

1 ALDEN F. ABBOTT
 2 General Counsel
 3 MATTHEW H. WERNZ
 mwernz@ftc.gov
 4 JOANNIE T. WEI
 5 jwei@ftc.gov
 Federal Trade Commission
 6 230 South Dearborn, Suite 3030
 7 Chicago, Illinois 60604
 312.960.5596 (Wernz)
 8 312.960.5607 (Wei)
 9 ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

10
 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 12 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13
 14 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17
 18 AGE OF LEARNING, INC., a
 corporation, also d/b/a ABCmouse and
 19 ABCmouse.com,

20
 21 Defendant.

Case No. 2:20-cv-7996

COMPLAINT FOR
 PERMANENT INJUNCTION
 AND OTHER EQUITABLE
 RELIEF

22 Plaintiff, the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”), for its Complaint alleges:

23 1. The FTC brings this action under Sections 13(b) and 19 of the Federal
 24 Trade Commission Act (“FTC Act”), 15 U.S.C. §§ 53(b) and 57b, and the Restore
 25 Online Shoppers’ Confidence Act (“ROSCA”), 15 U.S.C. § 8404, to obtain
 26 permanent injunctive relief, rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the
 27 refund of monies paid, disgorgement of ill-gotten monies, and other equitable relief

28 COMPLAINT

1 for Defendant’s acts or practices in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15
2 U.S.C. § 45(a), and in violation of Section 4 of ROSCA, 15 U.S.C. § 8403.

3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
5 §§ 1331, 1337(a), and 1345.

6 3. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1), (b)(2),
7 (c)(2), (c)(3), and (d), and 15 U.S.C. § 53(b).

8 **PLAINTIFF**

9 4. The FTC is an independent agency of the United States Government
10 created by statute. 15 U.S.C. §§ 41–58. The FTC enforces Section 5(a) of the
11 FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), which prohibits unfair or deceptive acts or practices in
12 or affecting commerce. The FTC also enforces ROSCA, 15 U.S.C. §§ 8401-8405.
13 ROSCA prohibits the sale of goods or services on the Internet through negative
14 option marketing without meeting certain requirements for disclosure, consent, and
15 cancellation to protect consumers. A negative option is an offer in which the seller
16 treats a consumer’s silence—i.e., their failure to reject an offer or cancel an
17 agreement—as consent to be charged for good and services. 16 C.F.R. § 310.2(w).

18 5. The FTC is authorized to initiate federal district court proceedings, by
19 its own attorneys, to enjoin violations of the FTC Act and ROSCA and to secure
20 such equitable relief as may be appropriate in each case, including rescission or
21 reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, and the
22 disgorgement of ill-gotten monies. 15 U.S.C. §§ 53(b), 57b, 8404.

23 **DEFENDANT**

24 6. Defendant Age of Learning, Inc. (“Age of Learning”), also doing
25 business as ABCmouse and ABCmouse.com, is a Delaware corporation with its
26 principal place of business at 101 North Brand Boulevard, 8th Floor, Glendale,
27 California 91203. Age of Learning transacts or has transacted business in this

28 COMPLAINT

1 District and throughout the United States. At all times material to this Complaint,
2 acting alone or in concert with others, Age of Learning has advertised, marketed,
3 distributed, or sold online educational programs to consumers throughout the
4 United States.

5 **COMMERCE**

6 7. At all times material to this Complaint, Defendant has maintained a
7 substantial course of trade in or affecting commerce, as “commerce” is defined in
8 Section 4 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 44.

9 **DEFENDANT’S BUSINESS PRACTICES**

10 8. From 2015 until at least 2018, Defendant failed to adequately disclose
11 key terms of memberships to access online educational content for children.
12 Touting twelve-month memberships for \$59.95, Defendant enrolled consumers in
13 yearly plans that renewed indefinitely at the same price after the twelve months
14 expired. Defendant failed to disclose material information about these and other
15 term memberships, including that they automatically renew, that Defendant would
16 charge members each year unless they cancel, and what consumers must do to
17 cancel. Even though consumers who signed up were prominently promised “Easy
18 Cancellation,” Defendant for years made cancellation difficult. Many consumers
19 tried without success to cancel by calling, emailing, or contacting Defendant
20 through a customer support form. Rather than accepting these cancellation
21 methods, Defendant instead required consumers to find and navigate a lengthy and
22 confusing cancellation path that repeatedly discouraged consumers from canceling
23 and, in many instances, resulted in consumers being billed again without their
24 consent. Over the course of at least three years, hundreds of thousands of
25 consumers visited Defendant’s cancellation path but remain enrolled. Even
26 consumers who completed Defendant’s cancellation path later discovered ongoing
27 charges for additional content they believed they had canceled along with their
28

COMPLAINT

1 base memberships. Defendant has received at least tens of thousands of consumer
2 complaints about these practices.

3 **Defendant's Misleading Enrollment Practices**

4 9. Defendant operates a membership-based online learning tool called
5 ABCmouse Early Learning Academy for children ages 2 to 8 years old.
6 ABCmouse includes digital content on reading, language arts, math, and other
7 subjects. Consumers can access ABCmouse at Defendant's website,
8 abcmouse.com, and through Defendant's mobile application ("app"). Defendant
9 provides consumers access to ABCmouse through memberships, which typically
10 cost from \$9.95 for monthly memberships to \$59.95 for twelve-month
11 memberships.

