

From: JANNEY & JANNEY COURT SERVICES 213 413 8024

08/15/2007 09:28

#792 P.041/062

SUMMONS
(CITACION JUDICIAL)

SUM-100

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:

(AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY, a Delaware Corporation,
KEVIN T. HUNSAKER, an individual, PATRICIA DUNN, an
individual, and DOES 1 through 100

FOR COURT USE ONLY
(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

THOMAS J. KRAZIT, an individual

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogadas. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales.

The name and address of the court is:

(El nombre y dirección de la corte es):
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
400 McAllister Street
Same
San Francisco, CA 94102
Civic Center Courthouse


CASE NUMBER: 07CV00066210
(Número del Caso):

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:

(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):
Kevin R. Boyle, Esq. (State Bar# 192718) 310/477-1700
PANISH, SHEA & BOYLE, LLP
1111 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 700 GORDON PARK-L1
Los Angeles, CA 90025 CHRISTIAN SAVINER

DATE: Aug 15 2007 Clerk, by _____ Deputy
(Fecha) (Secretario) (Adjunto)

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)
(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).



NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

- as an individual defendant
- as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
- on behalf of (specify):
under: CCP 416.10 (corporation) CCP 416.60 (minor)
 CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) CCP 416.70 (conservator)
 CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) CCP 416.80 (authorized person)
 other (specify):
- by personal delivery on (date):

From: JANNEY & JANNEY COURT SERVICES 213 413 8024

08/15/2007 09:31

#792 P.054/062

PANISH, SHEA & BOYLE, LLP
LAWYERS
11111 SANTA MONICA BOULEVARD, SUITE 700
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025
TEL: (310) 477-1700
FAX: (310) 477-1688
BRIAN J. PANISH, STATE BAR NO. 116060
KEVIN R. ROYLE, STATE BAR NO. 192718
RAHUL RAVIPUDI, STATE BAR NO. 204518

(SPACE BELOW FOR FILING STAMP ONLY)

ENDORSED
FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court

AUG 15 2007

GORDON PARKER, Clerk
BY: *[Signature]*
Clerk

CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE SET

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

IN & OF CALIFORNIA
9:00 AM
DEPARTMENT 212

THOMAS J. KRAZIT, an individual,
Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 07-266210

vs.

COMPLAINT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY, a
Delaware Corporation, KEVIN T.
HUNSAKER, an individual, PATRICIA
DUNN, an individual, and DOES 1 through
100,
Defendants.

1. Invasion of Privacy/Intrusion
2. Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress
3. Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 et seq.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

FILED BY FAX

COMES NOW the Plaintiff, THOMAS J. KRAZIT, who, on information and belief, complains and alleges as follows:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

1. Defendants have admitted that, as a general practice, they engaged in "pretexting" by attempting to obtain personal information of others through fraud and false pretenses. In an interview held on September 8, 2006, when asked if she believed pretexting is illegal, Defendant Patricia Dunn replied, "I have no idea, but it's wrong."

1 2. On September 12, 2006, Defendant Patricia Dunn, who was at the time, Chairman of
2 the Board for HP, admitted that pretexting “techniques were practiced on a number of individuals
3 including certain directors, two employees and a number of individuals outside of the company
4 including journalists.”

5 3. To further highlight HP’s widespread use of pretexting, on September 28, 2006,
6 Defendant Patricia Dunn testified before the United States Congress that “the fraudulent
7 misrepresentations of identity . . . was part of a standard arsenal” of HP tactics.

8 4. Subsequent to these disclosures and admissions, both State and Federal Governments
9 initiated civil and criminal indictments on HP, and its officers and agents. As a result of the State
10 Government investigations, on December 7, 2006, the Superior Court of the State of California
11 entered a Final Judgment and Permanent Injunction, which, among other things, impose monetary
12 penalties of \$14.5 million and required HP to undertake efforts to reform its corporate governance.

13 5. In addition, certain Defendants involved in the pretexting scandal have been indicted
14 by the United States Government. In fact, in January 2007, Bryan Wagner, a Colorado private
15 investigator, pleaded guilty to two felony charges in the San Jose federal court. In pleading guilty to
16 two felony counts, Bryan Wagner admitted that he was paid as part of a conspiracy with HP to make
17 fraudulent use of Social Security numbers and other confidential information to obtain the personal
18 phone records of reporters and HP officials as well as their family members.

19 6. Moreover, the Federal Government was so alarmed by Defendants’ conduct that it too
20 became involved by expediting the drafting and enactment of legislation. The United States Congress
21 drafted and the President signed into action the Telephone Records Privacy Act of 2006 which
22 expressly outlaws pretexting in an attempt to obtain another’s telephone records – the very acts
23 committed by Defendants.

24 7. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that by using Plaintiffs’ social
25 security numbers and other personal information, Defendants engaged in illegal and reprehensible
26 conduct which includes, but is not limited to, contacting Plaintiffs’ home, work and cellular phone
27 providers and falsely represented themselves as the Plaintiffs in order to obtain their private telephone
28 records.

1 8. Plaintiffs had a reasonable expectation of privacy in the intercepted information and
2 also had a reasonable expectation that such information would not be intercepted. Plaintiffs only
3 became aware of the interceptions and disclosure of their confidential communications and
4 information within the last year.

5 9. Accordingly, Plaintiffs bring this action to redress Defendants' attempts to obtain their
6 personal information through fraud and false pretenses.

7
8

PARTIES

9 10. Plaintiffs THOMAS SHANKLAND and REBECCA SHANKLAND are, and at all
10 relevant times herein were, residents of the State of California.

