

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ARTURO AMAYA, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
SPARK ENERGY GAS, LLC, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [15-cv-02326-JSW](#)

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE MOTION TO COMPEL
ARBITRATION; DENYING MOTION
TO DISMISS; AND GRANTING
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
CONTINUE HEARING DATE FOR
MOTION FOR CLASS
CERTIFICATION**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 48, 71

Now before the Court is the motion of Defendant Spark Energy Gas, LLC, individually and as successor-in-interest to Defendant Spark Energy Gas, L.P., (“Defendants”) to dismiss all claims in the First Amended Complaint and to compel arbitration of the claims of Plaintiff Barbara Gehrke.¹ The Court has considered the parties’ papers, relevant legal authority, and the record in this case. For the reasons that follow, the Court hereby DENIES WITHOUT PREJUDICE the motion to compel arbitration and DENIES the motion to dismiss. Additionally, the Court GRANTS Plaintiffs’ administrative motion to continue the schedule for the briefing and hearing of Plaintiffs’ motion for class certification.²

BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs allege that Defendants are retail energy suppliers that provide retail utilities services including natural gas and electricity. Plaintiffs are former customers of Defendants.

¹ Defendants’ motion to dismiss includes a request for dismissal of the claims of then-Plaintiff Margaret Smith. This portion of the motion, however, is moot in light of the November 18, 2015 notice of withdrawal of Plaintiff Smith. (Dkt. No. 53.)

² The Clerk has terminated Docket No. 69, as superseded by Docket No. 71.

1 Plaintiffs allege that Defendants engage in fraudulent and deceptive bait and switch sales
2 practices. Specifically, Plaintiffs allege that in or around October 2014, a representative of
3 Defendants approached Plaintiff Arturo Amaya at his home in Los Angeles, California and
4 convinced him to switch his energy provider from the Southern California Gas Company to Spark.
5 (First Amended Class Action Complaint (“FAC”) ¶ 12.) The discussion was “apparently
6 ‘scripted.’” (*Id.*) “The representative from Spark informed Plaintiff Amaya that he was signing
7 people up for a program designed to help low income families save money on their energy bills.
8 Specifically, the representative assured Plaintiff Amaya that his gas bills would decrease by”
9 twenty-five percent. (*Id.*) However, instead of decreasing, Plaintiff Amaya’s bills increased by
10 approximately twenty to thirty percent. (*Id.* ¶ 13.)

11 Likewise, as to Plaintiff Gehrke, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants’ representatives
12 approached her at her home in Rancho Cordova, California in or around February 2015. (*Id.*
13 ¶ 14.) In an “apparently ‘scripted’ conversation,” Defendants’ representative convinced her to
14 switch to Spark by promising her that her energy bills would go down. (*Id.*) Instead, her energy
15 bills increased by approximately one hundred percent. (*Id.* ¶ 16.) Ms. Gehrke also was
16 guaranteed that “she would receive a percentage savings, as specified in a ‘welcome letter’ off of
17 PG&E’s base energy rate for natural gas in the first two months with Spark.” (*Id.* ¶ 15.) When the
18 welcome letter arrived, however, it did not provide savings, but “quoted the exact same gas billing
19 rate that she would have received if she maintained Pacific Gas & Electric as her energy
20 provider.” (*Id.*)

21 In addition to these specific allegations, the FAC includes additional allegations relating to
22 the broader scheme, to the effect that the deceptive and high-pressure representations made by
23 Defendants’ representatives “were derived from Spark selling scripts, marketing and training
24 materials,” were part of a pyramid-marketing scheme, and targeted “low-income earners, the
25 elderly and non-English speaking persons,” and were made more harmful by a lengthy and
26 difficult cancellation process. (*Id.* ¶¶ 17, 25-28.)

