409, E. State Street, Rockford, Illinois.
- 50. After the oil and filter were changed, he was presented with a standard invoice with the Havoline Xpress Lube-Chevron logo and trademark in the upper left hand corner that itemizes a charge for shop supplies in the amount of \$2.99, which unbeknownst to Plaintiff Novak, was unlawful, unfair or deceptive. He would have objected to paying the fees if advised of their nature and demanded a refund.

He paid the full amount of the above invoice which includes a phony shop supply fee of \$2.99 see below and also attached as *Exhibit 7*.

Thillip Novek Cherry Mills Dr	008	9ATE PLANE SCALE 8/29/17 61614 Pd CL2
Transport State For (1.05) The Republic Propriet	100-4 market 61014	HAVE A NICE DAY!
DISUGATE COCCUS LICATO HINGIDS LICATO HINGIN LICATO HINGIDS LICATO HINGIDS LICATO HINGIDS LICATO HINGIDS	N/A N/A N/A N/A OR GRE GRE GRE GRE GRE GRE GRE GRE GRE G	FULL SERVICE DORVERTIONAL 1.00 34.9 OIL CHANGE CRACKE OF STATE SALES TAX TOTAL STATE SALES TAX TOTAL SALES TAX AUTHI 454209 CMANGE FULL SERVICE DORVERTIONAL 1.00 34.9 OIL CRACKE TAX TOTAL TAX TOTAL TAX TOTAL TAX TOTAL TAX TOTAL TAX TOTAL SALES TAX TOTAL TAX TOTAL SALES TAX TAX TOTAL SALES TAX TOTAL SALES TAX TOTAL SALES TAX
Zeminap Monitory is dedicated to Services Enricer looks forward to Historians are were greatermen	servicing your vehicle in the f	action. Your business is appreciated and your dresse Monkey uture. In support of this commitment, please see our warranty

TOLLING OF THE STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS

Discovery Rule

- 51. The tolling doctrine applies to cases of concealment like this one. Plaintiffs did not discover and could not discover through the exercise of due diligence that Chevron conspired to charge Plaintiffs' fabricated shop and environmental/hazardous waste disposal fees which had no basis in fact. Plaintiffs relied upon Chevron's expertise and knowledge. Otherwise, it is reasonable to infer that the consumer, if he or she knew the charges were invalid, would not have paid such fees. On the other hand, Chevron knew the charges were illegal and provided no benefit to the consumer.
- 52. Any statute of limitations otherwise applicable to any claims asserted herein have been tolled by the discovery rule.

Fraudulent Concealment

53. All applicable statutes of limitations have also been tolled by Chevron's active and ongoing fraudulent concealment of the facts alleged herein. Defendant knew that the add-on fees should not have been charged class members, but chose not to prohibit its dealers from charging them. Any otherwise applicable statutes of limitations have, therefore, been tolled by Chevron's active concealment of the facts alleged.

Estoppel

54. Defendants, Chevron and Havoline Xpress Lube, are under continuous duty to disclose to plaintiffs and class members the character and nature of their services but instead actively concealed the fact that these charges were fabricated. Plaintiffs and class members reasonably relied upon Chevron's representations that the charges were legitimate.

5

CLASS DEFINITION

associated with recycling or disposing of used oil and/or for shop supplies, in connection with an oil change performed by Havoline Xpress Lube at any time within the United States. Excluded from the class are defendants, including any entities in which defendants have a controlling interest, as well as their agents, representatives, officers, directors, employees, trustees, parents, children, heirs, assigns and successors, and other persons or entities related to or affiliated with defendants; and the judges to this case as assigned, their staff, and their immediate families. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend the class definition.

CLASS REPRESENTATIONS ALLEGATIONS

- 56. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate the foregoing allegations as if set forth herein.
- 57. Certification of plaintiffs claims for class wide treatment is appropriate. Plaintiffs can prove the elements of their claims on a class wide basis using the same evidence that would be used for actions alleging the same claims. This action has been brought, may be proper and may be properly maintained on behalf of the class proposed herein under FRCP 23 satisfying the commonality, typicality, adequacy, predominance, representation and superiority requirements of its provisions.

