1 2 3 4 5	MAUREEN E. McCLAIN (State Bar No. 062050) Email: mcclain@kmm.com ALEX HERNAEZ (State Bar No. 201441) Email: hernaez@kmm.com KAUFF McCLAIN & McGUIRE LLP One Post Street, Suite 2600 San Francisco, California 94104 Telephone: (415) 421-3111 Facsimile: (415) 421-0938		
6 7	Attorneys for Defendant DOLLAR TREE STORES, INC.		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	MIGUEL A. CRUZ, and JOHN D. HANSEN, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	CASE NO. C 07-02050 JL	
12		DEFENDANT DOLLAR TREE STORES, INC.'S NOTICE OF	
13	Plaintiffs,	MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS'	
14	V.	COMPLAINT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES	
15	DOLLAR TREE STORES, INC.,	IN SUPPORT THEREOF	
16	Defendant.	[Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12(b)(6)]	
17		DATE: TBD TIME:	
18		DEPT: JUDGE: Pending Assignment	
19		COMPLAINT FILED: April 11, 2007	
20	TRIAL DATE: No date set.		
21	TO PLAINTIFFS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:		
22	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on a date certain ¹ to be set by the United		
23	States District Court for the Northern District of California, Defendant Dollar Tree Stores,		
24	Inc. ("Dollar Tree") will ask that, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12(b)(6), the Court		
25	dismiss Count VII ("Fraud and Deceit") of the Complaint filed on April 11, 2007 by		
26	Defendant has filed a Declination to Proceed Before a Magistrate Judge and Request for Reassignment to a United States District Judge. Defendant has not selected a hearing date for this motion because this action has not yet been assigned to a United States District Judge.		
27			
28	and more you book as	in the second of	

KAUFF, MCCLAIN & MCGUIRE LLP ONE POST STREET SUITE 2600 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104 TELEPHONE (415) 421-3111

Case3:07-cv-02050-SC Document5 Filed05/09/07 Page2 of 6

1	Plaintiffs Miguel A. Cruz and John D. Hansen ("Plaintiffs"). Count VII should be	
2	dismissed because Plaintiffs have not complied with the heightened pleading	
3	requirements of Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 9(b), which mandates that fraud be alleged v	vith
4	particularity.	
5	The motion will be based upon this Notice of Motion and Motion and upon	
6	the Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the argument of counsel, the pleadings and	
7	papers filed herein, and any other matters properly considered by the Court.	
8	8 DATED: May 9, 2007 Respectfully submitted,	
9	9 KAUFF McCLAIN & McGUIRE LLF	,
10	0	
11	By: /S/ ALEX HERNAEZ	
12	2	
13	Attorneys for Defendant DOLLAR TREE STORES, INC.	
14	4 115533.v1	
15	5	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23 24		
24 25		
25 26		
20 27		
28 AIN LP ET	-2-	

KAUFF, MCCLAIN & MCGUIRE LLP ONE POST STREET SUITE 2600 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104 TELEPHONE (415) 421-3111

1

2

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

KAUFF, MCCLAIN & MCGUIRE LLP ONE POST STREET SUITE 2600 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104 TELEPHONE (415) 421-3111

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. RELIEF REQUESTED

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12(b)(6), Dollar Tree respectfully requests that the court dismiss Count VII for "Fraud and Deceit" because it is not pled with sufficient particularity as required by Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 9(b).

II. RELEVANT FACTS

On April 7, 2007, Plaintiffs, both have been employed by Dollar Tree as Store Managers (¶¶ 12-13), filed their "Complaint for Damages, Injunctive Relief and Restitution." The Complaint is styled as a putative class action and it alleges nine separate causes of action.¹ The primary issue raised by Plaintiffs is whether they, as Store Managers, were classified correctly as "exempt" employees under state and federal law (¶ 8).

III. ARGUMENT

Under California law, the elements of fraud, which gives rise to the tort action for deceit, are (a) misrepresentation (false representation, concealment, or nondisclosure); (b) knowledge of falsity; (c) intent to defraud, i.e., to induce reliance; (d) justifiable reliance; and (e) resulting damage. Small v. Fritz Companies, Inc., 30 Cal. 4th 167, 173 (2003); see also Glen Holly Entertainment, Inc. v. Tektronix, Inc., 100 F. Supp. 2d 1086, 1093 (C.D. Cal. 1999).

"To survive a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6), a complaint generally must satisfy only the minimal notice pleading requirements of Rule 8(a)(2)." Porter v. Jones, 319 F.3d 483, 494 (9th Cir. 2003). However, where, as here, "a complaint includes allegations of fraud, Federal Rule of

The nine Causes of Action are: Failure to Pay overtime (Count I); Failure to Pay Unpaid Wages at Termination (Count II); Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements (Count III); Meal Break Violations (Count IV); Rest Break Violations (Count V); Unfair Competition and Unfair Business Practices (Count VI); Fraud and Deceit (Count VII); Unjust Enrichment / Constructive Trust (Count VIII); and Equitable Relief including Preliminary and Permanent Injunctions (IX).