27 Plaintiffs allege the following claims on behalf of a putative class: (1) violation of
28 California’s Consumer Legal Remedies Act, California Civil Code section 1750 *et seq.*;

1 (2) common law fraud; (3) deceit by concealment in violation of California Civil Code sections
 2 1709 and 1710; (4) breach of contract and of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing;
 3 (5) violation of California's false advertising law, California Business and Professions Code
 4 section 17500, *et seq.*; (6) violation of California's false advertising law, California Business and
 5 Professions Code section 17507, *et seq.*; (7) violation of California's Unfair Competition Law,
 6 California Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* ("unfair" and "fraudulent"
 7 prongs); (8) violation of California's Unfair Competition Law, California Business and
 8 Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* ("unlawful" prong); and (9) negligent misrepresentation.

9 The Court shall address additional facts as necessary in its analysis.

10 ANALYSIS

11 A. Defendants' Motion to Compel Arbitration.

12 1. Legal Standards Applicable to the Motion to Compel Arbitration.

13 Pursuant to the Federal Arbitration Act ("FAA"), arbitration agreements "shall be valid,
 14 irrevocable, and enforceable, save upon such grounds that exist at law or in equity for the
 15 revocation of any contract." 9 U.S.C. § 2. Once the Court has determined that an arbitration
 16 agreement involves a transaction involving interstate commerce, thereby falling under the FAA,
 17 the Court "must issue an order compelling arbitration if the following two-pronged test is
 18 satisfied: (1) a valid agreement to arbitrate exists; and (2) that agreement encompasses the dispute
 19 at issue." *United Computer Systems v. AT&T Corp.*, 298 F.3d 756, 766 (9th Cir. 2002); *see also*
 20 9 U.S.C. §§ 2, 4; *Chiron Corp. v. Ortho Diagnostic Sys., Inc.*, 207 F.3d 1126, 1130 (9th Cir.
 21 2000).

22 The FAA represents the "liberal federal policy favoring arbitration agreements," and "any
 23 doubts concerning the scope of arbitrable issues should be resolved in favor of arbitration." *Moses*
 24 *H. Cone Memorial Hospital v. Mercury Constr. Corp.*, 460 U.S. 1, 24-25 (1983). Under the FAA,
 25 "once [the Court] is satisfied that an agreement for arbitration has been made and has not been
 26 honored," and the dispute falls within the scope of that agreement, the Court must order
 27 arbitration. *Prima Paint Corp. v. Flood & Conklin Mfg. Co.*, 388 U.S. 395, 400 (1967). The
 28 "central purpose of the [FAA is] to ensure that private agreements to arbitrate are enforced

1 according to their terms.” *Mastrobuono v. Shearson Lehman Hutton, Inc.*, 514 U.S. 52, 53-54
2 (1995) (quotation omitted). The “preeminent concern of Congress in passing the [FAA] was to
3 enforce private agreements into which parties had entered, a concern which requires that [courts]
4 rigorously enforce agreements to arbitrate.” *Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth,*
5 *Inc.*, 473 U.S. 614, 625-26 (1985) (quotations omitted). When determining whether the arbitration
6 clause encompasses the claims at issue, “all doubts are to be resolved in favor of arbitrability.”
7 *Simula v. Autoliv*, 175 F.3d 716, 721 (9th Cir. 1999). The party resisting arbitration bears the
8 burden of showing the arbitration agreement is invalid or does not encompass the claims at issue.
9 *See Green Tree Fin. Corp.–Ala. v. Randolph*, 531 U.S. 79, 91-92 (2000).

