

1 Todd M. Logan (SBN 305912)  
2 tlogan@edelson.com  
3 EDELSON PC  
4 329 Bryant Street, Suite 2C  
5 San Francisco, California 94107  
6 Tel: 415.212.9300  
7 Fax: 415.373.9435

8 *Attorney for Plaintiffs and the Putative Class*

9 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
10 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
11 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

12 KEVIN O’SHEA, MARK VITCOV, and  
13 ROD MORRIS, individually and on behalf  
14 of all others similarly situated,

15 *Plaintiffs,*

16 v.

17 24 HOUR FITNESS USA, INC., a  
18 California corporation,

19 *Defendant.*

Case No.: 3:16-cv-1668

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

20 Plaintiffs Kevin O’Shea, Mark Vitcov, and Rod Morris bring this Class Action  
21 Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial against Defendant 24 Hour Fitness USA, Inc. for  
22 fraudulently inducing consumers into purchasing supposed “lifetime memberships” to its  
23 gyms. Plaintiffs allege as follows upon personal knowledge as to themselves and their own  
24 acts and experiences, and as to all other matters, upon information and belief, including  
25 investigation conducted by their attorneys.

26 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

- 27 1. Defendant 24 Hour Fitness owns and operates the largest fitness center chain  
28 in the United States.
2. For the last twenty years, 24 Hour Fitness’s sales representatives have used a

1 uniform set of marketing tactics and aggressive sales pitches to induce consumers into  
2 purchasing “lifetime memberships” to its gyms, where they prepaid three years worth of  
3 membership fees and, in exchange, only had to pay nominal annual renewal fees each year  
4 thereafter (the “Annual Renewal Fee”). Under these purported “lifetime memberships,” the  
5 Annual Renewal Fees were supposed to remain constant for the remainder of the member’s  
6 life (the “Lifetime Fee Guarantee”).

7         3. Unfortunately, now under new ownership, 24 Hour Fitness decided to stop  
8 honoring the supposed Lifetime Fee Guarantees it had been promising to its members and  
9 began alerting its lifetime members—some of whom had paid the same Annual Renewal Fee  
10 for more than two decades—that their Annual Renewal Fees would increase in 2016 (in most  
11 cases, to either double or triple their previous rates).

12         4. Not surprisingly, thousands of outraged members began posting complaints on  
13 the Internet describing how they were promised lifetime memberships by 24 Hour Fitness’s  
14 sales representatives, but that 24 Hour Fitness was going to start raising their Annual  
15 Renewal Fees.<sup>1</sup> 24 Hour Fitness responded by pointing to fine print located on the second  
16 page of their standard form membership agreements and argued that it’s allowed to increase  
17 Annual Renewal Rates as much as it wishes—regardless of the uniform promises that it  
18 trained its sales representatives to make to induce consumers into purchasing supposed  
19 lifetime memberships.

20         5. In the end, 24 Hour Fitness’s conduct is a textbook example of a widespread  
21 bait and switch scheme: it promised thousands of consumers a lifetime membership with a  
22 Lifetime Fee Guarantee to get them to sign up for memberships and then later, after they  
23 signed up and committed to keeping their lifetime membership, started increasing their fees.

24         6. By and through these practices, and as explained in detail below, 24 Hour

---

25 <sup>1</sup> In fact, there is a petition on Change.org with over 2,300 24 Hour Fitness lifetime  
26 members complaining about these practices. See Change.org, *24 Hour Fitness Unfairly*  
27 *Raising Fees for Guaranteed Lifetime Annual Memberships* (accessed Mar. 25, 2016),  
28 <https://www.change.org/p/elizabeth-blair-ceo-24-hour-fitness-24-hour-fitness-unfairly-raising-fees-for-guaranteed-lifetime-annual-memberships>.

1 Fitness has made millions of dollars by deceiving thousands of hapless consumers—all in  
2 violation of the law.

3 **PARTIES**

4 7. Plaintiff Kevin O’Shea is a natural person and citizen of the State of  
5 California.

6 8. Plaintiff Mark Vitcov is a natural person and citizen of the State of Oregon.

7 9. Plaintiff Rod Morris is a natural person and citizen of the State of Texas.

8 10. Defendant 24 Hour Fitness USA, Inc. is a corporation existing under the laws  
9 of the State of California with its principal place of business located at 12647 Alcosta  
10 Boulevard, Suite 500, San Ramon, California 94583. 24 Hour Fitness conducts business  
11 throughout this District, the State of California, and the United States.

12 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 11. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2),  
14 because (i) at least one member of the Class is a citizen of a different state than the  
15 Defendant, (ii) the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interests and  
16 costs, and (iii) none of the exceptions under that subsection apply to this action.

17 12. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it is a California  
18 corporation, its principal place of business is located in California, designed its advertising  
19 materials in California, and the events giving rise to this lawsuit occurred, in substantial part,  
20 in California.

21 13. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a  
22 substantial part of the events giving rise to Plaintiffs’ claims occurred in, were directed to,  
23 and/or emanated from this District. Venue is additionally proper because Defendant is  
24 registered to, and regularly does, conduct business in this District, including by entering into  
25 consumer transactions in this District.

26 **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

27 14. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-2(d), this case should be assigned to the San  
28

1 Francisco Division.

2 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

3 **I. An Overview of 24 Hour Fitness.**

4 15. 24 Hour Fitness operates the largest chain of fitness centers in the United  
5 States, with gyms in over 420 cities (including 139 locations in California alone).

6 16. In order to use its facilities, consumers must first purchase a “gym  
7 membership that fits [their] schedule and [their] health and fitness goals,”<sup>2</sup> which they can do  
8 by walking into a 24 Hour Fitness location and speaking with a sales representative (known  
9 as a “Membership Counselor”).

10 17. Unfortunately, while there are a number of membership options that  
11 consumers can choose from, 24 Hour Fitness trains its Membership Counselors to use  
12 deception and high-pressure sales tactics to sell—what it claims are—lifetime memberships  
13 to its gyms.

14 **II. 24 Hour Fitness’s Membership Counselors Use Scripted Routines and Uniform**  
15 **Sales Pitches to Induce Consumers into Purchasing Supposed Lifetime**  
16 **Memberships.**

17 18. When 24 Hour Fitness was founded over 20 years ago, it started offering  
18 lifetime memberships because it (i) needed to raise capital in order to expand and wanted to  
19 use the prepaid membership dues required to be lifelong members to build new gyms, and (ii)  
20 sought to differentiate itself from other gyms during a time-period when there was a lot of  
21 competition in the fitness industry and fitness clubs were constantly going out of business.

22 19. Consumers could purchase these lifetime memberships by prepaying three  
23 years worth of membership fees. After that, these members would only have to pay nominal  
24 annual renewal fees each year thereafter, which were supposed to remain constant for the  
25 remainder of the member’s life.

26 20. In order to sell these lifelong memberships, 24 Hour Fitness designed scripted  
27 routines and aggressive sales pitches that it trained its Membership Counselors to use to

28 <sup>2</sup> Club Membership, 24 HOUR FITNESS, <http://www.24hourfitness.com/membership/>  
(last visited Apr. 1, 2016).

1 convince consumers into purchasing them.<sup>3</sup>

2           A.       *24 Hour Fitness Sold Lifetime Memberships to Consumers Even*  
3                    *Though Its Standard Membership Contracts Didn't Contain Any*  
4                    *Guarantees.*

5           21.       The problem is, after April 2006,<sup>4</sup> the standard form membership agreements  
6 that 24 Hour Fitness had these lifetime members sign didn't actually guarantee that their  
7 memberships would be lifelong. Instead, in fine print located on the second page of these  
8 standard form membership agreements, they actually said the opposite: that is, that 24 Hour  
9 Fitness could increase all subsequent annual renewal amounts on prepaid memberships.

