1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Todd M. Friedman (216752) Adrian R. Bacon (280332) Matthew R. Snyder (350907) Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman, P.C. 21031 Ventura Blvd., Suite 340 Woodland Hills, CA 91364 Phone: 323-306-4234 Fax: 866-633-0228 tfriedman@toddflaw.com abacon@toddflaw.com msnyder@toddflaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff	
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES UNLIMITED JURISDICTION	
10	OT (EII) IT ED (C	
11	NYREE HINTON,	CASE NO.:
12)	COMPLAINT
13	Plaintiff,	1. Violation of Unfair Competition Law
14	 -vs-	(Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 et seq.);
15	Ó	2. Violation of the California Consumer
	CAPITAL ONE FINANCIAL) CORPORATION; EXPERIAN)	Credit Reporting Agencies Act (Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. § 1785 <i>et seq.</i>)
16	INFORMATION SOLUTIONS, INC.; TRANS)	ů 1,
17	UNION LLC; EQUIFAX INFORMATION)	Reporting Agencies Act (15 U.S.C. §
18	SERVICES LLC.; and DOES 1-10 inclusive,	1681 <i>et seq.</i>); 4. Violation of the Rosenthal Fair Debt
19	Defendants.	Collection Practices Act (Cal. Civ.
		Code § 1788 et seq.);
20		5. Breach of Duty of Good Faith and Fair Dealing.
21		
22)	(Amount to Exceed \$35,000)
23	į (Jury Trial Demanded
24		
25		
26	I. INTRODUCTION	
27	1. Plaintiff, NYREE HINTON ("Plaintiff"), brings this action for damages and all	
28	other due and proper relief against Defendant CAPITAL ONE FINANCIAL CORPORATION	
20		

("Capital One") for Defendant Capital One's violations of California's Unfair Competition Law, Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act and the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act, all of which protect consumers such as Plaintiff from unfair lending and credit reporting by creditors. Plaintiff further alleges that by engaging in the conduct described herein, Defendant Capital One has breached its duty of good faith and fair dealing to Plaintiff.

2. Furthermore, this is an action for damages brought by an individual consumer for Defendants EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS, INC. ("XP"), TRANS UNION LLC ("TU") and EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES LLC's ("EF") violations of the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act which places regulations on consumer reporting agencies.

II. PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff, NYREE HINTON ("Plaintiff"), is a natural person residing in Los Angeles County in the state of California and a consumer.
- 4. Furthermore, Plaintiff is a "consumer" as defined by the FCRA, 15 U.S.C. §1681a, a "debtor" as defined by the RFDCPA, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(h), and a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).
- 5. At all relevant times herein, Defendant Capital One regularly provides information to consumer reporting agencies, and is therefore an "information furnisher" as defined by the FCRA and CCRAA. Defendant is also a "person" as defined by Cal. Civ. Code §1785.3(j).
- 6. At all relevant times herein, Defendant EF was a "consumer reporting agency" as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1681a(f) and Cal. Civ. Code §1785.3(d).
- 7. At all relevant times herein, Defendant XP was a "consumer reporting agency" as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1681a(f) and Cal. Civ. Code §1785.3(d).
- 8. At all relevant times herein, Defendant TU was a "consumer reporting agency" as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1681a(f) and Cal. Civ. Code §1785.3(d).
- 9. Defendants EF, XP, and TU will hereinafter be collectively referred to as "CRA Defendants."

11

12

10

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27 28

- 10. Defendants Capital One, EF, XP, and TU will hereinafter be collectively referred to as "Defendants."
- 11. At all relevant times, credit reports as alleged in this pleading are "consumer reports" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1681a(d).
- 12. The above named Defendants, and their subsidiaries and agents, are collectively referred to as "Defendants." The true names and capacities of the Defendants sued herein as DOE DEFENDANTS 1 through 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues such Defendants by fictitious names. Each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible for the unlawful acts alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend the Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when such identities become known.
- 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all relevant times, each and every Defendant was acting as an agent and/or employee of each of the other Defendants and was acting within the course and scope of said agency and/or employment with the full knowledge and consent of each of the other Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the acts and/or omissions complained of herein was made known to, and ratified by, each of the other Defendants.