10 However, a separate question exists when the Court is presented with the issue of whether
11 an agreement between the parties to arbitrate “was ever concluded.” *Buckeye Check Cashing, Inc.*
12 *v. Cardegna*, 546 U.S. 440, 444 n.1 (2006). The parties agree that the party moving to compel
13 arbitration has the burden to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that an agreement to
14 arbitrate exists. (Dkt. Nos. 56, 57.) To be enforceable, an arbitration agreement must first be
15 valid as a matter of state contract law. *First Options of Chicago, Inc. v. Kaplan*, 514 U.S. 938,
16 944 (1995). As to that question, the burden remains on the party moving to compel arbitration.
17 *See United Computer*, 756 F.3d at 766 (“[T]here is no evidence that either NCR or Lucent ever
18 entered into such an agreement with UCS [T]he burden remains upon UCS to demonstrate
19 why either one of those entities should remain in this litigation.”); *Bruni v. Didion*, 160 Cal. App.
20 4th 1272, 1282 (2008) (“The petitioner bears the burden of proving the existence of a valid
21 arbitration agreement by the preponderance of the evidence.”). The party opposing the petition to
22 arbitrate, however, retains “the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence any fact
23 necessary to its defense.” *Bruni*, 160 Cal. Appl 4th at 1282, *cited in Li v. A Perfect Day*
24 *Franchise, Inc.*, No. 10-cv-01189-LHK, 2011 WL 250418, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Jan 25, 2011).
25 “When considering a motion to compel arbitration, the court applies a standard similar to the
26 summary judgment standard of Fed. R. Civ. P. 56. . . . If there is doubt as to whether such an
27 agreement exists, the matter should be resolved through an evidentiary hearing or mini-trial.”
28 *Garbacz v. A.T. Kearny, Inc.*, No. C 05-05404 JSW, 2006 WL 870690, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 4,

1 2006) (quoting *McCarthy v. Providential Corp.*, No. C 94-0627 FMS, 1994 WL 387852, *2 (N.D.
2 Cal. July 19, 1994)).

3 **2. The Court Denies the Motion to Compel Arbitration.**

4 The disputed issue presented by Defendants' motion to compel arbitration concerns
5 whether a valid agreement to arbitrate was ever concluded between Defendants and Plaintiff
6 Barbara Gehrke. Defendants assert that the terms of service that they sent to Ms. Gehrke, and
7 which she accepted, contained an arbitration clause. Plaintiffs respond that the only terms of
8 service received by Ms. Gehrke did not contain any arbitration clause. Both sides have presented
9 evidence. The Court concludes that this disputed factual issue cannot be resolved on the present
10 record, and denies the motion to compel arbitration without prejudice.

11 In support of the motion, Defendants submit a January 19, 2015 welcome letter addressed
12 to Ms. Gehrke, accompanied by a document titled "California Residential and Small Commercial
13 Customer Disclosure Statement and Terms of Service." (Dkt. No. 48-7.) The top of pages 2-8 of
14 the terms of service document bears an identifying line that reads
15 "SEG_CA_RESI_SMCOMM_20140905." (*Id.*) Defendants submit these documents as exhibits
16 to the Declaration of Kira Jordan, the Senior Marketing Director for Spark Energy, LLC. (Dkt.
17 No. 48-1.) Jordan declares that she has personal knowledge of the authenticity of Defendants'
18 terms of service document due to her position within the company and "from reviewing Spark's
19 records," and that based on that knowledge, Defendants' copy of the welcome letter and terms of
20 service are true and correct.

21 On the other hand, Plaintiffs submit the declaration of Ms. Gehrke, who attaches what she
22 declares to be a true and correct copy of the January 19, 2015 welcome letter and terms of service
23 that she received from Defendants. (Dkt. No. 63-1.) The top of pages 2-7 of Plaintiff's terms of
24 service document bears an identifying line that reads "SEG_CA_RESI_SMCOMM_20140409."
25 (*Id.*) Plaintiffs initially submitted an unauthenticated copy of the welcome letter and terms of
26 service, with some of the pages duplicated and incorrectly ordered. (Dkt. No. 49-1.) In the
27 interest of justice and in the exercise of discretion, the Court gave Plaintiffs an opportunity to file
28 supplemental evidence to explain and attempt to cure these deficiencies (and Defendants an

1 opportunity to respond). Plaintiffs have done so, and have succeeded in raising a material issue of
2 fact regarding which version of the terms of service was mailed to Ms. Gehrke.

3 Indeed, on the present record, the Court finds that even if the burden of proof rested on
4 Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs have met that burden. Ms. Gehrke declares that she received the version of
5 the welcome letter and terms of service with no arbitration clause, and that she never received
6 another version prior to filing her complaint in this action. (Dkt. No. 63-1, ¶¶ 5-12.) This
7 declaration is unambiguous and within her personal knowledge.