10           22.       Nonetheless, when consumers visited 24 Hour Fitness seeking to purchase  
11 memberships, 24 Hour Fitness displayed marketing materials around its facilities  
12 encouraging prospective members to ask about its lifetime memberships.<sup>5</sup>

13           23.       24 Hour Fitness's Membership Counselors were then trained to push these  
14 supposed lifelong memberships and hurry prospective members through the contract so they  
15 wouldn't discover that that's not actually what their contracts said. Former 24 Hour Fitness  
16 managers even admit that their Membership Counselors were trained to promise "lifetime  
17 memberships" to potential lifetime members even though the written contracts did not reflect  
18 such a promise<sup>6</sup>, and, likewise, Membership Counselors even admit being trained to tell  
19 potential lifetime members that they would receive "lifetime memberships."<sup>7</sup>

20 <sup>3</sup> See Consumer Complaints and Reviews for 24 Hour Fitness, CONSUMER AFFAIRS,  
21 [https://www.consumeraffairs.com/health\\_clubs/24\\_hour\\_fitness.html?page=6](https://www.consumeraffairs.com/health_clubs/24_hour_fitness.html?page=6) (last visited  
22 Apr. 1, 2016) ("I used to work in sales at 24 Hour Fitness . . . and we were trained to tell  
23 people this is the price they would pay for the rest of their lives . . .").

24 <sup>4</sup> Prior to 2006, 24 Hour Fitness's membership contracts actually stated it would not  
25 increase lifetime members' Guaranteed Annual Renewal Amounts as long as they remained  
26 in good standing.

27 <sup>5</sup> BBB Business Review, *24Hour Fitness USA Inc*, [http://www.bbb.org/sdoc/business-  
28 reviews/health-clubs/24hour-fitness-usa-inc-in-carlsbad-ca-9000777/complaints](http://www.bbb.org/sdoc/business-reviews/health-clubs/24hour-fitness-usa-inc-in-carlsbad-ca-9000777/complaints) (last visited  
Mar. 6, 2016).

<sup>6</sup> Change.org, *24 Hour Fitness Unfairly Raising Fees for Guaranteed Lifetime Annual*  
29 *Memberships*, [https://www.change.org/p/elizabeth-blair-ceo-24-hour-fitness-24-hour-fitness-  
30 unfairly-raising-fees-for-guaranteed-lifetime-annual-memberships/c](https://www.change.org/p/elizabeth-blair-ceo-24-hour-fitness-24-hour-fitness-unfairly-raising-fees-for-guaranteed-lifetime-annual-memberships/c) (last visited Mar. 6,  
2016).

<sup>7</sup> Consumers Affairs, *24 Hour Fitness*,  
[https://www.consumeraffairs.com/health\\_clubs/24\\_hour\\_fitness.html?page=5](https://www.consumeraffairs.com/health_clubs/24_hour_fitness.html?page=5) (last visited

1           24. Every sales pitch used by 24 Hour Fitness’s Membership Counselors was  
2 virtually the same:

- 3           • First, after convincing consumers to purchase a lifelong membership, 24  
4 Hour Fitness’s Membership Counselors were instructed to tell potential  
5 members that they did not need to read the fine print on the written  
6 membership contracts because they were for “lifetime memberships”—as  
7 was verbally represented;<sup>8</sup>
- 8           • Then, 24 Hour Fitness’s Membership Counselors would tell the potential  
9 customer what a “great deal” they could get by purchasing a lifetime  
10 membership, at the same time they were being asked to sign the written  
11 agreement that contained no such guarantee.<sup>9</sup>

12           25. If a consumer was hesitant or insisted on reading the membership contracts  
13 before signing them, 24 Hour Fitness’s Membership Counselors were trained to get even  
14 more aggressive and insist that the potential member needed to sign immediately or risk  
15 losing a “great deal.”<sup>10</sup>

---

16 Mar. 8, 2016).

17 <sup>8</sup> See, e.g., Reddit, *24 Hour Fitness Increasing “Lifetime” membership rate - is this*  
18 *legal? (California)*,  
19 [https://www.reddit.com/r/legaladvice/comments/3ayunb/24\\_hour\\_fitness\\_increasing](https://www.reddit.com/r/legaladvice/comments/3ayunb/24_hour_fitness_increasing_lifetime_membership/)  
20 [lifetime\\_membership/](https://www.reddit.com/r/legaladvice/comments/3ayunb/24_hour_fitness_increasing_lifetime_membership/) (last visited Mar. 6, 2016) (emphasis added) (“I have bought 3  
21 different “lifetime” memberships [from 24 Hour Fitness]. I was told verbally that the rate  
22 was “for life” when purchasing each membership. This is why I bought them and paid a large  
“up front” amount of money. . . . My husband just got his notice and his rate has been  
increased from \$29 to \$79. . . . The sales rep at the 24 Hour Concord, CA did deceive me. I  
recall being told that the contracts are “all the same” and *no need to spend the time to read*  
*all the fine print.*”).

23 <sup>9</sup> See, e.g., Consumer Affairs, *24 Hour Fitness*,  
24 [https://www.consumeraffairs.com/health\\_clubs/24\\_hour\\_fitness.html?page=8](https://www.consumeraffairs.com/health_clubs/24_hour_fitness.html?page=8) (accessed Mar.  
25 10, 2016) (“24 Hour Fitness had a promotion back in 2006 of [\$]700.00 upfront . . . and after  
the third year a charge of 29.00 a year for life was going to apply. A sales associate gave me  
the contract to sign after he explained this “great deal” and I signed and I paid the 700  
hundred dollars there. After the third year I began to pay 29.00 every year. I continued for all  
this time without a problem until now that I received the annual bill charging me 104.00!!!”).

26 <sup>10</sup> See, e.g., BBB Business Review, *24Hour Fitness USA Inc.*,  
27 [http://www.bbb.org/sdoc/business-reviews/health-clubs/24hour-fitness-usa-inc-in-carlsbad-](http://www.bbb.org/sdoc/business-reviews/health-clubs/24hour-fitness-usa-inc-in-carlsbad-ca-9000777/complaints)  
28 [ca-9000777/complaints](http://www.bbb.org/sdoc/business-reviews/health-clubs/24hour-fitness-usa-inc-in-carlsbad-ca-9000777/complaints) (accessed Mar. 10, 2016) (“I was conned by a 24 Hour Fitness  
salesperson. I was told that for a prepaid membership of \$700 there were no monthly fees for

1                   B.       *Thousands of “Lifetime Members” are Outraged After 24 Hour*  
 2                   *Fitness Decides to No Longer Honor Its Lifetime Guarantees.*

3           26.       Unfortunately, now under new ownership, 24 Hour Fitness decided to stop  
 4 honoring the supposed Lifetime Fee Guarantees it had been promising to its members and  
 5 began alerting its lifetime members—some of whom had paid the same Annual Renewal Fee  
 6 for more than two decades—that their Annual Renewal Fees would increase in 2016 (in most  
 7 cases, to either double or triple their previous rates).