III. JURISDICTION & VENUE

- 14. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants conduct business in the State of California, as well as maintain contacts therewith, sufficient to demonstrate purposeful availment of the protection and obligations of this State's laws.
- 15. The Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles is the proper venue for this matter because a significant portion of the events giving rise to this action occurred within this County.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

16. On or around November 9, 2022, Plaintiff purchased a Tesla from IQAutos, and financed that purchase with a loan from Defendant Capital One.

- 17. Over the following six months, the vehicle experienced several service issues, which went unresolved. As a result, in or around July of 2023, Plaintiff filed a lawsuit against the car dealership and Capital One Auto Financing.
- 18. Thereafter, in or around August of 2023, Defendant Capital One—a different business entity tasked with the servicing and collection of loans owed to Capital One Auto Financing—restricted Plaintiff's access to its online portal effectively preventing him from being able to make payments or otherwise manage his auto loan.
- 19. As a result, on or around October 19, 2023, Defendant Capital One reported the auto loan as thirty-days past due.
- 20. On information and belief, however, the only reason the auto loan was past-due was because Capital One wrongfully restricted Plaintiff's access to its online portal preventing him from timely making his payments.
- 21. Defendant Capital One thus furnished inaccurate, false, or incomplete information to the consumer credit reporting agencies. This has resulted in a negative effect on Plaintiff's credit score.
- 22. Prior to the filing of this Complaint, Plaintiff informed Defendant Capital One of the nature of the information they are furnishing, namely that it is false, misleading, or incomplete, as well as harmful to Plaintiff's credit score.
- 23. Plaintiff has requested that Defendant Capital One cease furnishing such information.
- 24. However, Defendant Capital One refuses to correct the information reported on Plaintiff's consumer credit report.
- 25. Within two years of filing the instant complaint, Plaintiff disputed the accuracy of this reporting with CRA Defendants in writing.
- 26. CRA Defendants are aware that the information they disseminate will be used by various other persons or parties who will be reviewing this information for the purpose of extending credit, insurance or employment and that they have already done so.

- 27. The inaccurate information negatively reflects upon the Plaintiff, Plaintiff's credit repayment history, Plaintiff's financial responsibility as a debtor, and Plaintiff's credit worthiness.
- 28. The credit reports have been and continue to be disseminated to various persons and credit grantors, both known and unknown.
 - 29. Plaintiff has been damaged, and continues to be damaged, in the following ways:
 - Emotional distress and mental anguish associated with having incorrect derogatory personal information transmitted about Plaintiff to other people both known and unknown;
 - b. Denial and reduction of credit based on the incorrect, incomplete, and/or misleading reporting by Defendant Capital One;
- 30. At all times pertinent hereto, Defendants were acting by and through its agents, servants and/or employees who were acting within the course and scope of their agency or employment, and under the direct supervision and control of Defendants herein.
- 31. At all times pertinent hereto, the conduct of Defendants, as well as that of their agents, servants and/or employees, was malicious, intentional, willful, reckless, and in grossly negligent disregard for federal and state laws and the rights of Plaintiff herein.
- 32. Defendant Capital One violated sections 1681n and 1681o of the FCRA by engaging in the following conduct that violates 15 U.S.C. §1681s-2(b):
 - a. Willfully and negligently continuing to furnish and disseminate inaccurate and derogatory credit, account and other information concerning the Plaintiff to credit reporting agencies and other entities despite knowing that said information was inaccurate; and,
 - b. Willfully and negligently failing to comply with the requirements imposed on furnishers of information pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1681s-2.
- 33. CRA Defendants violated sections 1681n and 1681o of the FCRA by engaging in the following conduct that violates 15 U.S.C. §1681i:

derogatory credit, account and other information concerning the Plaintiff despite knowing that said information was inaccurate.