8 On the other hand, even though Ms. Jordan has, Defendants contend, “personal knowledge
9 of how to review Spark’s CIS system and retrieve a customer’s Welcome Letter and [Terms of
10 Service],” (Dkt. No. 64, at 2:24-25), Ms. Jordan’s testimony submitted to the Court lacks
11 foundation with respect to Ms. Jordan’s basis of knowledge of how Defendants’ electronically-
12 maintained copies of the terms of service are created and stored. (Dkt. 56-1 at PDF 14-16 (Depo.
13 100-02).) For example, the Court cannot ascertain on the present record whether Defendants
14 receive from their third-party vendor and store an original PDF copy of the terms of service
15 actually sent by Defendants’ third-party vendor to each customer, or whether Defendants store
16 customer data that is used, at need, to re-generate a terms of service document that is intended to
17 duplicate the original based on inputs such as geographic region and the date the terms of service
18 document was sent to the customer. It is undisputed that the welcome letter and terms of service
19 were sent to Ms. Gehrke by a third-party vendor, although the identity and location of the third-
20 party vendor has been the subject of some dispute. (*e.g.*, Dkt. No. 64-1 ¶ 3.) Ms. Jordan’s
21 testimony that it is not possible to alter the PDF documents at will does not adequately answer the
22 question of how the documents are generated and stored in the first place, whether by Defendants,
23 the third party vendor, or someone else. (*e.g.*, Dkt. 57-2 at PDF 21, Depo. 179.) This ambiguity is
24 important because the addition of the arbitration clause to Defendants’ terms of service occurred
25 around the time that Ms. Gehrke’s terms of service were sent to her on January 19, 2015. Ms.
26 Jordan testified to her belief that the change in the terms of service was actually effectuated in late
27 December 2014 or early January 2015, but the present record does not disclose sufficient
28 foundation for that belief for the Court to determine that it is impossible that the third-party vendor

1 sent Ms. Gehrke the older version of the terms of service on January 19, 2015. (Dkt. 57-2 at PDF
2 15; Depo. 155.) And Ms. Gehrke’s declaration that she received the older version is evidence that
3 it is possible, raising a factual question.

4 Defendants have provided no testimony from a witness who can fill in the gaps in Ms.
5 Jordan’s knowledge. Nor, it seems, have they as yet had the opportunity to depose Ms. Gehrke
6 regarding her recent declaration. In short, the evidence Defendants have presented to date fails to
7 demonstrate the existence of a valid arbitration agreement between the parties. If the terms of
8 service agreed to by Ms. Gehrke did not include an arbitration clause, there is no valid arbitration
9 agreement, and Ms. Gehrke cannot be compelled to arbitrate. Accordingly, the Court DENIES
10 Defendants’ motion to compel.

11 The Court does not reach Defendants’ objections to the Chase Declaration and to
12 paragraphs 1-4 of the Gehrke Declaration. The Court does not need to reach those issues to decide
13 that paragraphs 5-12 of the Gehrke Declaration are sufficient to rebut Defendants’ evidentiary
14 showing and raise a factual issue with regard to which terms of service were sent to Ms. Gehrke.

15 Pursuant to 9 U.S.C. § 4, “[i]f the making of the arbitration agreement or the failure,
16 neglect, or refusal to perform the same be in issue, the court shall proceed summarily to the trial
17 thereof.” Thus, the Court may hold a trial or evidentiary hearing to resolve whether an agreement
18 to arbitrate exists. This denial of the motion to compel arbitration is WITHOUT PREJUDICE to
19 Defendants renewing their motion after additional discovery, or filing a motion for the Court to
20 conduct an evidentiary hearing or other proceeding on this issue.

21 **B. Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss.**

22 **1. Legal Standards Applicable to the Motion to Dismiss.**

23 A motion to dismiss is proper under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) where the
24 complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. The Court’s “inquiry is limited
25 to the allegations in the complaint, which are accepted as true and construed in the light most
26 favorable to the plaintiff.” *Lazy Y Ranch LTD v. Behrens*, 546 F.3d 580, 588 (9th Cir. 2008).
27 Even under the liberal pleadings standard of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2), “a plaintiff’s
28 obligation to provide the ‘grounds’ of his ‘entitle[ment] to relief’ requires more than labels and

1 conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” *Bell Atl.*
2 *Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (citing *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 286 (1986)).