8           27.       Not surprisingly, thousands of consumers immediately began posting  
 9 complaints on the Internet, including the following examples:

- 10                   • I have this same contract. When it began, it was verbally expressed to me  
 11 that my rate could stay fixed at \$29 for life. All that was required was to  
 12 pay it when it was due and not cancel my membership and it would be  
 guaranteed to stay at that price for life. That is clearly not the case if I am  
 now being told that my rate is going up.<sup>11</sup>
- 13                   • Clear bait and switch.... Sales guy lied that \$30/month life time  
 14 membership due will never increase and had me sign on a contract that  
 15 clearly says in 3(c) that dues can be increased at any time. BAD FAITH.  
 willfully mis-lead me into signing a contract based on mis-information.  
 This happened across the nation over and over.<sup>12</sup>
- 16                   • I was told when I paid for three years that after the three years were up,  
 17 the payment would be “49 for the rest of my life”.<sup>13</sup>

18 three years and then it would only be \$29 per year thereafter. I specifically asked if that  
 19 annual fee was subject to change, and I was told, “No, after three years, just \$29 a year for as  
 20 long as you stay a member.” This was a lie. My annual renewal fee for the upcoming year  
 21 was increased 272% to \$79. *He also told me that the promotional offer was expiring that day*  
 22 *so I had to act that day or miss the offer.* This was a lie. . . . It is a brilliant con i[n] that they  
 23 cheated many people out of a relatively small amount of money with false claims that  
 24 required years to discover, so that no one will have recourse . . . *BTW, the contract was two*  
 25 *legal-sized pages of multiple columns of fine print. I told the salesperson I didn’t have my*  
 26 *reading glasses with me. That’s when he told me the offer ended that day.* And that is why I  
 27 specifically asked if the dues would ever be raised beyond the \$29 per year, and was told  
 28 “no.” . . . I am a senior living on a limited fixed income, and I would not have agreed to a  
 financial stipulation that contained unlimited fee increases with no cap.”)

<sup>11</sup> Change.org, *24 Hour Fitness Unfairly Raising Fees for Guaranteed Lifetime Annual Memberships*, <https://www.change.org/p/elizabeth-blair-ceo-24-hour-fitness-24-hour-fitness-unfairly-raising-fees-for-guaranteed-lifetime-annual-memberships/c> (last visited Mar. 6, 2016).

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- False advertising and selling practice. The sales person specifically told m that the \$29 would be for life – he said “we do this because you’ll be a customer for life.” This is corporate greed and false advertising.<sup>14</sup>
  - I was also told my rate was locked in “for life”. My rate increased from 29.99 annually to 79.99[.] They’re training their staff to lie to potential members. This is fraud!<sup>15</sup>
  - I was verbally promised no increase in rates after paying a significant amount up front and now they are talking about raising the rates. As it turns out the verbal contract and the written contract were not the same. This was a bait and switch and is disgusting behavior by 24 HR Fitness.<sup>16</sup>
  - I was told face to face that my rate would be 100 [p]er year as long as I stayed current at the end of my three year contract. Blatantly lied to by in gym personnel.<sup>17</sup>
  - On June 4, 2007 a 24 Hour[] Fitness [salesperson] sold me a 3 year plan for \$750 with the promise of \$29 a year after that. I bought into the plan on the value of the indefinite \$29-a-[year] payments [the salesperson] promised . . . only to be surprised [in 2015] by a \$79/year increase . . . an almost 300% increase . . . I call[ed] 24 Hour Fitness Customer Service and was told there was a “clause 3c” that allowed 24 Hour Fitness to raise rates . . . This came as a surprise to me because [the salesperson] had not brought this up during her pitch which now comes across as having been misleading at best and deceptive at worst. Price was a major selling point of the [prepaid] plan and for [the salesperson] to sell the \$29/year aspect without mentioning the said “clause 3c” **hidden in mounds of small print** at the back of the 5th page of the documentation she gave, smacks of shady practice that I would never have associated with an international corporate brand like 24 Hour Fitness. \$750 is a lot of money [to me] and plunking it down for [a] gym membership in one sitting is something I would never have done had I not believed 24 [Hour] Fitness could be trusted . . . .<sup>18</sup>
  - Purchased [a] 3 year Prepa[id] [Plan] for \$800 around June 19, 2006. (Reason I remember, it was a Birthday Gift . . . I paid half, mother paid half.) Was verbally promised a 3-year membership with a \$29.00 annual renewal membership . . . This price hike irritates, frustrates, and infuriates me as a 9-year customer of 24 Hour Fitness. In my honest opinion,

---

14 *Id.*

15 *Id.*

16 *Id.*

17 *Id.*

18 BBB Business Review, *24 Hour Fitness*, <http://www.bbb.org/sdoc/business-reviews/health-clubs/24hour-fitness-usa-inc-in-carlsbad-ca-9000777/complaints> (last visited Mar. 10, 2016). (Emphasis added.)



1                   **Bamboozled, Bait and Switched, Hoodwinked** all describes what 24  
 2 Hour Fitness is pulling here. I'm not exactly sure how legal this is but just  
 3 because it is legal does not make it right. For years I have been of the  
 4 belief that 24 Hour Fitness has been constantly trying to weed out the  
 5 loyal long term annual buyers. (Especially since the new acquisition/buy  
 6 out) . . . .<sup>19</sup>

7           28.     In addition to illustrating the outrage expressed by an overwhelming portion  
 8 of 24 Hour Fitness's members, these complaints also confirm that "lifetime members" were  
 9 all subjected to the virtually identical sales pitches described in Section II.A above. A local  
 10 news station, CBS Sacramento, even did a story about 24 Hour Fitness raising the rates of its  
 11 "lifetime" members and recognized that "there is power in a pattern of people [all] telling the  
 12 same story."<sup>20</sup>

13           29.     To make matters worse, 24 Hour Fitness responded to member inquiries about  
 14 why their "lifetime" rates were going up by claiming that they never had lifetime  
 15 memberships in the first place and are allowed to change the membership rates at anytime  
 16 according to the standard form written membership contracts.<sup>21</sup> In certain circumstances, 24  
 17 Hour Fitness even responded that it did not care what its Membership Counselors had  
 18 promised them.<sup>22</sup>

19           30.     The common theme among all of the complaints described above—a theme  
 20 reinforced by Plaintiffs' experiences in this case—is that 24 Hour Fitness designed its sales  
 21 tactics to misrepresent that its lifetime memberships came with Lifetime Fee Guarantees  
 22 specifically to lure consumers into purchasing lifetime memberships to its gyms.

23 <sup>19</sup> Consumer Affairs, *24 Hour Fitness*,  
 24 [https://www.consumeraffairs.com/health\\_clubs/24\\_hour\\_fitness.html?page=12](https://www.consumeraffairs.com/health_clubs/24_hour_fitness.html?page=12) (last visited  
 25 Mar. 10, 2016).

26 <sup>20</sup> Kurtis Ming, *Call Kurtis: 24 Hour Fitness Members Say Company Lied About  
 27 Lifetime Pricing*, CBS SACRAMENTO, <http://sacramento.cbslocal.com/2016/01/11/24-hour-fitness-members-deal-out-more-cash-than-they-expected/> (last visited Mar. 11, 2016).

28 <sup>21</sup> See, e.g., Facebook, *Ries Michael* (Feb. 17, 2016),  
<https://www.facebook.com/search/top/?q=ries%20michael%2024%20hour%20fitness> (last  
 visited Apr. 1, 2016).

<sup>22</sup> Consumer Affairs, *24 Hour Fitness*,  
[https://www.consumeraffairs.com/health\\_clubs/24\\_hour\\_fitness.html?page=2](https://www.consumeraffairs.com/health_clubs/24_hour_fitness.html?page=2) (last visited  
 Mar. 8, 2016).

