

1 KEVIN D. GAMARNIK (273445)  
2 *kgamarnik@foleybezek.com*  
3 FOLEY BEZEK BEHLE & CURTIS, LLP  
4 575 Anton Boulevard, Suite 710  
5 Costa Mesa, California 92626  
6 Telephone: (714) 556-1700  
7 Facsimile: (714) 546-5005

8 AARON L. ARNDT (290748)  
9 *aarndt@foleybezek.com*  
10 JORDAN A. LIEBMAN (317930)  
11 *liebman@foleybezek.com*  
12 FOLEY BEZEK BEHLE & CURTIS, LLP  
13 15 West Carrillo Street  
14 Santa Barbara, California 93101  
15 Telephone: (805) 962-9495  
16 Facsimile: (805) 962-0722

17 ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
19 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

20 TABITHA SPERRING, PAISLIE  
21 MARCHANT, and SALLY  
22 POSTON, individually and on behalf  
23 of similarly situated persons,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 v.

26 LLR, INC., a Wyoming corporation;  
27 LULAROE, LLC, a California  
28 limited liability company; LENNON  
LEASING, LLC, a Wyoming limited  
liability company; MARK A.  
STIDHAM, an individual; DEANNE  
S. BRADY a/k/a DEANNE  
STIDHAM, an individual; and DOES  
1-30, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1 **CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

2 Plaintiffs, Tabitha Sperring, Paislie Marchant, and Sally Poston (“Plaintiffs”)  
3 bring this Action against corporate defendants, LLR, Inc., LuLaRoe, LLC, and  
4 Lennon Leasing, LLC (collectively “Corporate Defendants” or “LuLaRoe”);  
5 individual defendants Mark A. Stidham and DeAnne S. Brady (a/k/a DeAnne  
6 Stidham) (collectively, “Individual Defendants”); and Does 1-30, inclusive.  
7 Corporate Defendants, Individual Defendants, and Does 1-30 are hereinafter  
8 collectively referred to as “Defendants.”

9 **Introduction to the Case**

10 1. LuLaRoe is an unlawful, fraudulent pyramid scheme which preys on  
11 stay-at-home mothers, promising them they can generate substantial income while  
12 still being able to spend time at home with their families. LuLaRoe recruits these  
13 mothers to become “consultants.” When joining, these recruited “consultants”  
14 believe that they will be able to sell LuLaRoe’s various clothing items to a retail  
15 market.

16 2. Since its inception in approximately 2013, the LuLaRoe pyramid  
17 scheme has generated billions of dollars in revenue, and at one point had  
18 approximately 80,000-100,000 consultants, all (including Plaintiffs defined below)  
19 who paid thousands of dollars for the initial opportunity to purchase from  
20 LuLaRoe clothing items for the purpose of selling such items.

21 3. However, from its inception to at least the middle of 2017,  
22 LuLaRoe’s consultants’ primary income was derived from their ability to recruit  
23 other participants into the LuLaRoe scheme, rather than the sales of products to  
24 ultimate users.

25 4. Defendants, at all times, had express knowledge that the LuLaRoe  
26 structure was an illegal pyramid scheme.

27 5. As explained by the Ninth Circuit in *Webster v. Omnitrition Int’l*, 79  
28 F.3d 776, 781 (9th Cir. 1996):

1 Pyramid schemes are said to be inherently fraudulent because they  
2 must eventually collapse. [Citation]. Like chain letters, pyramid  
3 schemes may make money for those at the top of the chain or  
4 pyramid, but “must end up disappointing those at the bottom who can  
find no recruits.” [Citation].

5 6. That is precisely what happened to Plaintiffs here, as well as  
6 thousands of other LuLaRoe consultants. Although putting in the effort, Plaintiffs,  
7 like other LuLaRoe consultants, failed because they were doomed from the start by  
8 the LuLaRoe plan that systematically rewarded recruiting consultants over retail  
9 sales of the product. This was a plan where LuLaRoe paid a significant portion of  
10 every dollar that Plaintiffs and other consultants paid for LuLaRoe products to  
11 others in the form of bonuses, regardless of the consultant’s actual retail sales. This  
12 was a plan where millions were paid to those few at the top (primarily Mark  
13 Stidham and Deanne Brady), at the expense of the many at the bottom. LuLaRoe  
14 was started by Mark Stidham and Deanne Brady (who essentially sit at the very  
15 top of the pyramid) in order to enrich themselves through a calculated endless  
16 chain scheme. Upon information and belief, Stidham and Brady have earned  
17 hundreds of millions of dollars in profit for themselves on the backs of women  
18 who were seeking a legitimate business opportunity where they could earn income  
19 while spending more time with their families.

20 7. Moreover, in order to further induce the consultants, including  
21 Plaintiffs, to continue purchasing substantial amounts of LuLaRoe inventory,  
22 Defendants made material misrepresentations and omissions, including, but not  
23 limited to, representing to consultants that as long as they “buy more” LuLaRoe  
24 products, they will “sell more” LuLaRoe products, representing that there is  
25 nothing to lose because LuLaRoe will honor a full 100% return policy (with free  
26 shipping and handling), and omitting that the LuLaRoe quality of product is  
27 declining and that the market is saturated, all while providing misleading income  
28 statements and retailer maps. All of these representations and omissions were

1 untrue, deceptive, and/or misleading.

2 8. Consequently, all Defendants, through their contrivance, preparation,  
3 set up, proposal, and operation of LuLaRoe have contrived, prepared, set up,  
4 proposed, and operated an unlawful pyramid scheme in violation of the California  
5 Penal Code § 327, which also forms the basis of a violation of the Unfair  
6 Competition Law (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*) and the False Advertising  
7 Law (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500, *et seq.*).

8 9. LuLaRoe's unlawful, fraudulent, and unfair scheme has affected tens  
9 of thousands of consultants all across the country and has been recognized by  
10 governmental agencies as an illegal scheme. For example, on or about January 23,  
11 2019, the Washington Attorney General filed suit against Defendants in King  
12 County Superior Court, alleging that LuLaRoe is an unlawful pyramid scheme.

13 10. Additionally, Defendants, in violation of Civil Code § 1812.200, *et*  
14 *seq.*, have operated an unlawful seller assisted marketing plan, which also  
15 independently forms the basis of a violation of the Unfair Competition Law (Bus.  
16 & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*) and the False Advertising Law (Bus. & Prof. Code  
17 § 17500, *et seq.*)

18 11. Moreover, given Defendants' further misrepresentations and  
19 omissions, as well as breaches of contract, Plaintiffs are further bringing breach of  
20 contract, California Corporations Code violation, and RICO claims against  
21 Defendants.

22 **Parties**

23 12. Plaintiff Tabitha Sperring is and at all relevant times was a resident  
24 of Butler, Pennsylvania. Sperring became a LuLaRoe Consultant in or around  
25 December 2016. She continued purchasing LuLaRoe product until approximately  
26 May 2018. Sperring is a net loser when considering how much she spent on the  
27 wholesale purchase of LuLaRoe products and how much she earned from selling  
28 those items to the retail market and/or bonuses earned from recruiting. Sperring

1 has suffered substantial losses as a LuLaRoe consultant, finding herself in  
2 approximately \$16,000.00 in credit card debt as a result of the LuLaRoe scheme.  
3 Sperring still has a substantial volume of inventory in her possession, for which  
4 she paid approximately \$11,000. Sperring has suffered damages as a direct and  
5 proximate result of Defendants' misconduct and breaches described herein.

6 13. Plaintiff Paislie Marchant was a resident of Greenville, South  
7 Carolina while she worked as a Consultant. She currently resides in Spartanburg,  
8 South Carolina. Marchant became a Consultant in or around December 2016. She  
9 continued purchasing LuLaRoe product until approximately December 2017.  
10 Marchant is a net loser when considering how much she spent on the wholesale  
11 purchase of LuLaRoe products and how much she earned from selling those items  
12 to the retail market and/or bonuses earned from recruiting. Marchant has suffered  
13 substantial losses as a LuLaRoe consultant. Marchant currently has a substantial  
14 volume of LuLaRoe inventory in her possession, for which she paid approximately  
15 \$10,000. Marchant has suffered damages as a direct and proximate result of  
16 Defendants' misconduct and breaches described herein.

17 14. Plaintiff Sally Poston is and at all relevant times was a resident of  
18 Martinez, California. Poston became a LuLaRoe Consultant in or around February  
19 2016. She continued purchasing LuLaRoe product until approximately October  
20 2017. Poston is a net loser when considering how much she spent on the wholesale  
21 purchase of LuLaRoe products and how much she earned from selling those items  
22 to the retail market and/or bonuses earned from recruiting. Poston has lost  
23 approximately \$22,000 as a result of the LuLaRoe scheme. Poston sold some of  
24 the product at a loss and gave away the rest. As to the items that Poston gave away,  
25 they had absolutely no market value, and were worthless. Poston has suffered  
26 damages as a direct and proximate result of Defendants' misconduct and breaches  
27 described herein.

28 15. Corporate Defendant LLR, Inc. is a Wyoming corporation with its

1 principal place of business at 1375 Sampson Avenue, Corona, CA 92879.

2 16. Corporate Defendant LuLaRoe, LLC, is a California limited liability  
3 company with its principal place of business at 1375 Sampson Avenue, Corona,  
4 CA 92879.

5 17. Corporate Defendant Lennon Leasing, LLC, is a Wyoming limited  
6 liability company with its principal place of business at 1375 Sampson Avenue,  
7 Corona, CA 92879.

8 18. Together, Corporate Defendants LLR, Inc., LuLaRoe, LLC, and  
9 Lennon Leasing, LLC, comprise the LuLaRoe multi-level marketing (MLM)  
10 apparel business (collectively “LuLaRoe”).

11 19. Corporate Defendants LLR, Inc., LuLaRoe, LLC, and Lennon  
12 Leasing, LLC operated as a common enterprise while engaging in the deceptive  
13 and unlawful practices alleged herein.

14 20. Because LuLaRoe operated as a common enterprise, each entity is  
15 jointly and severally liable for the acts and practices alleged.

16 21. Individual Defendant Mark A. Stidham (“Stidham”) is a California  
17 resident and co-founder of LuLaRoe. He serves as President and CEO of LLR,  
18 Inc., President of LuLaRoe, LLC, and President and Chief Executive Officer of  
19 Lennon Leasing, LLC. Stidham, at all relevant times, lived in or around Corona,  
20 California. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with  
21 others, Defendant Stidham formulated, directed, controlled, had the authority to  
22 control, or participated in the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint.

