1	MARK BRNOVICH		
2	ATTORNEY GENERAL		
3	(Firm State Bar No. 14000)		
4	MATTHEW DU MEE (STATE BAR NO. 028468) CONSUMER LITIGATION UNIT CHIEF COUNSEL		
	OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 2005 North Central Avenue		
5	Phoenix, AZ 85004-1592		
6	Telephone: (602) 542-7757		
7	Facsimile: (602) 542-4377		
8	Attorneys for the State of Arizona		
9	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA		
10	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA		
11	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARKEOTA		
12	STATE OF ARIZONA, ex rel. MARK Case No.		
13	BRNOVICH, Attorney General,  COMPLAINT		
14	Plaintiff, (Assigned to the Hon.		
15	V.		
16			
17	GUARDIAN PROTECTION SERVICES, INC.,		
18			
19	Defendant.		
	Plaintiff, State of Arizona <i>ex rel</i> . Mark Brnovich, the Attorney General (the "State"),		
20			
21	alleges the following for its Civil Complaint (the "Complaint") against Defendant Guardian		
22	Protection Services, Inc. ("Defendant" or "Guardian").		
23	NATURE OF CLAIMS		
24	1. Guardian directly and/or indirectly through its agents, convinced Arizona		

consumers to enter into contracts with unfair provisions pertaining to advertising, selling,

installing, monitoring and servicing electronic security systems to consumers, including non-

disclosure of automatic renewal terms; inadequately disclosed automatic renewal terms; non-

disclosure of options for canceling; non-disclosure of early termination fees; early termination

25

26

27

28

fees; early termination fees that bear no relationship to any amount lost or incurred by Defendant as a result of the customer's termination of services.

- 2. Guardian also misrepresented its inability to cancel some consumers' contracts after the consumers complained of deceptive, unfair and/or fraudulent acts, practices and/or omissions during the advertisement and/or sale of their security systems.
- 3. In addition, Guardian required consumers to pay substantial early termination fees for canceling their contracts, equaling the amount covering the entire remaining period of consumers' contracts, regardless of the size of that amount or its relationship to Defendant's expenses.
- 4. As a result of Guardian's actions, Arizona consumers collectively paid hundreds of thousands of dollars in unexpected and unfair early termination fees.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 5. The State brings this action pursuant to the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act, Arizona Revised Statutes ("A.R.S.") §§ 44-1521 to -1534, to obtain injunctive relief to permanently enjoin and prevent the unlawful acts and practices alleged in this Complaint, and to obtain other relief, including restitution, disgorgement of profits, gains, gross receipts, or other benefits, civil penalties, and costs and attorneys' fees.
  - 6. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction.
- 7. This Court may issue appropriate orders both prior to and following a determination of liability pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1528.
- 8. Defendant caused events to occur in this state out of which the claims which are the subject of this Complaint arose.
  - 9. Venue is proper in Maricopa County pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-401(17).

#### **PARTIES**

- 10. Plaintiff is the State of Arizona *ex rel*. Mark Brnovich, the Attorney General of Arizona, who is authorized to bring this action under the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act (the "CFA"), A.R.S. §§ 44-1521 to -1534.
  - 11. Defendant Guardian is a Pennsylvania corporation doing business in Arizona, with

7 8

9

11

12

10

13

15 16

14

17

18 19

21

22

20

23

24

25

26

27

28

its principal place of business in Warrendale, Pennsylvania.

#### **ALLEGATIONS**

- 12. Guardian sold alarm monitoring services to consumers in Arizona.
- 13. Guardian typically sold its services to homeowners through door-to-door salespeople, who attempted to convince consumers to sign an alarm-monitoring contract.
- As one might expect, Guardian's contracts obligated consumers to pay a monthly fee for Guardian's services over a set number of years. However, the contracts also contained other obligations that many consumers would not expect, including automatic renewal terms and early termination fees.
- 15. Most notably, Guardian contracts imposed early termination fees equal to all of the consumer's remaining monthly payments, regardless of the amount of the remaining payments.
- 16. For example, a consumer who purchased a five-year plan, but then chose to cancel after two months would be forced to pay for the remaining 58 months of the plan.
- 17. Many of Guardian's contracts inadequately disclosed these key terms either or did not disclose these key terms at all.
- 18. Guardian's contracts also inadequately disclosed cancellation options, and in some cases, Guardian misrepresented its inability to cancel consumers' contracts after the consumers complained of deceptive, unfair and/or fraudulent acts, practices and/or omissions during the advertisement and/or sale of their security systems.
- 19. As a result of Guardian's actions, Arizona consumers collectively paid hundreds of thousands of dollars in unexpected and unfair early termination fees, paid for automatically renewed services without adequate disclosure, and paid for contracts that they should have been able to cancel.

///

///

///

///

# 

## 

## 

## 

## 

# 

## 

#### FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

## VIOLATIONS OF THE ARIZONA CONSUMER FRAUD ACT,

### A.R.S. §§ 44-1521 to -1534

(Against Defendant Guardian Protection Services)

- 20. The State realleges all prior allegations of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 21. The conduct described in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint constitutes deception, deceptive or unfair acts or practices, fraud, false pretenses, false promises, misrepresentations, or concealment, suppression or omission of material facts with intent that others rely on such concealment, suppression or omission, in connection with the sale or advertisement of merchandise in violation of A.R.S. §§ 44-1521 to -1534, including, but not limited to:
- a. Defendant Guardian engaged in deceptive and unfair acts and practices by charging early termination fees equal to the entire amount of remaining payments in the contract;
- b. Defendant Guardian concealed, suppressed, or omitted material facts, including the details of its early termination fees, and did so with intent that others rely on such concealments, suppressions, or omissions;
- c. Defendant Guardian engaged in deceptive and unfair acts and practices by auto-renewing contracts without providing adequate notice;
- d. Defendant Guardian concealed, suppressed, or omitted material facts, including the details of its automatic renewal provisions, and did so with intent that others rely on such concealments, suppressions, or omissions;
- e. Defendant Guardian engaged in deceptive and unfair acts and practices by failing to cancel contracts upon request; and
- f. Defendant Guardian concealed, suppressed, or omitted material facts, including the details of its cancellation policies, and did so with intent that others rely on such concealments, suppressions, or omissions.

///

///

///

26

27

28

1	29.	Award	
2	circumstances.		
3	DAT	ΓED this 2.	
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			

the State such further relief the Court deems just and proper under the

23<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2020.

MARK BRNOVICH Attorney General

Matthew du Mee

Consumer Litigation Unit Chief Counsel

Attorneys for the State of Arizona