1 **III. Plaintiffs' Experiences.**

2 *A. Plaintiff O'shea's Experience.*

3 31. Plaintiff O'Shea purchased—what a 24 Hour Fitness representative promised  
4 was—a lifetime membership to 24 Hour Fitness for \$700 on January 28, 2008. It was  
5 important to his purchasing decision that this was a “lifetime” membership. His Annual  
6 Renewal Fee stayed at a locked-in rate of \$49 until January 2016, when it was raised to \$124.

7 *B. Plaintiff Vitcov's Experience.*

8 32. Plaintiff Vitcov purchased—what a 24 Hour Fitness representative promised  
9 was—a lifetime membership to 24 Hour Fitness for \$545 on February 25, 2007. He  
10 considered the promise of a lifetime rate to be very important to his purchasing decision. His  
11 Annual Renewal Fee stayed at his starting-rate of \$69 until recently, when it was increased to  
12 \$119.

13 *C. Plaintiff Morris's Experience.*

14 33. Plaintiff Morris purchased—what a 24 Hour Fitness representative promised  
15 was—a lifetime membership to 24 Hour Fitness for \$700 on December 16, 2006. He would  
16 not have prepaid such a substantial sum if not for the oral representation that his rate would  
17 stay capped for life. His Annual Renewal Fee stayed at a locked-in rate of \$49 until January  
18 2016, when it was increased to \$161.29.

19 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

20 34. **Class Allegations:** Plaintiffs bring this action pursuant to Federal Rule of  
21 Civil Procedure 23(b)(2) and Rule 23(b)(3) on behalf of themselves and classes of similarly  
22 situated individuals, defined as follows:

23 **Class:** All individuals in the United States who purchased a prepaid membership from  
24 24 Hour Fitness, whose contract was drafted in or after April 2006, and who  
maintained their membership with 24 Hour Fitness in or after April 2015.

25 **California Subclass:** All Class members who reside in the State of California.

26 **Oregon Subclass:** All Class members who reside in the State of Oregon.

27 **Texas Subclass:** All Class members who reside in the State of Texas.  
28

1  
2 The following people are excluded from the Class, California Subclass, Oregon Subclass,  
3 and Texas Subclass (collectively the “Class,” unless otherwise indicated): (1) any Judge or  
4 Magistrate presiding over this action and members of their families; (2) Defendant,  
5 Defendant’s subsidiaries, parents, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the  
6 Defendant or its parents have a controlling interest and its current or former employees,  
7 officers and directors; (3) persons who properly execute and file a timely request  
8 for exclusion from the Class; (4) persons whose claims in this matter have been finally  
9 adjudicated on the merits or otherwise released; (5) Plaintiffs’ counsel and Defendant’s  
10 counsel; and (6) the legal representatives, successors, and assigns of any such excluded  
11 persons.

12 35. **Numerosity:** The exact number of Class members is unknown and not  
13 available to Plaintiff at this time, but individual joinder in this case is impracticable. The  
14 Class likely consist of thousands of individuals. Members of the Class can be easily  
15 identified through Defendant’s records.

16 36. **Commonality and Predominance:** There are many questions of law and fact  
17 common to the claims of Plaintiffs and the other members of the Class, and those questions  
18 predominate over any questions that may affect individual members of the Class. Common  
19 questions for the Class include:

- 20 a) whether 24 Hour Fitness designed and trained its Membership  
21 Counselors to use scripted routines and aggressive sales pitches to  
22 induce consumers into purchasing lifetime memberships;
- 23 b) whether 24 Hour Fitness used scripted routines and aggressive sales  
24 pitches to induce consumers into purchasing lifetime memberships;
- 25 c) whether 24 Hour Fitness’s conduct constitutes fraud;
- 26 d) whether 24 Hour Fitness’s conduct violated Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750, *et*  
27 *seq.*;
- 28 e) whether 24 Hour Fitness’s conduct violated Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§

1 17200, *et seq.*;

2 f) whether 24 Hour Fitness's conduct violated Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1812.80  
3 *et seq.*;

4 g) whether 24 Hour Fitness's conduct violated Or. Rev. Stat. §§ 646.638,  
5 *et seq.*; and

6 h) whether 24 Hour Fitness's conduct violated Tex. Bus. & Com. Code  
7 §§ 17.50, *et seq.*

8 37. **Typicality:** Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the other Class  
9 members. Plaintiffs and the Class members sustained damages as a result of Defendant's  
10 uniform wrongful conduct during transactions with Plaintiffs and the Class.

11 38. **Adequate Representation:** Plaintiffs have and will continue to fairly and  
12 adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class, and they have retained counsel  
13 competent and experienced in complex litigation and class actions. Plaintiffs have no  
14 interests antagonistic to those of the Class, and Defendant has no defenses unique to  
15 Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs and their counsel are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on  
16 behalf of the members of the Class, and they have the resources to do so. Neither Plaintiffs  
17 nor their counsel have any interest adverse to those of the other members of the Class.

18 39. **Policies Generally Applicable to the Class:** This class action is appropriate  
19 for certification because Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally  
20 applicable to the Class, thereby requiring the Court's imposition of uniform relief to ensure  
21 compatible standards of conduct toward the members of the Class and making final  
22 injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the Class as a whole. Defendant's policies  
23 challenged herein apply and affect the members of the Class uniformly and Plaintiffs'  
24 challenge of these policies hinges on Defendant's conduct with respect to the whole of the  
25 Class, not on facts or law applicable only to Plaintiffs.

26 40. **Superiority:** This class action is also appropriate for certification because  
27 class proceedings are superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient  
28

1 adjudication of this controversy and joinder of all members of the Class is impracticable. The  
2 damages suffered by the individual Class members will likely be small relative to the burden  
3 and expense of individual prosecution of the complex litigation necessitated by Defendant's  
4 wrongful conduct. Thus, it would be virtually impossible for the individual Class members to  
5 obtain effective relief from Defendant's misconduct. Even if members of the Class could  
6 sustain such individual litigation, it would not be preferable to a class action because  
7 individual litigation would increase the delay and expense to all parties due to the complex  
8 legal and factual controversies presented in this Complaint. By contrast, a class action  
9 presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefits of single adjudication,  
10 economy of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court. Economies of time,  
11 effort, and expense will be fostered and uniformity of decisions will be ensured.

12 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
13 **Reformation**  
14 **(On Behalf of Plaintiffs and the Class)**

15 41. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.

16 42. As grounds for reformation, Plaintiffs plead in the alternative: (a) mutual  
17 mistake, (b) unilateral mistake, and (c) fraud in the inducement.

18 *(a) Mutual mistake*

19 43. Defendant orally offered Plaintiffs a "lifetime membership" in exchange for  
20 Plaintiffs making a substantial lump sum "prepayment" of their membership dues.

21 44. This oral offer of a "lifetime membership" included an oral promise that 24  
22 Hour Fitness would cap the Annual Renewal Fee at a lifetime rate.

23 45. Plaintiffs accepted this oral offer, and Plaintiffs and Defendant memorialized  
24 their agreement in a written contract.

25 46. Plaintiffs and Defendant's agents both believed that the written agreement  
26 accurately reflected their oral agreement.

27 47. As the draftsman of the written agreement and as the one making the  
28 representation of a "lifetime membership" with a Lifetime Fee Guarantee, 24 Hour Fitness

1 bore the risk that the written agreement did not conform to the oral agreement.

2 48. The parties' mutual mistake in accurately reducing their oral agreement to  
3 writing affected a material term because it resulted in the deletion of the Lifetime Fee  
4 Guarantee from the written agreement. The Lifetime Fee Guarantee was material to Plaintiffs  
5 because Plaintiffs would not have paid so much money up-front if they had known that they  
6 were not receiving a written promise of a lifetime membership rate.