23 22. Individual Defendant DeAnne Brady (“Brady”) is a California  
24 resident and co-founder of LuLaRoe. She serves as Secretary of LLR, Inc.; Chief  
25 Executive Officer and Secretary of LuLaRoe, LLC, and Secretary of Lennon  
26 Leasing, LLC. Brady, at all relevant times, lived in or around Corona, California.  
27 At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others,  
28 Brady formulated, directed, controlled, had the authority to control, or participated

1 in the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint.

2 23. Plaintiffs are unaware of the true names, identities and capacities of  
3 the Defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 30. When a name or capacity is  
4 known, Plaintiffs will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and  
5 capacities of Does 1 through 30.

6 24. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that each of  
7 the Defendants sued herein as a DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the  
8 events and happenings set forth herein and have proximately caused injuries and  
9 damages to Plaintiffs as set forth below.

10 25. Corporate Defendants, Individual Defendants, and DOES 1-30 will  
11 hereinafter be collectively referred to as “Defendants.”

12 26. Defendants, and each of them, carried out their acts both directly  
13 and/or through the acts and/or omissions of their agents, independent contractors,  
14 servants and/or employees, who at all times were acting within the course and  
15 scope of said agency, independent contractor agreement, and/or employment and  
16 the acts and omissions of said agents, independent contractors, servants and/or  
17 employees were authorized and ratified by all other said Defendants.

18 27. Whenever this Complaint references the acts, omissions or  
19 representations of any Defendant or Defendants, such allegation shall be deemed  
20 to mean the act, omission or representation of those Defendants named in the  
21 particular cause of action and each of them acting individually, jointly, and  
22 severally and/or in concert with the other Defendant(s).

23 28. To the extent that any of the claims alleged herein are barred by any  
24 limitations rules, such claims are equitably tolled against Defendants and/or  
25 Defendants are equitably estopped from asserting such limitation defense, given  
26 Defendants ongoing misrepresentations and concealment of material fact alleged  
27 herein.

28

### **Jurisdiction and Venue**

1  
2           29.     The Court has jurisdiction under the Class Action Fairness Act of  
3 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2), because the suit is a class action, the parties are  
4 minimally diverse, and the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, excluding  
5 interest and costs. The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' state  
6 law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

7           30.     This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because they  
8 had sufficient minimum contacts with California and within this District because,  
9 among other things, (i) the Individual Defendants reside in this District, (ii) the  
10 Corporate Defendants maintain their headquarters in this District, (iii) Defendants  
11 transact a substantial amount of business in California, including within this  
12 District, and (iv) Defendants have each purposefully availed themselves of the  
13 laws and markets of this District through the promotion, sale, and distribution of  
14 their products and seller assisted marketing plans from within California and  
15 within this District.

16           31.     Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c)  
17 because a substantial number of the acts, omissions, and transactions that  
18 established the claims of Plaintiffs and the Class occurred within this District.  
19 Defendants conducted business and solicited business relating to the endless chain  
20 scheme and unregistered seller assisted marketing plan from this District.  
21 Defendants transacted their affairs, resided within California and this District, and  
22 Defendants' wrongful acts occurred in this District.


### **The Facts**

23  
24           32.     LuLaRoe is MLM company founded by husband and wife couple,  
25 Individual Defendants Mark Stidham and DeAnne Brady in 2013, that promotes  
26 and sells colorfully patterned leggings, shirts, skirts, and dresses through a network  
27 of independent distributors called "Independent Fashion Consultants" (hereinafter  
28 "Consultants").






1 a. “Sponsors” were the lowest tier. Any Consultant could become  
2 a “Sponsor” by recruiting Consultants. Sponsors who met a minimum purchase  
3 requirement of 175 pieces per month were eligible for a 5% “override bonus on the  
4 Personal Volume (Payments Received)” of their sponsored Consultants.



21 b. “Trainers” were the second tier. A “Trainer” had to qualify  
22 with “250 pieces (100 of which must be generated by their personal orders), at  
23 least three Personally Sponsored Fashion Consultants, with a total of ten Fashion  
24 Consultants in their team and 1,750 Total Group pieces ordered and paid for.”  
25 Trainers were eligible to earn “qualification points” to reduce their own personal  
26 purchase requirement. Trainers earned a 5% bonus on personally sponsored  
27 Consultants and a 3% bonus on the rest of the team’s inventory purchases.

28

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



c. “Coaches” were the third tier. Coaches had to meet the requirements of a Trainer and have at least three First Level Trainers. Coaches had a minimum group volume of 1,750 pieces and were eligible for Trainer Leadership Bonuses in addition to 1% of the Dollar Amount of any Second Level Leader’s Group Volume. Coaches were also eligible to receive leadership “points,” which could be cashed out or be used for other rewards such as the LuLaRoe Cruise.

///  
///  
///


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



d. “Mentors” were the top tier. To qualify as a Mentor, a Consultant had to meet the requirements of a Trainer and have at least three leadership lines with coaches or above and three additional leadership lines. In addition to the Coach Bonuses, Mentors were eligible to earn 1% of the Dollar Amount of the total inventory purchases of all Third Level Leaders teams.

///  
///  
///

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



38. Income earned through the Leadership Bonus Plan significantly dwarfed retail profits for top consultants. At a Leadership Conference themed, “Be the Light” hosted at the Riverside Convention Center in California in January 2017, Defendant Brady asked Consultants to publicly state their last month’s total retail sales and bonus checks. Consultants, at Defendant Brady’s direction, announced the amounts of their monthly bonus checks, which ranged from \$85,000 to \$307,000. Compared to their monthly retail sales, which ranged from \$12,000 to \$25,000, it was clear that the primary opportunity for compensation was not through sale of LuLaRoe apparel, but bonuses earned through recruiting.

39. When a Consultant would recruit (or sponsor) another Consultant, that lower level participant would be part of the recruiting Consultant’s “downline” and the recruiting Consultant would be part of the lower level participant’s

1 “upline.” Defendants encouraged Consultants to build a team of “downline”  
2 Consultants underneath them who would purchase the LuLaRoe product as  
3 inventory for which the “upline” Consultants would earn bonuses or commissions  
4 from such “downline” inventory purchases.

5 40. Defendants’ bonus plan was not tied to retail sales, but rather, was  
6 tied to the value of the inventory orders purchased by “downline” Consultants. The  
7 Bonus Plan made clear that consultants’ compensation was based on inventory  
8 orders purchased by “downline” Consultants, and not based on retail sales.

9 41. Defendants incentivized “upline” Consultants to encourage the  
10 “downline” Consultants to purchase as much inventory as possible regardless of  
11 whether they were making any sales to end-users.

12 42. Defendants were able to sell substantial amounts of inventory to the  
13 “downline” Consultants, who had difficulty making money on their own sales to  
14 end-consumers. By pushing sales to Consultants and the recruitment of  
15 Consultants, the market became oversaturated with Consultants and products.

#### 16 *Sales and Marketing Activities*

17 43. Defendants’ sales and marketing activities similarly emphasize  
18 recruiting individuals into the LuLaRoe MLM and encouraging inventory  
19 purchases in connection with their participation, rather bona fide retail sales. As  
20 stated in their marketing materials, “One of the greatest financial awards LuLaRoe  
21 has to offer Consultants is its proven Leadership Bonus Plan” where “you can earn  
22 significant income when you sponsor and build a strong T.E.A.M. that has  
23 consistently grown sales.”

24 44. Defendants promote the LuLaRoe program through a variety of  
25 channels, including websites, social media, videos, testimonials, weekly webinars,  
26 conference calls, training calls, and live presentations and meetings at conferences.  
27 Defendants used a number of channels to promote the LuLaRoe Program, such as  
28 “opportunity calls,” “opportunity events,” “trainer calls,” and “pop-ups.”

1 LuLaRoe’s core management team, including Defendants Stidham and Brady plan,  
2 host, and execute “opportunity calls,” “opportunity events,” and “trainer calls.”

3 45. “Opportunity events” are events designed to recruit new Consultants  
4 and motivate existing Consultants to do the same, typically hosted in hotel  
5 ballrooms, conference rooms, or convention centers around the country. LuLaRoe  
6 annually hosted a conference called VISION for active Consultants. Individual  
7 Defendants often spoke at “opportunity events.”

8 46. “Opportunity calls,” often hosted by Defendant Brady, are weekly  
9 conference calls to promote and market the LuLaRoe MLM to potential recruits.

10 47. “Trainer calls” are calls designed to entice and train consultants to  
11 grow their teams through the Leadership Bonus Program.

12 48. “Pop-ups” are events hosted by Consultants, where Consultants are  
13 encouraged to recruit “Hostesses” in order to help them sell LuLaRoe  
14 merchandise. LuLaRoe encourages Consultants to reward “Hostesses” with free  
15 LuLaRoe merchandise, and at each “pop-up,” recruit additional “Hostesses” for  
16 additional “pop-ups.”

17 49. Through each of these channels, Defendants encouraged consumers,  
18 including Plaintiffs, to become LuLaRoe Consultants and to recruit others,  
19 including friends and family members, to do the same.

20 50. In trainings, Defendants represent that a key to success is “Buy more,  
21 sell more.” This “buy more, sell more” was a practice done to encourage inventory  
22 loading, by inducing Consultants to purchase as much inventory as possible  
23 (profiting those at the top—i.e., Stidham and Brady).

24 51. Defendants further emphasize the key to success is growing “Group  
25 Volume” to receive large rewards through the Leadership Bonus Plan.

26 52. Defendants’ goal was to have the Consultants purchase more  
27 product, rather than focusing on the actual end sales to consumers. Defendants  
28 further encouraged Consultants to continue buying more and more product,

1 encouraging them to take 100% of all profits earned from sales to purchase more  
2 product.

3 **Defendants' Business Opportunity and Income Claims**

4 53. In order to recruit Consultants to the LuLaRoe MLM, Defendants  
5 assert throughout their sales and marketing activities that consumers can earn  
6 significant rewards through the LuLaRoe MLM, and that Consultants' income  
7 potential is significant.