3 Pursuant to *Twombly*, a plaintiff must not merely allege conduct that is conceivable but
4 must allege “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Id.* at 570. “A
5 claim has facial plausibility when the Plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw
6 the reasonable inference that the Defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Ashcroft v.*
7 *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). If the allegations are
8 insufficient to state a claim, a court should grant leave to amend, unless amendment would be
9 futile. *See, e.g., Reddy v. Litton Indus., Inc.*, 912 F.2d 291, 296 (9th Cir. 1990); *Cook, Perkiss &*
10 *Lieche, Inc. v. N. Cal. Collection Serv., Inc.*, 911 F.2d 242, 246-47 (9th Cir. 1990).

11 Claims sounding in fraud or mistake are subject to the heightened pleading requirements of
12 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(b), which requires that a plaintiff claiming fraud “must state
13 with particularity the circumstances regarding fraud or mistake.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b). To satisfy
14 Rule 9(b), the allegations must be “specific enough to give defendants notice of the particular
15 misconduct which is alleged to constitute the fraud charged so that they can defend against the
16 charge and not just deny that they have done anything wrong.” *Semegen v. Weidner*, 780 F.2d
17 727, 731 (9th Cir. 1985). This specificity must include an account of the “time, place, and specific
18 content of the false representations as well as the identities of the parties to the
19 misrepresentations.” *Swartz v. KPMG LLP*, 476 F.3d 756, 764 (9th Cir. 2007) (quotation
20 omitted). A fraud by omission claim, however, does not need to meet the strict requirements of
21 Rule 9(b) because in such cases, “a plaintiff cannot plead either the specific time of the omission
22 or the place, as he is not alleging an act, but a failure to act.” *Morris v. BMW of North America,*
23 *LLC*, No. C 07-02827 WHA, 2007 WL 3342612, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2007) (quoting
24 *Washington v. Baezinger*, 673 F.Supp. 1478, 1482 (N.D. Cal. 1987)).

25 As a general rule, “a district court may not consider material beyond the pleadings in ruling
26 on a Rule 12(b)(6) motion.” *Branch v. Tunnell*, 14 F.3d 449, 453 (9th Cir. 1994) (citation
27 omitted), *overruled on other grounds by Galbraith v. County of Santa Clara*, 307 F.3d 1119 (9th
28 Cir. 2002). However, documents subject to judicial notice, such as matters of public record, may

1 be considered on a motion to dismiss. *See Harris v. County of Orange*, 682 F.3d 1126, 1132 (9th
2 Cir. 2012). The Court may also consider “material which is properly submitted as part of the
3 complaint.” *Branch*, 14 F.3d at 453 (citation omitted). Finally, the Court may consider a
4 document not attached to the FAC if (1) the complaint refers to the document; (2) the complaint
5 necessarily relies on the document; (3) the document is central to the plaintiff’s claim; and (4) no
6 party questions the authenticity of the copy attached to the 12(b)(6) motion. *Daniels-Hall v. Nat’l*
7 *Educ. Ass’n*, 629 F.3d 992, 998 (9th Cir. 2010); *see also Harris*, 682 F.3d at 1132. If this test is
8 satisfied, the Court may treat such a document as part of the complaint, and may assume that its
9 contents are true for the purposes of a motion to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
10 12(b)(6). *Id.* The “district court may, but is not required to incorporate documents by reference.”
11 *Davis v. HSBC Bank Nevada, N.A.*, 691 F.3d 1152, 1159 (9th Cir. 2012). In considering such
12 documents, the Court does not convert a motion to dismiss to one for summary judgment. *See Lee*
13 *v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 688-89 (9th Cir. 2001); *Mack v. S. Bay Beer Distrib.*, 798
14 F.2d 1279, 1282 (9th Cir. 1986), *overruled on other grounds by Astoria Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass’n v.*
15 *Solimino*, 501 U.S. 104 (1991).