7 49. Thus, the written agreement should be reformed to conform to the parties' oral  
8 understanding.

9 (b) Unilateral mistake

10 50. In the alternative, Plaintiffs are entitled to reformation on the basis of  
11 unilateral mistake.

12 51. 24 Hour Fitness knew, suspected, or had reason to know that Plaintiffs  
13 believed that the written agreement was a "lifetime membership" at the time of signing.

14 52. The written agreement was not actually a lifetime membership and did not  
15 reflect the oral promise that a "lifetime membership" included a Lifetime Fee Guarantee.

16 53. This misunderstanding went to the essence of the contract, since Plaintiffs  
17 believed that the contract was for a "lifetime membership" and would not have bought the  
18 membership if they had known 24 Hour Fitness was not going to honor it.

19 54. Plaintiffs were, in fact, mistaken about whether the written agreement  
20 contained a Lifetime Fee Guarantee. In actuality, the written agreement in Section 3(c)  
21 purported to give 24 Hour Fitness the power to raise the Annual Renewal Fee as much as it  
22 wanted.

23 55. 24 Hour Fitness knew or had reason to know that Plaintiffs were mistaken  
24 about the terms of the written contract because 24 Hour Fitness caused Plaintiffs' mistake  
25 through its oral representations.

26 56. 24 Hour Fitness used Plaintiffs' mistake to take advantage of Plaintiffs.

27 57. Had Plaintiffs known that the written contract was not a true lifetime  
28

1 membership, Plaintiffs would not have signed the agreement.

2 58. Plaintiffs are thus entitled to reformation of the written agreement to reflect  
3 Plaintiffs' understanding that the written contract reflected a lifetime membership with a  
4 Lifetime Fee Guarantee.

5 (c) Fraud in the inducement

6 59. In the alternative, Plaintiffs are entitled to reformation on the basis of fraud in  
7 the inducement.

8 60. Defendants represented to Plaintiffs that the written agreement reflected the  
9 "lifetime membership" that they were orally promised, including a lifetime cap on the  
10 Annual Renewal Fee.

11 61. Defendants knew that this representation was not true at the time it was made.

12 62. Defendants made this representation to persuade and induce Plaintiffs to sign  
13 the written agreement.

14 63. Plaintiffs reasonably relied on Defendants' representation that the written  
15 agreement was a "lifetime membership."

16 64. And Plaintiffs would not have signed the contract if Plaintiffs had known that  
17 the written agreement did not reflect the orally promised "lifetime membership."

18 65. Thus, Plaintiffs are entitled to reformation of the written agreement to  
19 conform with what Defendants' orally represented the membership to be: a lifetime  
20 membership which included a Lifetime Fee Guarantee.

21 66. As a result of either the mutual mistake, the unilateral mistake known to  
22 Defendants, or Defendants' fraud, Plaintiffs and the Class seek a declaratory judgment that  
23 their contracts have been reformed to include a Lifetime Fee Guarantee.

24 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
25 **Restitution**  
26 **(On Behalf of Plaintiffs and the Class)**

27 67. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.

28 68. Reformation of the written agreement to reflect the orally represented

1 “lifetime membership” is an insufficient remedy by itself because Plaintiffs have still  
2 overpaid for Annual Renewal Fees that were higher than the orally represented “lifetime”  
3 rate. Plaintiffs’ Annual Renewal Fee *should have* been capped at their starting rate. But  
4 Plaintiffs paid amounts beyond the cap because 24 Hour Fitness demanded these payments  
5 and told Plaintiffs that their memberships would be canceled if they did not pay.

6 69. Restitution is appropriate to restore these overpayments to Plaintiffs.

7 70. Plaintiffs conferred a benefit on 24 Hour Fitness by overpaying on the Annual  
8 Renewal Fee above the amount of the orally represented lifetime rate.

9 71. 24 Hour Fitness would be unjustly enriched if it got to keep the difference  
10 between the orally represented lifetime rate and the actual fee assessed. It would be  
11 inequitable to allow 24 Hour Fitness to retain money it obtained via fraud or taking  
12 advantage of Plaintiffs’ mistake.

13 72. Thus, Plaintiffs are entitled to restitution in the amount of any overpayments  
14 (beyond the capped amount).

15 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**  
16 **Violation of California Legal Remedies Act**  
17 **Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750, *et seq.***  
18 **(On Behalf of Plaintiff O’Shea and the California Subclass)**

19 73. Plaintiff O’Shea incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth  
20 herein.

21 74. 24 Hour Fitness violated the following CLRA provisions by representing to  
22 consumers that it was selling them a lifetime membership with a Lifetime Fee Guarantee  
23 when in fact it was not:

- 24 • Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(5) (for representing that services have  
25 “characteristics” or “benefits” which they do not in fact have);
- 26 • Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(13) (for making false or misleading statements  
27 as to the existence of price reductions);
- 28 • Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(14) (for representing that a transaction confers  
or involves legal rights when it does not in fact involve or confer those



1 rights); ad

- 2 • Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(18) (for misrepresenting the authority of a  
3 salesperson to negotiate the final terms of a transaction with a consumer).

4 75. By putting posters on its gyms stating “Lifetime Memberships” when its  
5 written adhesion contracts did not confer any lifetime benefits, 24 Hour Fitness violated Cal.  
6 Civ. Code § 1770(a)(9) by advertising services with the intent not to sell them as advertised.

7 76. Plaintiff O’Shea was damaged by these CLRA violations because he would  
8 either not have bought a 24 Hour Fitness membership at all, would not have paid as much up-  
9 front for such a membership, or would have sought cheaper options if he had not been misled  
10 to believe that he was receiving a “lifetime membership”—with a Lifetime Fee Guarantee.

11 77. As a result of Defendant’s CLRA violations, some members of the California  
12 Subclass chose to cancel their memberships instead of paying for a fee increase that they saw  
13 as unfair.

14 78. Pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1780(a)(2), Plaintiff O’Shea asks for an order  
15 permanently enjoining the methods, acts, and practices of 24 Hour Fitness that constitute a  
16 CLRA violation—including an order requiring 24 Hour Fitness to reinstate any prepaid  
17 members who cancelled their memberships after being assessed an increased Annual  
18 Renewal Fee. Plaintiff O’Shea also requests costs and attorneys’ fees under Cal. Civ. Code §  
19 § 1780(d).

20 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
21 **Violation of Unfair Competition Law**  
22 **Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200**  
23 **(On Behalf of Plaintiff O’Shea and the California Subclass)**

24 79. Plaintiff O’Shea incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth  
25 herein.

26 *(a) Unfair prong*

27 80. The unfair prong of the UCL is intentionally broad to allow courts to prevent  
28 new schemes to defraud.

81. 24 Hour Fitness has engaged in an unfair business practice by orally

1 promising a lifetime membership and then having consumers instead sign a written  
2 agreement that contained no such lifetime guarantees.

3 82. The harm of this business practice to consumers outweighs any legitimate  
4 benefit, and the practice runs counter to the public policy of the State of California embodied  
5 in numerous state statutes which forbid fraud and fraudulent business practices.

6 (b) Fraud prong

7 83. Members of the public were likely to be deceived when 24 Hour Fitness orally  
8 promised a “lifetime membership” but did not actually include any “lifetime” provisions in  
9 its written agreements.

10 84. Plaintiff O’Shea was so-deceived into thinking the written agreement actually  
11 reflected a “lifetime membership.”

12 85. Plaintiff O’Shea lost money or property by paying up-front for a lifetime  
13 membership with a Lifetime Fee Guarantee and not actually receiving a true lifetime  
14 membership. Plaintiff O’Shea was also damaged by overpaying for Annual Renewal Fees  
15 that were assessed beyond the orally promised cap.