8 54. Defendants repeatedly tout that the LuLaRoe MLM offers anyone an  
9 easy path to financial freedom and independence with part-time work. Print  
10 materials for recruiting distributed by LuLaRoe state: "MAKE A FULL-TIME  
11 INCOME DOING PART TIME WORK. BECOME A LULAROE  
12 INDEPENDENT BUSINESS OWNER" and "WANT TO EARN FULL-TIME  
13 INCOME FOR PART-TIME WORK? ASK ME HOW?" LuLaRoe's document  
14 titled "How Long to Pay Back My Initial Investment" said that LuLaRoe is a  
15 "simple business" in which Consultants can "earn full-time income for part-  
16 timework." Defendants claimed that "[w]ith LuLaRoe, in a matter of a few  
17 months, you can completely repay your initial investment and have money in the  
18 bank." LuLaRoe encouraged consultants to frame and hang these print materials at  
19 "pop-up parties" and distribute these materials to potential recruits. At an  
20 opportunity event in 2015, Defendant Stidham also made similar lifestyle claims of  
21 "full-time income on part-time work":

22 We started this business on the premise that you could make a full-  
23 time income on part-time, part-time work, alright? I always boiled  
24 that down to this, a party takes about 5 hours. Uh, we say it takes 5  
25 hours because the party itself takes about an hour and half because  
26 you got to set it up. You take it down. You gotta call and prep the  
27 hostess. You have to organize your inventory. So, you have lots of  
28 ancillary ... activities that goes with the party. So ... I think it's very  
generous to say you have 5 hours for a party. Now, can you do 4  
parties in a week? 4 parties times 5 hours is 20 hours; 20 hours in the  
week is definitely part time work. Now what do you make if you do 4



1 parties in a week? Average party sales are about 25 pieces. Okay, so 4  
2 parties in a week equals 100 pieces sold in a week. There's are 52  
3 weeks in a year, but we're gonna give you two weeks off. So 50  
4 weeks take 100 pieces, that's 5000 pieces sold in a year. Average  
5 profit is 12 to 15 dollars per item, that's 60 to 75 thousand dollars a  
6 year working 20 hours a week.”

6 55. Defendant Brady made lifestyle and income claims during  
7 “opportunity calls” designed to recruit new Consultants, “opportunity events”  
8 designed to motivate Consultants to recruit others, and in webinars put on by  
9 existing Consultants:

10 a. “You are going to make about three to five-thousand on  
11 average, I'm saying on average, you know, you gonna, you're going to have to get  
12 yourself going. ... Your business will start to grow and it will grow and grow and  
13 grow ... On average our consultants are paying their debt back ... anywhere from  
14 2 weeks to 2 months, depending on how much you want to commit to. ...”

15 b. “In fact, today, I was making calls. I reached out to 25 retailers  
16 that are selling an average of 12 to 15, [correct self] 10 to 15 thousand a month, I  
17 mean is that, is that comprehensible or what, it's amazing, to make that kind of  
18 money, doing it part-time, being a stay at home mom. ...”

19 c. “I mean I could blow your, your mind away by telling you that  
20 we have over 100 people that make a lot of money, like between 50 thousand to  
21 500 thousand dollars a month, and I'm not lying.”

22 d. “What really affects me is when women call me and say, ‘my  
23 husband just lost his job, so I guess I'm it.’ And they say, ‘do you think I can do it  
24 DeAnne?’ And I get to get my pom-poms out, and I say, ‘But don't you see this is  
25 an answer! This is easy! This is fun! This is something you guys can do together  
26 and he can watch the kids while you go and do parties.’”

27 e. “This is a business that is going to bring in a lot of money for  
28 you, a lot of money, I mean a lot. I'm going to say that over.”



**Failure to Disclose Material Terms**

1  
2           59. Prospective Consultants, including Plaintiffs, relied on information  
3 publicly available on LuLaRoe’s website in evaluating whether the LuLaRoe  
4 MLM will be a worthwhile business opportunity. However, LuLaRoe fails to  
5 disclose accurate information material to their decision.

6           60. For example, LuLaRoe on its website has published annual  
7 disclosure statements on its website since 2014. The figures contained in the  
8 company’s disclosure statements do not show the whole picture and are  
9 misleading. Among other things, the disclosure statements only take into account  
10 “active” Consultants who have met minimum purchase thresholds and omit  
11 participants who fared worse. Additionally, LuLaRoe never published a 2017  
12 Income Statement, leaving a 2016 Income Statement on its website, which was not  
13 reflective of 2017 when business declined. As such, LuLaRoe misled prospective  
14 Consultants who evaluated whether to join the LuLaRoe MLM in 2017.

15           61. Likewise, this intentional failure to publish the 2017 Income  
16 Statements and leave up the 2016 Income Statements (which was not reflective of  
17 2017 when business declined) misled Consultants into purchasing more products.

18           62. LuLaRoe’s “Retailer Map,” which is published on its website,  
19 misrepresents the number of active Consultants in a particular geographic location.  
20 While LuLaRoe maintains data and statistics on the location and number of active  
21 and inactive retailers, the map understates the number of Consultants, misleading  
22 potential Consultants about the level of saturation of active Consultants in a  
23 location. The map informs prospective Consultants about market saturation, which  
24 is material information about the potential business opportunity. Instead of  
25 updating the map with accurate information, LuLaRoe added a disclaimer to the  
26 map in 2018, the efficacy of which was diluted by stating that it “cannot and does  
27 not guarantee the accuracy of the Retailer Map” in non-conspicuous fine grey  
28 print.

1                    **Unfair and Deceptive Practices Encouraging Inventory Loading**

2            63. Defendants also engage in a number of practices that encourage  
3 Consultants to purchase significant wholesale inventory. Defendants engaged in  
4 unfair and deceptive business practices that encourage inventory loading. Such  
5 practices include educating Consultants that a key to success is maintaining  
6 significant inventory; not permitting Consultants to pick the pattern or size of  
7 apparel included in inventory purchases (and providing primarily unpopular  
8 patterns); and marketing limited edition “unicorn” pieces to create a “frenzy” of  
9 inventory ordering. LuLaRoe intentionally only placed a few popular items within  
10 each shipment.

11            64. Defendants deceptively trained Consultants that the key to success is  
12 “Buy more, sell more.” In training materials, LuLaRoe encourages Consultants to  
13 invest all profits from retail sales back into inventory purchases:

14            Having a wide selection will lead to more customer engagement and  
15 bigger sales. It is crucial that you carry a significant number of pieces  
16 in every size before moving onto other styles. We have found that our  
17 Consultants who carry several hundred items in their inventory have  
18 the highest rate of success. Of course there are no set-in-stone rules,  
and you may proceed at your own pace, but we have learned that  
abundant inventory often creates abundant sales!

19            65. Defendant Brady stated in a November 14, 2016 mentor call:

20            The way this business was created, was you have the merchandise,  
21 you put it before people and you sell it and you have money in your  
22 bank account. That is how this business goes and the more investment  
23 that you put into your business, you treating it like a business, the first  
90 days to 120 days, YOU DO NOT SPEND YOUR MONEY. Sorry,  
24 you can buy an ice cream cone, or a diet coke or cup of coffee and  
gas, you pour everything back in your business ... well this kind of  
25 business is driven by the more you invest in your business, the more  
26 you have, the more you are going to sell it. So I want to reach out to  
27 you and let you know and give you permission that this is a business  
that is going to bring in a lot of money for you, A LOT, I mean A  
28 LOT, I'm going to say that over.



1 inventories the merchandise and deems it resalable, LuLaRoe issues a refund  
2 check. This complex process was not disclosed to Consultants, including class  
3 members, when they agreed to become consultants.

4 69. Rather, when deciding to be a LuLaRoe consultant, Plaintiffs,  
5 including class members, were led to believe that they will receive a 90% refund  
6 upon returning all LuLaRoe items. Plaintiffs and other class members believed that  
7 there was low risk in proceeding to sell LuLaRoe products because of the 90%  
8 refund policy. Thus, if a consultant invested \$5,000 but was unable to sell any  
9 product, that consultant believed that upon return, she would receive \$4,500, only  
10 risking \$500.

11 70. On April 25, 2017, in order to induce more purchases of LuLaRoe  
12 product, LuLaRoe announced it would be changing its 90% policy to 100%, and  
13 committed to paying for return shipping. LuLaRoe made representations that the  
14 revised 100% policy would not go away.

15 71. On June 30, 2017, LuLaRoe deceptively posted a “Home Office  
16 Update” on LuLaRoe’s online portal “Build.” “This policy does not have an  
17 expiration date, nor does it have a required timeframe in which the product should  
18 have been purchased in.” However, without any advance notice to Consultants,  
19 LuLaRoe announced on September 13, 2017, that it would no longer honor the  
20 100% refund policy. The promise of a 100% return policy induced Consultants,  
21 including Plaintiffs, to purchase more product.

22 72. Also, LuLaRoe sent emails to Consultants, including Plaintiffs,  
23 stating:

24 INDEPENDENT FASHION RETAILERS, WHO WISH TO  
25 CANCEL THEIR RETAILER AGREEMENT, WILL BE  
26 REFUNDED 100% OF THE WHOLESALE AMOUNT. How  
27 AWESOME is that? On top of that, LuLaRoe will also cover your  
shipping by sending you shipping labels!

28 (Emphasis in original).

1           73. The promise to provide a 100% refund induced Consultants,  
2 including Plaintiffs, to purchase more LuLaRoe inventory. Consultants, including  
3 Plaintiffs, in conjunction with the representation that buying more will lead to  
4 selling more, purchased more product, comfortable that if they are unable to sell  
5 the product, they can return for a full refund.

6           74. However, at the time that Defendants made such representation for a  
7 100% return, they did not intend to actually honor such 100% return policy.

8           75. Following the announcement, many retailers who had started the exit  
9 process experienced issues with their refunds, including a lack of response to  
10 initiating refunds, delays in sending formstacks, miscalculations in the amount of  
11 refunds owed (which became known among Consultants as “LuLaMath”), and  
12 significantly delayed or non-payment of refunds.

13           76. Word spread quickly amongst LuLaRoe Consultants about  
14 LuLaRoe’s failure to honor the repurchase representation. As a result of  
15 LuLaRoe’s failure to honor its written repurchase policy, many Consultants,  
16 including Plaintiffs, did not send in their merchandise because they believed  
17 LuLaRoe would not refund them the appropriate amount, if at all. Many  
18 Consultants, like Plaintiffs, were forced to attempt to mitigate their losses through  
19 other means, such as G.O.O.B. sales, consignment thrift shops, or simply giving  
20 away merchandise at a loss. Many others are still holding onto boxes of unsaleable  
21 inventory. LuLaRoe’s items that many of the Consultants simply gave away are  
22 worthless and could not be sold.