Numerosity and Ascertainability

58. The members of the class are so numerous and geographically dispersed that individual joinder is impractical. There are no less than 10,000 members in this nationwide class. The precise number of nationwide class members may be ascertained from Chevron's and/or HXL books and RAM computer records. Defendants have comprehensive lists of class vehicle owners and the vehicles that had their oil changed in their possession. As reflected in the Havoline Xpress Lube invoices, class members are readily identifiable. Defendants' computer files have

comprehensive lists of class members names and addresses, as well as the make, model and identification number of their vehicle.

- 59. The identity of the customers who were charged shop supply and oil recycling fees are in the possession of Chevron and HXL.
- 60. Accordingly, the disposition of the claims of class members in a single action will provide substantial benefits to all parties and to the court. Class members may be readily notified by recognized, court-approved notice dissemination methods, which may include U.S. mail, electronic mail, internet postings, comment and/or published notice.

Typicality

61. The claims of the representative plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the other class members and that the representative plaintiffs, like all class members, had their oil and filter changed at an HXL Center. The representative plaintiffs, like all class members, have been damaged by defendants. The representative plaintiffs, like all class members, have been injured by the same conduct or course of action by defendants — sham charges for used oil recycling and/or shop supplies. The factual basis of defendants misconduct is common to all class and represent a common thread of misconduct resulting in injury to all class members. The class representatives possess the same legal interest and have endured the same legal injury as other class members.

Adequate Representation

62. Plaintiffs are members of the nationwide class and will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interest of the class. Plaintiffs have retained counsel with considerable experience in consumer class actions. Plaintiffs and their counsel are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the class and have the financial resources to do so. Neither plaintiffs, nor their counsel, have interests adverse or antagonistic to the class.

Predominance of Common Questions Relate to Plaintiffs Claims

- 63. Federal courts have held that common questions of fact predominate when the defendant acts toward the class members in a similar or common way such as the case here by charging add on fees. The resolution of the common question of whether Chevron engaged in the common course of conduct and business practice that resulted in it overcharging representatives Potter and Novak and the putative class members is in violation of California law.
- 64. The claim requires generalized, class wide proof and is based upon the same legal theory i.e. overcharging its customers by assessing a oil recycling/disposal fee or shop fees resulting in claims for breach of contract, unjust enrichment and consumer fraud. Damages flowing from the claim are the same for each class member.

Superiority

- 65. Defendants engaged in a common course of conduct giving rise to the legal rights sought to be enforced by the class members. Similar or identical statutory and common law violations and deceptive practices are involved. Individual questions, if any, pale by comparison to the numerous common questions that predominate.
- 66. The damages sustained by the class members flow, in each instance, from a common nucleus of operative facts —defendant's misconduct of marketing and charging illegitimate fees to class members. A class action where individual damages are minimal is the only means that will provide class members with a viable remedy and such small individual claims are not enough to justify the expenses of separate litigation.
- 67. Class treatment in this court, as a court with original jurisdiction over the class claims will conserve the resources of the courts and the litigants, and will promote consistency and efficiency and adjudication by providing common

3 4

5 6

7 8

9

10 11

12 13

14

16

15

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

answers to the common questions of knowledge, conduct, duty and breach that predominate in this action.

This Action is Brought Under Rule 23(b)(3)

- 68. This action is brought under Rule 23(b)(3) primarily because the relief sought per individual member of the class is small given the burden and expense of individual prosecution of potentially extensive litigation necessitated by the conduct of defendants. Hence, individual class members are unlikely to have any interest in controlling the prosecution of their claims. There are no anticipated difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of the claim on behalf of the class.
- 69. This class action is manageable because of the large number of potential class members basing their claims on the same common course of conduct by Chevron, emanating from its headquarters in this district. A class action is a more manageable and more efficient use of judicial resources than individual claims.
- 70. It would be virtually impossible for the class members to seek redress on an individual basis and even if some class members themselves could afford such individual litigation, the court system could not.

