- 2. Plaintiff Dawn Toff is, and at all times relevant herein was, a resident of the State of California. Ms. Toff obtained a Dickey's Franchise Disclosure Document and subsequently purchased a Dickey's franchise in Hollister, California.
- 3. Plaintiff Donna Schiano is, and at all times relevant herein was, a resident of the State of California. Ms. Schiano obtained a Dickey's Franchise Disclosure Document and subsequently purchased a Dickey's franchise in San Ramon.
- 4. Plaintiff Alfred Pena is, and at all times relevant herein was, a resident of the State of California. Mr. Pena obtained a Dickey's Franchise Disclosure Document and subsequently purchased a Dickey's franchise in Tracy, California.
- 5. Plaintiff Christy Bagby is, and at all times relevant herein was, a resident of the State of California. Ms. Bagby obtained a Dickey's Franchise Disclosure Document and subsequently purchased a Dickey's franchise in Santa Maria, California.
- 6. Plaintiff James Domsic is, and at all times relevant herein was, a resident of the State of California. Mr. Domsic obtained a Dickey's Franchise Disclosure Document and subsequently purchased a Dickey's franchise in Davis, California.
- 7. Plaintiffs Charyl Hart, George Jones, and GJones3 Ventures, LLC are, and at all times relevant herein were, residents of the State of California. Plaintiffs obtained a Dickey's Franchise Disclosure Document and subsequently purchased a Dickey's franchise in Redondo Beach, California.
- 8. Defendant Dickey's Barbecue Restaurant is a Texas corporation with its principal place of business at 4514 Cole Avenue, Suite 1015, Dallas, Texas 75205. Defendant operates a chain of corporate and franchise restaurants known as Dickey's Barbecue Pits.

## **JURISDICTION**

9. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) in that there is complete diversity of citizenship between all of the Plaintiffs and all of the Defendants and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.

10. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) in that a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the judicial district.

#### **FACTS**

#### **Defendants:**

- 11. Defendant Dickey's was formed in 1994 for the purpose of selling Dickey's Barbecue Pit franchises. Dickey's has affiliated companies, Dickey's Barbecue Pit, Inc., Restaurant Growth, Inc. and Pitmaster Team, Inc., that operates corporate Dickey's Barbecue Pit restaurants in Texas and South Dakota. The first Dickey's Barbecue Pit opened in 1941.
- 12. Dickey's Barbecue Pit is a combination quick service/fast casual dining experience. Customers place protein orders at the beginning of the service counter, then move down cafeteria-style picking side dishes. When they reach the cash register, their protein order is waiting, allowing them to pay and immediately eat.

### THE FRANCHISES

- 13. The Dickey's FDD provided to each Plaintiff contained the following representations:
- a. It would cost approximately \$60,000 to build out a restaurant conversion franchise location;
- b. Dickey's would allow a franchise to request an alternate supplier, which request would be granted upon evaluation of objective and reasonable criteria.
- c. Dickey's would protect Plaintiffs' territory, which territory was to be selected by Plaintiffs.
- d. Dickey's would provide on-site evaluation to assist in the establishment of the franchise.
- e. Dickey's would provide an initial training prior to the opening of the franchise.

28 | ///

f.	Dickey's would allow	a franchise t	to request:	menu (	changes,	which
request would be g	granted upon evaluation	of objective	e and reaso	nable	criteria.	

- g. Plaintiffs owed a total of 9% of **net** sales to Dickey's to cover its royalty and marketing fund.
- 14. Outside of the FDD, Dickey's employees made the following representations to Plaintiffs:
- a. Dickey's employees represented to the Plaintiffs that Dickey's was experiencing "tremendous growth" with store revenues increasing at a rate of 5% each year, that Dickey's was the fastest growing barbecue concept in the country and that they were beating their "record low build out costs" at just under \$60,000 including the franchise fee and purchase of initial inventory;
- b. Dickey's would provide everything that a bank would need to approve a loan to open the franchise;
- c. Dickey's had never had a franchise that ever had trouble finding financing once they saw Dickey's business plan;
- d. Dickey's would only sell one franchise in each northern California city;
- e. If Plaintiffs did not accept the locations chosen by Dickey's, they would lose their deposit and not be given another opportunity to open a franchise store in that city;
- f. Plaintiffs did not need to have prior restaurant experience because they would be trained completely by Dickey's;
- g. Each store would make at least \$800,000 in the first year and it would only go up from there. Plaintiffs would make so much money that they would want a second and then a third restaurant, at which point they could retire and just collect the income;
- h. Plaintiffs should get a secondary, not a prime, location because a Dickey's will draw as a destination restaurant;

	i.	Plaintiffs needed to use an architect referred by Dickey's for the
build out;		

- j. Dickey's provided national advertising for the franchisees out of the marketing fund;
- k. Plaintiffs were required to buy a dedicated van to support the catering business;
- l. Dickey's would provide accountings showing how it used the marketing fund;
  - m. Franchisees could purchase used equipment;
- n. Dickey's required the stores to purchase from US Foods at a price that Dickey's negotiated for the benefit of its stores; and
- o. A franchise could be sold, including transfer of all store obligations.