23           77. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that many LuLaRoe consultants  
24 that did submit their merchandise to LuLaRoe are still waiting months, if not more  
25 than a year, to receive their refund check.

26           78. In sum, LuLaRoe’s business model was a pyramid scheme. The  
27 primary business opportunity in the LuLaRoe MLM was its Leadership Bonus  
28 Plan, which rewarded compensation solely based on recruiting and inventory

1 purchases.

2 79. Further, Defendants' marketing and sales activities, misleading  
3 income and lifestyle claims, emphasis on recruiting and inventory purchases over  
4 emphasis on sales to consumers outside the LuLaRoe organization, and inventory  
5 loading practices ensured that the primary business opportunity with LuLaRoe was  
6 through recruitment.

7 80. LuLaRoe experienced exponential growth, creating substantial  
8 income for the individual Defendants. Defendant Stidham announced in February  
9 2017, that LuLaRoe had over 70,000 Consultants nationwide and that by August  
10 10, 2017, LuLaRoe had achieved "over \$1.5 Billion in retail sales for 2017 so far  
11 this year."

12 81. As a result of Defendants' business and marketing practices that  
13 encouraged inventory loading, LuLaRoe faced so much demand for inventory that  
14 it could not keep up with orders. In early 2017, the quality of LuLaRoe's  
15 merchandise declined, with Consultants receiving mis-sized merchandise or low-  
16 quality merchandise, such as leggings with mismatched pant leg lengths or  
17 merchandise that quickly developed holes.

18 82. LuLaRoe also provided items that were improperly stored outside  
19 and were unsaleable when received by the Consultants. LuLaRoe failed to disclose  
20 to Consultants that the quality was declining and that the merchandise was  
21 improperly stored.

22 83. Even with these production and quality problems, LuLaRoe  
23 continued encouraging inventory loading.

24 84. Defendants market the LuLaRoe MLM as a transformational,  
25 empowering opportunity to achieve dreams and achieve financial freedom while  
26 providing a flexible and part time alternative to traditional employment.  
27 Defendants' marketing prominently features testimonials of independent, stylish,  
28 affluent women who have it all: a successful career, flexibility and time to spend



1 with their children, and a harmonious marriage. LuLaRoe marketing materials  
2 claim that joining the LuLaRoe Program can “change lives,” “build confidence,”  
3 and offer Consultants the opportunity to “create freedom, serve others and  
4 strengthen families.” In reality, LuLaRoe's pyramid scheme business model and  
5 compensation plan, and its corresponding marketing activities dictated that during  
6 any particular time, a majority of Consultants, including Plaintiffs, lost money.

7 **Plaintiffs Would Not Have Joined LuLaRoe and/or Purchased Additional**  
8 **LuLaRoe Product Had They Known the Truth**

9 85. Each of the Plaintiffs was exposed to Defendants’ direct and indirect  
10 representations and/or omissions regarding, among other things, that they can  
11 generate substantial income while still being able to spend time with their families  
12 (e.g., full time income working part-time hours).

13 86. Each of the Plaintiffs, based on some or all of the aforementioned  
14 representations and omissions, became LuLaRoe consultants, paying the  
15 “onboarding” fee.

16 87. In truth, LuLaRoe Consultants were not likely to earn substantial  
17 income.

18 88. Each of the Plaintiffs was also exposed to Defendants’ direct and  
19 indirect representations and/or omissions regarding, among other things, (a) to  
20 “buy more, sell more” by taking profits from any sales and investing it into more  
21 LuLaRoe product, (b) that LuLaRoe will honor a 100% return policy, (c) the  
22 income statements made on LuLaRoe’s website, (d) the misleading retailer map on  
23 LuLaRoe’s website, (e) the saturation of the Consultant market, (f) the decline in  
24 the quality of the products, and (g) that Defendants intentionally only placed a few  
25 popular items within each shipment.

26 89. Each of the Plaintiffs, based on some or all of the aforementioned  
27 representations and omissions, continued purchasing LuLaRoe products.

28 90. In truth, LuLaRoe did not provide a 100% full refund. In truth, the

1 market was extremely saturated with Consultants. In truth, the quality of the  
2 products was declining. In truth, the majority of the items sold by LuLaRoe to  
3 Consultants were not saleable. Consultants, including Plaintiffs, were unaware of  
4 these facts when purchasing more and more inventory.

5 **Class Action Allegations**

6 91. Plaintiffs bring this action as a class action under Federal Rule of  
7 Civil Procedure 23.

8 92. Plaintiffs seek to represent a nationwide class defined as follows:

9 “All LuLaRoe Consultants in the United States from January 1, 2013  
10 until the present that lost money as LuLaRoe Consultants.”

11 93. Excluded from the class are the Defendants, and their officers and  
12 directors, family members, legal representatives, heirs, successors or assigns.  
13 Further excluded from the class are each of the Plaintiffs from *Lemberg, et al. v.*  
14 *LuLaRoe, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 5:17-cv-02102-AB-SHK (C.D. Cal.).

15 94. Plaintiffs seek relief for themselves and all members of the class.

16 95. While the exact number of members in the Class are unknown to  
17 Plaintiffs at this time and can only be determined by appropriate discovery,  
18 membership in the Class is ascertainable based upon the records maintained by  
19 Defendants. It is estimated that the members of the Class exceed 25,000  
20 individuals. Therefore, the Class is so numerous that individual joinder of all Class  
21 members is impracticable under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1).

22 96. There are questions of law and/or fact common to the class including  
23 but not limited to:

- 24 a. Whether Defendants are operating an endless chain;  
25 b. Whether Consultants paid money to Defendants for (1) the right  
26 to sell a product and (2) the right to receive, in return for recruiting others, rewards  
27 which were unrelated to the sale of the product to retail consumers;  
28 c. Whether Defendants have met the factors set forth in *In re*

1 *Amway Corp.*, 93 F.T.C. 618 (1979): (1) upline distributors are required to buy  
2 back from any person they recruited any saleable, unsold inventory upon the  
3 recruit's leaving the enterprise; (2) every participant is required to sell at wholesale  
4 or retail at least 70% of the products bought in a given month to receive a bonus  
5 that month; and (3) to receive a bonus, each participant was required to submit  
6 proof of retail sales made to at least ten different consumers;

7 d. Whether Defendants omitted to inform Plaintiffs and the Class  
8 that they were entering into an illegal scheme where an overwhelming number of  
9 participants lose money;

10 e. Whether it was deceptive to represent to Consultants that if  
11 they "buy more" they will "sell more;"

12 f. Whether it was fraudulent and unfair to promise Consultants  
13 that Defendants will honor a 100% return policy which was not honored;

14 g. Whether Defendants acted deceptively and/or unfairly by  
15 failing to inform Consultants about the decline in the quality of the products and  
16 the improper storage of clothing;

17 h. Whether it was deceptive and/or unfair for Defendants to  
18 intentionally include only a few popular items in each shipment;

19 i. Whether it was deceptive and/or unfair to omit a 2017 income  
20 statement from the website and provide only a 2016 income statement;

21 j. Whether Defendants' conduct constitutes an unlawful, unfair  
22 and/or deceptive trade practice under California state law;

23 k. Whether Defendants' conduct constitutes unfair competition  
24 under California state law;

25 l. Whether Defendants' conduct constitutes false advertising  
26 under California state law; and

27 m. Whether LuLaRoe violated rules regarding seller assisted  
28 marketing plans under California law.

1           97.     These and other questions of law and/or fact are common to the class  
2 and predominate over any question affecting only individual class members.

3           98.     Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the class in that, among  
4 other things, Plaintiffs were Consultants for Defendants and lost money.

5           99.     Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the  
6 class. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of those of the class. Plaintiffs' interests are  
7 fully aligned with those of the class. And Plaintiffs have retained counsel  
8 experienced and skilled in complex class action litigation.

9           100.    Class action treatment is superior to the alternatives for the fair and  
10 efficient adjudication of the controversy alleged, because such treatment will allow  
11 many similarly-situated persons to pursue their common claims in a single forum  
12 simultaneously, efficiently and without unnecessary duplication of evidence,  
13 effort, and expense that numerous individual actions would engender.

14           101.    Plaintiffs know of no difficulty likely to be encountered in the  
15 management that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

16           **The ADR Provisions That Plaintiffs are Subject to are Unconscionable**

17           102.    Plaintiffs are aware that various Plaintiffs in the *Lemberg, et al. v.*  
18 *LuLaRoe, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 5:17-cv-02102-AB-SHK (C.D. Cal.) action filed  
19 similar claims against Defendants. Plaintiffs are further aware that Defendants  
20 successfully compelled such claims to arbitration. However, there are key  
21 arguments and authorities that the parties did not address during that motion to  
22 compel arbitration briefing.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

///  
///  
///

**CLAIMS BASED ON VIOLATION OF ENDLESS CHAIN SCHEME**

**FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**(ENDLESS CHAIN SCHEME; California Penal Code §327**

**and Section 1689.2 of the California Civil Code)**

**Against All Defendants**

**(On Behalf of the Class)**

103. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate all allegations above, save and except any allegation that can be interpreted to allege any violation of any duty, obligation, or term or condition, imposed by any LuLaRoe Independent Consultant Program Application & Agreement, LuLaRoe’s policies and procedures, or LuLaRoe compensation plan.

104. Penal Code § 327 provides:

Every person who contrives, prepares, sets up, proposes, or operates any endless chain is guilty of a public offense ....

As used in this section, an “endless chain” means any scheme for the disposal or distribution of property whereby a participant pays a valuable consideration for the chance to receive compensation for introducing one or more additional persons into participation in the scheme or for the chance to receive compensation when a person introduced by the participant introduces a new participant. Compensation, as used in this section, does not mean or include payment based upon sales made to persons who are not participants in the scheme and who are not purchasing in order to participate in the scheme.

105. Section 1689.2 of the California Civil Code provides:

A participant in an endless chain scheme, as defined in Section 327 of the Penal Code, may rescind the contract upon which the scheme is based, and may recover all consideration paid pursuant to the scheme, less any amounts paid or consideration provided to the participant pursuant to the scheme.

106. Here, each Defendant contrived, prepared, set up, proposed and/or operated an endless chain scheme.

1           107. Plaintiffs and the class have suffered an injury in fact and have lost  
2 money or property because of Defendants' operation of an endless chain, business  
3 acts, omissions, and practices.