CHOICE OF LAW

71. California law applies because a substantial part of the alleged bad fath, misleading, deceptive, unfair, and unlawful acts and practices were implemented, facilitated, encouraged, authorized and emanated from Defendant's corporate headquarters located in this District at San Ramon, California adversely affecting the named plaintiffs and other class members nationwide, including California residents all of whom paid the phony add on oil recycling and shop supply fees. In addition, material and relevant contracts—between Chevron and its operatives— implementing, enabling and authorizing the bad faith, deceptive, unfair, and unlawful conduct were formed in the State of California within this

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

District at Defendant's corporate headquarters. (Ex. 2 & 3) These contracts mandated that California law applied to all matters pertaining to these contracts.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I: FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION BREACH OF CONTRACT BY CHEVRON

- 72. Plaintiffs restate and incorporate herein by reference the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 73. Defendants, through its agents, offered class members an oil and filter change for a sum certain and in some cases, as low as \$18.99. Class members accepted the offer or other lump sum offers, which did not include the add on charges, and proceeded to have their oil and filter changed.
- 74. Prior to presenting the invoice to its customers, defendant, Chevron, was responsible for setting or permitting a price structure that included add on oil recycling or disposal fees and shop supply fees, thereby increasing the cost of the oil change and thereby breaching the terms of the oral or implied in fact contract.
- 75. Defendant, Chevron, was responsible for the imposition of these add on fees, when it set, approved, permitted or ratified the fee schedule for the Centers, which included oil recycling or disposal fees and/or shop supply fees.
- 76. As a result of these breaches, class members were damaged by the amount of these erroneous and unjustified add on fees.
- 77. Chevron breached the contracts entered into by class members with Chevron's operatives damaging class members in amounts equal to the false charges.

COUNT II: SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION BREACH OF THE COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING

78. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in the proceeding paragraphs is though alleged in this Count.

25

26

- 79. Plaintiffs and class members bring this claim in the alternative to their breach of contract claim.
 - 80. A covenant of good faith and fair dealing is implied in every contract.
- 81. Where a contract vests one party with discretion, but provides no standard for the exercise discretion, the duty of good faith and fair dealing applies and the party exercising discretion must do so in a commercially reasonable manner that satisfies the objectively reasonable expectation of the other party.
- 82. Based upon defendant, Chevron's representation regarding the prices of the oil change and filter was objectively reasonable for plaintiffs and class members to expect that defendant, Chevron, by setting or approving the prices, would not have permitted the inclusion of illicit oil recycling fees or shop supply fees, which had no relationship whatsoever to the service performed by Chevron's Operators. There exists no objectively reasonable reason on the part of class members to expect that defendants would have inserted in their standardized invoices charges that were fictitious.
- 83. Chevron abused any discretion they had in setting, approving, ratifying, or enabling oil recycling or disposal fees or shop supply fees, which had no relationship to the service performed.
- 84. Plaintiffs and class members perform all required duties and all conditions required for defendants to accomplish oil and filter change, without the added fees.
- 85. As a result of Defendants breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, plaintiffs in the class are entitled to damages in the amount of the payment made by prospective class members for oil recycling or disposal fees and shop supply fees.

2 3

4 5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

93.

25

26 27

28

Plaintiffs and class members damages are traceable to and resulted

directly and proximately from	conduct alleged in this complaint.	
directly and proximately from	conduct aneged in this complaint.	

- be permitted to retain monies belonging to Plaintiffs and class members it unjustly received as a result of its unlawful and deceptive conduct described herein.