16 2. The Court Denies the Motion to Dismiss.

17 Defendants move to dismiss each of Plaintiffs’ claims in the FAC. They rely on three legal
18 theories. First, Defendants contend that the Court should consider various contracts and selling
19 scripts to determine that no scripted misrepresentations were made, and, if they were, that
20 Plaintiffs could not have reasonably relied on the alleged oral misrepresentations made by sales
21 representatives because the written contracts that Plaintiffs received before having to make a
22 binding decision about switching utility providers contained complete, true, and correct
23 information about each of the matters allegedly misrepresented orally. Second, Defendants
24 contend that Plaintiffs lack standing to pursue claims based on variable rates, because their
25 contracts were never converted from fixed to variable rates. Third, Defendants contend that
26 Plaintiffs’ allegations of fraud are insufficiently particularized under Federal Rule of Civil
27 Procedure 9(b).

28 In order to dismiss under Defendants’ first theory, the Court would need to rely on sales

1 scripts, welcome letters, and terms of service that are not attached to the FAC, but have been
2 submitted by Defendants as exhibits to a declaration in support of the motion to dismiss. (Dkt.
3 No. 48-4-48-7.) The Court may consider a document not attached to the FAC if (1) the complaint
4 refers to the document; (2) the complaint necessarily relies on the document; (3) the document is
5 central to the plaintiff’s claim; and (4) no party questions the authenticity of the copy attached to
6 the 12(b)(6) motion. *Daniels-Hall v. Nat’l Educ. Ass’n*, 629 F.3d 992, 998 (9th Cir. 2010).

7 With regard to the sales scripts, in the FAC, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants’
8 representatives’ discussions with them were “apparently ‘scripted.’” (FAC ¶¶ 12, 14.)³ They
9 further allege that “[e]ach representation made orally by or on behalf of the Defendant was
10 consistent with one another and were [sic] derived from Spark selling scripts, marketing and
11 training materials”; that “Defendant’s centrally orchestrated scheme involves training sales
12 representatives through sophisticated and uniform selling scripts and other marketing materials”;
13 and that Defendants provide their sales representatives with “training materials and selling
14 ‘scripts.’” (*Id.* ¶¶ 17, 26, 28.) Defendants contend that these allegations are sufficient to permit
15 the Court to consider the scripts attached as Exhibits 3 and 7 to the Declaration of Kira Jordan in
16 support of the motion to dismiss.

17 The Court finds that the sales scripts are central to Plaintiffs’ claim. The Court need not
18 reach the question of whether the scripts proffered by Defendants were referred to and relied upon
19 in the FAC, however, because it is plain that Plaintiffs question their authenticity. *See Harris*,
20 682 F.3d at 1132. This fact differentiates this case from one in which a plaintiff pleads himself
21 out of a claim because documents attached to or incorporated by his complaint set forth
22 *uncontested* facts that effectively and persuasively rebut the complaint’s conclusory allegations.
23 *See Sprewell v. Golden State Warriors*, 266 F.3d 979, 988-89 (9th Cir. 2001). Here, the sales
24 scripts proffered by Defendants are in tension with the factual allegations of the Complaint
25 regarding what occurred during the “apparently ‘scripted’” conversations, but the factual
26

27 ³ The Court does not consider the allegations or documents relating to former Plaintiff Margaret
28 Smith, who has been withdrawn as Plaintiff following her death. In any event, doing so would not
alter the analysis of this order.

1 allegations of paragraphs 12-16 of the Complaint are not conclusory and the proffered scripts are
2 insufficient to effectively and persuasively rebut them.