4           108. As a matter of law, Defendants misrepresentations and material  
5 omissions, knowledge, and intent follow from the inherently fraudulent nature of  
6 the fact that they were operating a pyramid scheme. *See Webster v. Omnitrition*  
7 *Int'l*, 79 F.3d 776, 788 (9th Cir. 1996).

8           109. Moreover, there is an inherent deceptiveness in endless chain  
9 schemes where the fact that the "futility" of the plan is not "apparent to the  
10 consumer participant." *Id.*

11           110. Here, the futility was not apparent to the Plaintiffs nor any of the  
12 other class member Consultants.

13           111. Moreover, Defendants do not have in place the following rules (and  
14 certainly do not enforce the following rules): (1) upline distributors are required to  
15 buy back from any person they recruited any saleable, unsold inventory upon the  
16 recruit's leaving the enterprise; (2) every participant is required to sell at wholesale  
17 or retail at least 70% of the products bought in a given month to receive a bonus  
18 that month; and (3) to receive a bonus, each participant was required to submit  
19 proof of retail sales made to at least ten different consumers.

20           112. Plaintiffs and the class are entitled to:

21           a. Rescind the contract upon which the scheme is based and  
22 recover all consideration paid under the scheme, less any amounts paid or  
23 consideration provided to the participant under the scheme, or, in the alternative,  
24 any other rescission-like remedy appropriate under the circumstances;

25           b. Restitution, compensatory and consequential damages (where  
26 not inconsistent with their request for rescission or restitution); and

27           c. Attorneys' fees, costs, pre- and post-judgment interest.  
28



1 participants for the purchase of product by participants, not the retail sale of  
2 products or services.

3 120. Defendants made numerous misleading representations about the  
4 business opportunity available to the Consultants and the income that a Consultant  
5 can realize by becoming a Consultant and participating in the scheme.

6 121. Defendants knew, or should have known, that the representations  
7 about the business opportunity presented to Consultants were misleading in nature.

8 122. As a direct result of Defendants' fraudulent representations and  
9 omissions regarding their endless chain described herein, Defendants wrongly  
10 acquired money from Plaintiffs and the members of the classes.

11 123. Furthermore, Defendants fraudulently misrepresented facts about the  
12 amount of money that a Consultant would earn, including false statements about  
13 Defendants' consultants' historic sales volume and profitability and the amount of  
14 time in which Consultants recoup their investment and become profitable.

15 124. Each of the named Plaintiffs actually relied on the alleged fraudulent  
16 conduct. Had any of the named Plaintiffs known the truth behind Defendants  
17 misrepresentations and/or material omissions, none of the Plaintiffs would have  
18 become Consultants.

19 125. Defendants knew that Plaintiffs and the class would reasonably rely  
20 on their representations and material omissions, which would cause the Plaintiffs  
21 and the class to join the fraudulent scheme and purchase the products, and  
22 Plaintiffs did in fact reasonably rely on such representations and omissions by  
23 joining the scheme and purchasing products.

24 126. The fraudulent acts, representations, and omissions described herein  
25 were material not only to Plaintiffs and the class, but also to reasonable persons.

26 **Defendants' Sales and Marketing Plan is Unfair**

27 127. Under California Business and Professions Code § 17200, a business  
28 practice is "unfair" if it violates established public policy or if it is immoral,



1 unethical, oppressive or unscrupulous and causes injury which outweighs its  
2 benefits.

3 128. For the reasons set forth herein and above, Defendants' promotion  
4 and operation of an unlawful and fraudulent endless chain, and their fraudulent  
5 representations and omissions regarding the business opportunity for Consultants  
6 was unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous in that Defendants had been duping  
7 Plaintiffs and the class out hundreds of millions of dollars.

8 129. Defendants' actions have few, if any, benefits. Thus, the injury  
9 caused to Plaintiffs and the class easily and dramatically outweighs the benefits, if  
10 any.

11 130. Defendants should be made to disgorge all ill-gotten gains and return  
12 to Plaintiffs and the class all wrongfully taken amounts.

13 131. Finally, Defendants' unlawful, fraudulent and unfair acts and  
14 omissions will not be completely and finally stopped without orders of an  
15 injunctive nature. Under California Business and Professions Code section 17203,  
16 Plaintiffs and the class seek a judicial order of an equitable nature against all  
17 Defendants, including, but not limited to, an order declaring such practices as  
18 complained of to be unlawful, fraudulent and unfair, and enjoining them from  
19 further undertaking any of the unlawful, fraudulent and unfair acts or omissions  
20 described herein.

21 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

22 **False Advertising**

23 **(California Business and Professions Code § 17500, *et seq.*)**

24 **Against All Defendants**

25 **(On Behalf of the Class)**

26 132. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate all allegations above, save and  
27 except any allegation that can be interpreted to allege any violation of any duty,  
28 obligation, or term or condition, imposed by any LuLaRoe Independent Consultant

1 Program Application & Agreement, LuLaRoe’s policies and procedures, or  
2 LuLaRoe compensation plan.

3 133. Defendants’ business acts, false advertisements and materially  
4 misleading omissions constitute false advertising, in violation of the California  
5 Business and Professions Code § 17500, *et seq.* Each of the Defendants are either a  
6 person, firm, corporation, association, or an employee thereof, that, with intent,  
7 directly, or indirectly, in order to dispose of property, induced the class, including  
8 Plaintiffs, to become Consultants, based on untrue, and misleading statements  
9 regarding whether it was selling and/or promoting a seller assisted marketing plan.  
10 Defendants knew that its representations and/or omissions were false and/or  
11 misleading.

12 134. As explained in *Webster*, “the operation and promotion of an endless  
13 chain scheme within the meaning of Penal Code § 327 is an inherently deceptive  
14 marketing practice, actionable under §17500.” *Webster*, 79 F.3d at 788.

#### 15 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

#### 16 **Violation of California Corporations Code**

#### 17 **Against all Defendants**

#### 18 **(On Behalf of the Class)**

19 135. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate all allegations above, save and  
20 except any allegation that can be interpreted to allege any violation of any duty,  
21 obligation, or term or condition, imposed by any LuLaRoe Independent Consultant  
22 Program Application & Agreement, LuLaRoe’s policies and procedures, or  
23 LuLaRoe compensation plan.

24 136. California Corporations Code §25401 provides that it is unlawful for  
25 any person to offer to sell or sell a security in California by means of any written  
26 or oral communication, which includes an untrue statement of a material fact or  
27 omits to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in  
28 light of the circumstances under which the statements were made, not misleading.

1           137. The clothing items that the Corporate Defendants sold to  
2 Consultants, including Plaintiffs, were securities.

3           138. Defendants, by engaging in the conduct described above, in  
4 connection with the purchase or sale of a security, by the use of written or oral  
5 communications made untrue statements of material facts and/or omitted to state  
6 material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the  
7 circumstances, under which they were made, accurate and not misleading. Among  
8 other things, Corporate Defendants failed to explain that the investment in  
9 LuLaRoe clothing was an illegal pyramid scheme.

10           139. To the extent any of the Defendants did not directly offer or sell the  
11 security, such Defendants are still liable because they either control the seller of  
12 the security, are officers or directors of the seller of the security, and/or are  
13 employees that materially aided in the seller's misrepresentations/omissions. Cal.  
14 Corp. Code § 25504 provides that "[e]very person who directly or indirectly  
15 controls a person liable under 25501 [providing remedy for violation of § 25401]  
16 ... every partner in a firm so liable, every principal executive officer or director of  
17 a corporation so liable, every person occupying a similar status or performing  
18 similar functions, every employee of a person so liable who materially aids in the  
19 act or transaction constituting the violation, and every broker-dealer or agent who  
20 materially aids in the act or transaction constituting the violation, are also liable  
21 jointly and severally with and to the same extent as such person, unless the other  
22 person who is so liable had no knowledge of or reasonable grounds to believe in  
23 the existence of the facts by reason of which the liability is alleged to exist."

24           140. Moreover, California Corporations Code § 25504.1 provides: "Any  
25 person who materially assists in any violation of section 25110, 25120, 25130,  
26 25133, or 25401...with intent to deceive or defraud, is jointly and severally liable  
27 with any other person liable under this chapter for such violation." Thus, to the  
28 extent any Defendant did not directly sell any of the securities, such Defendants

1 are alternatively liable under § 25504.1 because they materially assisted the selling  
2 Defendants’ with misrepresentations/omissions as alleged herein, with the intent to  
3 deceive or defraud.

4 **CLAIMS BASED ON VIOLATION THE CALIFORNIA SELLER**  
5 **ASSISTED MARKETING PLAN ACT**

6 **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

7 **(The California Seller Assisted Marketing Plan Act §§ 1812.200, *et seq.*)**

8 **Against Defendants**

9 **(On Behalf of the Class)**

10 141. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate paragraphs 1-102 above.

11 142. Defendants’ seller assisted marketing plan meets the definitions of a  
12 “seller assisted marketing plan” under the California Seller Assisted Marketing  
13 Plan Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1812.200, *et seq.* and did not qualify for any  
14 exemptions thereunder.

15 143. Under the California Seller Assisted Marketing Plan Act,  
16 (“California SAMP Act”), California requires that seller assisted marketing plans  
17 that operate from within California that offer business opportunities to the general  
18 public to: (1) register with the California Attorney General’s Office; (2) to provide  
19 significant disclosure statements to potential buyers of the marketing plan being  
20 sold prior to signing any contracts; and (3) to provide the buyers of the marketing  
21 plan specific contractual rights after a purchase has been made. *See* Cal. Civ. Code  
22 §§ 1812.200, *et seq.*

23 144. Here, Defendants operated within California, offering business  
24 opportunities to the general public, but willfully and intentionally failed to (1)  
25 register with the California Attorney General’s Office; (2) provide the significant  
26 disclosures to prospective Consultants as required by the California SAMP Act;  
27 and (3) provide the Consultants with the buyer-specific contractual rights required  
28 by the California SAMP Act.

1 145. Defendants were cognizant of the SAMP Act and its rules,  
2 referencing the act within its own written materials.

3 146. In a webinar, Mark Stidham described LuLaRoe as follows:

4 It is one of the best business opportunities that you can use to  
5 leverage that hard work, time and effort to get a return on your  
6 investment. We have built this business - we have designed the  
7 compensation plan, we designed the product, we designed the  
8 sales method, all of it designed to create an opportunity for you  
to make extra money.