1 2 3

4

5

6

7 8

10 11

12

9

13 14

16 17

15

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26

27

KAUFF, McCLAIN & McGuire llp ONE POST STREET SUITE 2600 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104 TELEPHONE (415) 421-3111 Civil Procedure 9(b) requires more specificity including an account of the time, place, and specific content of the false representations as well as the identities of the parties to the misrepresentations." Swartz v. KPMG LLP, 476 F.3d 756, 764 (9th Cir. 2007) (internal citations and quotations omitted).

"To comply with Rule 9(b), allegations of fraud must be specific enough to give defendants notice of the particular misconduct which is alleged to constitute the fraud charged so that they can defend against the charge and not just deny that they have done anything wrong." Id. Accordingly, "Plaintiff[s] must attribute false or misleading statements to a particular defendant and must set forth specific descriptions of the fraudulent representation. Allegations which are vague and conclusory are insufficient to satisfy Rule 9." Campbell v. Allstate Ins. Co., 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12550 (C.D. Cal. 1998). Moreover, where the defendant is a corporation, the complaint should identify the particular agent, employee or officer accused of uttering the alleged misrepresentation. Swartz, 476 F.3d at 764; see also Herndon v. Scientific Applications Int'l Corp., 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 79520 (S.D. Cal. 2006) (dismissing complaint where, inter alia, plaintiff did not identify the individuals who executed or negotiated the allegedly fraudulent contracts, billings, or certifications); United States ex rel. Man Tai Lam v. Tenet Healthcare Corp., 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 95946 (W. D. Tex. 2006) (dismissing fraud claim against hospital where plaintiff failed to specifically identify the physicians accused of fraud).

Here, Count VII alleges two theories—first, that certain unnamed individuals "suppressed facts and did not disclose to Plaintiffs" that Plaintiffs were nonexempt under state and federal law (¶ 78); and second, that certain unnamed individuals incorrectly represented to Plaintiffs that Plaintiffs are exempt under state and federal law (¶ 79). The generality of these allegations cannot be reconciled with Rule 9(b)'s command that "the circumstances constituting fraud or mistake shall be stated with particularity."

KAUFF, MCCLAIN & MCGUIRE LLP ONE POST STREET SUITE 2600 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104 TELEPHONE (415) 421-3111 Instead of specifically "identifying the parties to the misrepresentation," Plaintiffs state only that Dollar Tree acted "through its officers, human resource directors, regional managers, district managers, area managers, and others" (¶ 77) (emphasis added). This open-ended list is insufficient on its face. Indeed, the inclusion of the phrase "and others" renders the pleading worthless to Dollar Tree. In order "to defend against the charge and not just deny that it has done anything wrong," Dollar Tree must know who Plaintiffs believe "possessed knowledge of wrongdoing" and improperly "suppressed" this knowledge (¶ 78). Likewise, it must know who Plaintiffs believe made the supposedly "continuous" false representations (¶ 79).

Nor does the Complaint include "an account of the time, place, and specific content of the false representations." Swartz, 476 F.3d at 764; see also Edwards v. Marin Park, Inc., 356 F.3d 1058, 1066 (9th Cir. 2004) (To avoid dismissal under Rule 9(b), Plaintiffs' Complaint must "state the time, place, and specific content of the false representations."). Instead, Plaintiffs include a single summary of their theory (¶ 79) and then another open-ended list of places where presumably some variation of this statement was uttered—i.e., "[t]hrough hiring interviews, meetings, inter-office memos, employment forms, job descriptions, and other methods" (¶ 79)(emphasis added). Plaintiffs do not even attempt to carry their "time, place and content" pleading burden. And, as previously explained, the inclusion of the ambiguous "and other methods" phrase renders this allegation of no value to Dollar Tree.

Finally, to the extent that Plaintiffs rely on supposedly fraudulent assertions contained in documents such as "inter-office memos, employment forms [and] job descriptions" (¶ 79), Dollar Tree is entitled to a comprehensive list thereof. E.g., Behrman v. Allstate Life Ins. Co., 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7262 * 9 (S. D. Fla. 2005) (affirming dismissal of fraud claim where plaintiff failed to identify "the specified documents or oral representations in which such statements or omissions were allegedly made"); see also Marin Park, Inc., 356 F.3d at 1066 (affirming dismissal of fraud claim

Case3:07-cv-02050-SC Document5 Filed05/09/07 Page6 of 6

1	where plaintiff failed to "attach the [allegedly fraudulent] notices to her complaint or to		
2	any other filing in this case").		
3	IV. CONCLUSION		
4	For the foregoing reasons, the court should dismiss Count VII pursuant to		
5	Fed. R. Civ. proc. 12(b)(6).		
6	DATED: May 9, 2007	Respectfully submitted,	
7		KAUFF McCLAIN & McGUIRE LLP	
8			
9		By: /S/ ALEX HERNAEZ	
10		ALEX HERNAEZ	
11		Attorneys for Defendant DOLLAR TREE STORES, INC.	
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
2425			
26 26			
26 27			
28 LAIN LLP EET		-6-	

KAUFF, MCCLAIN & MCGUIRE LLP ONE POST STREET SUITE 2600 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104 TELEPHONE (415) 421-3111