16 86. Plaintiff O’Shea asks for restitution for any overpayment beyond the orally  
17 promised cap and an injunction against the complained-of business practices to prevent  
18 further violations of the UCL.

19 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **Fraud**

21 **(On Behalf of Plaintiff O’Shea and the California Subclass)**

22 87. Plaintiff O’Shea incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth  
23 herein.

24 (a) Intentional misrepresentation

25 88. 24 Hour Fitness orally represented to Plaintiff O’Shea that his written contract  
26 contained a legally enforceable provision guaranteeing him a capped lifetime rate on his  
27 Annual Renewal Fee.

28 89. 24 Hour Fitness represented that 24 Hour Fitness could *never* increase

1 Plaintiff O’Shea’s Annual Renewal Fee. And 24 Hour Fitness represented to Plaintiff O’Shea  
2 that he was becoming a “lifetime member” by prepaying his membership dues.

3 90. 24 Hour Fitness’s representations were false: it removed the Lifetime Fee  
4 Guarantee provision from its written adhesion contract in April 2006. After April 2006, it  
5 effectively no longer offered lifetime memberships (in writing).

6 91. 24 Hour Fitness knew at the time of the representation of a “lifetime  
7 membership” that it effectively no longer offered this type of membership (in writing).  
8 Continuing to orally promise lifetime memberships to consumers was reckless, and 24 Hour  
9 Fitness acted without regard for the truth.

10 92. 24 Hour Fitness intended for Plaintiff O’Shea to rely on the promise of a  
11 lifetime membership and to induce him to prepay for his membership up-front in exchange  
12 for this false promise of a Lifetime Fee Guarantee.

13 93. Plaintiff O’Shea reasonably relied on 24 Hour Fitness’s representation that he  
14 was purchasing a “lifetime” membership.

15 94. Plaintiff O’Shea was harmed when 24 Hour Fitness raised his Annual  
16 Renewal Fees and told him that the payment of the higher fees was mandatory or his  
17 membership would be cancelled. Had Plaintiff O’Shea not relied on 24 Hour Fitness’s  
18 promise of a “lifetime” membership, he could have received a better locked-in rate from  
19 another fitness center or considered other payment options with 24 Hour Fitness. If Plaintiff  
20 O’Shea had not prepaid a substantial sum of money up-front, he could have received the  
21 time-value of his money (such as interest).

22 (b) False promise

23 95. 24 Hour Fitness promised Plaintiff O’Shea a “lifetime” membership. This  
24 promise was important to the transaction: Plaintiff O’Shea would have considered other  
25 gyms or other payment options with 24 Hour Fitness had 24 Hour Fitness *not* promised  
26 Plaintiff O’Shea a “lifetime” membership.

27 96. 24 Hour Fitness did not intend to provide this “lifetime” membership or its  
28

1 attendant Lifetime Fee Guarantee when the promise was made. 24 Hour Fitness removed this  
2 lifetime guarantee from its written contracts in April 2006 precisely because 24 Hour Fitness  
3 intended to raise its Annual Renewal Fee in the future, even though it continued to orally  
4 promise potential customers a “lifetime” membership rate.

5 97. 24 Hour Fitness intended that Plaintiff O’Shea rely on the promise of a  
6 “lifetime” membership in purchasing a 24 Hour Fitness membership.

7 98. Plaintiff O’Shea reasonably relied on this promise by prepaying a significant  
8 sum of money up-front in exchange for what he reasonably believed to be a “lifetime  
9 membership.”

10 99. 24 Hour Fitness did not, in actuality, provide the orally promised Lifetime Fee  
11 Guarantee to Plaintiff O’Shea. 24 Hour Fitness raised his rates.

12 100. Plaintiff O’Shea was harmed by paying additional money for his Annual  
13 Renewal Fee when he was promised that this fee would stay capped at a lifetime rate. If  
14 Plaintiff O’Shea had joined another gym instead, he could have been locked into better rates.  
15 Alternatively, if Plaintiff O’Shea had known that the membership did not truly offer  
16 “lifetime” protections, he could have bargained with 24 Hour Fitness for a better price.

17 101. Plaintiff O’Shea asks for compensatory and punitive damages subject to  
18 proof.

19 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
20 **Violation of Health Studio Services Contract Law**  
21 **Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1812.80, *et seq.***  
22 **(On Behalf of Plaintiffs O’Shea and the California Subclass)**

23 102. Plaintiff O’Shea incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth  
24 herein.

25 103. 24 Hour Fitness is a provider of “health studio services” within the meaning  
26 of Cal. Civ. Code § 1812.81.

27 104. 24 Hour Fitness violated Cal Civ. Code § 1812.86 by placing *no limit* in its  
28 contracts on the amount it can charge customers over their lifetimes. For customers who  
signed up between January 1, 2006 and January 1, 2010, 24 Hour Fitness is not permitted to

1 charge them more than \$3,000 (including their prepayment amount) over the course of their  
 2 lifetimes. § 1812.86(b). For customers that signed up after January 1, 2010, 24 Hour Fitness  
 3 cannot charge them more than \$4,400 (including their prepayment amount) over the course  
 4 of their lifetimes. § 1812.86(c). Contracts that are non-compliant with § 1812.86 are void *ab*  
 5 *initio*, so Plaintiff O’Shea is entitled to have his membership fees refunded. Cal. Civ. Code §  
 6 1812.91.

7 105. 24 Hour Fitness also violated § 1812.92 by willfully and falsely, fraudulently,  
 8 and/or misleadingly representing to consumers that its prepaid memberships were lifetime  
 9 memberships, when the written contract contained no lifetime provisions. Consumers  
 10 reasonably relied on this representation by investing a substantial sum of money to purchase  
 11 a prepaid membership from 24 Hour Fitness in the belief that they were receiving a locked-in  
 12 lifetime rate. 24 Hour Fitness specifically trained its salespeople to tell consumers that they  
 13 were receiving lifetime memberships, even though such memberships did not exist on paper.  
 14 Because 24 Hour Fitness’s conduct violated §1812.92, its prepaid memberships are void *ab*  
 15 *initio*, so Plaintiff O’Shea is entitled to have his membership fees refunded. § 1812.92.

16 106. For 24 Hour Fitness’s violation of California’s Health Studio Services  
 17 Contract Law, Plaintiff O’Shea requests actual damages, treble damages, and attorneys’ fees,  
 18 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1812.94(a).

19 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
 20 **Unlawful Trade Practices Act**  
 21 **Or. Rev. Stat. §§ 646.638, *et seq.***  
 22 **(On behalf of Plaintiff Vitcov and the Oregon Subclass)**

23 107. Plaintiff Vitcov incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth  
 24 herein.

25 108. By orally representing that Plaintiff Vitcov would receive a “lifetime  
 26 membership” with a Lifetime Fee Guarantee when the written contract contained no such  
 27 lifetime provisions, 24 Hour Fitness violated the following provisions of Oregon’s UTPA:

- 28 • Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.608(e) (for representing that services have  
 “characteristics,” “benefits,” and “qualities” that they do not have);

- 1 • Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.608(j) (for making false or misleading statements of
- 2 facts regarding the existence of price reductions);
- 3 • Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.608(t) (for concurrently with delivery of services,
- 4 failing to disclose any known, material nonconformity);
- 5 • Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.608(u) (for engaging in unfair or deceptive conduct in
- 6 trade or commerce); and
- 7 • Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.608(cc) (for failing to furnish a written list of all
- 8 membership categories, which would have shown there was no lifetime
- 9 membership, and for orally selling a form of membership plan that was
- 10 not included on any written list). *See also* Or. St. § 646A.032.