3 Moreover, Plaintiffs have expressly questioned the authenticity of the sales scripts as the
4 only source material for the “apparently scripted” conversations of Defendants’ sales
5 representatives. *Compare Davis*, 691 F.3d at 1161 (holding that the plaintiff did not challenge the
6 documents’ authenticity despite ample opportunity to do so); *Knievel v. ESPN*, 393 F.3d 1068,
7 1076 (9th Cir. 2005) (discussing documents of undisputed authenticity). The proffered scripts are
8 documents kept internally by Defendants, which were not available to Plaintiffs before being
9 produced as exhibits to the Jordan Declaration. Plaintiffs have as yet had no opportunity, through
10 discovery, to test either the authenticity of the proffered sales scripts or to investigate whether
11 other training and marketing materials exist that supplement or contradict the proffered sales
12 scripts. Of course, if Plaintiffs only asserted that they had not previously had access to the
13 proffered scripts, this in and of itself would be insufficient to challenge the scripts’ authenticity.
14 An assertion that Plaintiffs “have not had access to and reviewed the proffered documents is a
15 matter unrelated to their authenticity—i.e., whether the documents are ‘what [their] proponent
16 claims.’” *Davis*, 691 F.3d at 1161 (quotation omitted). Here, however, Plaintiffs do more than
17 assert that they have not had access to or previously reviewed the sales scripts. In contrast to the
18 plaintiffs in *Davis*, Plaintiffs dispute the authenticity of the proffered scripts and correctly contend
19 that their lack of access to the scripts has deprived them of the opportunity to test the scripts’
20 authenticity. (*See, e.g.*, Opp. at 11 (“Spark has not—and, absent discovery, cannot—sufficiently
21 demonstrate that the scripts it produced are the same scripts used by the sales representatives who
22 approached Plaintiffs. . . . Spark’s production of these unauthenticated ‘sales scripts’ do[es] not
23 rule out the possibility its agents utilize *additional* uniform documents and practices to induce
24 consumers to switch to Spark, as alleged in the FAC.”).) Accordingly, the Court will not consider
25 the proffered sales scripts as documents whose authenticity no party questions. Without the sales
26 scripts, the Court must reject Defendants’ argument that the Complaint fails adequately to allege
27 any scripted misrepresentations.

28 For the reasons discussed in connection with Defendants’ motion to compel arbitration, the

1 Court likewise finds that on the present record the terms of service sent by Defendants to Plaintiff
2 Gehrke cannot be considered as documents whose authenticity no party questions. The welcome
3 letters present a closer question, however. In the FAC, Plaintiffs refer to and rely on a welcome
4 letter that Plaintiff Gehrke received from Spark Energy, although they do not refer to a welcome
5 letter for Plaintiff Amaya. (FAC ¶ 15.) Moreover, no party has questioned the authenticity of the
6 welcome letters submitted by both Plaintiffs and Defendants as such, only of the terms of service
7 attached thereto. (Dkt. Nos. 48-5, 48-7, 49-1, 63-1.) The Court concludes, however, that the
8 welcome letters and terms of service cannot, at this stage of the litigation, be considered
9 separately. Although the welcome letters set forth certain plan details, including some initial fee
10 rates, these can only be understood in the context of the details set forth in the attached terms of
11 service, which explain, *inter alia*, how Defendants' variable rates will apply. Accordingly,
12 because the welcome letters and terms of service, read as a whole, are disputed, the Court declines
13 to consider them as part of the Complaint for the purpose of the motion to dismiss. *See Daniels-*
14 *Hall*, 629 F.3d at 998; *see also Davis*, 691 F.3d at 1159 (The "district court may, but is not
15 required to incorporate documents by reference.").

16 Each of the theories set forth in section IV of Defendants' motion to dismiss requires the
17 Court to consider the welcome letters, terms of service, or sales scripts.⁴ Without reference to
18 these documents, Defendants' arguments for dismissal fail.

19 Defendants' second argument is that Plaintiffs lack standing to pursue claims based on
20 variable rates. In part, this argument fails for the reasons discussed above, because it requires
21 consideration of the sales scripts and written contracts. Defendants also contend, however, that
22 none of the named plaintiffs have alleged that they were Spark customers for more than 12
23 months, or that their contracts were converted from fixed to variable rates. Therefore, Defendants
24 argue, Plaintiffs lack standing to pursue claims based on Defendants' variable rate plans. In the
25 claims in question, however, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants made oral misrepresentations to

26
27 ⁴ The exception is Defendants' argument that "unjust enrichment" is not a separate cause of action.
28 (Mot. at 10.) However, Plaintiffs concede that they do not allege a separate cause of action for
unjust enrichment. (Opp. at 20.)