34. Additionally, CRA Defendants did not maintain and follow reasonable procedures

a.

to assure maximum possible accuracy of the information it disseminated, thus violating 15 U.S.C. §1681e(b).

Willfully and negligently failing to reinvestigate and properly respond to

Plaintiff's dispute such that Defendant disseminated inaccurate and

- 35. Similarly, CRA Defendants violated Cal. Civ. C. § 1785.16 by failing to reasonably reinvestigate and correct the inaccurate and false information on Plaintiff's credit report after receiving a dispute from Plaintiff.
- 36. Defendants' conduct was a direct and proximate cause, as well as a substantial factor, in causing the injuries, damages and harm to Plaintiff that are outlined more fully above, and as a result, Defendants are liable to compensate Plaintiff for the full amount of statutory, actual and punitive damages, along with attorneys' fees and costs, as well as such other relief permitted by law.
- 37. As a result of the above violations of the FCRA and CCCRA, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer injury to Plaintiff's feelings, personal humiliation, embarrassment, mental anguish and emotional distress, and Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for Plaintiff's actual damages, statutory damages, and costs and attorney's fees.
- 38. Furthermore, at various and multiple times prior to the filing of the instant complaint, including within the one year preceding the filing of this complaint, Defendant Capital One contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect an alleged outstanding debt.
- 39. §1788.17 of the RFDCPA mandates that every debt collector collecting or attempting to collect a consumer debt shall comply with the provisions of Sections 1692b to 1692j, inclusive, of, and shall be subject to the remedies in Section 1692k of, Title 15 of the United States Code statutory regulations contained within the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. §1692d, and §1692d(5).

- 40. Defendant Capital Ones' conduct violated the RFDCPA in multiple ways, including without limitation the following:
 - a) Engaging in conduct the natural consequences of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse Plaintiff (15 U.S.C. § 1692d);
 - b) Using unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt from Plaintiff (15 U.S.C. § 1692e).
- 41. As a result of the above violations of the RFDCPA, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer injury to Plaintiff's feelings, personal humiliation, embarrassment, mental anguish and emotional distress, and Defendant Capital One is liable to Plaintiff's actual damages, statutory damages, and costs and attorney's fees.
- 42. The conduct described herein amount to numerous violations of California's Unfair Competition Law, as well as the CA CCRAA, FCRA, RFDCPA, and TILA, and for such violations, Plaintiff here and now seeks remediation of all of Defendants' wrongful acts in the form of all due and proper legal and equitable relief.

COUNT I: VIOLATION OF THE UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW

(Against Defendant Capital One Only)

- 43. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as though the same were set forth at length herein.
- 44. Actions for relief under the unfair competition law may be based on any business act or practice that is within the broad definition of the UCL. Such violations of the UCL occur as a result of unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business acts and practices. A plaintiff is required to provide evidence of a causal connection between a defendant's business practices and the alleged harm--that is, evidence that the defendant's conduct caused or was likely to cause substantial injury. It is insufficient for a plaintiff to show merely that the defendant's conduct created a risk of harm. Furthermore, the "act or practice" aspect of the statutory definition of unfair competition covers any single act of misconduct, as well as ongoing misconduct.