## **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

- 15. The joinder of all class members as parties is impracticable. The disposition of these claims in a class action will provide substantial benefits to both the parties and the Court. The class is ascertainable and maintains a sufficient community of interest. The rights of each class member were violated in a similar fashion upon Defendants' wrongful conduct. The remedy requested will involve all class members.
- 16. The class representatives' claims are typical of the claims of the members of the class because of class representatives and all other members of the class were damaged by the same wrongful conduct committed by Defendants as alleged more fully above and below.
- 17. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class. The interests of the class representatives are coincident with, and not antagonistic to, the interests of the other members of the class.

///

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

18.	The class representatives have retained competent class counsel who are
experienced	in the prosecution of class-action litigation.

- 19. Questions of law and fact common to the members of the class are central here and predominate over questions which may affect only individual members.
- 20. Plaintiffs bring this lawsuit individually and on behalf of those similarly situated. The class is defined as follow: All companies and individuals who own or have owned some portion of a Dickey's Barbecue Pit franchise restaurant in the State of California.
  - 21. Common issues amongst class members include:
    - a. They were sold a franchise based on a false FDD.
    - b. They were misled about the cost of opening the restaurant.
- c. They were not provided with appropriate marketing and promotional support.
  - d. They were not provided a protected territory.
  - e. They were forced to purchase goods at above-market prices.
  - f. They were subjected to excessive expenses.
  - g. They were not provided adequate training.

# **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### Fraud

- 22. All preceding allegations are incorporated by reference.
- 23. Defendants made the following representations to Plaintiffs:
- a. Conversion of a restaurant space into a Dickey's, including payment of all opening inventory, permit fees, franchise and training fees, would total approximately \$60,000.
- b. Dickey's was selling franchises in Northern California pursuant to a lawful FDD.
  - c. Dickey's would provide a protected territory.

1	d. Dickey's would provide an on-	site evaluation prior to lease			
2	2 execution.				
3	e. Dickey's would provide pre-op	pening training.			
4	f. Royalties and marketing fees v	would be based on the "net" sales.			
5	g. Dickey's provided a valid basis	s for estimating anticipated			
6	6 restaurant revenues.				
7	7 h. Franchisees could use alternate	suppliers so long as they suggested			
8	8 sources that could be objectively evaluated as relia	able.			
9	i. Franchisees could add new me	nu items so long as they could			
10	demonstrate that they were conducive to the Dicke	ey's image and standards.			
11	j. Dickey's operated a national m	arketing program and conducted			
12	promotions.				
13	k. Dickey's would provide account	ntings related to its marketing			
۱4	program.				
15	1. The franchisees could purchase	e used equipment.			
16	m. A senior member of Dickey's v	would be present for the restaurant			
17	opening.				
18	n. Dickey's negotiated competitive	re prices at group discount rates.			
19	19 24. Those representations were false as for	ollows:			
20	a. The cost of the build-out alone	exceeded specific and written			
21	representations. This did not include opening investigations.	entory, permit fees, franchise fees or			
22	training costs.				
23	b. The FDD contained material fa	lsities.			
24	c. Dickey's did not provide a prov	tected territory.			
25	d. Dickey's did not provide a pre-	opening evaluation of the			
26	restaurants.				
27	e. Dickey's did not provide pre-o	pening training. Instead, they made			
28	the franchisees travel to Texas to wash dishes in their affiliates' corporate stores.				

CHORSNES BARTOLOTTA MCGUIRE LLP 2550 FIFTH AVENUE, 11TH FLOOR	San Diego, Calfornia 92103 (619) 236-9363 FAX (619) 236-9653
THORSNES B	SAN

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

f. Royalties and marketing fees were not calculated based on the no
sales. Rather, they were calculated based on gross sales. Had they been calculated
based on net sales, no royalties would ever have been due because store was never
profitable.

- Pre-contract representations created an unreasonable expectation of g. how much the stores would earn.
- h. The Franchisees repeatedly requested a change in vendors to decrease costs and improve product quality. Each time the new vendor was either superior or equal to the existing vendor but no approval was forthcoming.
- i. Plaintiffs repeatedly requested permission to offer new menu items such as BBQ chicken salad or breakfast items, all of which are offered by other Dickey's stores. However, Dickey's refused each request.
- Dickey's did not offer a marketing program in Northern California. j. Those dollars were spent in Texas where they provided no benefit to the California restaurants. Dickey's also did not provide promotions. The franchisees were on their own to come up with their own promotions on a case by case basis.
  - k. The franchises never received any marketing fund accountings.
- 1. Dickey's required the franchisees to purchase expensive oversized and new equipment.
  - A senior member of Dickey's did not attend the store openings. m.
- Dickey's franchisees were forced to purchase product at overn. market prices and were not permitted to source cheaper equivalent quality replacements.
- At the time each of the above misrepresentations was made, Defendants 25. knew or should have known of the falsity.
- Plaintiffs relied on the representations in deciding to pay the application 26. fee and open a Dickey's Barbecue Pit.

///

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 27. As a result of Defendants' bad conduct, Plaintiffs suffered injury in an amount to be proven at the time of trial.
- 28. Defendants committed the above-described conduct with oppression, fraud, and malice, entitling Plaintiffs to an award of punitive damages.

## **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### Violation of California Franchise Investment Law

- 29. All preceding allegations are incorporated by reference.
- 30. California Corporations Code §§ 31200 and 31201 prohibits misrepresentation or material omission in a Franchise Disclosure Document.
- 31. California Corporations Code § 31302 provides that anyone who participates in the violation of the California Franchise Investment Law is jointly and severally liable for all damages awarded.
  - 32. Defendants violated each of the above-referenced laws.
- 33. Defendants' violation of the Franchise Investment Laws caused damage to Plaintiff in an amount to be proven at the time of trial.
- 34. Plaintiffs will also seek an award of attorneys' fees, declaratory relief and injunctive relief as provided by California Corporations Code § 31302.5.

# THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

## **Violation of Unfair Competition Laws**

- 35. All preceding allegations are incorporated by reference.
- 36. Defendants engaged in unfair conduct as is set forth above.
- 37. Defendants engaged in fraudulent conduct as is set forth above.
- 38. Defendants engaged in unlawful conduct as is set forth above.
- 39. Plaintiffs were proximately harmed as the result of Defendants' unfair, fraudulent and/or unlawful conduct.

26 ///

27 | ///

28 ///

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

## **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

### **Declaratory Relief**

- 40. All preceding allegations are incorporated by reference.
- 41. Section 27 of the franchise agreement purports to require all disputes between Plaintiffs and Dickey's to be resolved by AAA arbitration. This provision is unenforceable and Plaintiffs seek a judicial declaration to that end and, if necessary, an injunction to prevent Dickey's from enforcing the provision unlawfully.

## **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury, on all issues triable by a jury, in the above-entitled action.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiffs pray for relief as follows:

### On the First Cause of Action:

- 1. For damages according to proof;
- 2. For punitive damages;
- 3. For costs of suit;
- 4. For such and other relief as the Court deems appropriate.

# On the Second Cause of Action:

- 1. For damages according to proof;
- 2. For an award of attorneys' fees;
- 3. For costs of suit; and
- 4. For such and other relief as the Court deems appropriate.

# On the Third Cause of Action:

- 1. For declaratory relief;
- 2. For injunctive relief;
- 3. For restitution and disgorgement.
- 4. For costs of suit; and
- 5. For such and other relief as the Court deems appropriate.

	1	On th	ne Fourth Cause	of Act	ion:
	2	1.	For declaratory	relief	
	3	2.	For injunctive r	elief;	
	4	3.	For costs of sui	t; and	
	5	4.	For such and ot	her re	lief as the Court deems appropriate.
	6				
	7	Dated: July	2, 2015		THORSNES BARTOLOTTA McGUIRE LLP
	8	,		Bv:	/s/Karen R. Frostrom
<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	9			Dv.	VINCENT J. BARTOLOTTA, JR., ESQ. KAREN R. FROSTROM, ESQ. REBECCA BLAIN MORRISON, ESQ. Attorneys for Plaintiffs Amy Meadows, Dawn Toff, Donna Schiano, Alfred Pena, Christy Bagby, James Domsic, Charyl Hart, George Jones and GJones3 Ventures LLC. individually and as class representatives
	10				REBECCA BLAIN MORRISON, ESQ.
ELLF	11				Amy Meadows, Dawn Toff, Donna Schiano,
1 HOKSNES BAKLOUU I I A MCCUIKE LLF 2550 Fifth Avenue, 11th Floor San Diego, California 92103 (619) 236-363 FAX (619) 236-9653	12				Charyl Hart, George Jones and GJones Ventures
I A IMIC 11 TH FLO INIA 921 163 -9653	13				EEC. marviduanv and as class representatives
LO1 ENUE, ALIFO 236-9 9) 23(	14				
SAKI FIFTH A DIEGO, (619 FAX (0	15				
DV.	16				
HOK	17				
	18				
	19				
	20				
	21				
	22				
	23				
	24				
	25				
	26				
	27				
	28				
					11

1105309v1

3:15-CV-02139-MEJ