11 11. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that at all times mentioned
12 herein, defendant, HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY (hereinafter referred to as "HP"), was and
13 now is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware,
14 and that said defendant was and now is authorized to do and is doing business in the State of
15 California, and that said defendant has regularly conducted business in the State of California.

16 12. On information and belief, Defendant Kevin T. Hunsaker is an individual who, at all
17 relevant times was the in-house counsel and ethics chief for HP and was a resident of the State of
18 California.

19 13. On information and belief, Defendant Patricia Dunn is an individual who, at all relevant
20 times, was the Chairman of Hewlett Packard and a resident of the State of California.

21 14. The true names and/or capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate,
22 governmental or otherwise of defendants, DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiffs
23 at this time, who therefore sues said defendants by such fictitious names, and when the true names
24 and/or capacities of said defendants have been ascertained, Plaintiffs will amend this complaint
25 accordingly. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that each defendant designated
26 herein as a DOE is responsible, negligently or in some other actionable manner, for the events and
27 happenings hereinafter referred to, and caused injuries and damages proximately thereby to Plaintiffs
28

1 as hereinafter alleged, either through said defendants' own conduct or through the authorized and/or
2 ratified conduct of its agents, servants or employees or in some other manner.

3 15. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that at all times mentioned
4 herein, defendants, and each of them, including DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, were the agents,
5 servants, employees, joint venturers, successors-in-interest and/or alter ego of their codefendants, and
6 were, as such, acting within the scope, course and authority of said agency, employment, joint venture,
7 successorship-in-interest and/or alter ego and that each and every defendant, as aforesaid, when acting
8 as a principal, was negligent in the selection and hiring of each and every other defendant as the agent,
9 servant, employee and/or joint venturer, and that each and every defendant, when acting as a manager,
10 director and/or officer of the defendant corporation, authorized, ratified or otherwise approved of the
11 acts of its agents, employees and/or representatives as alleged herein.

12
13 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **(Invasion of Privacy/Intrusion as Against All Defendants)**

15 17. Plaintiffs replead and incorporate herein by reference all of the allegations contained
16 in the preceding paragraphs.

17 18. Plaintiffs had a legally protected privacy interest in their confidential records.

18 19. Plaintiffs had a reasonable expectation of privacy under the circumstances that their
19 confidential records and communications would not be intercepted, copied and/or reviewed.

20 20. Defendants' conduct in pretexting to obtain Plaintiffs' confidential records constitutes
21 a serious invasion of privacy.

22 21. In addition, Defendants conspired to and intentionally intruded into the Plaintiffs'
23 solitude and private affairs by surreptitiously pretexting and obtaining information about Plaintiffs'
24 private affairs without their knowledge or consent. Defendants' intrusion was highly offensive to a
25 reasonable person because, among other things, the intrusion resulted in the revelation of confidential
26 and private communications.

27 ///

28

1 22. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions alleged above, Plaintiffs
2 suffered damages, including emotional distress damages, all according to proof at trial, but in excess
3 of the minimum jurisdictional limit of the Court.

4 23. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions alleged above, Plaintiffs have
5 lost and will continue to lose income, interest and benefits, in an amount to be proven at the time of
6 trial, which amount is in excess of the minimum jurisdictional limit of the Court, as well as additional
7 foreseeable consequential and incidental damages in an amount to be shown at the time of trial.

8 24. In addition, Defendants' conduct as described herein was done with a conscious
9 disregard of Plaintiffs' rights, and was done with the intent to vex and annoy them. In fact,
10 Defendants continued to commit the alleged illegal and bad acts even after confirming that such
11 actions were illegal and inappropriate. Defendants' acts constitute oppression, fraud and/or malice
12 under California *Civil Code* § 3294, entitling Plaintiffs to an award of punitive damages in an amount
13 appropriate to punish or set an example of the Defendants, and each of them, in an amount to be
14 determined at trial.

15

16

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

17

(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress as Against All Defendants)

18

19

25. Plaintiffs replead and incorporate herein by reference all of the allegations contained
in the preceding paragraphs.

20

21

26. Defendants' intentional acts of pretexting to obtain Plaintiffs' confidential and personal
records without their consent were outrageous.

22

23

24

27. Defendants intended to cause Plaintiffs emotional distress or acted with reckless
disregard of the probability of causing them emotional distress, and did so for the purpose of causing
Plaintiffs to suffer humiliation and mental anguish.

25

26

28. Plaintiffs suffered severe emotional distress as a proximate result of Defendants'
outrageous conduct.

27

///

28

PANISH, SHEA & BOYLE, LLP
1111 SANTA MONICA BOULEVARD, SUITE 700
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025

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

10. Injunctive Relief as permitted under California *Business & Professions Code* §§ 17200 et.seq.
11. Reasonable attorneys' fees as permitted under California *Business & Professions Code* §§ 17200 et.seq.

DATED: August 14, 2007

PANISH, SHEA & BOYLE, LLP



BRIAN J. PANISH
KEVIN R. BOYLE
RAHUL RAVIPUDI
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 hereby demand a trial by jury for all causes of action in the instant matter.

DATED: August 14, 2007

PANISH, SHEA & BOYLE, LLP



BRIAN J. PANISH
KEVIN R. BOYLE
RAHUL RAVIPUDI
Attorneys for Plaintiff

PANISH, SHEA & BOYLE, LLP
1111 SANTA MONICA BOULEVARD, SUITE 700
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025