SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

(AVISO AL DEMANDADO): through DOE 50,

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: FLIGHTCAR INCORPORATED, and DOE 1

FOR COURT USE ONLY

(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): OF CALIFORNIA, by and through Dennis J. Herrera, City Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

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 waming 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. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación

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.sucorte.ca.gov), 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 abogados. 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.lawhelpcalifomia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre

in acuerdo o una concesión de ar	rbitraje en un caso de de	recho civil. Tiene que
il caso.		
C iún	nao dal Caso):	*7
IIA <u>U</u>	<u>u c - 1 3 - 5</u>	31807
	•	4 , 0
v. or plaintiff without an attorne	ev is:	
el demandante, o del demanda	ante que no tiene abo	nado est.
39669) 415-55	4 - 3 9 9 7 4 1 5	9auo, 63j. - 127 - 1611
(SBN 184058)	74-2007 415	-43/-4044
KEITH D TOM		
	at 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	_
		, Deputy
(Secretario)		(Adjunto
ummons (form POS-010).)		
of Service of Summons, (POS	S-010)).	
RVED: You are served		
	-16.3	
	A caso. ITA If, or plaintiff without an attorned demandate, o del demandate, and a served dant. Clerk, by	CASE NUMBER: (A) or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (a) demandante, o del demandante que no tiene about 39669) (SBN 184058) (SBN 184058) (Clerk, by

(Para prueba de entrega de e	sta citatión use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (P	OS-010)).
[SEAL]	NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served 1 as an individual defendant.	
!	2. as the person sued under the fictitious name of (s)	pecify):
	3. on behalf of (specify):	
	under: CCP 416.10 (corporation) CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)	CCP 416.60 (minor) CCP 416.70 (conservatee) CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
Form Adopted for Manufatan III.	other (specify): 4. by personal delivery on (date):	Page 1

1						
1	DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669 City Attorney	ENDORSED				
2	YVONNE R. MERÉ, State Bar #173594 Chief Attorney	San Francisco County Superior Count				
3	Neighborhood and Resident Safety Division JENNIFER E. CHOI, State Bar #184058	JAY 3 1 3013				
4	Deputy City Attorney 1390 Market Street, Sixth Floor	CLERK OF THE COURT				
5	San Francisco, California 94102-5408 Telephone: (415) 554-3887	By: KEITH D. TOM Deputy Clark				
6	Facsimile: (415) 437-4644 E-Mail: jennifer.choi@sfgov.org					
7	L-Ivian. jeinnier.enoi@sigov.oig					
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
10						
11	SUPERIOR COURT OF T	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
12	COUNTY OF	SAN FRANCISCO				
13	UNLIMITEI	D JURISDICTION 1 Cage No. C G C - 1 3 - 5 3 1 8 0 7				
14	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, by and through Dennis J.	Case No.				
15	Herrera, City Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco,	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND OTHER RELIEF				
16	Plaintiff,	Type of Case: (42) Other Complaint				
17	VS.					
18	FLIGHTCAR INCORPORATED, and DOE 1 through DOE 50,					
19 20	Defendants.					
21						
22	The PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, by and through San Francisco City					
23	Attorney DENNIS J. HERRERA ("People"), file their Complaint against Defendants FLIGHTCAR					
24	INCORPORATED, and DOE ONE through DOE FIFTY (collectively "Defendants" or "FlightCar").					
25	The People hereby allege as set forth below:					
26		ODUCTION				
27	1. This action arises out of FlightCar's unlawful and unfair operation of a rental car					
28	company and parking lot catering to individuals traveling to and from the San Francisco International					
20		1				
	COMPLAINT, PEOPLE V. FLIGHTCAR INC.					

Airport ("SFO"). All other similarly situated businesses comply with SFO's permitting and fee requirements, which are aimed at regulating the heavy volume of travelers and commercial businesses that utilize SFO and providing revenues necessary for SFO to maintain the SFO facilities such businesses use and the SFO operations from which such businesses derive commercial benefit. Despite multiple requests by SFO to operate lawfully and fairly, FlightCar refuses to comply and claims that it is not subject to SFO's requirements.

2. FlightCar's flouting of SFO's permitting and fee requirements constitutes an unlawful and unfair business practice in violation of the Unfair Competition Law, as codified in California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200-17210 ("UCL"). FlightCar's unlawful and unfair business practices prevent it from being regulated by SFO, deprive SFO of funds needed for its operation and maintenance, and confer on it an unfair advantage over other similarly situated businesses that operate legally and fairly.

PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, by and through Dennis J. Herrera, City Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco (the "People"), brings this action pursuant to California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, 17204 and 17206.
- 4. Defendant FlightCar Incorporated ("Defendant" or "FlightCar") is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business located at 960 David Street, Burlingame, California 94010. FlightCar also lists P.O. Box 985, Millbrae, California 94430 as its address in corporate filings with the California Secretary of State. From February 2013 to the present, FlightCar has owned and operated a rental car company and parking lot for individuals traveling to and from SFO.
- 5. Defendants DOE ONE through DOE FIFTY are sued herein under fictitious names. The People do not at this time know the true names or capacities of said defendants, but pray that the same may be alleged herein when ascertained.
- 6. At all times herein mentioned, each Defendant was an agent, servant, employee, partner, franchisee and joint venturer of each other Defendant and at all times was acting within the course and scope of said agency, service, employment, partnership, franchise and joint venture.

Actions taken, or omissions made, by FlightCar's employees or agents in the course of their employment or agency for FlightCar are considered to be actions or omissions of FlightCar for the purposes of this Complaint.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. The San Francisco Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action. FlightCar conducts unlawful and unfair business practices in the City and County of San Francisco ("City"), and the City Attorney has express authority under Business and Professions Code section 17204 to prosecute this case on behalf of the People of the State of California.
- 8. Venue is proper before this Court because FlightCar does business in the City. Specifically, FlightCar directs advertising to City residents through its website, billboards on highways in the City or between SFO and the City, and radio ads, conducts reservation and payment transactions for its rentals with City residents online and over the phone, accepts cars from City residents who are traveling out of SFO, and rents cars to City tourists. FlightCar also touts its association with SFO in its advertisements.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 9. SFO is a world renowned international airport owned by the City and County of San Francisco. The Airport Commission is a department of the City and County of San Francisco and operates and manages SFO.
- 10. SFO is one of the busiest airports in the world. In 2012, over 44 million passengers traveled through SFO. Each day, tens of thousands of individuals use SFO's 1.5 miles of roadways.
- 11. Given the huge number of passengers and employees of SFO and airport-related businesses who traverse SFO's roadways and facilities, SFO must regulate the use of its roadways and facilities to reduce traffic congestion so as to enhance the experience of SFO travelers, increase the economic productivity of SFO and all who use it, advance public safety and reduce pollution and environmental degradation. Among other things, SFO has invested in the construction of the AirTrain, a light rail transit system that connects all SFO terminals, terminal garages, the BART station, and the Rental Car Center. SFO encourages passengers and employees to use the AirTrain and requires all rental car companies to transport customers to the terminals via the AirTrain by dropping off their

passengers at the Rental Car Center instead of using buses, taxis or other low occupancy vehicles. In 2012, the AirTrain carried almost eight million individuals. By requiring and promoting use of the AirTrain, over taxis, limousines, vans, buses and other vehicles, to transport passengers to and from SFO terminals, SFO significantly reduces traffic congestion and associated pollution.

- 12. SFO's regulations are mandated by the federal government. SFO receives federal funding annually for capital improvements. In order to be eligible for federal funding, SFO must comply with particular requirements, such as imposing a schedule of charges for use of its facilities and services that generates sufficient income to be as financially self-sustaining as possible. 49 U.S.C. Section 47107(a)(13)(A). California Government Code Section 50474 also authorizes SFO to regulate the use of its roadways and other facilities and impose fees on those who use them.
- 13. As part of this regulation, SFO requires companies specializing in the transport of travelers to and from SFO, including on and off-Airport rental car companies, to obtain permits, pay fees, and follow designated traffic pathways. A rental car company is defined as a person or entity in the business of renting passenger vehicles to the public. Cal. Civil Code §1936(a)(1). In fiscal year 2011-2012, SFO collected over \$94 million dollars in fees from rental car companies operating both on and off SFO property. The fees constitute more than 10% of SFO's annual operating budget.
- 14. FlightCar operates a rental car company and parking lot for individuals traveling into and out of SFO. FlightCar's business model is as follows: travelers flying out of SFO leave their cars at FlightCar's rental facility in Burlingame, California. FlightCar transports the traveler to SFO and drops them off curbside at the terminal. In exchange for free parking and other monetary compensation, FlightCar rents departing travelers' cars to arriving travelers who fly into SFO. FlightCar picks up the arriving passengers curbside at the terminal and transports them to its rental facility where they pick up the car they have rented. The cars are returned in time for the owner's return. The returning traveler is picked up by FlightCar at the terminal and brought back to FlightCar's rental facility and retrieves his or her car. All contractual transactions between FlightCar and its customers are conducted online or over the phone.
- 15. FlightCar advertises its business on its website, through radio spots, and on billboards on the highways leading to SFO. FlightCar's advertising targets individuals traveling to and from

SFO, including San Francisco residents. FlightCar's advertising also emphasizes its association with SFO and highlights its low rental rates.