9 147. Defendants have sold the LuLaRoe marketing plan to over 80,000  
10 Consultants nationwide, including Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs and the class purchased the  
11 marketing plan in connection with starting their own LuLaRoe business. Plaintiffs  
12 continued purchasing LuLaRoe marketing plans.

13 148. The Defendants' seller assisted marketing plan involved Defendants'  
14 sale or lease of product, equipment, supplies, and services for initial payment  
15 exceeding \$500 to the Plaintiffs and the Class in connection with or incidental to  
16 beginning, maintaining, or operating their respective LuLaRoe businesses.

17 149. From within California, Defendants individually and by and through  
18 their agents advertised and otherwise solicited the purchase or lease of product,  
19 equipment, supplies, and/or services to the Plaintiffs and the Class as alleged  
20 above.

21 150. Defendants individually and through its/their agents represented that:  
22 (1) Plaintiffs and the Class were likely to earn an amount in excess of the initial  
23 payment; (2) there is a market for LuLaRoe products that were purchased by the  
24 Plaintiffs and the Class; and (3) LuLaRoe would, in whole or in part, buy back or  
25 is likely to buy back the LuLaRoe product initially sold to the Plaintiffs and the  
26 Class.

27 151. Defendants also represented or implied that they have sold the  
28 LuLaRoe seller assisted marketing plan to at least five other individuals in the

1 previous 24 months, and intend to sell the LuLaRoe seller assisted marketing plan  
2 to at least five individuals in the next 12 months.

3 152. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and other Consultants with,  
4 among other things, the following information which would have been important  
5 to them as to whether to invest and continue investing in the LuLaRoe seller  
6 assisted marketing plan: (1) retail sales statistics for Consultants, (2) LuLaRoe  
7 financials, (3) earnings by the Stidhams, and (4) state of the LuLaRoe retail market

8 153. Defendants are sellers of “Seller Assisted Marketing Plans.”  
9 Defendants even misrepresented that it was selling a “Seller Assisted Marketing  
10 Plans,” stating in its Application and Agreement that “neither this Agreement, nor  
11 any compensation bonuses, commissions or incentive plans or programs pertaining  
12 to the Product, business consultants, Policies and Procedures, Leadership Bonus  
13 Plan or Price List of LLR constitutes a ... seller assisted marketing plan.”

14 154. Moreover, Defendants did not provide the Plaintiffs or the Class a  
15 “Disclosure Document or an Information Sheet” as required by Cal. Civ. Code §§  
16 1812.205 and 1812.206. Furthermore, the LuLaRoe business opportunity contracts  
17 did not meet the substantive requirements of Cal. Civ. Code § 1812.209. Nor was  
18 the Defendants’ seller assisted marketing plan registered as required by Cal. Civ.  
19 Code § 1812.203.

20 155. As more fully alleged above, Defendants individually and through  
21 its agents, made earnings and market representations to the Plaintiffs and the Class  
22 without the substantiating data or disclosures required by Cal. Civ. Code §  
23 1812.204. The representations were fraudulent in violation of Cal. Civ. Code §§  
24 1812.201 and 1812.204.

25 156. Plaintiffs purchased Defendants’ “Seller Assisted Marketing Plans”  
26 and continued purchasing their “Seller Assisted Marketing Plans.” In reliance on  
27 the misrepresentations and omissions alleged herein, Plaintiffs continued  
28 purchasing product from LLR, Inc. and continued to believe, among other things,

1 that LLR, Inc. was running a legitimate business that did not violate the Seller  
2 Assisted Marketing Plan laws or other laws.

3 157. Defendants’ sale of an unregistered “Seller Assisted Marketing Plan”  
4 from the state of California entitles the Plaintiffs and the Class to their actual  
5 damages, attorneys’ fees, rescission of the agreements at issue, and punitive  
6 damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1812.215 and 1812.218.

7 158. Defendants’ disclosure violations entitle Plaintiffs and the Class to  
8 their actual damages, attorneys’ fees, rescission of the agreements at issue, and  
9 punitive damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1812.215 and 1812.218.

10 159. Defendants’ anti-fraud violations entitle the Plaintiffs and the Class  
11 to recover their damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1812.215 and 1812.218.

12 160. By performing the foregoing acts, Defendants acted with the intent to  
13 injure Plaintiffs and acted with malice, oppression, and/or fraud. Alternatively, the  
14 acts Defendants performed were despicable and in conscious disregard of the  
15 probability of damage to Plaintiffs and the rest of the putative class members, and,  
16 thus, the conduct alleged herein supports an award of punitive damages pursuant to  
17 Civil Code section 3294 in an amount designed to punish Defendants and to deter  
18 such conduct in the future. To the extent that such acts by Defendants were  
19 conducted through their employees, those employees were either its officers,  
20 directors or managing agents of Defendants, or such officers, directors or  
21 managing agents were aware in advance that such conduct would occur, exhibited  
22 conscious disregard for the rights of others in employing the employee, or directed  
23 or ratified such conduct by its employee(s).

24  
25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28





1 169. As a direct result of Defendants' fraudulent representations and  
2 omissions regarding the seller assisted marketing plan described herein,  
3 Defendants wrongly acquired money from Plaintiffs and the members of the  
4 classes.

5 170. Each of the named Plaintiffs actually relied on the alleged fraudulent  
6 conduct. Had any of the named Plaintiffs known the truth behind Defendants  
7 misrepresentations and/or material omissions, none of the Plaintiffs would have  
8 purchased such seller assisted marketing plan, nor would they have continued to  
9 purchase such seller assisted marketing plans.

10 171. Defendants knew that Plaintiffs and the class would reasonably rely  
11 on their representations and material omissions, which would cause the Plaintiffs  
12 and the class to purchase and continue purchasing seller assisted marketing plans,  
13 and Plaintiffs did in fact reasonably rely on such representations and omissions by  
14 purchasing and continuing to purchase such seller assisted marketing plans.

15 172. The fraudulent acts, representations, and omissions described herein  
16 were material not only to Plaintiffs and the class, but also to reasonable persons.

17 **Defendants' Sales and Marketing Plan is Unfair**

18 173. Under California Business and Professions Code § 17200, a business  
19 practice is "unfair" if it violates established public policy or if it is immoral,  
20 unethical, oppressive or unscrupulous and causes injury which outweighs its  
21 benefits.

22 174. For the reasons set forth herein and above, Defendants' promotion  
23 and operation of a seller assisted marketing plan in violation of California law was  
24 unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous in that Defendants had been duping  
25 Plaintiffs and the class out hundreds of millions of dollars.

26 175. Defendants' actions have few, if any, benefits. Thus, the injury  
27 caused to Plaintiffs and the class easily and dramatically outweighs the benefits, if  
28 any.

1 176. Defendants should be made to disgorge all ill-gotten gains and return  
2 to Plaintiffs and the class all wrongfully taken amounts.

3 177. Finally, Defendants' unlawful, fraudulent and unfair acts and  
4 omissions will not be completely and finally stopped without orders of an  
5 injunctive nature. Under California Business and Professions Code section 17203,  
6 Plaintiffs and the Class seek a judicial order of an equitable nature against all  
7 Defendants, including, but not limited to, an order declaring such practices as  
8 complained of to be unlawful, fraudulent and unfair, and enjoining them from  
9 further undertaking any of the unlawful, fraudulent and unfair acts or omissions  
10 described herein.

11 **SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

12 **False Advertising**

13 **(California Business and Professions Code § 17500, *et seq.*)**

14 **Against All Defendants**

15 **(On Behalf of the Class)**

16 178. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate paragraphs 1-102 and 141-177.

17 179. Defendants' business acts, false advertisements and materially  
18 misleading omissions constitute false advertising, in violation of the California  
19 Business and Professions Code § 17500, *et seq.*

20 180. Each of the Defendants are either a person, firm, corporation,  
21 association, or an employee thereof, that, with intent, directly, or indirectly, in  
22 order to dispose of property, induced the class, including Plaintiffs, to become  
23 Consultants, based on untrue, and misleading statements regarding whether it was  
24 selling and/or promoting a seller assisted marketing plan. Defendants knew that its  
25 representations and/or omissions were false and/or misleading.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
2 **Violation of California Corporations Code**  
3 **Against all Defendants**  
4 **(On Behalf of the Class)**

5 181. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate paragraphs 1-102 and 141-180  
6 above.

7 182. California Corporations Code § 25401 provides that it is unlawful for  
8 any person to offer to sell or sell a security in California by means of any written  
9 or oral communication, which includes an untrue statement of a material fact or  
10 omits to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in  
11 light of the circumstances under which the statements were made, not misleading.

12 183. The clothing items that the Corporate Defendants sold to  
13 Consultants, including Plaintiffs, were securities.

14 184. Defendants, by engaging in the conduct described above, in  
15 connection with the purchase or sale of a security, by the use of written or oral  
16 communications made untrue statements of material facts and/or omitted to state  
17 material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the  
18 circumstances, under which they were made, accurate and not misleading. Among  
19 other things, Defendants failed to explain that the investment in LuLaRoe clothing  
20 was a seller assisted marketing plan that violated California law.

21 185. To the extent any of the Defendants did not sell the clothing directly,  
22 they are still liable because such Defendants either control the selling Defendant,  
23 are officers or directors of the selling Defendant, and/or are employees that  
24 materially aided in selling Defendants' misrepresentations/omissions. Cal. Corp.  
25 Code § 25504 provides that "[e]very person who directly or indirectly controls a  
26 person liable under 25501 [providing remedy for violation of § 25401] ... every  
27 partner in a firm so liable, every principal executive officer or director of a  
28 corporation so liable, every person occupying a similar status or performing

1 similar functions, every employee of a person so liable who materially aids in the  
2 act or transaction constituting the violation, and every broker-dealer or agent who  
3 materially aids in the act or transaction constituting the violation, are also liable  
4 jointly and severally with and to the same extent as such person, unless the other  
5 person who is so liable had no knowledge of or reasonable grounds to believe in  
6 the existence of the facts by reason of which the liability is alleged to exist.”

7 186. Moreover, California Corporations Code § 25504.1 provides that  
8 “Any person who materially assists in any violation of section 25110, 25120,  
9 25130, 25133, or 25401...with intent to deceive or defraud, is jointly and severally  
10 liable with any other person liable under this chapter for such violation.” Thus, to  
11 the extent any Defendant did not directly sell the securities, such Defendants are  
12 alternatively liable under § 25504.1 because they materially assisted the selling  
13 Defendant with misrepresentations/omissions as alleged herein, with the intent to  
14 deceive or defraud.

15 **CLAIMS BASED ON DEFENDANTS’ FRAUD INDUCING**  
16 **CONSULTANTS TO CONTINUE PURCHASING PRODUCT AFTER**  
17 **THEIR INITIAL INVESTMENT**  
18 **NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
19 **(Unfair and Deceptive Practices Claims Under**  
20 **Cal. Bus, & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*)**  
21 **Against All Defendants**  
22 **(On Behalf of the Class)**

23 187. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate paragraphs 7, 12-32, 44-47, 50, 52,  
24 55-56, 61-66, 70-74, 80-82, 88-95, 96(e)-(l), 97-102. This claim does not  
25 incorporate any allegations that can be interpreted to allege any violation of any  
26 duty, obligation, or term or condition, imposed by any LuLaRoe Independent  
27 Consultant Program Application & Agreement, LuLaRoe’s policies and  
28 procedures, or LuLaRoe’s compensation plan.

1 188. Defendants have engaged in constant unlawful, fraudulent, and unfair  
2 business acts or practices, and unfair, deceptive, false and misleading advertising  
3 within the meaning of the California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et*  
4 *seq.* The acts or practices alleged constitute a pattern of behavior, pursued as a  
5 wrongful business practice that has victimized thousands of Consultants.

6 **Defendants’ Sales and Marketing Plan was Unlawful**

7 189. Under California Business and Professions Code § 17200, an  
8 “unlawful” business practice is one that violates California law.

9 190. Defendants’ business practices are unlawful under §17200 because  
10 they violate §17500 *et seq.*, as alleged in the Tenth Claim.

11 **Defendants’ Sales and Marketing Plan is Fraudulent**

12 191. Under California Business and Professions Code § 17200, a  
13 “fraudulent” business practice is one that is likely to deceive the public.

14 192. Defendants each separately made misrepresentations or omitted  
15 material information in order to fraudulently and unfairly induce Consultants,  
16 including Plaintiffs, to continue purchasing products after becoming LuLaRoe  
17 Consultants, by, among other things:

- 18 a. Misrepresenting that if they “buy more.” they will then “sell  
19 more;”
- 20 b. Misrepresenting that they will honor a 100% return policy,  
21 which Defendants never intended to honor;
- 22 c. Misrepresenting the retailer map to conceal just how saturated  
23 the Consultant market was;
- 24 d. Failing to disclose that the quality in the products is declining  
25 and/or being improperly stored;
- 26 e. Intentionally providing only a few popular items in each  
27 shipment so that Consultants would have to purchase more items; and
- 28 f. Intentionally omitting the 2017 income statement, and leaving a

1 2016 income statement, which was not reflective of 2017 when business was  
2 declining.

3 193. Defendants knew, or should have known, that the representations  
4 encouraging Consultants to purchase additional product were misleading in nature.

5 194. As a direct result of Defendants' fraudulent representations and  
6 omissions described above, Defendants wrongly acquired money from Plaintiffs  
7 and the members of the classes.

8 195. Each of the named Plaintiffs actually relied on the alleged fraudulent  
9 conduct. Had any of the named Plaintiffs known the truth behind Defendants  
10 misrepresentations and/or material omissions, Plaintiffs would not have continued  
11 purchasing product from Defendants.

12 196. Defendants knew that Plaintiffs and the class would reasonably rely  
13 on their representations and material omissions, which would cause the Plaintiffs  
14 and the class to purchase additional products, and Plaintiffs did in fact reasonably  
15 rely on such representations and omissions by continuing to purchase such  
16 products.

17 197. The fraudulent acts, representations, and omissions described herein  
18 were material not only to Plaintiffs and the class, but also to reasonable persons.

19 **Defendants' Sales and Marketing Plan is Unfair**

20 198. Under California Business and Professions Code § 17200, a business  
21 practice is "unfair" if it violates established public policy or if it is immoral,  
22 unethical, oppressive or unscrupulous and causes injury which outweighs its  
23 benefits.

24 199. For the reasons set forth above, Defendants' representations and  
25 omissions were unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous in that Defendants had  
26 been duping Plaintiffs and the class into continuing to purchase products that  
27 Plaintiffs and the class members would have difficulty in selling.

28 200. Defendants' actions have few, if any, benefits. Thus, the injury

1 caused to Plaintiffs and the class easily and dramatically outweighs the benefits, if  
2 any.

3 201. Defendants should be made to disgorge all ill-gotten gains and return  
4 to Plaintiffs and the class all wrongfully taken amounts.

5 202. Finally, Defendants' unlawful, fraudulent and unfair acts and  
6 omissions will not be completely and finally stopped without orders of an  
7 injunctive nature. Under California Business and Professions Code § 17203,  
8 Plaintiffs and the class seek a judicial order of an equitable nature against all  
9 Defendants, including, but not limited to, an order declaring such practices as  
10 complained of to be unlawful, fraudulent and unfair, and enjoining them from  
11 further undertaking any of the unlawful, fraudulent and unfair acts or omissions  
12 described herein.

13 **TENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

14 **False Advertising**

15 **(California Business and Professions Code § 17500, *et seq.*)**

16 **Against All Defendants**

17 **(On Behalf of the Class)**

18 203. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate paragraphs 7, 12-32, 44-47, 50, 52,  
19 55-56, 61-66, 70-74, 80-82, 88-95, 96(e)-(l), 97-102, 187-202. This claim does not  
20 incorporate any allegations that can be interpreted to allege any violation of any  
21 duty, obligation, or term or condition, imposed by any LuLaRoe Independent  
22 Consultant Program Application & Agreement, LuLaRoe's policies and  
23 procedures, or LuLaRoe's compensation plan.

24 204. Defendants' following business acts, false advertisements and  
25 materially misleading omissions constitute false advertising, in violation of the  
26 California Business and Professions Code § 17500, *et seq.*:

27 a. Misrepresenting that if they "buy more," they will then "sell  
28 more;"





1           208. Defendants, by engaging in the conduct described above, in  
2 connection with the purchase or sale of a security, by the use of written or oral  
3 communications made untrue statements of material facts and/or omitted to state  
4 material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the  
5 circumstances, under which they were made, accurate and not misleading. Among  
6 other things, Defendants

7           a. Misrepresented that if they “buy more,” they will then “sell  
8 more;”

9           b. Misrepresented that Defendants will honor a 100% return  
10 policy, which Defendants never intended to honor;

11           c. Misrepresented the retailer map to conceal just how saturated  
12 the Consultant market was;

13           d. Failed to disclose that the quality in the products is declining  
14 and/or being improperly stored;

15           e. Intentionally provided only a few popular items in each  
16 shipment so that Consultants would have to purchase more items; and

17           f. Intentionally omitted the 2017 income statement, and leaving a  
18 2016 income statement, which was not reflective of 2017 when business was  
19 declining.

20           209. To the extent any of the Defendants did not directly sell the  
21 securities, such Defendants are likewise liable because they either control the  
22 selling Defendant, are officers or directors of selling Defendant, and/or are  
23 employees that materially aided in selling Defendant’s misrepresentations/  
24 omissions. Cal. Corp. Code § 25504 provides that “[e]very person who directly or  
25 indirectly controls a person liable under 25501 [providing remedy for violation of  
26 § 25401] ... every partner in a firm so liable, every principal executive officer or  
27 director of a corporation so liable, every person occupying a similar status or  
28 performing similar functions, every employee of a person so liable who materially

1 aids in the act or transaction constituting the violation, and every broker-dealer or  
2 agent who materially aids in the act or transaction constituting the violation, are  
3 also liable jointly and severally with and to the same extent as such person, unless  
4 the other person who is so liable had no knowledge of or reasonable grounds to  
5 believe in the existence of the facts by reason of which the liability is alleged to  
6 exist.”

7 210. Moreover, California Corporations Code § 25504.1 provides that  
8 “Any person who materially assists in any violation of section 25110, 25120,  
9 25130, 25133, or 25401...with intent to deceive or defraud, is jointly and severally  
10 liable with any other person liable under this chapter for such violation.” To the  
11 extent any of the Defendants did not directly sell securities, they are still  
12 alternatively liable under § 25504.1 because they materially assisted selling  
13 Defendant with misrepresentations/omissions as alleged herein, with the intent to  
14 deceive or defraud.

15 **TWELFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

16 **RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1962 (a))**

17 **Against All Defendants**

18 **(On Behalf of the Class)**

19 211. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate paragraphs 7, 12-32, 44-47, 50, 52,  
20 55-56, 61-66, 70-74, 80-82, 88-95, 96(e)-(l), 97-102 above. Plaintiffs do not  
21 incorporate any allegations that expressly plead or imply that (a) Defendants were  
22 operating a pyramid scheme or endless chain scheme, and (b) that Consultants’  
23 purchase of LuLaRoe product was the purchase of a security. Moreover, this claim  
24 does not incorporate any allegations that can be interpreted to allege any violation  
25 of any duty, obligation, or term or condition, imposed by any LuLaRoe  
26 Independent Consultant Program Application & Agreement, LuLaRoe’s policies  
27 and procedures, or LuLaRoe’s compensation plan.

28 212. Defendants and others willfully and intentionally violated and

1 continue to violate RICO and California law with the goal of obtaining money,  
2 directly and indirectly, through a pattern of racketeering activities in violation of  
3 the mail and wire fraud statutes, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 and 1343, 18 U.S.C. 1962(a).

4 213. Defendants engaged in activities affecting federal interstate and  
5 foreign commerce and are entities capable of holding a legal or beneficial interest  
6 in property. Defendants are “persons,” as that term is defined by 18 U.S.C.  
7 §1961(3).

8 214. Defendants make up the enterprise, an association of entities and  
9 individuals associated to operate a fraudulent scheme. The enterprise is not a legal  
10 entity within the meaning of “enterprise” as defined by 18 U.S.C. § 1961(4).  
11 Defendants have been members of this enterprise from at least approximately 2013  
12 and continuing until the present. Defendants are separate entities and individuals  
13 that make up the enterprise:

14 a. Deanne Brady is one of the founders, architects, beneficiaries  
15 and promoters of the fraudulent enterprise. Through interstate wires and mails,  
16 Brady makes misrepresentations and omits material facts regarding working as a  
17 Consultant and/or purchases pertaining to LuLaRoe products.