COUNT III: THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION UNCONSCIONABILITY

- 86. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in the proceeding paragraphs is though alleged in this Count.
- 87. Defendants practice of offering low price of oil and filter changes while unilaterally adding contrived charges such as oil recycling or disposal fees and shop supply fees, which had no relationship to the oil and filter changes.
- 88. Defendants practices in the hope of charging for services unrelated to the oil and filter change is unreasonably favorable to defendants, Chevron and HXL and unduly harsh and is, therefore, substantively unconscionable.
- 89. The levy of such unreasonable and fabricated charges have harmed plaintiffs and class members and have caused them to suffer damages and the amount of the add on fees charged by defendants.

COUNT IV: FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION UNJUST ENRICHMENT

- 90. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference every allegation set forth in the proceeding paragraphs as though alleged this Count.
- 91. Plaintiffs class members bring this claim in the alternative to their breach of contract, breach of the covenant of good faith, and fair dealing claims.
- 92. Defendants knowingly retained a benefit at the expense of class members for services not rendered and supplies not delivered to the consumer or by overcharging its customers by adding on a recycling and/or shop supply fees.

95. Plaintiffs and the class had no adequate remedy at law.

96. Wherefore, Plaintiff and class members seek disgorgement of and/or a constructive trust disgorging all profits, benefits and other compensation by defendants retained from plaintiffs and class members through this inequitable conduct.

COUNT V: FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION NEGLIGENCE

- 97. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference every allegation set forth in the proceeding paragraphs as though alleged in this Count.
- 98. Plaintiffs and class members bring this claim in the alternative to their breach of contract, breach of the covenant of good faith, fair dealing claims, and unjust enrichment claims.
- 99. Chevron devised and dictated to its dealers a standard form to be used as an invoice for charging class members who had their oil and filter changed at HXL shops. Each of the dealerships had signage, both exterior and interior, that exhibited Chevron's name and trademarks identifying the Centers as being operated by Chevron and HXL.
- 100. Chevron required its HXL Centers to install a retail automation system and interface it with Chevron's system. This RAS along with impromptu inspections endowed Chevron with the authority and capability of auditing and monitoring all sales, charges, and take appropriate corrective measures to ensure consumers were properly charged for services rendered by HXL and cease unlawful charges.
- 101. Chevron knew or should have known that HXL shops were billing its customers for made-up charges.
- 102. Chevron, under these circumstances, had a duty to consumer class members to prohibit false charges by HXL or by Chevron.
- 103. Chevron was guilty of negligently failing to control and monitor false costs it knew HXL Centers were charging its customers, when it had the

opportunity and ability to do so. Chevron was further guilty of negligently facilitating or failing to prohibit oil recycling and shop supply fees.

104. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid negligence of Chevron, class members sustained damages in the amount of the payment for false charges and should be reimbursed therefore.

COUNT VI: SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW (Business. & Professional Code §§17200 et seq.)

- 105. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate the foregoing allegations as if set forth herein.
- 106. California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL"), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code \$\$17200, et seq., proscribes acts of unfair competition, including "any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business acts or practices and unfair, deceptive, untrue, or misleading advertisements."
- 107. Chevron's conduct, as described herein, was and is in violation of the UCL.
- 108. Chevron's conduct, as described herein, was and is in violation of the UCL in at least the following ways:
 - (a) Chevron's acts and practices of aiding and abetting it's Operators to repeatedly charge its customers oil recycling and/or shop supply fees, constitutes unfair or deceptive acts and practices, and is injurious to consumer class members;
 - (b) Defendants material misrepresentations or omissions that oil recycling and shop supply fees were lawful, when they were not, is unfair and deceptive. These deceptive acts or practices were designed so that class members relied upon it and were damaged by payment of the invalid fees;
 - (c) Charging these fees separately obscures the true nature of the charge and makes it appear as though the fee is a dedicated charge that is required by law, and that the fees cannot be negotiated by any customer, which was false;
 - (d) Advertising prices that appear lower than they actually are (because the fee is not plainly disclosed up front) is an unfair practice for consumers and competitors in that it distorts

seek an award of attorney's fees and costs.

- 111. The acts, practices, misrepresentations and omissions by defendants described above, and defendants dissemination of deceptive and misleading advertising and marketing materials in connection therewith, occurring in the course of conduct involving trade or commerce, constitute unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices within the meaning of each of the above-enumerated statutes.
- 112. Defendant's acts and practices created a likelihood of confusion or of misunderstanding and misled, deceived or damaged plaintiffs and members of the class in connection with the sale or advertisement of the cheap oil changes. Defendant's conduct also constituted the use or employment of deception, fraud, false pretense, false promise, misrepresentation, or knowingly concealing, suppressing, or omitting a material fact with intent that others rely upon the concealment, suppression or omission in connection with the sale or advertisement of goods or services whether or not a person has in fact been misled, deceived or damaged in violation of each of the above-enumerated statutes.
- 113. Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the class members, seek monetary damages, treble damages and such other and further relief as set forth in each of the above-enumerated statutes.
- 114. Plaintiffs seek to enjoin further unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent acts or practices by Chevron under Cal. Bus. Prof. §17200.
- 115. Plaintiffs request that this court enter such orders or judgments as maybe necessary to enjoin Chevron from continuing its unfair, unlawful, and/or deceptive practices and to restore to plaintiff and members of the class any money it acquired by unfair competition, including restitution and/or restitutionary disgorgement, as provided in Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17203 and Cal. Civ. Code §3345; and for such other relief set forth below.

1		PRAYER FOR RELIEF
2	WHE	REFORE, plaintiffs and the class members request that the court enter
3	an order or	judgment against defendants, including the following:
4	A.	Certification of the action as a Class Action pursuant to Rule 23(b)(3)
5	of the Feder	ral Rules of Civil Procedure, and appointment of plaintiffs as class
6	representat	ives and their counsel of record as class counsel;
7	В.	Damages in the amount of monies paid fees;
8	C.	Actual damages, statutory damages, punitive or treble damages, and
9	such other i	relief as provided by the statutes cited herein;
10	D.	Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on such monetary relief;
11	Е.	The costs of bringing this suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees;
12	F.	An award of reasonable attorney fees and costs to be paid out of the
13	common fur	nd for the above;
14	G.	All other relief to which plaintiffs and members of the class may be
15	entitled at l	aw or in equity; and
16	Н.	Chevron should be enjoined from charging add on fees.
17		JURY DEMAND
18	Plair	atiffs hereby DEMAND TRIAL BY JURY on their own behalf and on
19	behalf of cla	ass members.
20		DATED: November 20th 2017
21		Respectfully submitted,
22		/0/
23		/S/
24	Donald V. D	One of Plaintiffs attorneys
25	Donald K. B (admission	sought pro hac vice)
26	Law Office	Law (0213152) of Donald K. Birner
27	d.birner@c	omeasthet wer Dr.
28	2613 Mayflo Pekin, IL 61 309-642-158 Fax: 309-92	00 4 9 5_5838
	r ax. 909-92	U-UUU U

Ī	Case 3:17-cv-06	689 Docume	nt 1 Filed 11/20/1	17 Page 32 of 32	
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					
			39		

ed 11/20/17 Page 1 of 2 Case 3:17-cv-06689

The JS-CAND 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved in its original form by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court to initiate the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS
Donald E. Potter and Phillip M. Novak, individually and on behalf of those similarly situated

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Tazewell County State of Illinois (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Donald K. Birner 2613 Mayflower Dr Pekin IL 61554

 $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{DEFENDANTS} \\ \textbf{CHEVRON PRODUCTS COMPANY D/B/A Havoline Xpress Lube} \end{array}$ Contra Costa County (California)