- 16. FlightCar's website boasts the following:
 - "We have the cheapest rentals. Guaranteed. Prove us wrong and get a free rental."
 - "Rent a sweet ride."
 - "We're revolutionizing the airport parking and car rental industries one car at a time join us by listing your car."
 - "FlightCar lets people parking at the airport rent their vehicles out to other travelers."
- 17. On the same website, FlightCar's Mission Statement is as follows, "our founders, former students from Harvard, Princeton, and MIT, started FlightCar with a goal to improve both the airport parking and rental experiences for ordinary travelers."
 - 18. On its billboards, FlightCar advertises "Get free parking at SFO" and "Now at SFO."
- 19. FlightCar began operating in February 2013. At the time, FlightCar conducted its operations at a parking garage on SFO property. Before beginning operations, FlightCar neglected to obtain any of the required permits or pay any of the required fees of SFO. SFO notified FlightCar of its obligations under the law and required FlightCar to comply. FlightCar refused to comply. Instead, FlightCar moved its operations off-airport to a lot four miles south of SFO in Burlingame, California, and notified SFO that it was not a rental car company subject to SFO's regulations. SFO notified FlightCar that as an off-Airport rental car company that catered primarily to individuals traveling to and from SFO, FlightCar was still subject to its regulations.
- 20. FlightCar's obligations include obtaining the requisite SFO permits and paying the requisite fees described in SFO Rules and Regulations. For example, FlightCar must obtain a Commercial Ground Transportation Permit to transport its customers to and from SFO. The purpose of this permit is to enable SFO to regulate and manage the commercial traffic that travels through SFO. FlightCar must also transport its customers from its rental facility not to the curbside departure or arrival areas in front of the terminals, but instead to the Airport Rental Car Center (on SFO property) and to require the customers to use the AirTrain to get to and from airport terminals. Finally, FlightCar must obtain an off-airport rental car business permit through which it agrees to

abide by SFO's regulations, including payment to SFO of 10% of its gross profits and a \$20 transportation fee for each rental car transaction.

- 21. FlightCar's move to a location off-airport does not relieve FlightCar of its obligations to SFO. Airports are authorized to charge fees to rental car companies that serve the airport's passengers whether their retail facilities or cars are located on or off airport property. *Alamo Rent-A-Car, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors of Orange County, et al.* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 198. The fees are authorized even for off-airport rental car companies because such companies serve the airport's passengers and thus derive a commercial benefit from the airport. *Id.*, at 208. FlightCar's customer base is comprised primarily of passengers traveling in and out of SFO, and, as a result, FlightCar derives a significant commercial benefit from SFO. Government Code Section 50474.1 also specifically authorizes SFO to impose fees on rental car companies for the costs associated with the construction, maintenance and operation of the AirTrain.
- 22. FlightCar has nevertheless refused to comply with SFO's requirements. It insists that it is not a rental car company subject to SFO's regulations. FlightCar also claims that it is not obligated to transport its customers to the terminal via AirTrain because it arranges for them to be picked up and dropped off curbside at the terminals.
- 23. FlightCar continues to operate its business from the Burlingame facility. FlightCar has no permits, pays no fees, and drops off its customers curbside at the airport terminal, in violation of SFO regulations.
- 24. Other than FlightCar, all off-airport rental car companies that primarily serve SFO passengers, but otherwise have no presence on SFO property, comply with SFO's permitting and fee requirements. In 2012, these other off-airport rental car companies paid over \$2 million dollars in profit fees and transportation fees to SFO.
- 25. As a result of FlightCar's unfair and unlawful business practices, FlightCar is able to charge lower prices on its rentals, gaining an unfair advantage over similarly situated businesses that are forced to charge higher prices in order to operate lawfully and fairly.
- 26. On May 23, 2013, FlightCar launched identical operations at Logan International Airport, in Boston, Massachusetts. As here, FlightCar has no permits and pays no fees to Logan for

the privilege of serving those who travel in and out of the airport, in violation of Logan's rules and regulations. FlightCar has represented that it intends on launching operations at additional airports in the near future.