11 109. By posting signs around its gyms stating “Lifetime Memberships,” 24 Hour  
12 Fitness violated Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.608(i) for advertising goods with the intent not to  
13 provide them as advertised.

14 110. Plaintiff Vitcov has suffered an ascertainable loss by overpaying beyond the  
15 orally promised lifetime cap on his Annual Renewal Fees. This loss was the direct result of  
16 Defendant’s aforementioned violations of Oregon’s UTPA.

17 111. On behalf of himself and others similarly situated, Plaintiff Vitcov requests  
18 the greater of: actual damages or statutory damages of \$200 per person, plus punitive  
19 damages, and any equitable relief the Court considers necessary or proper to remedy the  
20 violations of the UTPA. Plaintiff Vitcov also request costs and attorneys’ fees pursuant to §  
21 646.638(3).

22 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **Fraud**

24 **(On behalf of Plaintiff Vitcov and the Oregon Subclass)**

25 112. Plaintiff Vitcov incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth  
26 herein.

27 113. Defendant made a representation that Plaintiff Vitcov was purchasing a  
28 lifetime membership, which included a Lifetime Fee Guarantee.

1           114. Defendant’s representation was in fact false because: the written agreement  
2 nowhere contained the word “lifetime” and it even asserted 24 Hour Fitness’s right to raise  
3 the Annual Renewal Fee at any time.

4           115. The representation that Plaintiff Vitcov was buying a “lifetime membership”  
5 was material to the transaction because it went to the very core of what Plaintiff Vitcov  
6 believed he was buying.

7           116. 24 Hour Fitness knew or was willfully ignorant about the truth of its  
8 representation that the written agreement represented a “lifetime membership.”

9           117. 24 Hour Fitness intended for its representation that Plaintiff Vitcov was  
10 buying a “lifetime membership” to induce him to pay a significant amount of money up-front  
11 and to sign its written adhesion contract.

12           118. Plaintiff Vitcov did both of these things in reliance on Defendant’s oral  
13 representations.

14           119. Plaintiff Vitcov did not know that he was not in fact getting any written legal  
15 promise of a “lifetime” membership or a lifetime cap on Annual Renewal Fees.

16           120. Plaintiff Vitcov relied and had a right to rely on Defendant’s oral  
17 representations that the membership was a “lifetime membership”—both because Plaintiff  
18 Vitcov’s reliance was reasonable and because as the more sophisticated party in the  
19 transaction, 24 Hour Fitness was under a legal duty to accurately portray to Plaintiff Vitcov  
20 what he was signing.

21           121. Plaintiff Vitcov’s injuries—in overpaying for Annual Renewal Fees beyond  
22 the promised lifetime cap and not having the opportunity to seek a better deal—were directly  
23 and proximately caused by Defendant’s oral representation that Plaintiff Vitcov was  
24 purchasing and signing a “lifetime membership.”

25           122. Plaintiff Vitcov asks for compensatory and punitive damages subject to proof.  
26  
27  
28

**NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**Texas Health Spa Act**  
**Tex. Occ. Code §§ 702.001 *et seq.***  
**(On Behalf of Plaintiff Morris and the Texas Subclass)**

1  
2  
3 123. Plaintiff Morris incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth  
4 herein.

5 124. 24 Hour Fitness is a “health spa” within the meaning of Tex. Occ. Code §  
6 702.003(4).

7 125. In violation of § 702.402(a)(2)(D), 24 Hour Fitness made material  
8 misrepresentations to prospective members about the membership rights they would be  
9 receiving if they purchased a prepaid membership. 24 Hour Fitness told prospective members  
10 that they would be receiving a Lifetime Fee Guarantee, when—in fact—no such guarantee  
11 appeared in the written membership contract. Prospective members relied on the oral  
12 representation of a Lifetime Fee Guarantee in prepaying a substantial sum of money when  
13 purchasing their membership. Such members were harmed when 24 Hour Fitness raised their  
14 Annual Renewal Fees.

15 126. 24 Hour Fitness also violated § 702.311(3) by willfully and falsely,  
16 fraudulently, and/or misleadingly representing to consumers that its prepaid memberships  
17 were lifetime memberships, when the written contract contained no lifetime provisions.  
18 Consumers reasonably relied on this representation by investing a substantial sum of money  
19 to purchase a prepaid membership from 24 Hour Fitness in the belief that they were receiving  
20 a locked-in lifetime rate. 24 Hour Fitness specifically trained its salespeople to tell consumers  
21 that they were receiving lifetime memberships, even though such memberships did not exist  
22 on paper. Because 24 Hour Fitness’s conduct violated § 702.311(3), its prepaid memberships  
23 are void *ab initio*, so Plaintiff is entitled to have his membership fees returned. § 702.311(3).

24 127. For 24 Hour Fitness’s violation of the HSA, Plaintiff Morris requests actual  
25 damages, punitive damages, reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, and all proper equitable  
26 relief, including reformation to reflect a Lifetime Fee Guarantee and a permanent injunction  
27 requiring 24 Hour Fitness to retrain its sales staff to stop representing prepaid memberships  
28



1 as lifetime memberships.

2 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
3 **Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act**  
4 **Tex. Bus. & Com. Code §§ 17.50 *et seq.***  
5 **(On Behalf of Plaintiff Morris and the Texas Subclass)**

6 128. Plaintiff Morris incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if fully  
7 set forth herein.

8 (a) Unconscionable act or course of conduct

9 129. By orally promising consumers a “lifetime membership” when none existed in  
10 writing with the intent to later claim that no such agreement existed, 24 Hour Fitness engaged  
11 in an “unconscionable action or course of action” in violation of Tex. Bus. & Com. Code §  
12 17.50(a)(3).

13 130. 24 Hour Fitness took advantage of consumers’ lack of legal knowledge and  
14 experience in a grossly unfair manner.

15 (b) Enumerated violations

16 131. By misleading consumers as to the nature of the written contract and as to the  
17 existence in the writing of a “lifetime membership” with its attendant Lifetime Fee  
18 Guarantee, 24 Hour Fitness used a false, misleading, or deceptive practice. 24 Hour Fitness’s  
19 conduct—when coupled with consumers’ detrimental reliance on its oral representations and  
20 24 Hour Fitness’s violation of an enumerated provision of Tex. Bus. & Com. Code §  
21 17.46(b)—constitutes a violation of the Texas DTPA.

22 132. 24 Hour Fitness’s misleading oral representation that its written adhesion  
23 contracts contained “lifetime” guarantees violates the following enumerated provisions of the  
24 DTPA:

- 25 • § 17.46(b)(5): for representing that services have “characteristics” that they in  
26 fact do not have;
- 27 • § 17.46(b)(7): for representing that services are of a particular type when they  
28 are not;
- § 17.46(b)(11): for making false or misleading statements about the existence

1 of price reductions;

- 2 • § 17.46(b)(12): for representing that an agreement confers legal rights that it
- 3 does not confer;
- 4 • § 17.46(b)(14): for misrepresenting the authority of a salesman to negotiate
- 5 the final terms of a consumer contract;
- 6 • § 17.46(b)(24): for failing to disclose information concerning services—which
- 7 was known at the time of the transaction—when such failure to disclose was
- 8 intended to induce the consumer into a transaction into which the consumer
- 9 would not have entered had the information been disclosed; and
- 10 • Tex. Occ. Code § 702.402(a)(2)(D): for making material misrepresentations to
- 11 prospective members about the membership rights they would be receiving if
- 12 they purchased a prepaid membership. A violation of Tex. Occ. Code §
- 13 702.402(a)(2)(D) is also a violation of the DTPA. Tex. Occ. Code § 702.403.