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

309 925 3037, Kaiser Kha	n 1388 Sutter Street Suite 910	San Francisco, C.	A 94102							
II. BASIS OF JURIS	SDICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)		IZENSHIP OF PI Diversity Cases Only)	RINCI	PAL PARTIE	S (Place an "X and One Bo			intiff
1 U.S. Government Plainti	ff 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government No	ot a Party)		of This State	PTF		rated <i>or</i> Princip	pal Place		DEF × 4
2 U.S. Government Defend	dant × 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of	f Parties in Item III)		of Another State	x 2	2 Incorpor of Busin	rated and Princ ness In Another	cipal Place	5	5
	(mateure emigensing eg	, i willes in them till,		or Subject of a n Country	3	3 Foreign	Nation		6	6
	UIT (Place an "X" in One Box									
CONTRACT	TO	RTS		FORFEITURE/PENA		BANKRUP			R STAT	
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL I	NJURY	625 Drug Related Seiz		422 Appeal 28 US	ů .	375 False		
120 Marine 130 Miller Act	310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability	365 Personal Inju Liability	ry – Product	Property 21 USC 690 Other	8 991	423 Withdrawal 2 § 157	8 USC	376 Qui ' § 372	9(a))	
140 Negotiable Instrument	320 Assault, Libel & Slander	367 Health Care/		LABOR		PROPERTY R	JGHTS			ortionment
150 Recovery of Overpayment Of	330 Federal Employers' Liability	Pharmaceutic Injury Produ	ct Liability	710 Fair Labor Standa 720 Labor/Managemen		820 Copyrights 830 Patent		410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking		anking
Veteran's Benefits	340 Marine	368 Asbestos Per Product Liab		Relations		835 Patent—Abbro	eviated New	450 Com		
151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted	345 Marine Product Liability	PERSONAL PR	-	740 Railway Labor Ac	et	Drug Applica	ition	460 Depo		
Student Loans (Excludes	350 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud	OLEKII	751 Family and Medic	al	840 Trademark				fluenced & nizations
Veterans)	355 Motor Vehicle Product	371 Truth in Lend	dino	Leave Act		SOCIAL SEC	URITY	480 Cons		
153 Recovery of	Liability	380 Other Person		790 Other Labor Litiga		861 HIA (1395ff)		490 Cabl		
Overpayment	360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury -Medical	Damage		791 Employee Retirem Income Security A		862 Black Lung (923)			, ommodities
of Veteran's Benefits	Malpractice	385 Property Dan	nage Product			863 DIWC/DIWV		Excha		Jiiiiio di ti Co
160 Stockholders' Suits	Maipractice	Liability		IMMIGRATION	N .	864 SSID Title X	VI	890 Othe	er Statuto	ory Actions
X 190 Other Contract	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PET	TITIONS	462 Naturalization Application		865 RSI (405(g))		891 Agri	cultural	Acts
195 Contract Product Liability	440 Other Civil Rights	HABEAS CO	ORPUS	465 Other Immigration	2	FEDERAL TAX	X SUITS	893 Envi	ironment	al Matters
196 Franchise	441 Voting	463 Alien Detain	ee	Actions		870 Taxes (U.S. F			dom of l	nformation
REAL PROPERTY	442 Employment	510 Motions to V	acate			Defendant)	lamitin or	Act		
210 Land Condemnation	443 Housing/	Sentence				871 IRS-Third Pa	arty 26 USC	896 Arbi		
220 Foreclosure	Accommodations	530 General				§ 7609				e Procedure r Appeal of
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	445 Amer. w/Disabilities—	535 Death Penalt	y						cy Decis	
240 Torts to Land	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities-Other	OTHE							-	ality of Stat
245 Tort Product Liability	448 Education	540 Mandamus &	t Other					Statut		,
290 All Other Real Property	448 Education	550 Civil Rights								
		555 Prison Condi	tion							
		560 Civil Detaine								
		Conditions o Confinement								
X 1 Original		Remanded from			erred fron		ultidistrict		ıltidistric	
Proceeding	State Court	Appellate Court	Reope	ened Another	r District	(specify) Lit	tigation–Transf	èr Liti	igation–	Direct File
VI. CALCOL OF	ite the U.S. Civil Statute under	which you are filin	ng (Do not co	ite jurisdictional statutes i	unless di	versity):				
AUTUUN	8 U.S.C 1332 (d) (2)									
Bi	rief description of cause: action to recover unfair, de	eceptive or unla	wful fees	charged consumers	by def	fendant				
_	IN ✓ CHECK IF THIS IS A		DEM.	AND \$ 5,000,000.00)	CHECK YES	•			
COMPLAINT:		1. K. CIV. P.				JUKY DEMA		× Yes	No	
VIII. RELATED CAS	SE(S), $IIIDGE$			DOCKET MIL	MDED					