CAUSE OF ACTION

FOR UNLAWFUL AND UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES BROUGHT BY PLAINTIFF PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS (California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200-17210)

- 27. The People hereby incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 26 as though fully set forth herein.
- 28. The People bring this cause of action in the public interest in the name of the People of the State of California, pursuant to Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, 17204 and 17206 in order to protect consumers and competitors of the services provided by FlightCar from the unlawful and unfair business practices committed by FlightCar within the City and County of San Francisco, State of California.
- 29. The violations of law described herein have been and are being carried out in part within the City and County of San Francisco. The actions of FlightCar are in violation of the laws and public policies of the City and County of San Francisco and the State of California, and are inimical to the rights and interest of the general public.
- 30. FlightCar is now engaging in and, for a considerable period of time and at all times pertinent to the allegations of this Complaint, has engaged in unlawful business practices prohibited by California's Unfair Competition Law by operating in violation of the following laws:
 - Rule 4.4 of the SFO Rules and Regulations by failing to follow SFO's designated traffic routes for rental car companies.
 - Rule 4.7(a) of the SFO Rules and Regulation by failing to apply for and obtain a
 Commercial Ground Transportation Operating Permit from SFO.
 - Rule 4.7(c)(2) of the SFO Rules and Regulation by failing to pay the fees required of off-airport rental car companies.
 - California Government Code Section 50474.1 by failing to pay fees required of offairport rental car companies.

2.5

- 31. FlightCar is now engaging in and, for a considerable period of time and at all times pertinent to the allegations of this Complaint, has engaged in unfair business practices prohibited by California's Unfair Competition Law as follows:
 - By dodging SFO's fees, FlightCar has been able to charge lower prices for rentals than similarly situated rental car companies.
 - By actively promoting an association with SFO and targeting its advertising to SFO
 passengers, FlightCar has incurred a substantial commercial benefit, without having to
 pay any of the lawfully imposed fees other rental car companies pay to obtain the same
 benefit.
 - By actively promoting and advertising its business in a manner that is untrue and misleading.
 - By targeting SFO customers while refusing to pay SFO's fees, FlightCar has been unjustly enriched at the expense of SFO and deprived SFO of funds needed for its operation.
- 32. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing acts and practices, FlightCar has received income, profits, and other benefits, which they would not have received if FlightCar had not engaged in the violations of the UCL described in this Complaint.
- 33. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing acts and practices, FlightCar has obtained a competitive unfair advantage over similar businesses that have not engaged in such practices.
- 34. The People have no adequate remedy at law in that damages are insufficient to protect the public from the harm caused by the conditions described in this Complaint.
- 35. Unless injunctive relief is granted to enjoin the unfair and unlawful business practices of FlightCar, the People will suffer irreparable injury and damage.
- 36. By engaging in unfair and unlawful business practices described herein, FlightCar is subject to civil penalties in the amount of up to \$2,500.00 per violation, pursuant to California Business and Professions Code Section 17206.

PRAYER

2.5

///

WHEREFORE, the People pray that:

Declaratory Relief

1. FlightCar be declared to have engaged in unfair and unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code Sections 17200-17210;

Injunctive Relief

- 2. FlightCar be enjoined and restrained from operating as an off-airport rental company and parking lot until FlightCar fully complies with SFO's permitting and fee requirements;
- 3. Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code Section 17203-17204, FlightCar, its agents, officers, managers, representatives, employees, and anyone acting on its behalf, and their heirs, successors, and assignees be enjoined from committing unlawful and unfair business practices in their operation of FlightCar;
- 4. FlightCar be enjoined from spending, transferring, encumbering, or removing from California any money received for the unfair and unlawful acts alleged in the Complaint;

Penalties

- 5. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section 17206, FlightCar be ordered to pay a civil penalty of up to \$2,500.00 for each act of unfair and unlawful competition in violation of Business and Professions Code Sections 17200-17210;
- 6. FlightCar be ordered to pay restitution for money obtained through an unfair business practice to those persons in interest from whom the property was taken or wrongfully withheld, including SFO, pursuant to California Business and Professions Code Section 17203 and *People v. Beaumont Investment, Ltd., et al.* (2003) 111 Cal.App.4th 102, 134-136;

/// /// ///

Fees and Costs

- 7. The People be awarded their costs incurred herein pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1032; and
 - 8. the Court grant such other and further relief as this Court should find just and proper.

Dated: 5/31/13

DENNIS J. HERRERA City Attorney YVONNE MERÈ Chief Attorney JENNIFER E. CHOI Deputy City Attorneys

Attorneys for Plaintiff PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA