

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

CS WANG & ASSOCIATE, SAT NARAYAN dba EXPRESS HAULING, ROBERT MEYER dba MANGIA NOSH, TAYSIR TAYEH dba CHIEF'S MARKET, and JAY SCHMIDT INSURANCE AGENCY, INC., individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,
Plaintiffs,

vs.

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., FIFTH THIRD BANK, FIRST DATA MERCHANT SERVICES LLC, VANTIV, INC., NATIONAL PROCESSING COMPANY, IRONWOOD FINANCIAL, LLC dba IRONWOOD PAYMENTS, DEWITT LOVELACE, and JOHN LEWIS,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:16-cv-11223

Judge Rebecca R. Pallmeyer

Magistrate Judge Mary M. Rowland

ANSWER & DEFENSES OF DEFENDANTS
FIRST DATA MERCHANT SERVICES LLC AND WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. TO
PLAINTIFFS' SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

Defendants Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. ("Wells Fargo") and First Data Merchant Services LLC ("First Data") (together, "Defendants") file their Answer and Defenses to Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint ("Complaint"), respectfully showing the Court as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and California small businesses who were secretly recorded during telemarketing calls made by International Payment Services, LLC ("IPS") and Ironwood and their owners and directors on behalf of Wells Fargo, Fifth Third, First Data, Vantiv, and NPC.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations cast against them in Paragraph 1 of Plaintiffs' Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a

belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 1 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

2. Wells Fargo and Fifth Third are nationally known banks. Both Wells Fargo and Fifth Third maintain nationwide credit and debit card processing divisions. These divisions process the credit and debit card transactions that occur at businesses around the country every day.

ANSWER: Defendants admit Wells Fargo is a national banking association and an acquiring bank in the payment-card-processing industry. Defendants deny the remaining allegations cast against them in Paragraph 2 of Plaintiffs' Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations about Defendant Fifth Third contained in Paragraph 2 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

3. Beginning in 2011, Wells Fargo employed IPS, a telemarketing and sales firm, to sell credit and debit card payment processing services to businesses across the country. IPS was and is owned and controlled by three brothers: Brian Bentley, Andrew Bentley, and Adam Bentley and operated under the names PrimePay Global and ElitePay Global.

ANSWER: Defendants state the nature of Wells Fargo's relationship with IPS is set forth in Wells Fargo's contract with IPS. Defendants deny that contract states "Wells Fargo employed IPS, a telemarketing and sales firm, to sell credit and debit card payment processing services to businesses across the country." Defendants deny any remaining allegations cast against them in Paragraph 3 of the Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 3 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

4. In 2014, IPS ended its relationship with Wells Fargo and began selling credit and debit card payment processing services on behalf of Fifth Third.

ANSWER: Defendants admit the relationship between IPS and Wells Fargo changed significantly in 2014. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegation regarding when IPS began selling credit and debit card payment processing services on behalf of Fifth Third and therefore deny this allegation. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

5. As part of its sales program, IPS made thousands of telemarketing calls to California businesses every day, including the Plaintiffs. During these calls, IPS telemarketers discussed sensitive business matters with their sales targets, including Plaintiffs, and solicited confidential and valuable financial data from them.

ANSWER: Paragraph 5 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

6. IPS surreptitiously recorded each and every one of these phone calls and stored those recordings on a cloud-based system accessible from the internet. This scheme was designed and executed by the three Bentley brothers.

ANSWER: Paragraph 6 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

7. In 2015, IPS sold its business operations – including its telemarketing call centers and technology infrastructure – to Ironwood. Key IPS personnel, including telemarketing and sales managers, immediately began working for Ironwood. Ironwood continued IPS’s work on behalf of Fifth Third.

ANSWER: Paragraph 7 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

8. Ironwood continued IPS’s practices, including the surreptitious recordation of phone calls, without interruption after it purchased IPS’s telemarketing operations.

ANSWER: Paragraph 8 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

9. In addition to selling payment processing services performed by Wells Fargo and Fifth Third, IPS was also employed by First Data, Vantiv, and NPC to sell credit and debit card processing hardware (point-of-sale terminals, PIN pads, etc.). Every one of IPS’s telemarketing calls had the dual purpose of selling payment processing services (on behalf of Wells Fargo and Fifth Third) and hardware (for First Data, Vantiv, and NPC).

ANSWER: Defendants state the nature of First Data’s relationship with IPS is set forth in First Data’s contracts with IPS. Defendants deny that contract states “IPS was also employed by First Data . . . to sell credit and debit card processing hardware (point-of-sale terminals, PIN pads, etc.).” Defendants deny any remaining allegations cast against them in

Paragraph 9 of the Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 9 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

10. Likewise, Ironwood began selling credit and debit card processing hardware for Vantiv and NPC when it began selling processing services for Fifth Third.

ANSWER: Paragraph 10 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

11. Defendants violated the California Invasion of Privacy Act ("CIPA"), Cal. Penal Code §§ 632 and 632.7, each time they secretly recorded a phone call to or from a California business owner.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 11 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

12. Plaintiffs bring this action seeking remedy for these illegal practices.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 12 of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

13. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2). The matter in controversy exceeds the sum of \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is a class action in which there are numerous class members who are citizens of states different from Defendants. The number of members of each proposed class is in the aggregate greater than 100

and more than two-thirds of the class reside in states other than a state in which a Defendant is a citizen.

ANSWER: Paragraph 13 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 13 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

14. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Ironwood because Ironwood conducted business in Illinois and a substantial portion of the offending telephone calls were placed from the Ironwood call center located at 40 Schuman Boulevard in Naperville, Illinois.

ANSWER: Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 14 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

15. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Dewitt Lovelace and John Lewis because each of them personally directed and implemented Ironwood's secret recordation program at the Ironwood call center located at 40 Schuman Boulevard in Naperville, Illinois. As shown in this Complaint, each of Dewitt Lovelace and John Lewis directed Ironwood personnel working in Illinois to record telephone calls made to Plaintiffs and the Ironwood classes in person at the Naperville call center and through telephone calls, emails, and text messages to Ironwood personnel working in Illinois.

ANSWER: Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 15 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

16. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Wells Fargo and First Data because each of them solicits and transacts business in Illinois by selling and providing payment processing

services and hardware to Illinois merchants and thus have purposefully availed themselves of the laws of this forum. Furthermore, each of them marketed those same services and products to Plaintiffs and members of the classes through telephone calls made from Illinois that are the subject of this suit. Each of Wells Fargo and First Data directed and controlled the form and manner of those telephone solicitations as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 16 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

17. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC because each of them solicits and transacts business in Illinois by selling and providing payment processing services and hardware to Illinois merchants and thus have purposefully availed themselves of this forum. Furthermore, each of them marketed and continues to market those same services and products to Plaintiffs and members of the classes through telephone calls made from Illinois that are the subject of this suit. Each of Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC directed and controlled the form and manner of those telephone solicitations as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 17 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

18. The Court has jurisdiction over Wells Fargo, First Data, Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC for the additional reason that they all employed IPS, as their agent, to secretly record phone calls from the IPS call centers located at 212 West Van Buren Street in Chicago, Illinois and 40 Schuman Boulevard in Naperville, Illinois.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations cast against them in Paragraph 18 of the Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 18 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

19. Venue is proper in the Northern District of Illinois (Eastern Division) because Defendants conduct business in this District and a substantial part of the secretly recorded telephone calls at issue were made and recorded from call centers in Chicago, Illinois and Naperville, Illinois, which are within this District and Division.

ANSWER: Paragraph 19 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 19 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

20. Defendant Wells Fargo is a National Banking Association registered with the Comptroller of the Currency in Sioux Falls, South Dakota with its main branch at 101 N. Phillips Ave., Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

ANSWER: Defendants admit Wells Fargo is a national banking association with its main office in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. Defendants deny any remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 20 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

21. Defendant Fifth Third is an Ohio banking corporation with its headquarters in Cincinnati, Ohio.

ANSWER: Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 21 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

22. Defendant First Data Merchant Services, LLC is a Florida limited liability corporation with its headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia. On December 30, 2015 First Data Merchant Services Corporation filed Articles of Conversion with the state of Florida thereby converting itself into First Data Merchant Services, LLC. All liabilities were assumed by and transferred to First Data Merchant Services, LLC at the time of conversion.

ANSWER: Defendants admit First Data Merchant Services LLC is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Florida with its principal address in the State of Georgia. The remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 22 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 22 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

23. Defendant Vantiv is a Delaware corporation with its headquarters in Cincinnati, Ohio.

ANSWER: Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 23 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

24. Defendant NPC is a Nebraska corporation with its headquarters in Cincinnati, Ohio.

ANSWER: Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 24 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

25. Defendant Ironwood is a Mississippi corporation with its headquarters in Salt Lake City, Utah and which operated a telemarketing call center in Naperville, Illinois from

roughly 2015 to 2016 from which a substantial number of the calls at issue in this case were made and recorded.

ANSWER: Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 25 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

26. Defendant Dewitt Lovelace is an owner and officer of Ironwood residing in the state of Mississippi.

ANSWER: Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 26 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

27. Defendant John Lewis is an owner and officer of Ironwood residing in the state of Mississippi.

ANSWER: Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 27 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

28. Plaintiff CS Wang and Associate is a California partnership that was a party to confidential telephone communications that were surreptitiously recorded by IPS on behalf of Wells Fargo and First Data. Specifically, the recorded phone call was initiated by IPS and received by CS Wang and Associate on a landline telephone in Santa Clara County, California.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 28 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

29. Plaintiff Sat Narayan dba Express Hauling is a sole proprietorship that was a party to telephone communications that were surreptitiously recorded by IPS on behalf of Fifth Third,

Vantiv, and NPC. Specifically, the recorded phone call was initiated by IPS and received by Sat Narayan dba Express Hauling on a cellular telephone in Alameda County, California.

ANSWER: Paragraph 29 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

30. Plaintiff Robert Meyer dba Mangia Nosh is a sole proprietorship that was a party to confidential telephone communications that were surreptitiously recorded by Ironwood on behalf of Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC and by IPS on behalf of Fifth Third, Vantiv and NPC. Specifically, the recorded phone calls were initiated by Ironwood and IPS and received by Robert Meyer dba Mangia Nosh on a landline telephone in Marin County, California.

ANSWER: Paragraph 30 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

31. Plaintiff Taysir Tayeh dba Chief's Market is a sole proprietorship that was a party to telephone communications that were surreptitiously recorded by Ironwood on behalf of Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC and by IPS on behalf of Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC. Specifically, the recorded phone calls were initiated by Ironwood and IPS and received by Taysir Tayeh dba Chief's Market on a cordless telephone in Placer County, California.

ANSWER: Paragraph 31 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient

to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

32. Plaintiff Jay Schmidt Insurance Agency, Inc. is a California corporation that was a party to telephone communications that were surreptitiously recorded by IPS on behalf of Wells Fargo and First Data. Specifically, the recorded call was initiated by IPS and received by [Plaintiff Name Reserved Until Filing] on a cordless telephone in Santa Clara County, California.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 32 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

The Credit and Debit Card Payment Processing Industry in the United States

33. Every business in the United States that wishes to accept payment via VISA or Mastercard must have a relationship with a bank that is a member of the VISA and Mastercard systems. The "member bank" that each business (or "merchant") contracts with is called an acquiring bank or "acquirer". In this case, the acquirers at issue are Wells Fargo and Fifth Third.

ANSWER: Defendants admit Wells Fargo enters into contracts with merchants and provides, among other products and services, acquiring bank services. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 33 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

34. Acquirers like Wells Fargo and Fifth Third handle and process every credit and debit card transaction that occurs at its acquired merchants' places of business. In return for these "merchant processing" services, the acquirer charges the merchant a processing fee equal to a percentage of the dollar value of each transaction.

ANSWER: Defendants state the nature of the acquiring bank services Wells Fargo provides merchants are governed by the specific terms and conditions of the contracts between those parties. The terms and conditions of those contracts are the highest and best evidence thereof, and Defendants deny any allegation contained in Paragraph 34 of the Complaint inconsistent therewith. Defendants deny any remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 34 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

35. The more merchants an acquiring bank acquires, the more transactions it processes and the more money it obtains in processing fees. According to a report authored by the Federal Reserve System, the total value of noncash payments in the United States in 2012 was \$79 trillion.¹ Acquiring merchants is big business.

ANSWER: Paragraph 35 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

36. Due to the sheer size of the credit and debit card processing market in the United States, acquiring banks like Wells Fargo and Fifth Third often lack the sales staff necessary to solicit the countless number of small merchants across the United States. As a result, acquirers work with "Third Party Agents" or "TPAs" like IPS and Ironwood.

ANSWER: Defendants admit Wells Fargo entered into a contract with IPS. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 36 of the Complaint.

¹ Federal Reserve System. *2013 Federal Reserve Payment Study: Recent and Long-Term Payment Trends in the United States: 2003-2012*. December 2013, https://www.frbservices.org/files/communications/pdf/research/2013_payments_study_summary.pdf.

37. These sales-oriented TPAs (also known as “Independent Sales Organizations”), solicit merchants on behalf of an acquiring bank. In return, the acquiring bank pays the sales organization a portion of the processing fee that is collected from the merchant on each of the merchant’s transactions.

ANSWER: Defendants admit Wells Fargo, as an acquiring bank, has entered into contracts with certain independent sales organizations, pursuant to which those independent sales organizations have solicited merchants to sign up for Wells Fargo’s acquiring bank services in exchange for agreed upon fees. Defendants deny any remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 37 of the Complaint.

38. In order to manage the enormous data involved in processing the billions of credit and debit card transactions occurring nationwide, acquiring banks work with technology-oriented TPAs known as “processors”. First Data, Vantiv, and NPC are processors that specialize in these services, which range from telecommunications software design to customer service. Working with processors allows acquiring banks to focus on their core financial competencies.

ANSWER: Defendants admit First Data provides, among other goods and services, payment-card processing services. Defendants deny any remaining allegations cast against them in Paragraph 38 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations about Defendants Vantiv and NPC contained in Paragraph 38 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

39. The complexity of the financial, technological, and inter-business dealings required to network together a system involving millions of consumers, many thousands of merchants, and hundreds of sales TPAs often means that the relationship between an acquiring bank or processor is closer than arms-length.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 39 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

40. Wells Fargo and First Data partnered with each other to create a payment processing "Program" consisting of networked financial, technological, and business functions that they each shared an interest in and derived shared profits from. This partnership was in place at all times relevant to this suit.

ANSWER: Defendants admit that they formed a program whereby the different services of each Defendant might be jointly offered to potential customers during the time IPS was providing sales services to Wells Fargo. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 40 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

41. Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC also worked closely together to create the network of financial communications, technology services, customer service functions and other business competencies required to process credit and debit card payments across the country and around the world. The company that would become Vantiv began as a wholly-owned subsidiary of Fifth Third before it was launched as an independent entity. At all times relevant to this suit, Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC each shared an interest in their joint payment processing network and derived shared profits from it as partners.

ANSWER: Paragraph 41 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

42. Like sales TPAs, processor TPAs also share in the fees generated by payment processing activities. Accordingly, First Data was paid a percentage of the processing fee

charged on Wells Fargo merchant transactions, just as IPS was. Similarly, Vantiv and NPC were paid a percentage of the processing fee charged on each Fifth Third transaction, alongside Ironwood.

ANSWER: Defendants admit First Data received fees in exchange for the processing services it provided in connection with its relationship with Wells Fargo. Defendants deny the remaining allegations cast against them in Paragraph 42 of Plaintiffs' Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations about Defendants IPS, Vantiv and NPC contained in Paragraph 42 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

43. In addition to selling payment processing services, processor TPAs also sell credit and debit card processing hardware (point-of-sale terminals, PIN pads, etc.) to merchants. This hardware is marketed and sold to merchants by sales TPAs at the same time that payment processing services are.

ANSWER: Paragraph 43 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

44. In this case, IPS marketed First Data hardware at the same time it sold payment processing services for Wells Fargo. Ironwood marketed hardware on behalf of Vantiv and NPC at the same time it sold payment processing services for Fifth Third. Profit from these hardware sales is shared between the sales TPA (IPS or Ironwood) and the processor TPA (First Data or Vantiv and NPC).

ANSWER: Defendants state the nature of First Data's relationships with IPS and with Wells Fargo is set forth in First Data's contracts with those entities. Defendants state the terms and conditions of those contracts are the highest and best evidence thereof, and Defendants deny any allegation contained in Paragraph 44 of the Complaint inconsistent therewith. Defendants deny the remaining allegations cast against them in Paragraph 44 of Plaintiffs' Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations about Defendants Vantiv, NPC, IPS, and Ironwood contained in Paragraph 44 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

45. Together acquirers, processor TPAs, and sales TPAs combine to provide payment processing services to merchants across the country. Acquiring banks like Wells Fargo and Fifth Third initiate and complete financial transactions among member banks. Processor TPAs like First Data, Vantiv, and NPC manage the data transfers those transactions are based on. Finally, sales TPAs like IPS and Ironwood bring these services to market on behalf of both acquirers and processors. All of these entities share in the revenues generated by the processing fees collected by the acquiring bank from each merchant.

ANSWER: Defendants state the nature of First Data's relationships with IPS, with Wells Fargo, and with certain merchants is set forth in First Data's contracts with those entities. Defendants state the terms and conditions of those contracts are the highest and best evidence thereof, and Defendants deny any allegation contained in Paragraph 45 of the Complaint inconsistent therewith. Defendants deny the remaining allegations cast against them in Paragraph 45 of Plaintiffs' Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations about Defendants Fifth Third, Vantiv, NPC, IPS, and

Ironwood contained in Paragraph 45 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

Acquiring Banks' Control Over Their Third Party Agents

46. VISA and Mastercard have rules and standards in place that govern an acquirer's employment of TPAs. These requirements (the "VISA rules" and "Mastercard rules") are described in the VISA Product and Service Rules, VISA Global Acquirer Risk Standards, VISA Third Party Agent Due Diligence Risk Standards, and Mastercard Rules, respectively.

ANSWER: Defendants admit that Visa and MasterCard have rules. Defendants deny any remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 46 of the Complaint.

47. With respect to sales-oriented TPAs like IPS or Ironwood, the VISA rules required Wells Fargo and Fifth Third to:

- Register the TPA as its agent with the VISA system;
- Conduct a comprehensive initial on-site inspection of the TPA's place of business;
- Physically inspect the TPA's solicitation and sales materials during the on-site inspection;
- Review and monitor the TPA on an ongoing, monthly basis;
- Conduct an in-depth annual review of the TPA;
- Regularly review the TPA's solicitation materials according to a written policy approved by the Wells Fargo or Fifth Third boards of directors;
- Provide the TPA with policies and procedures for complying with industry-related laws, regulations, and proper solicitation practices;
- Provide sales training and education to the TPA;
- Implement an underwriting, monitoring, and control policy for the TPA to be approved by the Wells Fargo or Fifth Third boards of directors;

- Approve the TPA based on a review of sound business practices without resorting to contractual language that limits Wells Fargo's or Fifth Third's liability for the TPA's conduct;
- "Accept responsibility for any and all losses caused by [the TPA]".

ANSWER: Paragraph 47 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 47 of the Complaint.

48. Pursuant to these standards, an acquiring bank in the VISA system has the power and, indeed, obligation to supervise, direct, and control its registered TPAs' sales and telemarketing programs to ensure compliance with the VISA rules.

ANSWER: Paragraph 48 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 48 of the Complaint.

49. Wells Fargo did supervise and control IPS's sales practices during the time that IPS was its registered agent, approximately 2011 to 2014.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 49 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

50. Fifth Third did supervise and control Ironwood's sales practices during the time that Ironwood was its registered agent, approximately 2015 to the present day.

ANSWER: Paragraph 50 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

51. Wells Fargo contracted with First Data to supervise and control IPS on Wells Fargo's behalf in order to ensure compliance with the VISA rules. First Data employed representatives assigned to IPS whose job was to carry out the inspections and supervisory duties enumerated above. These activities show that if the relationship between Wells Fargo and First Data did not arise to the level of a partnership, then at the very least First Data was an agent of Wells Fargo with the authority to supervise IPS's telemarketing operations.

ANSWER: Paragraph 51 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains argument and legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 51 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

52. Similarly, Fifth Third contracted with Vantiv and NPC to supervise and control Ironwood on behalf of Fifth Third in order to ensure compliance with the VISA rules. Vantiv and NPC employed representatives whose job was to carry out the inspections and supervisory duties enumerated above. These activities show that if the relationship between Fifth Third and Vantiv and NPC did not arise to the level of partnership, then at the very least Vantiv and NPC were agents of Fifth Third with the authority to supervise Ironwood's telemarketing operations.

ANSWER: Paragraph 52 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

IPS's Sales Practices on Behalf of Wells Fargo and First Data

53. In 2011, Wells Fargo conducted a due diligence review of IPS and formally registered IPS as its Third Party Agent in the VISA and Mastercard systems. It further entered

into a written “Marketing Agreement” with IPS (and First Data) that implemented the requirements set down by the VISA rules and Mastercard rules.

ANSWER: Defendants admit they entered into a contract with IPS, the terms and conditions of which are the highest and best evidence thereof, and that Defendants followed their normal procedures for registering ISOs. Defendants deny any allegation contained in Paragraph 53 of the Complaint inconsistent therewith. Defendants deny any remaining allegations cast against them in Paragraph 53 of the Complaint.

54. The Marketing Agreement between Wells Fargo, First Data, and IPS explicitly stated that IPS would act as an agent of both Wells Fargo and First Data when soliciting merchants to the Wells Fargo and First Data “Program”. After entering into the Marketing Agreement, IPS began to make sales calls nationwide on behalf of Wells Fargo and First Data, first under the trade name PrimePay Global and later as ElitePay Global.

ANSWER: Defendants admit they entered into an agreement with IPS. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 54 of the Complaint.

55. IPS’s sales strategy began with the telemarketing call. Its practice was to make telemarketing sales calls to merchants with the goal of scheduling an in-person meeting between the merchant and a sales representative. That field representative would then visit the merchant’s place of business and sell Wells Fargo’s merchant processing services as well as hardware offered by First Data.

ANSWER: Paragraph 55 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

56. IPS telemarketers followed a “script” that spelled out the introduction the telemarketer was to make to call recipients and the description of the services and products offered. The IPS script instructed telemarketers to tell call recipients that IPS was “with Wells Fargo”. IPS telemarketers were required to follow that script, did so, and told recipients the call was being placed on behalf of Wells Fargo.

ANSWER: Paragraph 56 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

57. Wells Fargo had actual knowledge that IPS telemarketers informed call recipients that IPS was “with Wells Fargo” because Wells Fargo was provided copies of IPS’s scripts for review and approval. Wells Fargo further communicated with IPS personnel in Illinois to approve IPS call scripts that stated IPS was “with Wells Fargo”. In doing so, Wells Fargo ratified the use of these scripts.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 57 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint.

58. The recipients of IPS’s telemarketing calls had a reasonable expectation that the calls were confidential because the IPS representative introduced only his or herself, did so as a representative of a trusted entity like Wells Fargo, the topic of the call was business-related, and a business’s method of processing credit and debit card transactions is by its nature sensitive and confidential.

ANSWER: Paragraph 58 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 58 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

59. IPS contributed to each merchant's objective expectation of privacy by engaging in the practice of "Caller ID Spoofing". A caller "spoofs" the Caller ID of a call recipient by using technology that conceals the caller's true phone number by causing the Caller ID to show a fake number instead.

ANSWER: Paragraph 59 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

60. IPS engaged in "Caller ID Spoofing" by causing merchants' Caller ID systems to display a local California number instead of the true number of IPS's out of state telemarketing centers. Caller ID Spoofing is a widely practiced strategy in the telemarketing industry that tricks business owners into believing they are receiving a phone call from a local customer instead of an out of state sales call.

ANSWER: Paragraph 60 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

61. In other words, the purpose of Caller ID Spoofing is to induce a merchant's reasonable expectation that he or she is not being called by a telemarketer and is not reasonably

likely to be recorded on the call. Because of this practice, Plaintiffs and class members had no idea they were receiving a telemarketing call until recording had already begun.

ANSWER: Paragraph 61 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

62. During telemarketing calls, IPS representatives asked small business owners to disclose their business's monthly or annual credit and debit card sales volume. A company's credit and debit card sales volume is sensitive and confidential and of significant value to that owner's competitors, vendors, and commercial real estate lessors. There is an obvious and reasonable expectation when discussing sensitive financial information that the call is private.

ANSWER: Paragraph 62 of Plaintiffs' Complaint states a legal conclusion which does not require a response. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny such allegations.

63. IPS telemarketers asked for merchants' credit and debit card sales volume because larger volume dealers were more valuable to Wells Fargo – and therefore also to First Data and IPS, since each of them received a portion of the processing fee that Wells Fargo charged the merchant.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 63 of the Complaint.

64. Despite the fact that Plaintiffs and members of each class had a reasonable expectation of privacy, IPS made a recording of each telemarketing call it made to them on behalf of Wells Fargo and First Data.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 64 of the Complaint.

65. IPS never made any disclosure of any kind to any recipients of its calls that the calls were recorded. None of Plaintiffs were at all aware that their communications were being recorded.

ANSWER: Paragraph 65 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

66. IPS stored the audio recordings in cloud-based data systems provided by Veracity Networks, LLC. Parties to the recorded calls were not informed that the recordings were transferred to the custody of this third party.

ANSWER: Paragraph 66 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

67. Whenever an IPS telemarketer successfully scheduled an in-person sales call with a merchant, he or she submitted a paper slip to the IPS "Confirmation Department". Staff in the Confirmation Department then listened to the audio recording of the phone call to ensure that the merchant had truly agreed to the meeting.

ANSWER: Paragraph 67 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient

to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

68. Recordings were also made available to IPS field sales representatives who used them as sales tools to learn more about potential sales targets and tailor their sales presentation with that information. As a result, field representatives were more likely to complete a sale to the benefit of IPS, Wells Fargo, and First Data.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations cast against them in Paragraph 68 of the Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 68 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

69. The recordings were not used to improve customer service or train customer service personnel.

ANSWER: Paragraph 69 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

70. The system of secretly recording telephone calls with sales targets was devised and implemented directly by Brian Bentley, Andrew Bentley, and Adam Bentley during meetings that occurred at the Chicago call center at the time it was opened for business in roughly 2011. The three men then again met in Illinois to implement the recordation program while opening the Naperville call center, which replaced the Chicago center in roughly 2014.

ANSWER: Paragraph 70 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient

to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

71. An IPS employee repeatedly cautioned Andrew Bentley, while he was present in the state of Illinois for meetings and during telephone calls Andrew Bentley placed to the employee in Illinois, that the IPS practice of secretly recording telephone calls to California businesses was illegal. At those times, Andrew Bentley directed the IPS employee who told him the program was illegal “not to worry about it” and to continue recording phone calls to California businesses.

ANSWER: Paragraph 71 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

72. Andrew Bentley, Brian Bentley, and Adam Bentley further approached Veracity Networks, LLC and engaged them to provide the technology and services necessary to record phone calls and store them.

ANSWER: Paragraph 72 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

73. It was unreasonable for Andrew Bentley, Brian Bentley, and Adam Bentley to design the secret recordation program, engage a vendor to provide the requisite technology infrastructure, and then direct employees to secretly record telephone calls to California businesses when it was illegal to do so.

ANSWER: Paragraph 73 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

74. First Data had actual knowledge that calls to Plaintiffs were secretly recorded because copies of recorded calls were provided to First Data at First Data's request.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 74 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

75. Whenever a business agreed to purchase payment processing hardware through IPS, it was First Data's practice to call the merchant and ask the merchant to verbally confirm the sale. This was called "getting the verbal".

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 75 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

76. Occasionally, First Data personnel were unable to reach a merchant to get verbal confirmation of an IPS sale. In these instances, First Data would request the audio of the full recording of IPS calls to the relevant merchant to confirm the sale. First Data sales managers assigned to IPS were told by IPS personnel that all calls to merchants were recorded and available to be requested. Sales managers regularly requested and relied on full length recordings of IPS calls in this manner.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 76 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

77. Simply by listening to the full-length recordings of the IPS calls – which never contained a disclosure that recording occurred – First Data had actual knowledge that IPS was

surreptitiously recording its phone calls to merchants. Because Ironwood funneled many thousands of California merchants to First Data, and First Data knew that recordings of all calls were being made and available on request, First Data had actual knowledge that calls to Plaintiffs and class members were recorded without disclosure.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 77 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

78. By repeatedly requesting the surreptitious recordings of phone calls made to merchants by IPS, First Data benefited from and ratified IPS's practice of secretly recording its telemarketing calls to Plaintiffs and class members.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 78 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

79. Furthermore, First Data continued to control and supervise IPS in order to ensure compliance with the VISA rules on behalf of Wells Fargo as described above.

ANSWER: Paragraph 79 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 79 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

80. IPS's website and marketing materials further represented to merchants that IPS was affiliated with First Data and prominently featured the First Data logo. Similarly, First Data's website and marketing materials advertised to the public that its dealings with sales TPAs like IPS were "partnerships".

ANSWER: Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of whether "IPS's website and marketing materials further represented to merchants that IPS was affiliated with First Data and prominently featured the First Data logo."