DATE

(Place an "X" in One Box Only)

10/20/2017

Print

IF ANY (See instructions):

DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (Civil Local Rule 3-2)

Save As...

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

× SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND

/s/ Donald K. Birner

SAN JOSE

Reset

EUREKA-MCKINLEYVILLE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS-CAND 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet. The JS-CAND 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved in its original form by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court to initiate the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I. a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
 - b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
 - **Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)."
- Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
 - (1) United States plaintiff. Jurisdiction based on 28 USC §§ 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
 - (2) United States defendant. When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
 - (3) Federal question. This refers to suits under 28 USC § 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
 - Diversity of citizenship. This refers to suits under 28 USC § 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below: NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS-CAND 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- **Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.
 - (1) Original Proceedings. Cases originating in the United States district courts.
 - (2) Removed from State Court. Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 USC § 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.
 - (3) Remanded from Appellate Court. Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
 - (4) Reinstated or Reopened. Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
 - (5) Transferred from Another District. For cases transferred under Title 28 USC § 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
 - Multidistrict Litigation Transfer. Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 USC § 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.
 - (8) Multidistrict Litigation Direct File. Check this box when a multidistrict litigation case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.
 - Please note that there is no Origin Code 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC § 553. Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service.
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.
 - Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.
 - Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS-CAND 44 is used to identify related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.
- IX. Divisional Assignment. If the Nature of Suit is under Property Rights or Prisoner Petitions or the matter is a Securities Class Action, leave this section blank. For all other cases, identify the divisional venue according to Civil Local Rule 3-2: "the county in which a substantial part of the events or omissions which give rise to the claim occurred or in which a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is situated."
- Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Northern District of California

Donald E. Potter, and Phillip Novak individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated)))				
Plaintiff(s))				
v.	Civil Action No.				
Chevron Products Company, a division of Chevron U.S.A. Inc. d/b/a Havoline Xpress Lube.)))				
Defendant(s))				
SUMMONS IN	NA CIVIL ACTION				
To: (Defendant's name and address) Corporation service compincorporated service. 2710 Gateway Oaks Dr S Sacramento, CA 95833	eany which will do business in California as CSC - Lawyers				
A lawsuit has been filed against you.					
are the United States or a United States agency, or an office	you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you cer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. aswer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of ion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,				
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.					
	CLERK OF COURT				
Date: 11/20/2017					
	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk				

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

was ra	This summons for (no ceived by me on (date)	ame of individual and title, if a	ny)					
was re	cerved by the on (aate)		·					
	☐ I personally served the summons on the individual at (place) on (date) ; or							
	☐ I left the summon	as at the individual's resid	ence or usual place of abode with (name)					
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resid							
	on (date)	, and mailed a	copy to the individual's last known address; or					
	☐ I served the sumn	nons on (name of individual)		, who is				
	designated by law to	o accept service of process	s on behalf of (name of organization)					
			on (date)	; or				
	☐ I returned the sum	nmons unexecuted becaus	e	; or				
	☐ Other (specify):							
	My fees are \$	for travel and	\$ for services, for a total of \$	0.00				
	I declare under penal	lty of perjury that this info	ormation is true.					
Date:								
			Server's signature					
		-	Printed name and title					
		-	Server's address					

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print Save As... Reset

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Chevron Accused of Adding 'Fictional' Recycling/Shop Supply Fees to Oil Change Prices</u>