UNFAIR

- 45. California Business & Professions Code § 17200 prohibits any "unfair ... business act or practice." Defendant's acts, omissions, misrepresentations, and practices as alleged herein also constitute "unfair" business acts and practices within the meaning of the UCL in that its conduct is substantially injurious to purchasers, offends public policy, and is immoral, unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous as the gravity of the conduct outweighs any alleged benefits attributable to such conduct. There were reasonably available alternatives to further Defendant's legitimate business interests, other than the conduct described herein. Plaintiff reserves the right to allege further conduct which constitutes other unfair business acts or practices. Such conduct is ongoing and continues to this date.
- 46. In order to satisfy the "unfair" prong of the UCL, a consumer must show that the injury: (1) is substantial; (2) is not outweighed by any countervailing benefits to purchasers or competition; and, (3) is not one that purchasers themselves could reasonably have avoided.
- 47. Here, Defendant Capital One's conduct has caused and continues to cause substantial injury to Plaintiff. Plaintiff has suffered injury in fact due to Capital One's decision to unjustifiably restrict Plaintiff's ability to timely make payments on his auto loan, thereby causing injury to his credit and causing him to incur unowed late fees. Thus, Capital One's conduct has caused substantial injury to Plaintiff.
- 48. Moreover, Capital One's conduct as alleged herein solely benefits Capital One while providing no benefit of any kind to any consumer. Such conduct results in unowed late fees and improper interest accruing on the auto loan, which Capital One claims Plaintiff owes. In reality, the only reason these fees and interest are accruing is because Capital One will not allow Plaintiff to timely make payments. Thus, the injury suffered by Plaintiff is not outweighed by any countervailing benefits to purchasers.
- 49. Finally, the injury suffered by Plaintiff is not an injury that Plaintiff could reasonably have avoided. After Plaintiff filed suit to protect his rights with respect to his vehicle purchase, Capital One—a completely separate business entity not named in that litigation—wrongfully restricted Plaintiff's access to the only portal he uses to make payments on his auto

- 56. California Civil Code § 1785.25 (a) states that a "person shall not furnish information on a specific transaction or experience to any consumer credit reporting agency if the person knows or should know the information is incomplete or inaccurate."
- 57. Based on these violations of Civil Code § 1785.25 (a) by Capital One and Civil Code § 1785.16 by CRA Defendants, Plaintiff is entitled to the remedies afforded by Civil Code § 1785.31, including actual damages, attorney's fees, pain and suffering, injunctive relief, and punitive damages in an amount not less than \$100 nor more than \$5,000, for each violation as the Court deems proper.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that judgment be entered against Defendants for the following:

- A. Actual damages;
- B. Statutory damages;
- C. Costs and reasonable attorney's fees; and
- D. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT II: VIOLATION OF THE FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT

- 58. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as though the same were set forth at length herein.
- 59. To the extent that Defendants' actions, counted above, violated the FCRA, those actions were done knowingly and willfully.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that judgment be entered against Defendant for the following:

- A. Actual damages;
- B. Statutory damages;
- C. Costs and reasonable attorney's fees; and
- D. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper

6

10

11 12

13

14

15

17

16

18 19

20

2223

2425

2627

28

COUNT IV: VIOLATION OF THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

(Against Defendant Capital One Only)

- 60. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as though the same were set forth at length herein.
- 61. To the extent that Defendants' actions, counted above, violated the RFDCPA, those actions were done knowingly and willfully.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that judgment be entered against Defendants for the following:

- A. Actual damages;
- B. Statutory damages;
- C. Costs and reasonable attorney's fees; and
- D. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper

COUNT V: BREACH OF DUTY OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING (Against Defendant Capital One Only)

- 62. Plaintiff includes by reference all previous paragraphs as if set forth herein.
- 63. All parties to a contract are obliged to refrain preventing one another from receiving the reasonably expected benefits of the contract. To make out a claim for a violation of this duty, Plaintiff must show the following: 1) there was a contract between Plaintiff and Defendant; 2) Plaintiff performed their obligation or was relieved therefrom; 3) Defendant unfairly prevented Plaintiff from receiving the benefits of the contract; and 4) as a result, Plaintiff was harmed.
- 64. Plaintiff was engaged in a contractual relationship with Defendant Capital One, namely with respect to the auto loan for Plaintiff's Tesla.
- 65. Plaintiff performed all obligations arising out of the contract and in no way interfered with Defendant Capital One's ability to perform their own.
- 66. By engaging in the conduct herein described, Defendant Capital One unfairly prevented Plaintiff from receiving the benefits of the contract.