In the Matter of

REVERB COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,
a corporation, and

TRACIE SNITKER,
individually and
as an officer and director
of the corporation.

COMPLAINT

The Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Reverb Communications Inc., a corporation, and Tracie Snitker, an officer and director of the corporation (“respondents”), have violated the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and it appearing to the Commission that this proceeding is in the public interest, alleges:

1. Respondent Reverb Communications, Inc. (“Reverb”) is a California corporation with its principal office or place of business at 18711 Tiffeni Drive, Twain Harte, CA 95383.

2. Respondent Tracie Snitker is the 100% owner and the only officer and director of Reverb. At all times relevant to this complaint, Tracie Snitker, individually or in concert with others, formulated, directed, controlled, or participated in the acts or practices of the corporation, including the acts or practices alleged in this complaint.

3. The acts and practices of respondents, as alleged herein, have been in or affecting commerce, as “commerce” is defined in Section 4 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

4. Reverb provides sales, marketing, and public relations services to clients, including clients that develop gaming applications offered for sale to consumers via the iTunes store, an electronic retail platform operated by Apple Inc. Reverb’s fee often includes a percentage of the sales of its clients’ gaming applications.
5. The iTunes store allows users to publicly review gaming applications available for purchase via the iTunes store. Such reviews are accomplished by means of a rating (of between one and five stars) and also written commentary. Readers of these reviews have the opportunity to confirm on the site whether or not they found them useful.

6. From approximately November 2008 through May 2009, Reverb employees, including individual Respondent Tracie Snitker, and company managers, posted public reviews about Reverb’s clients’ gaming applications in the iTunes store. These reviews were posted using account names that would give the readers of these reviews the impression they had been submitted by disinterested consumers.

7. In these reviews, Reverb employees endorsed the products by consistently giving Reverb’s clients’ gaming applications four and five star ratings. Reverb employees also submitted positive written comments, including but not limited to the following examples:

   “Amazing new game”

   “ONE of the BEST”

   “[Developer of gaming application being reviewed] hits another home run with [gaming application being reviewed]”

   “Really Cool Game”

   “GREAT, family-friendly board game app”

   “One of the best apps just got better” and

   “[Developer of gaming application being reviewed] does it again!”

8. Through the means described in Paragraphs 5-7, respondents have represented, expressly or by implication, that reviews of certain gaming applications were independent reviews reflecting the views of ordinary consumers.

9. In truth and in fact, the reviews for those gaming applications were not independent reviews reflecting the views of ordinary consumers. The reviews were created by employees of Reverb, a company hired to promote the gaming applications and often paid a percentage of the applications’ sales. Therefore, the representation set forth in Paragraph 8 was, and is, false and misleading.

10. Through the means described in Paragraphs 5-7, respondents have represented, expressly or by implication, that reviews for certain gaming applications reflected endorsements from persons who had used those gaming applications. Respondents failed to disclose that those reviews were written by employees of Reverb, a company hired to promote the gaming applications and often paid a percentage of the applications’ sales. These facts would have been
material to consumers in their purchasing decision regarding the gaming applications. The failure to disclose these facts, in light of the representation made, was, and is, a deceptive practice.

11. The acts and practices of respondents as alleged in this complaint constitute unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce in violation of Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

THEREFORE, the Federal Trade Commission this _____ day of ________________, 2010, has issued this Complaint against respondents.

By the Commission.

Donald S. Clark
Secretary