These allegations therefore stand denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 80 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

IPS's Sales Practices on Behalf of Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC

81. In 2014, IPS discontinued working in the employ of Wells Fargo and began performing telemarketing and sales work in the employ of Fifth Third.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations cast against them in Paragraph 81 of Plaintiffs' Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations about Defendant Fifth Third contained in Paragraph 81 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

82. IPS also ceased work on behalf of First Data and began telemarketing and sales work on behalf of Vantiv and NPC, the processor TPAs employed by Fifth Third.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations cast against them in Paragraph 82 of Plaintiffs' Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations about Defendants Vantiv, NPC and Fifth Third contained in Paragraph 82 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

83. Despite the change in acquiring bank and processor, IPS continued its sales and marketing activities exactly as it had before.

ANSWER: Paragraph 83 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

84. At that time, Fifth Third conducted a due diligence review of IPS and formally registered IPS as its Third Party Agent in the VISA and Mastercard systems. It further entered

into a written agreement with IPS that included the requirements set down by the VISA and Mastercard system rules.

ANSWER: Paragraph 84 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

85. IPS's telemarketing, sales, and customer service practices on behalf of Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC were identical in all respects to those it undertook on behalf of Wells Fargo and First Data and described above and incorporated here. IPS specifically continued its practice of surreptitiously recording confidential communications with Plaintiffs and class members. Fifth Third had actual knowledge that IPS call scripts stated that IPS was "with Fifth Third" because Fifth Third was provided with call scripts containing that language for approval, which Fifth Third did approve and ratify the use of. Brian Bentley, Andrew Bentley, and Adam Bentley also continued to implement and execute the program of secretly recording these communications.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations cast against them in Paragraph 85 of Plaintiffs' Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations about Defendants Fifth Third, Vantiv, NPC, Brian Bentley, Andrew Bentley and Adam Bentley contained in Paragraph 85 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

86. Just like First Data before them, Vantiv and NPC had actual knowledge that calls to Plaintiffs were being secretly recorded because they too received copies of recorded phone calls where no disclosure of recordation was made. These recordings were used by Vantiv and NPC to confirm that merchants had agreed to purchase hardware, just as First Data had done

before them. By listening to these recordings, which never included a warning that calls were being recorded, Vantiv and NPC became aware of IPS's illegal recordation program. Because IPS regularly funneled new California merchants to Vantiv and NPC, both knew that the recorded calls were also being made to California merchants. Vantiv and NPC therefore utilized the IPS recording program to their financial benefit and ratified it on behalf of Fifth Third by that persistent use.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations cast against them in Paragraph 86 of Plaintiffs' Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations about Defendants Fifth Third, Vantiv and NPC contained in Paragraph 86 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

87. IPS likewise advertised its affiliation with Vantiv and NPC on its website. Similarly, Vantiv's and NPC's websites and marketing materials advertised to the public that sales TPAs like IPS who sold on their behalf were their "partners".

ANSWER: Paragraph 87 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

Ironwood's Sales Practices on Behalf of Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC

88. In 2015, Ironwood purchased IPS's telemarketing operations, including its call centers and technology infrastructure. IPS ceased to market and sell payment processing services and hardware. Ironwood was registered by Fifth Third with the VISA and Mastercard systems in the same manner as IPS and Ironwood, Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC entered into their own agreement.

ANSWER: Paragraph 88 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

89. Key IPS personnel, including telemarketers and field sales representatives, immediately joined Ironwood and continued their work on behalf of Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC. These personnel continued to operate out of the telemarketing call centers developed and equipped by IPS, including the center in Naperville, Illinois.

ANSWER: Paragraph 89 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

90. During in-person meetings at the Naperville call center, Dewitt Lovelace and John Lewis were notified by the same employee described above (now of Ironwood, then of IPS) that the program of secretly recording calls to California businesses was illegal. Mr. Lovelace and Mr. Lewis did not deny that the recording was illegal, but directed the employee to continue making the recordings anyway. Both Lewis and Lovelace reiterated these instructions via telephone calls, emails, and text messages directed to employees of the Naperville call center. It was unreasonable for Lewis and Lovelace to direct employees to secretly record phone calls to California businesses when they knew it was illegal to do so.

ANSWER: Paragraph 90 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient

to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

91. When the employee persisted in advising Lewis and Lovelace to discontinue the recording program, he was fired.

ANSWER: Paragraph 91 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

92. Ironwood continued to use Veracity Networks, LLC to store call recordings, but later began to store the recordings on cloud-based sales and data storage systems provided by Integrated Reporting is Simple, LLC as well. In this way, Dewitt Lovelace and John Lewis knowingly refined and expanded the system of illegally recording phone calls to California merchants including Plaintiffs and members of the classes.

ANSWER: Paragraph 92 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

93. Like Wells Fargo with IPS, Fifth Third had the right to review and approve or deny the call scripts used by Ironwood telemarketers and used that power. In this way, Fifth Third had actual knowledge that Ironwood telemarketers advised recipients of calls, including Plaintiffs and members of the classes, that Ironwood was "with Fifth Third."

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations cast against Wells Fargo in Paragraph 93 of Plaintiffs' Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a

belief as to the truth of the allegations about Defendants Fifth Third and Ironwood contained in Paragraph 93 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

94. Also like Wells Fargo before it, Fifth Third had all the powers and obligations set out in the Visa Rules and Mastercard Rules and exercised those powers to satisfy those obligations.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations cast against Wells Fargo in Paragraph 94 of Plaintiffs' Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations about Defendant Fifth Third contained in Paragraph 94 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

95. Vantiv and NPC continued to have actual knowledge that Ironwood was illegally recording phone calls because, as with IPS before, Vantiv and NPC requested full-length copies of recorded phone calls in order to confirm sales. In fact, Vantiv and NPC sales managers knew that they could request a recording of any call Ironwood made to a merchant whenever necessary. Those calls never contained a warning that recording was taking place. Because Ironwood funneled many thousands of California merchants to Vantiv and NPC, and each knew that recordings of all calls were available to be requested, Vantiv and NPC had actual knowledge that calls to Plaintiffs and class members were secretly recorded.

ANSWER: Paragraph 95 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

96. Vantiv and NPC benefitted financially from the Ironwood recordation program because it allowed them to confirm sales they would not have been able to otherwise. Their persistent use of the secret recordings ratified the Ironwood recordation program.

ANSWER: Paragraph 96 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

97. Like IPS, Ironwood also advertised its affiliation with Vantiv and NPC on its website. Vantiv and NPC continued to advertise that it was "partners" with sales TPAs like Ironwood.

ANSWER: Paragraph 97 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

98. In sum, Ironwood's sales practices on behalf of Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC were identical in all material respects to those carried out by IPS on behalf of Wells Fargo and First Data and later on behalf of Fifth Third, Vantiv, and NPC. Those practices specifically include the program of secretly recording confidential communications with California merchants. For the sake of brevity, this Complaint omits a point-by-point restatement of each allegation against Ironwood and instead incorporates here those allegations made above against IPS but with Ironwood in its place. Further, this Complaint incorporates the allegations made against Wells Fargo and First Data here, but with Fifth Third in the place of Wells Fargo, and NPC and Vantiv in the place of First Data.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations cast against them in Paragraph 98 of Plaintiffs' Complaint. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations about Defendants Ironwood, IPS, Fifth Third, Vantiv and NPC contained in Paragraph 98 of Plaintiffs' Complaint; these allegations therefore stand denied.

99. For the sake of absolute clarity, the course of conduct carried out by the respective acquiring banks, sales TPAs, and processor TPAs was identical in all material respects and the factual allegations made against one of them in this Complaint apply equally to other Defendants in each category, except where already stated otherwise. The names may have changed, but the course of conduct remained the same.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 99 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

Plaintiffs' Discovery of the Secret Recordings

100. In June of 2016, Counsel for Plaintiffs were contacted by a person who self-identified as a former employee of IPS and Ironwood. That individual provided detailed information regarding the pattern of secretly recording phone calls made by Defendants to California businesses. Plaintiffs did not learn that they were secretly recorded by Defendants until they communicated with Counsel. Before that time, there was nothing the Plaintiffs could have reasonably done to discover that their phone calls with Defendants were secretly recorded.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 100 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

California Invasion of Privacy Act

101. At all relevant times, there was in full force and effect an Act of the California State Legislature entitled the California Invasion of Privacy Act (“CIPA”), Cal. Penal Code § 630, *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 101 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 101 of the Complaint.

102. CIPA forbids the recordation of confidential communications that occur over two telephones (§ 632) and any communications involving at least one cellular or cordless telephone (§ 632.7).

ANSWER: Paragraph 102 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 102 of the Complaint.

103. IPS’s and Ironwood’s practice of surreptitiously recording its communications with Plaintiffs and class members violated Cal. Penal Code §§ 632 and 632.7.

ANSWER: Paragraph 103 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

104. Plaintiffs and class members were injured by IPS and Ironwood’s practice of creating audio records because recording the calls violated their privacy and the practice of storing the recordings in cloud-based computer systems accessible by the internet created a risk of data breach.

ANSWER: Paragraph 104 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

105. Plaintiffs bring this action as a class action pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a), 23(b)(1), 23(b)(2) and 23(b)(3) on their own behalf and on behalf of six classes of individuals defined as follows:

The Wells Fargo-IPS § 632 Class

All businesses who received a telemarketing call from IPS on a telephone in California during the time that IPS was a registered third party agent of Wells Fargo and who did not sign a contract with IPS.

The Wells Fargo-IPS § 632.7 Class

All businesses who received a telemarketing call from IPS on a wireless telephone in California during the time that IPS was a registered third party agent of Wells Fargo and who did not sign a contract with IPS.

The Fifth Third-IPS § 632 Class

All businesses who received a telemarketing call from IPS on a telephone in California during the time that IPS was a registered third party agent of Fifth Third Bank and who did not sign a contract with IPS.

The Fifth Third-IPS § 632.7 Class

All businesses who received a telemarketing call from IPS on a wireless telephone in California during the time that IPS was a registered third party agent of Fifth Third and who did not sign a contract with IPS.

The Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632 Class

All businesses who received a telemarketing call from Ironwood on a telephone in California and who did not sign a contract with Ironwood.

The Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632.7 Class

All businesses who received a telemarketing call from Ironwood on a wireless telephone in California and who did not sign a contract with Ironwood.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 105 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, including all subparts.

106. Specifically excluded from the classes are Defendants, Defendants' officers, directors and employees, and members of their immediate family, and any Judge who may preside over this case and his or her immediate family.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 106 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

107. The members of the classes are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. The exact number of class members is unknown at this time but can be determined through Defendants' records. There are tens of thousands of class members. The exact number of persons in each class can be determined from records maintained by IPS, Ironwood, Veracity Networks, LLC, and Integrated Reporting Is Simple, LLC.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 107 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

108. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the members of the classes as all such members were similarly affected by Defendants' wrongful conduct as alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 108 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

109. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class members. Plaintiffs have retained competent and experienced class counsel.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 109 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

110. Common questions of fact and law predominate over any individual issues for the Wells Fargo-IPS § 632 Class. The common questions of law and fact include:

- a. Whether Plaintiffs' and class members' confidential telephonic communications were recorded by IPS in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632;
- b. Whether the circumstances surrounding the recorded calls created a reasonable expectation that the telephonic communications were private.
- c. Whether Wells Fargo and/or First Data are vicariously liable for the recordation of communications with class members by IPS in violation of Cal. Penal. Code § 632.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 110 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, including all subparts.

111. Common questions of law and fact predominate over any individual issues for the Wells Fargo-IPS § 632.7 Class. The common questions of law and fact include:

- a. Whether Plaintiffs' and class members' cellular or cordless telephonic communications were recorded by IPS in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7;
- b. Whether Wells Fargo and/or First Data are vicariously liable for the recordation of communications with class members by IPS in violation of Cal. Penal. Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 111 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, including all subparts.

112. Common questions of law and fact predominate over any individual issues for the Fifth Third-IPS § 632 Class. The common questions of law and fact include:

- a. Whether Plaintiffs' and class members' confidential telephonic communications were recorded by IPS in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632;

- b. Whether the circumstances surrounding the recorded calls created a reasonable expectation that the telephonic communications were private.
- c. Whether Fifth Third and/or Vantiv and/or NPC are vicariously liable for the recordation of communications with class members by IPS in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 112 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, including all subparts.

113. Common questions of law and fact predominate over any individual issues for the Fifth Third-IPS § 632.7 Class. The common questions of law and fact include:

- a. Plaintiffs' and class members' cellular or cordless telephonic communications were recorded by IPS in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7;
- b. Whether Fifth Third and/or Vantiv and/or NPC are vicariously liable for the recordation of communications with class members by IPS in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 113 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, including all subparts.

114. Common questions of law and fact predominate over any individual issues for the Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632 class. The common questions of law and fact include:

- a. Whether Plaintiffs' and class members' confidential telephonic communications were recorded by Ironwood in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632;
- b. Whether Dewitt Lovelace and/or John Lewis caused Plaintiffs' and class members' confidential telephonic communications to be recorded in violation of § 632;
- c. Whether the circumstances surrounding the recorded calls created a reasonable expectation that the telephonic communications were private;
- d. Whether Fifth Third, Vantiv, and/or NPC are vicariously liable for Ironwood's recordation of confidential communications with class members in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 114 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, including all subparts.

115. Common questions of law and fact predominate over any individual issues for the Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632.7 Class. The common questions of law and fact include:

- a. Whether Plaintiffs' and class members' cellular or cordless telephonic communications were recorded by Ironwood in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7;
- b. Whether Dewitt Lovelace and/or John Lewis caused Plaintiffs' and class members' cellular or cordless telephonic communications to be recorded in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7;
- c. Whether Fifth Third, Vantiv, and/or NPC are vicariously liable for Ironwood's recordation of cellular or cordless telephonic communications with class members in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 115 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, including all subparts.

116. A class action is superior to any other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. The damages suffered by Plaintiffs and the other class members are relatively small compared to the burden and expense that would be required to individually litigate their claims against Defendants, so it would be impracticable for class members to individually seek redress for Defendants' wrongful conduct. Litigating individual class members' claims would also produce a multiplicity of cases, congesting the judicial system, and creates a potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments. Class treatment, by contrast, provides manageable judicial treatment calculated to bring a rapid conclusion to the litigation of all claims arising from Defendants' misconduct. Class certification, therefore, is appropriate under Rule 23(b)(3).

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 116 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

117. Class certification is also appropriate under Rule 23(b)(1) because the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the classes would create a risk of adjudications with respect to individual class members that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to this adjudication and/or substantially impair their ability to protect these interests.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 117 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

118. Class certification is also appropriate under Rule 23(b)(2) because Defendants have acted, or refused to act, on grounds generally applicable to the class, thereby making final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief appropriate for the class.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 118 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

CLAIMS OF THE WELLS FARGO-IPS § 632 CLASS

COUNT I

Against

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.

(on behalf of CS Wang & Associate and the Wells Fargo-IPS § 632 Class)

Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632

119. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

120. IPS's conduct described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Paragraph 120 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

121. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of IPS's violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 121 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

122. IPS held itself out to Plaintiff and class members as an agent acting on behalf of Wells Fargo and did so with Wells Fargo's full knowledge and approval.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 122 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

123. Wells Fargo granted IPS the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and IPS did solicit Plaintiff and class members on behalf of Wells Fargo as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 123 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

124. Wells Fargo had the power and obligation to direct and control IPS's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 124 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

125. IPS and Wells Fargo contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 125 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

126. Accordingly, IPS acted as an agent or apparent agent of Wells Fargo or its partner or joint venturer when it surreptitiously recorded telemarketing telephone calls with Plaintiff and class members and was operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time it did so.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 126 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

127. Further, Wells Fargo knowingly directed IPS to carry out its practice of secretly recording telemarketing calls to Plaintiff and class members and ratified that practice by persistently approving and allowing it.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 127 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

128. Additionally, Wells Fargo was engaged in a partnership or principal-agent relationship with First Data as described in this Complaint and is bound by First Data's ratification of the IPS call recordation program.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 128 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

129. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiff and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 129 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 129 of the Complaint.

130. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiff to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 130 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 130 of the Complaint.

131. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that Wells Fargo be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 131 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. from recording confidential telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. and award Plaintiff and each class member whose confidential telephonic communications were recorded on behalf of Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this “WHEREFORE” paragraph of Plaintiffs’ Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT II
Against
FIRST DATA MERCHANT SERVICES, LLC
(on behalf of CS Wang & Associate and the Wells Fargo-IPS § 632 Class)
Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632

132. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

133. IPS’s conduct described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Paragraph 133 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

134. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of IPS’s violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 134 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint.

135. IPS held itself out to merchants across the country as a sales agent of First Data and did so with First Data’s full knowledge and authority.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 135 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint.

136. First Data granted IPS the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and IPS did solicit Plaintiff and class members on behalf of First Data as described in this complaint.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 136 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

137. First Data had the power to direct and control IPS's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 137 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

138. IPS and First Data contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 138 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

139. Accordingly, IPS acted as an agent or apparent agent of First Data or its partner or joint venturer when it surreptitiously recorded telemarketing telephone calls with Plaintiff and class members and was operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time it did so.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 139 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

140. Further, First Data knowingly directed IPS to carry out its practice of secretly recording telemarketing calls to Plaintiff and class members and ratified that practice by persistently approving and allowing it.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 140 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

141. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiffs and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 141 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 141 of the Complaint.

142. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiffs to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 142 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 142 of the Complaint.

143. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that First Data be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 143 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining First Data Merchant Services, LLC from recording confidential telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against First Data Merchant Services, LLC and award Plaintiff and each class member whose confidential telephonic

communications were recorded on behalf of First Data Merchant Services, LLC damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

CLAIMS OF THE WELLS FARGO-IPS § 632.7 CLASS

COUNT III

Against

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.

(on behalf of Jay Schmidt Insurance Agency, Inc. and the Wells Fargo-IPS § 632.7 Class)

Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7

144. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

145. IPS's conduct described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Paragraph 145 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

146. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of IPS's violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 146 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

147. IPS held itself out to Plaintiff and class members as an agent acting on behalf of Wells Fargo and did so with Wells Fargo's full knowledge and approval.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 147 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

148. Wells Fargo granted IPS the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and IPS did solicit Plaintiff and class members on behalf of Wells Fargo as described in this complaint.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 148 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

149. Wells Fargo had the power to direct and control IPS's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 149 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

150. IPS and Wells Fargo contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 150 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

151. Accordingly, IPS acted as an agent or apparent agent of Wells Fargo or its partner or joint venturer when it surreptitiously recorded telemarketing cellular and cordless telephone calls with Plaintiff and class members and was operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time it did so.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 151 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

152. Further, Wells Fargo knowingly directed IPS to carry out its practice of secretly recording telemarketing calls to Plaintiff and class members and ratified that practice by persistently approving and allowing it.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 152 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

153. Additionally, Wells Fargo was engaged in a partnership or principal-agent relationship with First Data as described in this Complaint and is bound by First Data's ratification of the IPS call recordation program.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 153 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

154. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiffs and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 154 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 154 of the Complaint.

155. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiffs to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 155 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 155 of the Complaint.

156. Plaintiffs and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that Wells Fargo be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 through the acts of its agents, partners or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 156 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. from recording cellular or cordless telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. and award Plaintiff and each class member whose cellular or cordless telephone communications were recorded on behalf of Wells Fargo, N.A. damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT IV

Against

FIRST DATA MERCHANT SERVICES, LLC

(on behalf of Jay Schmidt Insurance Agency, Inc. and the Wells Fargo-IPS § 632.7 Class)

Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7

157. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

158. IPS's conduct described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Paragraph 158 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

159. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of IPS's violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 159 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

160. IPS held itself out to merchants across the country as a sales agent acting on behalf of First Data and did so with First Data's full knowledge and approval.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 160 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

161. First Data granted IPS the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and IPS did solicit Plaintiff and class members on behalf of First Data as described in this complaint.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 161 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

162. First Data had the power to direct and control IPS's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 162 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

163. IPS and First Data contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 163 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

164. Accordingly, IPS acted as an agent or apparent agent of First Data or its partner or joint venturer when it surreptitiously recorded telemarketing cellular and cordless telephone calls with Plaintiff and class members and was operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time it did so.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 164 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

165. Further, First Data knowingly directed IPS to carry out its practice of secretly recording telemarketing calls to Plaintiff and class members and ratified that practice by persistently approving and allowing it.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 165 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

166. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiff and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 166 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 166 of the Complaint.

167. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiff to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 167 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 167 of the Complaint.

168. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that First Data be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 168 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining First Data Merchant Services, LLC from recording cellular or cordless telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against First Data Merchant Services, LLC and award Plaintiff and each class member whose cellular or cordless telephone communications were recorded on behalf of First Data Merchant Services, LLC damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

CLAIMS OF THE FIFTH THIRD-IPS § 632 CLASS

COUNT V

Against

FIFTH THIRD BANK

(on behalf of Robert Meyer dba Mangia Nosh and the Fifth Third-IPS § 632 Class)

Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632

169. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

170. IPS's conduct described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Paragraph 170 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

171. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of IPS's violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 171 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

172. IPS held itself out to Plaintiff and class members as an agent acting on behalf of Fifth Third and did so with Fifth Third's full knowledge and approval.

ANSWER: Paragraph 172 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

173. Fifth Third granted IPS the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and IPS did solicit Plaintiff and class members on behalf of Fifth Third as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 173 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

174. Fifth Third had the power and obligation to direct and control IPS's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 174 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

175. IPS and Fifth Third contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 175 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

176. Accordingly, IPS acted as an agent or apparent agent of Fifth Third or its partner or joint venturer when it surreptitiously recorded telemarketing telephone calls with Plaintiff and

class members and was operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time it did so.

ANSWER: Paragraph 176 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

177. Further, Fifth Third was engaged in a partnership or principal-agent relationship with Vantiv and NPC as described in this Complaint and is bound by their ratification of the IPS call recordation program.

ANSWER: Paragraph 177 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

178. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiff and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 178 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 178 of the Complaint.

179. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiff to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 179 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 179 of the Complaint.

180. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that Fifth Third be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 180 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining Fifth Third Bank from recording confidential telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against Fifth Third Bank and award Plaintiff and each class member whose confidential telephonic communications were recorded on behalf of Fifth Third Bank damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT VI
Against
VANTIV, INC.
(on behalf of Robert Meyer dba Mangia Nosh and the Fifth Third-IPS § 632 Class)
Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632

181. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

182. The conduct of IPS described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Paragraph 182 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

183. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of IPS's violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 183 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

184. IPS held itself out to merchants across the country as an agent acting on behalf of Vantiv and did so with Vantiv's full knowledge and authority.

ANSWER: Paragraph 184 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

185. Vantiv granted Ironwood the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and IPS did solicit Plaintiff and class members on behalf of Vantiv as described in this complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 185 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient

to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

186. Vantiv had the power to direct and control IPS's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 186 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

187. IPS and Vantiv contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants.

ANSWER: Paragraph 187 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

188. Accordingly, IPS acted as an agent or apparent agent of Vantiv or its partner or joint venturer when surreptitiously recording telemarketing telephone calls with Plaintiff and class members and were operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time it did so.

ANSWER: Paragraph 188 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

189. Further, Vantiv knowingly directed IPS to carry out its practice of secretly recording telemarketing calls to Plaintiff and class members and ratified that practice by persistently approving and allowing it.

ANSWER: Paragraph 189 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

190. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiffs and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 190 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 190 of the Complaint.

191. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiffs to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 191 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 191 of the Complaint.

192. Plaintiffs and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that Vantiv be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 192 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining Vantiv, Inc. from recording confidential telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against Vantiv, Inc. and award Plaintiff and each class member whose confidential telephonic communications were recorded on behalf of Vantiv, Inc. damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT VII
Against
NATIONAL PROCESSING COMPANY
(on behalf of Robert Meyer dba Mangia Nosh and the Fifth Third-IPS § 632 Class)
Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632

193. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

194. The conduct IPS described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Paragraph 194 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

195. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of IPS's violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 195 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

196. IPS held itself out to merchants across the country as an agent of NPC and did so with NPC's full knowledge and authority.

ANSWER: Paragraph 196 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

197. NPC granted IPS the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and IPS did solicit Plaintiff and class members on behalf of NPC as described in this complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 197 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

198. NPC had the power to direct and control IPS's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 198 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

199. IPS and NPC contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants.

ANSWER: Paragraph 199 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

200. Accordingly, IPS acted as an agent or apparent agent of NPC or its partner or joint venturer when surreptitiously recording telemarketing telephone calls with Plaintiffs and class members and were operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time they did so.

ANSWER: Paragraph 200 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

201. Further, NPC knowingly directed IPS to carry out its practice of secretly recording telemarketing calls to Plaintiff and class members and ratified that practice by persistently approving and allowing it.

ANSWER: Paragraph 201 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

202. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiffs and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 202 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 202 of the Complaint.

203. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiffs to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 203 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 203 of the Complaint.

204. Plaintiffs and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that NPC be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 204 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining National Processing Company from recording confidential telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against National Processing Company and award Plaintiff and each class member whose confidential telephonic communications were recorded on behalf of National Processing Company damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

CLAIMS OF THE FIFTH THIRD-IPS § 632.7 CLASS

COUNT VIII

Against

FIFTH THIRD BANK

(on behalf of Taysir Tayeh dba Chief's Market, Sat Narayan dba Express Hauling, and the Fifth Third-IPS § 632.7 Class)

Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7

205. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

206. The conduct of IPS described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Paragraph 206 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

207. Plaintiffs and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of IPS's violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 207 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

208. IPS held itself out to Plaintiffs and class members as an agent acting on behalf of Fifth Third and did so with Fifth Third's full knowledge and approval.

ANSWER: Paragraph 208 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

209. Fifth Third granted IPS the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and IPS did solicit Plaintiffs and class members on behalf of Fifth Third as described in this complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 209 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

210. Fifth Third had the power and obligation to direct and control IPS's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 210 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

211. IPS and Fifth Third contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants.

ANSWER: Paragraph 211 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

212. Accordingly, IPS acted as an agent or apparent agent of Fifth Third or its partner or joint venturer when surreptitiously recording telemarketing telephone calls with Plaintiffs and

class members and was operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time it did so.

ANSWER: Paragraph 212 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

213. Further, Fifth Third was engaged in a partnership or principal-agent relationship with Vantiv and NPC as described in this Complaint and is bound by Vantiv's and NPC's ratification of the IPS call recordation program.

ANSWER: Paragraph 213 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

214. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiffs and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 214 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 214 of the Complaint.

215. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiffs to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 215 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 215 of the Complaint.

216. Plaintiffs and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that Fifth Third be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 216 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining Fifth Third Bank from recording cellular or cordless telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against Fifth Third Bank and award Plaintiff and each class member whose cellular or cordless telephone communications were recorded on behalf of Fifth Third Bank damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT IX
Against
VANTIV, INC.
(on behalf of Taysir Tayeh dba Chief's Market, Sat Narayan dba Express Hauling, and the
Fifth Third-IPS § 632.7 Class)
Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7

217. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

218. The conduct of IPS's described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Paragraph 218 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

219. Plaintiffs and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of IPS's violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 219 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

220. IPS held itself out to merchants across the country as an agent acting on behalf of Vantiv and did so with Vantiv's full knowledge and authority.

ANSWER: Paragraph 220 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

221. Vantiv granted IPS the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and IPS did solicit Plaintiffs and class members on behalf of Vantiv as described in this complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 221 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient

to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

222. Vantiv had the power to direct and control IPS's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 222 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

223. IPS and Vantiv contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants.

ANSWER: Paragraph 223 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

224. Accordingly, IPS acted as an agent or apparent agent of Vantiv or its partner or joint venturer when surreptitiously recording telemarketing telephone calls with Plaintiffs and class members and were operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time it did so.

ANSWER: Paragraph 224 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

225. Further, Vantiv knowingly directed IPS to carry out its practice of secretly recording telemarketing calls to Plaintiff and class members and ratified that practice by persistently approving and allowing it.

ANSWER: Paragraph 225 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

226. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiffs and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 226 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 226 of the Complaint

227. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiffs to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 227 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 227 of the Complaint.

228. Plaintiffs and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that Vantiv be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 228 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining Vantiv, Inc. from recording cellular or cordless telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiffs and the class against Vantiv, Inc. and award Plaintiffs and each class member whose cellular or cordless telephone communications were recorded on behalf of Vantiv, Inc. damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT X
Against
NATIONAL PROCESSING COMPANY
(on behalf of Taysir Tayeh dba Chief's Market, Sat Narayan dba Express Hauling, and the
Fifth Third-IPS § 632.7 Class)
Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7

229. Plaintiffs incorporate all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

230. The conduct of IPS described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Paragraph 230 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

231. Plaintiffs and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of IPS's violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 231 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

232. IPS held itself out to merchants across the country as an agent of NPC and did so with NPC's full knowledge and authority.

ANSWER: Paragraph 232 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

233. NPC granted IPS the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and Ironwood did solicit Plaintiffs and class members on behalf of NPC as described in this complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 233 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

234. NPC had the power to direct and control IPS's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 234 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

235. IPS and NPC contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants.

ANSWER: Paragraph 235 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

236. Accordingly, IPS acted as an agent or apparent agent of NPC or its partner or joint venturer when surreptitiously recording telemarketing telephone calls with Plaintiffs and class members and were operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time they did so.

ANSWER: Paragraph 236 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

237. Further, NPC knowingly directed IPS to carry out its practice of secretly recording telemarketing calls to Plaintiff and class members and ratified that practice by persistently approving and allowing it.