14 133. Also, 24 Hour Fitness’s placing signs on its gyms stating “Lifetime

15 Memberships” constituted advertising services with intent not to sell them as advertised, in

16 violation of Tex. Bus. & Com. Code § 17.46(b)(9).

17 134. Plaintiff Morris is a consumer within the meaning of the DTPA and has

18 suffered economic damages—in the form of overpayments and opportunity costs in failing to

19 seek a better deal—as a direct result from 24 Hour Fitness’s violations of the DTPA.

20 135. 24 Hour Fitness’s conduct was a producing cause of Plaintiff Morris’s

21 damages.

22 136. Plaintiff Morris asks for economic damages equal to any money had and

23 received by 24 Hour Fitness that constituted an overpayment of the Annual Renewal Fee

24 above-and-beyond the orally promised lifetime cap. Plaintiff Morris additionally seeks treble

25 damages as punitive damages under the DTPA. Awarding treble damages in this case is

26 necessary to encourage private enforcement of Texas’s consumer protection laws. Pursuant

27 to § 17.50(d), Plaintiff Morris also requests attorneys’ fees. Lastly, Plaintiff Morris requests

28

1 any other relief the Court deems proper, as permitted by the DTPA.

2 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
3 **Fraud**  
4 **(On Behalf of Plaintiff Morris and the Texas Subclass)**

5 137. Plaintiff Morris incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth  
6 herein.

7 *(a) Fraudulent misrepresentation*

8 138. A representation was made by 24 Hour Fitness that Plaintiff Morris was  
9 buying a “lifetime membership,” with a Lifetime Fee Guarantee. This representation was  
10 material because Plaintiff Morris would not have purchased the membership or would have  
11 demanded to pay less for it if he knew that the contract did not reflect any lifetime  
12 guarantees.

13 139. The representation was false: 24 Hour Fitness’s written contract contained no  
14 “lifetime” guarantees.

15 140. At the time the statement was made, 24 Hour Fitness knew it was false or  
16 acted with reckless disregard of its truth.

17 141. 24 Hour Fitness made the representation with the intent that it induce Plaintiff  
18 Morris to sign the written agreement and pay a substantial sum up-front in the belief he was  
19 receiving a “lifetime membership.”

20 142. Plaintiff Morris in fact relied on the representation of a “lifetime membership”  
21 by purchasing the membership and signing the written contract.

22 143. Plaintiff Morris thereby suffered injury by overpaying Annual Renewal Fees  
23 beyond the capped-amount and by losing an opportunity to seek more advantageous  
24 membership options from other fitness-providers or from 24 Hour Fitness itself.

25 *(b) Fraud by nondisclosure*

26 144. Alternatively, Plaintiff Morris pleads fraud by nondisclosure.

27 145. 24 Hour Fitness failed to disclose to Plaintiff Morris that the written adhesion  
28 contract did not contain the word “lifetime” anywhere in it and did not reflect any of the oral

1 representations of its salespeople of a “lifetime” membership.

2 146. 24 Hour Fitness did not disclose that the written contract did not contain a  
3 Lifetime Fee Guarantee.

4 147. By making oral suggestions to the contrary, Defendant had a duty to inform  
5 Plaintiff Morris that the written contract did not contain these material provisions.

6 148. These provisions were material because Plaintiff Morris would not have  
7 bought a membership with 24 Hour Fitness or would have sought a better deal if he had  
8 known that the written contract did not contain any “lifetime” guarantees.

9 149. Defendant knew that Plaintiff Morris was ignorant of these facts, and Plaintiff  
10 Morris was not on equal footing with Defendant in terms of discovering these facts because  
11 Defendant drafted the adhesion contract.

12 150. Defendant was deliberately silent in correcting Plaintiff Morris’s belief that  
13 the written contract contained lifetime guarantees.

14 151. By failing to disclose these facts, 24 Hour Fitness intended to induce Plaintiff  
15 Morris to sign the written contract and pay a substantial sum of money up-front in exchange  
16 for what Plaintiff *believed* was a “lifetime membership.”

17 152. Plaintiff Morris relied on Defendant’s nondisclosure in signing the agreement  
18 and paying the up-front agreed sum.

19 153. Plaintiff Morris was injured by acting without knowledge that the adhesion  
20 contract did not reflect a true lifetime membership because 24 Hour Fitness later used the  
21 terms of the written contract to raise the Annual Renewal Fees beyond the orally represented  
22 lifetime-cap.

23 154. Plaintiff Morris asks for compensatory and punitive damages for Defendant’s  
24 fraudulent conduct.

25 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

26 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the Class, respectfully request  
27 that the Court enter an order:

1 A. Certifying this case as a class action on behalf of the Class defined above,  
2 appointing Plaintiffs as representatives of the Class, and appointing their counsel as class  
3 counsel;

4 B. Declaring that Plaintiffs are entitled to reformation of their written contracts to  
5 reflect a lifetime membership with its attended guarantees;

6 C. Declaring that Defendant's conduct, as set out above, violates the CLRA,  
7 UCL, HSSCL, UTPA, DTPA, and HSA;

8 D. Declaring that Defendant's conduct constitutes fraud;

9 E. Awarding damages, including restitutionary, statutory, and punitive damages  
10 where applicable, to Plaintiffs and the Class in an amount to be determined at trial;

11 F. Awarding Plaintiffs and the Class their reasonable litigation expenses and  
12 attorneys' fees;

13 G. Awarding Plaintiffs and the Class pre- and post-judgment interest, to the  
14 extent allowable;

15 H. Awarding such other injunctive and declaratory relief as is necessary to  
16 protect the interests of Plaintiffs and the Class; and

17 I. Awarding such other and further relief as the Court deems reasonable and just.

18 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

19 Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury for all issues so triable.

20 Respectfully submitted,

21 **KEVIN O'SHEA, MARK VITCOV, and**  
22 **ROD MORRIS**, individually and on behalf of  
all others similarly situated

23 Dated: April 2, 2016

24 By: /s/ Todd M. Logan  
One of Plaintiffs' Attorneys

25 Todd M. Logan (SBN 305912)  
26 tlogan@edelson.com  
EDELSON PC  
27 329 Bryant Street, Suite 2C  
San Francisco, California 94107  
28 Tel: 415.212.9300

Fax: 415.373.9435

*Attorney for Plaintiffs and the Putative Class*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Kevin O'Shea, Mark Vitcov, and Rod Morris

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Mateo (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Edelson PC, 329 Bryant Street, San Francisco, CA 94107, 415.212.9300

DEFENDANTS

24 Hour Fitness USA, Inc.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Contra Costa (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff, 2 U.S. Government Defendant, 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party), 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, PTF DEF, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Table with 5 columns: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES. Includes various legal categories like Insurance, Personal Injury, Real Estate, etc.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding, 2 Removed from State Court, 3 Remanded from Appellate Court, 4 Reinstated or Reopened, 5 Transferred from Another District, 6 Multidistrict Litigation

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 28 U.S. Code § 1332(d)(2)(A)

Brief description of cause: Action for fraud based on Defendant's false representation of a "lifetime" membership rate.

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ 5,000,000+ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE April 1, 2016 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Todd Logan

(Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND, SAN JOSE, EUREKA

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44**

## Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.  
 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.  
 United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.  
 Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.  
 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.  
 Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.  
 Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.  
 Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.  
 Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.  
 Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.  
 Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.
- VI. Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.  
 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.  
 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.
- Date and Attorney Signature.** Date and sign the civil cover sheet.