18 b. Mark Stidham is one of the founders, architects, beneficiaries  
19 and promoters of the fraudulent enterprise. Through interstate wires and mails,  
20 Stidham makes misrepresentations and omits material facts regarding working as a  
21 consultant and/or purchases pertaining to LuLaRoe products.

22 c. Lennon Leasing, LLC is the owner of the LuLaRoe mark and  
23 promotes the fraudulent enterprise through the use of the LuLaRoe mark which are  
24 used through interstate wires and mails.

25 d. LLR, Inc. is the operational arm of the enterprise that purchases  
26 clothing to then sell to Consultants.

27 e. LuLaRoe, LLC oversees, among other things, the marketing of  
28 the sales of LuLaRoe products to Consultants.

1           215. From approximately January 2013 and continuing until the present,  
2 within the Central District of California and elsewhere, Defendants in association  
3 with each other knowingly, willfully, and unlawfully participated, directly and  
4 indirectly in the conduct of the affairs of the enterprise through a pattern of  
5 racketeering activity. Each defendant knowingly participated in the scheme to  
6 defraud with specific intent to deceive.

7           216. From at least 2013 and continuing until the present, Defendants  
8 executed a scheme to defraud through a pattern of racketeering made up of distinct  
9 acts of mail and wire fraud under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 and 1343. The enterprise  
10 engaged in and affected interstate and foreign trade. The enterprise transacts  
11 business through the instrumentalities of interstate commerce such as telephones,  
12 facsimile machines, the internet, email, and the United States mail and interstate  
13 commercial carrier to communicate in furtherance of the activities of the  
14 enterprise. The enterprise advertises, markets, and sells products and services  
15 throughout the United States. The operation of the enterprise continued over  
16 several years, including activities in every state, and has affected and damaged,  
17 and continues to affect and damage, commercial activity.

18           217. To further the goals of the enterprise, which were to (1) earn money  
19 through fraudulent means, (2) entice Consultants to continue purchasing products  
20 from LuLaRoe; and (3) reap large profits for themselves based on false  
21 representations, Defendants engaged in various forms of illegal activity, including,  
22 but not limited to mail fraud and wire fraud.

23           218. The pattern of racketeering activity alleged is distinct from the  
24 enterprise. Each act of racketeering activity is distinct from the enterprise in that  
25 each is a separate offense committed by an entity or individual while the enterprise  
26 is an association of entities and individuals. The enterprise has an ongoing  
27 structure and/or organization supported by personnel and/or associates with  
28 continuing functions or duties.

1           219. The racketeering acts set out above and below, and others, all had the  
2 same pattern and similar purpose of defrauding and/or injuring Plaintiffs and the  
3 class for the benefit of the enterprise and its members. Each racketeering act was  
4 related, had a similar purpose, involved the same or similar participants and  
5 methods of commission and had similar results affecting Plaintiffs and the class.  
6 The racketeering acts of mail and wire fraud were also related to each other in that  
7 they were part of the enterprise goal to fraudulently induce Plaintiffs to purchase  
8 product.

9           220. Defendants' wrongful conduct has been and remains part of the  
10 enterprise's way of doing business and constitutes a continuing threat to the  
11 property of Plaintiffs and the class. Without the repeated acts of mail and wire  
12 fraud, the enterprise's fraudulent scheme would not have succeeded.

13           221. Revenue gained from the pattern of racketeering activity, which  
14 constitutes a significant portion of the total income of Defendants, was reinvested  
15 in the operations of the enterprise for the following purposes: (a) to expand the  
16 enterprise through additional false and misleading advertising and promotional  
17 materials aimed at having Consultants continue to purchase additional product and  
18 facilitate the execution of the illegal scheme.

19           222. Plaintiffs were injured by the reinvestment of the racketeering  
20 income into the enterprise because, among other things, they continued purchasing  
21 more product and the market became saturated with LuLaRoe product and  
22 consultants.

23           223. In connection with promoting and executing their illegal scheme,  
24 members of the enterprise knowingly and recklessly placed and caused to be  
25 placed in the United States mail or by interstate commercial carrier, or took or  
26 received therefrom, matters or things to be sent to or delivered by the United States  
27 mail or by interstate commercial carrier comprising, among other things product,  
28 invoices, letters, promotional materials, brochures, products and checks to

1 Plaintiffs and the class and received communications between and among  
2 themselves through the United States mail, in all fifty states and the District of  
3 Columbia. It was reasonably foreseeable that these mailings or receipts would take  
4 place in furtherance of the fraudulent scheme.

5       224. In connection with promoting and executing their illegal scheme,  
6 members of the enterprise engaged in wire fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343,  
7 by, among other things, knowingly and recklessly transmitting or causing to be  
8 transmitted with wire communications, in interstate and foreign trade, materials  
9 promoting the fraudulent scheme and fraudulent seller assisted marketing plan on,  
10 among other things, internet web sites, email, telephone, and text messages,  
11 including promotional materials, product information, and invoices. Defendants  
12 maintain websites on the internet promoting LuLaRoe products where inducements  
13 to continue working as a consultant are made. Defendants also maintain and host  
14 online hosting promotional videos making material misrepresentations and  
15 omissions of material fact regarding the fraudulent scheme. Defendants sent and  
16 received these interstate wire communications to and from all fifty states and the  
17 District of Columbia.

18       225. Each Defendant has promoted the enterprise. Each use of the mail or  
19 wire by Defendants done in furtherance of the LuLaRoe Pyramid is an act of  
20 racketeering.

21       226. Defendants' representations and omissions were the proximate cause  
22 of Plaintiffs and the class joining the fraudulent scheme and also purchasing  
23 product. Defendants' representations and omissions were also the proximate cause  
24 of Plaintiffs and the class being unable to sell their product.

25       227. To the extent proof of reliance is legally required, in engaging in the  
26 aforementioned wire and mail fraud, Defendants knew that Plaintiffs and the class  
27 would reasonably rely on their representations and omissions which would cause  
28 the plaintiffs and the class to become consultants and purchase products.

1 228. Defendants knew that the misrepresentations and omissions  
2 described herein in promoting and executing the fraudulent scheme were material.

3 229. Had Plaintiffs and the class known the truth behind Defendants'  
4 misrepresentations and omissions, they would not have purchased and would not  
5 have continued to purchase LuLaRoe product. Moreover, had Defendants not  
6 made the misrepresentations and omissions, Plaintiffs would not have lost money  
7 on the purchase of LuLaRoe product.

8 230. Defendants' acts of mail and wire fraud were a proximate cause of  
9 the injuries that Plaintiffs and the class suffered. Because of Defendants' pattern of  
10 unlawful conduct, Plaintiffs and the Class lost hundreds of millions (if not billions)  
11 of dollars.

12 231. Under 18 U.S.C. § 1964, Plaintiffs and the class are entitled to treble  
13 their damages, plus interest, costs and attorney's fees.

14 **THIRTEENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

15 **RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1962 (c))**

16 **Against All Defendants**

17 **(On Behalf of the Class)**

18 232. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate paragraphs 7, 12-32, 44-47, 50, 52,  
19 55-56, 61-66, 70-74, 80-82, 88-95, 96(e)-(l), 97-102, 211-231 above. Plaintiffs do  
20 not incorporate any allegations that expressly plead or imply that (a) Defendants  
21 were operating a pyramid scheme or endless chain scheme, and (b) that  
22 Consultants' purchase of LuLaRoe product was the purchase of a security.  
23 Moreover, this claim does not incorporate any allegations that can be interpreted to  
24 allege any violation of any duty, obligation, or term or condition, imposed by any  
25 LuLaRoe Independent Consultant Program Application & Agreement, LuLaRoe's  
26 policies and procedures, or LuLaRoe's compensation plan.

27 233. Defendants are associated with the enterprise. In violation of 18  
28 U.S.C. § 1962(c), Defendants conducted and/or participated in the conduct of the

1 affairs of the enterprise, including participation in activities in furtherance of the  
2 fraudulent scheme, through the pattern of racketeering activity earlier alleged.

3 234. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' violation of 18  
4 U.S.C. § 1962(c), Plaintiffs were induced to, and did, become consultants and  
5 purchased billions of dollars of the LuLaRoe products. Moreover, as a direct and  
6 proximate result of Defendants' violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c), Plaintiffs lost  
7 money on their purchase of product. Plaintiffs were injured by Defendants'  
8 unlawful conduct. The funds used to buy LuLaRoe products constitute property of  
9 Plaintiffs and the class within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c).

10 235. Under 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c), Plaintiffs and the class are entitled to  
11 treble their damages, plus interest, costs and attorney's fees.

12 **FOURTEENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

13 **RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1962 (d))**

14 **Against All Defendants**

15 **(On Behalf of the Class)**

16 236. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate paragraphs 7, 12-32, 44-47, 50, 52,  
17 55-56, 61-66, 70-74, 80-82, 88-95, 96(e)-(l), 97-102, 211-235 above. Plaintiffs do  
18 not incorporate any allegations that expressly plead or imply that (a) Defendants  
19 were operating a pyramid scheme or endless chain scheme, and (b) that  
20 Consultants' purchase of LuLaRoe product was the purchase of a security.  
21 Moreover, this claim does not incorporate any allegations that can be interpreted to  
22 allege any violation of any duty, obligation, or term or condition, imposed by any  
23 LuLaRoe Independent Consultant Program Application & Agreement, LuLaRoe's  
24 policies and procedures, or LuLaRoe's compensation plan.

25 237. Defendants agreed to work together in a symbiotic relationship to  
26 carry on the illegal scheme. Under that agreement, Defendants and others  
27 conspired to violate 18 U.S.C. § 1962(a) and (c), in violation of 18 U.S.C. §  
28 1962(d).





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

Dated: March 8, 2019

FOLEY BEZEK BEHLE & CURTIS, LLP

By: /s/ Kevin D. Gamarnik  
KEVIN D. GAMARNIK  
AARON L. ARNDT  
JORDAN A. LIEBMAN  
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

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

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiffs demand a jury trial as provided by Rule 38(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Dated: March 8, 2019

FOLEY BEZEK BEHLE & CURTIS, LLP

By: /s/ Kevin D. Gamarnik  
KEVIN D. GAMARNIK  
AARON L. ARNDT  
JORDAN A. LIEBMAN  
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

# ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Class Action: LuLaRoe Is a Pyramid Scheme that 'Preys on Stay-At-Home Mothers'](#)

---