ANSWER: Paragraph 237 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

238. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiff and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 238 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 238 of the Complaint.

239. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiff to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 239 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 239 of the Complaint.

240. Plaintiffs and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that NPC be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 240 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining National Processing Company from recording cellular or cordless telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiffs and the class against National Processing Company and award Plaintiffs and each class member whose cellular or cordless telephone communications were recorded on behalf of National Processing Company damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this “WHEREFORE” paragraph of Plaintiffs’ Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

CLAIMS OF THE FIFTH THIRD-IRONWOOD § 632 CLASS

COUNT XI

Against

IRONWOOD FINANCIAL, LLC dba IRONWOOD PAYMENTS

(on behalf of Robert Meyer dba Mangia Nosh and the Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632 Class)

Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632

241. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

242. Ironwood’s conduct described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Paragraph 242 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

243. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of Ironwood’s violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 243 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint.

244. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiffs and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 244 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 244 of the Complaint.

245. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiffs to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 245 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 245 of the Complaint.

246. Plaintiffs and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that Ironwood be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 246 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining Ironwood Financial, LLC dba Ironwood Payments from recording confidential telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against Ironwood Financial, LLC dba Ironwood Payments and award Plaintiff and each class member whose confidential telephonic communications were recorded by Ironwood Financial, LLC damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT XII
Against
FIFTH THIRD BANK
(on behalf of Robert Meyer dba Mangia Nosh and the Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632 Class)
Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632

247. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

248. The conduct of Ironwood described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Paragraph 248 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

249. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of Ironwood's violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 249 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

250. Ironwood held itself out to Plaintiff and class members as an agent acting on behalf of Fifth Third and did so with Fifth Third's full knowledge and approval.

ANSWER: Paragraph 250 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

251. Fifth Third granted Ironwood the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and Ironwood did solicit Plaintiff and class members on behalf of Fifth Third as described in this complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 251 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

252. Fifth Third had the power and obligation to direct and control Ironwood's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 252 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

253. Ironwood and Fifth Third contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants.

ANSWER: Paragraph 253 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

254. Accordingly, Ironwood acted as an agent or apparent agent of Fifth Third or its partner or joint venturer when surreptitiously recording telemarketing telephone calls with

Plaintiff and class members and was operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time it did so.

ANSWER: Paragraph 254 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

255. Further, Fifth Third was engaged in a partnership or principal-agent relationship with Vantiv and NPC as described in this Complaint and is bound by Vantiv's and NPC's ratification of the Ironwood call recordation program.

ANSWER: Paragraph 255 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

256. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiffs and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 256 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 256 of the Complaint.

257. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiffs to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 257 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 257 of the Complaint.

258. Plaintiffs and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that Fifth Third be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 258 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining Fifth Third Bank from recording confidential telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against Fifth Third Bank and award Plaintiff and each class member whose confidential telephonic communications were recorded on behalf of Fifth Third Bank damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT XIII

Against

VANTIV, INC.

(on behalf of Robert Meyer dba Mangia Nosh and the Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632 Class)

Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632

259. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

260. The conduct of Ironwood described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Paragraph 260 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

261. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of Ironwood's violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 261 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

262. Ironwood held itself out to merchants across the country as an agent acting on behalf of Vantiv and did so with Vantiv's full knowledge and authority.

ANSWER: Paragraph 262 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

263. Vantiv granted Ironwood the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and Ironwood did solicit Plaintiff and class members on behalf of Vantiv as described in this complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 263 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient

to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

264. Vantiv had the power to direct and control Ironwood's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 264 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

265. Ironwood and Vantiv contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants.

ANSWER: Paragraph 265 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

266. Accordingly, Ironwood acted as an agent or apparent agent of Vantiv or its partner or joint venturer when surreptitiously recording telemarketing telephone calls with Plaintiff and class members and were operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time it did so.

ANSWER: Paragraph 266 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

267. Further, Vantiv knowingly directed Ironwood to carry out its practice of secretly recording telemarketing calls to Plaintiff and class members and ratified that practice by persistently approving and allowing it.

ANSWER: Paragraph 267 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

268. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiffs and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 268 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 268 of the Complaint.

269. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiffs to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 269 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 269 of the Complaint.

270. Plaintiffs and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that Vantiv be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 270 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining Vantiv, Inc. from recording confidential telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against Vantiv, Inc. and award Plaintiff and each class member whose confidential telephonic communications were recorded on behalf of Vantiv, Inc. damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT XIV
Against
NATIONAL PROCESSING COMPANY
(on behalf of Robert Meyer dba Mangia Nosh and the Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632 Class)
Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632

271. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

272. The conduct Ironwood described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Paragraph 272 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

273. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of Ironwood's violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 273 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

274. Ironwood held itself out to merchants across the country as an agent of NPC and did so with NPC's full knowledge and authority.

ANSWER: Paragraph 274 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

275. NPC granted Ironwood the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and Ironwood did solicit Plaintiff and class members on behalf of NPC as described in this complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 275 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

276. NPC had the power to direct and control Ironwood's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 276 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

277. Ironwood and NPC contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants.

ANSWER: Paragraph 277 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

278. Accordingly, Ironwood acted as an agent or apparent agent of NPC or its partner or joint venturer when surreptitiously recording telemarketing telephone calls with Plaintiffs and class members and were operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time they did so.

ANSWER: Paragraph 278 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

279. Further, Vantiv knowingly directed Ironwood to carry out its practice of secretly recording telemarketing calls to Plaintiff and class members and ratified that practice by persistently approving and allowing it.

ANSWER: Paragraph 279 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

280. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiffs and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 280 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 280 of the Complaint.

281. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiffs to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 281 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 281 of the Complaint.

282. Plaintiffs and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that NPC be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 282 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining National Processing Company from recording confidential telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against National Processing Company and award Plaintiff and each class member whose confidential telephonic communications were recorded on behalf of National Processing Company damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this “WHEREFORE” paragraph of Plaintiffs’ Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT XV
Against
DEWITT LOVELACE
(on behalf of Robert Meyer dba Mangia Nosh and the Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632 Class)
Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632

283. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

284. The conduct of Dewitt Lovelace described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Paragraph 284 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

285. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of Dewitt Lovelace’s violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 285 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint.

286. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiffs and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 286 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 286 of the Complaint.

287. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiffs to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 287 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 287 of the Complaint.

288. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that Dewitt Lovelace be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 288 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining Dewitt Lovelace from recording confidential telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against Dewitt Lovelace and award Plaintiff and each class member whose confidential telephonic communications were recorded at the direction of Dewitt Lovelace damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT XVI

Against

JOHN LEWIS

(on behalf of Robert Meyer dba Mangia Nosh and the Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632 Class)

Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632

289. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

290. The conduct of John Lewis described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Paragraph 290 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

291. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of John Lewis's violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 291 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

292. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiffs and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 292 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 292 of the Complaint.

293. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiffs to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 293 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 293 of the Complaint.

294. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that John Lewis be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 294 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining John Lewis from recording confidential telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against John Lewis and award Plaintiff and each class member whose confidential telephonic communications were recorded at the direction of John Lewis damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

CLAIMS OF THE FIFTH THIRD-IRONWOOD § 632.7 CLASS

COUNT XVII

Against

IRONWOOD FINANCIAL, LLC dba IRONWOOD PAYMENTS

(on behalf of Taysir Tayeh dba Chief's Market and the

Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632.7 Class)

Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7

295. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

296. The conduct of Ironwood described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Paragraph 296 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

297. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of Ironwood's violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 297 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

298. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiff and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 298 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 298 of the Complaint.

299. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiff to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 299 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 299 of the Complaint.

300. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that Ironwood be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 300 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining Ironwood Financial, LLC dba Ironwood Payment from recording cellular or cordless telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against Ironwood Financial, LLC dba Ironwood Payments and award Plaintiff and each class member whose cellular or cordless telephone communications were recorded by Ironwood Financial, LLC damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT XVIII
Against
FIFTH THIRD BANK
(on behalf of Taysir Tayeh dba Chief's Market and the
Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632.7 Class)
Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7

301. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

302. The conduct of Ironwood described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Paragraph 302 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

303. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of Ironwood's violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 303 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

304. Ironwood held itself out to Plaintiff and class members as an agent acting on behalf of Fifth Third and did so with Fifth Third's full knowledge and approval.

ANSWER: Paragraph 304 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

305. Fifth Third granted Ironwood the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and Ironwood did solicit Plaintiff and class members on behalf of Fifth Third as described in this complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 305 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

306. Fifth Third had the power and obligation to direct and control Ironwood's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 306 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

307. Ironwood and Fifth Third contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants.

ANSWER: Paragraph 307 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

308. Accordingly, Ironwood acted as an agent or apparent agent of Fifth Third or its partner or joint venturer when surreptitiously recording telemarketing telephone calls with Plaintiff

and class members and was operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time it did so.

ANSWER: Paragraph 308 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

309. Further, Fifth Third was engaged in a partnership or principal-agent relationship with Vantiv and NPC as described in this Complaint and is bound by Vantiv's and NPC's ratification of the IPS call recordation program.

ANSWER: Paragraph 309 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

310. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiffs and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 310 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 310 of the Complaint.

311. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiffs to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 311 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 311 of the Complaint.

312. Plaintiffs and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that Fifth Third be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 312 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining Fifth Third Bank from recording cellular or cordless telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against Fifth Third Bank and award Plaintiff and each class member whose cellular or cordless telephone communications were recorded on behalf of Fifth Third Bank damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT XIX
Against
VANTIV, INC.
(on behalf of Taysir Tayeh dba Chief's Market and the
Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632.7 Class)
Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7

313. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

314. The conduct of Ironwood described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Paragraph 314 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

315. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of Ironwood's violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 315 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

316. Ironwood held itself out to merchants across the country as an agent acting on behalf of Vantiv and did so with Vantiv's full knowledge and authority.