1 falsely advertise and promise customers terms of service more favorable than terms later provided.
2 (FAC ¶¶ 36, 53-54.) This legal theory is similar to a theory previously affirmed in *In re First*
3 *Alliance Mortg. Co.*, 471 F.3d 977, 991-992 (9th Cir. 2006) (affirming jury’s finding of class-wide
4 fraud based on lender’s oral misrepresentations). Plaintiffs’ allegations that the terms and
5 conditions that they received from Defendants were not what they had been promised provide
6 sufficient injury-in-fact to allege standing for the purpose of this motion to dismiss. *See Lujan v.*
7 *Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992). Of course, as Plaintiffs acknowledge, their
8 ability to represent a class that includes claims relating to variable rate plans must be revisited at
9 the class certification stage.

10 The Court also denies Defendants’ motion to dismiss based on their third argument, which
11 is that Plaintiffs’ claims are insufficiently particularized under Rule 9(b). Plaintiffs have pled the
12 approximate month during which Defendants’ representatives approached Plaintiffs Amaya and
13 Gehrke at each of their homes; the location of the homes; and the specific representation of
14 decreased pricing that Defendants’ sales representatives allegedly made in order to induce Mr.
15 Amaya and Ms. Gehrke to switch to Defendants’ utility services. (FAC ¶¶ 12-16.) By pleading
16 the “time, place, and specific content of the false representations as well as the identities of the
17 parties to the misrepresentations,” Plaintiffs have satisfied the requirements of Rule 9(b). *Swartz*
18 *v. KPMG LLP*, 476 F.3d 756, 764 (9th Cir. 2007) (quotation omitted).

19 **C. Plaintiffs’ Motion to Continue Class Certification Proceedings.**

20 The Court has reviewed Plaintiffs’ administrative motion to continue the briefing and
21 hearing of Plaintiffs’ motion for class certification and the opposition thereto. Because of the need
22 for supplemental briefing on Defendants’ motion to compel arbitration and the time for ruling on
23 that motion, the Court finds that Plaintiffs have shown good cause for continuing the class
24 certification hearing. Additionally, the Court agrees with Plaintiffs that the question of whether to
25 amend the complaint to substitute proposed Plaintiff Gabino Ortiz for deceased Plaintiff Margaret
26 Smith should be resolved prior to briefing on class certification. Accordingly, the Court GRANTS
27 Plaintiffs’ administrative motion.
28

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court DENIES WITHOUT PREJUDICE the motion to compel arbitration of the claims of Plaintiff Gehrke.

The Court also DENIES Defendants' motion to dismiss the claims of Plaintiffs Gehrke and Amaya in the First Amended Complaint.


The Court GRANTS Plaintiff's motion to continue the schedule for the briefing and hearing of Plaintiffs' motion for class certification. The hearing on the motion for class certification is hereby continued from June 3, 2016 to **August 5, 2016 at 9:00 a.m.**

The November 18, 2015 Notice of Withdrawal of Deceased Plaintiff Margaret Smith states that Plaintiffs seek to file a Second Amended Complaint in order to substitute a new class representative, Gabino Ortiz, for Margaret Smith. The parties shall promptly meet and confer regarding whether they will stipulate to this amendment or whether a motion is required. No later than April 18, 2016, the parties shall file one of the following: (a) if the parties agree to the proposed amendment of the Complaint to substitute a new class representative, the parties shall file a stipulation and proposed order regarding the schedule for the filing of the Second Amended Complaint and the response thereto; or (b) if the parties do not agree to the proposed amendment of the Complaint to substitute a new class representative, Plaintiffs shall file an appropriate motion.

Absent further order of this Court, Defendants' response to the First Amended Complaint is due within the time provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 11, 2016



JEFFREY S. WHITE
United States District Judge