ANSWER: Paragraph 316 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

317. Vantiv granted Ironwood the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and Ironwood did solicit Plaintiff and class members on behalf of Vantiv as described in this complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 317 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient

to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

318. Vantiv had the power to direct and control Ironwood's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 318 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

319. Ironwood and Vantiv contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants.

ANSWER: Paragraph 319 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

320. Accordingly, Ironwood acted as an agent or apparent agent of Vantiv or its partner or joint venturer when surreptitiously recording telemarketing telephone calls with Plaintiff and class members and were operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time it did so.

ANSWER: Paragraph 320 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

321. Further, Vantiv knowingly directed Ironwood to carry out its practice of secretly recording telemarketing calls to Plaintiff and class members and ratified that practice by persistently approving and allowing it.

ANSWER: Paragraph 321 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

322. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiffs and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 322 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 322 of the Complaint.

323. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiffs to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 323 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 323 of the Complaint.

324. Plaintiffs and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that Vantiv be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 324 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining Vantiv, Inc. from recording cellular or cordless telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against Vantiv, Inc. and award Plaintiff and each class member whose cellular or cordless telephone communications were recorded on behalf of Vantiv, Inc. damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT XX
Against
NATIONAL PROCESSING COMPANY
(on behalf of Taysir Tayeh dba Chief's Market and the
Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632.7 Class)
Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7

325. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

326. The conduct of Ironwood described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Paragraph 326 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

327. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of Ironwood's violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 327 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

328. Ironwood held itself out to merchants across the country as an agent of NPC and did so with NPC's full knowledge and authority.

ANSWER: Paragraph 328 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

329. NPC granted Ironwood the authority to act as its agent and solicit merchants on its behalf and Ironwood did solicit Plaintiff and class members on behalf of NPC as described in this complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 329 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

330. NPC had the power to direct and control Ironwood's telemarketing and sales programs and did exercise that power as described in this Complaint.

ANSWER: Paragraph 330 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

331. Ironwood and NPC contributed their respective business expertise to the common project of processing credit card transactions for profit and shared in the fees collected from merchants.

ANSWER: Paragraph 331 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

332. Accordingly, Ironwood acted as an agent or apparent agent of NPC or its partner or joint venturer when surreptitiously recording telemarketing telephone calls with Plaintiffs and class members and were operating in the scope of that agency relationship, partnership, joint venture, or other business association each time they did so.

ANSWER: Paragraph 332 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

333. Further, NPC knowingly directed Ironwood to carry out its practice of secretly recording telemarketing calls to Plaintiff and class members and ratified that practice by persistently approving and allowing it.

ANSWER: Paragraph 333 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

334. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiff and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 334 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 334 of the Complaint.

335. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiff to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 335 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 335 of the Complaint

336. Plaintiffs and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that NPC be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 through the acts of its agents, partners, or joint venturers.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 336 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining National Processing Company from recording cellular or cordless telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against National Processing Company and award Plaintiff and each class member whose cellular or cordless telephone communications were recorded on behalf of National Processing Company damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this “WHEREFORE” paragraph of Plaintiffs’ Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT XXI
Against
DEWITT LOVELACE
(on behalf of Taysir Tayeh dba Chief’s Market and the
Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632.7 Class)
Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7

337. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

338. The conduct of Dewitt Lovelace described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Paragraph 338 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

339. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of Dewitt Lovelace’s violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 339 of Plaintiffs’ Complaint.

340. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiff and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 340 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 340 of the Complaint.

341. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiff to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 341 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 341 of the Complaint.

342. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that Dewitt Lovelace be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 342 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining Dewitt Lovelace from recording cellular or telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against each of Dewitt Lovelace and award Plaintiff and each class member whose cellular or cordless telephone communications were recorded at the direction of Dewitt Lovelace and damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

COUNT XXII
Against
JOHN LEWIS
(on behalf of Taysir Tayeh dba Chief's Market and the
Fifth Third-Ironwood § 632.7 Class)
Violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7

343. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs into this Count as if fully alleged herein.

ANSWER: Defendants incorporate, as if set forth fully herein, their answers and defenses to the previous paragraphs.

344. The conduct of John Lewis described herein constitutes a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Paragraph 344 of Plaintiffs' Complaint does not appear to assert any allegation against Defendants, and Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein; these allegations therefore stand denied.

345. Plaintiff and class members have suffered an injury to their privacy as a proximate result of John Lewis's violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 as described herein.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 345 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

346. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 grants Plaintiff and class members the power to bring a private action to remedy a violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and fixes the amount of damages recoverable at \$5,000 per such violation.

ANSWER: Paragraph 346 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 346 of the Complaint.

347. Cal. Penal Code § 637.2 further entitles Plaintiff to bring an action to enjoin and restrain any violation of Cal. Penal Code § 630 *et seq.*

ANSWER: Paragraph 347 of Plaintiffs' Complaint contains legal conclusions to which no response is required; to the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 347 of the Complaint.

348. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to relief and part of said relief demands that John Lewis be perpetually restrained from continued violations of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 348 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court (a) grant permanent injunctive relief enjoining John Lewis from recording cellular or telephonic communications without the consent of all parties to those communications in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7 and (b) enter judgment for Plaintiff and the class against John Lewis and award Plaintiff and each class member whose cellular or cordless telephone communications were recorded at the direction of John Lewis and damages in the amount of \$5,000 per violation of Cal. Penal Code § 632.7, reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

ANSWER: Defendants deny the allegations contained in this "WHEREFORE" paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint and deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief they seek.

GENERAL DENIAL

Defendants deny each and every allegation and/or statement contained in Plaintiffs' Complaint not expressly admitted herein.

FIRST DEFENSE

To the extent Plaintiffs seek any damages that are not mandated by statute, Plaintiffs have failed to mitigate such purported damages because Plaintiffs failed to contact Wells Fargo and/or First Data regarding any concern about the recordation of any information they purportedly provided during any phone call immediately and contemporaneously therewith.

SECOND DEFENSE

To the extent Plaintiffs were concerned about the recordation of any information they purportedly provided during any phone call, Plaintiffs reasonably should have contacted Wells Fargo and/or First Data regarding the same immediately and contemporaneously and therefore should have discovered whether any calls were recorded. Accordingly, Plaintiffs claims are barred by the applicable statute(s) of limitation.

THIRD DEFENSE

To the extent Plaintiffs were concerned about the recordation of any information they purportedly provided during any phone call, Plaintiffs reasonably should have contacted Wells Fargo and/or First Data regarding the same immediately and contemporaneously therewith and therefore should have discovered whether any calls were recorded at or about the time of the creation of the alleged recording. Accordingly, Plaintiffs claims are barred by the doctrine of estoppel, laches and/or waiver.

FOURTH DEFENSE

Venue in the Northern District of Illinois is improper and/or inconvenient, as all of the putative plaintiffs are in California and the Court is interpreting California law.

FIFTH DEFENSE

Plaintiffs have alleged that “[t]here are tens of thousands of class members.” Application of California Penal Code §§ 632 and 632.7 in this case would violate the Due Process Clause under both the California Constitution and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, as well as Article I, section 17 of the California Constitution, which prohibits the imposition of excessive fines, and if a class were to be certified and liability were found, the statutory damages provided under California Penal Code §§ 632 and 632.7 would be grossly disproportionate to any “harm” suffered by the putative class members.

SIXTH DEFENSE

California Civil Code § 3359 requires that damages in all cases be reasonable and if any claim appears to create a right to unconscionable and grossly oppressive damages, contrary to substantial damages, then no more than reasonable damages can be recovered. The harm alleged by Plaintiffs is limited to an “injury to their privacy.” Plaintiffs have alleged that “[t]here are tens of thousands of class and sub-class members.” If a class were to be certified and liability were found, the statutory damages provided under California Penal Code §§ 632 and 632.7 would be unconscionable and grossly oppressive in violation of California Civil Code § 3359.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiffs and each Class hereby demand a trial by jury on all issues that may be tried and decided by jury.

WHEREFORE, Defendants respectfully request that Plaintiffs’ claims be dismissed in their entirety and that Defendants be awarded their costs and attorneys’ fees and any other relief as the Court finds appropriate.

[signature block follows on next page]

Dated: February 26, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Anthony Porcelli

Anthony Porcelli
Claire Brennan
Polsinelli PC
150 North Riverside Plaza, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: (312) 819-1900
Facsimile: (312) 819-1910
APorcelli@Polsinelli.com
CBrennan@Polsinelli.com

/s/ John W. Peterson

John W. Peterson (pro hac vice)
Matthew S. Knoop (pro hac vice)
Polsinelli PC
401 Commerce Street, Suite 900
Nashville, TN 37219
Telephone: (615) 259-1510
Facsimile: (615) 259-1573
john.peterson@polsinelli.com
mknoop@polsinelli.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on February 26, 2019, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to all counsel of record, namely:

Myron M. Cherry
Jacie C. Zolna
Benjamin R. Swetland
Jessica Cherry Chavin
Myron M. Cherry & Associates LLC
30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2300
Chicago, Illinois 60602
mcherry@cherry-law.com
jzolna@cherry-law.com
bswetland@cherry-law.com
jchavin@cherry-law.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

George James Tzanetopoulos
Michael Thomas Werner
Baker Hostetler
191 North Wacker Drive, Suite 3100
Chicago, IL 60606
gtzanetopoulos@bakerlaw.com
mwerner@bakerlaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Fifth Third Bank,
Vantiv, Inc., and National Processing
Company*

James R. Figliulo
James H. Bowhay
Peter A. Silverman
Figliulo & Silverman
Ten South LaSalle Street, Suite 3600
Chicago, IL 60603
jfigliulo@fslegal.com
jbowhay@fslegal.com
psilverman@fslegal.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Ironwood Financial,
LLC d/b/a Ironwood Payment, DeWitt
Lovell, and John Lewis*

/s/ John W. Peterson