12 10. On ABCmouse.com and in its app, Defendant has advertised
13 membership to ABCmouse Early Learning Academy. Above an animated image
14 of a teacher gesturing to her classroom, Defendant displayed a bright green gift tag
15 with a prominent link offering consumers a "Special Offer 38% OFF Annual
16 Membership! Learn More!" The following is a representative image of such an
17 offer from Defendant's website:
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



11. Consumers who clicked on the “Special Offer” link were directed to an enrollment page with the same green gift tag. There, next to a prechecked box, in large blue and red bold font, Defendant offered consumers a membership costing either “**\$59.95 for 12 Months**” or “4 equal monthly installments of \$19.75.” Defendant promised “**Easy Cancellation**” in bold, red text, stating: “If your family does not absolutely love ABCmouse, you can cancel at any time!” Defendant promised the same “Easy Cancellation” to consumers who enroll in monthly memberships. To enroll, consumers were required to submit their email address, password, and payment information, and they also were required to check

1 a box agreeing to Defendant’s terms and conditions. A representative image of the
 2 enrollment page is below:



12. Consumers who used this page to sign up for a twelve-month
 ABCmouse membership were instead enrolled in a negative option plan under
 which Defendant charged them \$59.95 immediately and each year thereafter until
 they affirmatively have canceled. For at least three years, Defendant did not
 disclose these facts anywhere on the enrollment page. Nor did Defendant disclose
 how consumers were to accomplish the advertised “easy cancellation.”

1 13. Similarly, when consumers enrolled in a 30-day free trial of an
2 ABCmouse monthly membership, Defendant often offered them alternative
3 payment options following their free month, including twelve months for \$39.95 or
4 six months for \$29.95. Defendant also often offered all consumers who signed up
5 for twelve-month memberships access for twelve months at the cost of \$39.95 to
6 Defendant’s “Assessment Center,” a separate service that includes quizzes and
7 lessons to measure children’s skills. Defendant did not disclose that after charging
8 consumers who selected these options immediately for the stated membership
9 term, Defendant would charge consumers again at the end of that period for the full
10 six or twelve months, and on a recurring basis thereafter until they canceled.

11 14. Rather, during these three years, Defendant described the ongoing
12 nature of these term memberships only in separately hyperlinked terms and
13 conditions. Even if consumers were to click on the hyperlinked terms and
14 conditions, however, they would be unlikely to see that Defendant’s term
15 memberships automatically renew each year. Defendant buried this information in
16 dense text, in small font and in single-spaced type.

17 15. Not until in or around early 2018, after receiving a Civil Investigative
18 Demand from the Federal Trade Commission, did Defendant modify its term
19 membership enrollment pages to include information about the membership’s
20 automatic renewal. Even then, for its twelve-month membership, Defendant
21 buried that information in the smallest font on the page under a bright red heading
22 labeled “Easy Cancellation.” This disclosure was not close to or in similar size,
23 brightness, or prominence to Defendant’s representation that consumers were
24 paying “**\$59.95 for 12 Months**” of membership. Thus, despite this modification,
25 consumers were unlikely to see any disclosure of the automatic renewal of their
26 twelve-month memberships.

1 16. Tens of thousands of consumers have complained to Defendant that
2 they did not know that ABCmouse memberships would automatically renew.
3 These complaints have continued after the 2018 change discussed in paragraph 13
4 above. Many of these consumers also complained that they had not authorized
5 Defendant to charge their accounts on an ongoing basis. For example, one
6 consumer who was surprised to be charged automatically for a second twelve-
7 month period complained, “No one asked me if I wanted to subscribe again. My
8 personal account was just accessed without my permission.”

9 17. Defendant was well aware of these types of consumer complaints.
10 Indeed, in January 2015, after completing an internal review, Defendant concluded
11 that common customer support issues include that the “Subscription page is
12 misleading,” and “Customers are confused about their billing plan on registration,
13 customers do not like that they [are] not notified of their auto-renewal.”

14 18. Despite that conclusion, no changes were made, and consumers
15 continued to complain. More than a year later, a customer service representative
16 described a consumer complaint as “the standard ‘I only subscribed for 1 year and
17 now I’m being billed again’ complaint.” By 2018, three years after the internal
18 review, Defendant’s Vice President of Customer Support described the same
19 problem, that consumers were complaining that automatic renewals of twelve-
20 month memberships were:

21 catching them off guard as they did not recognize it was an auto-
22 renewal [W]e encounter many customers that are confused as to
23 what it is that they are signing up for in terms of length of subscription
24 and even more so how much and when they will be charged.

25 19. Despite more than three years of similar complaints, Defendant
26 continued to enroll consumers in term memberships without clearly and
27
28

1 conspicuously disclosing to them the ongoing charges associated with those
2 memberships or how to cancel them.

3 **Defendant Made It Difficult for Consumers to Cancel**

4 20. ABCmouse memberships—including monthly and term
5 memberships—automatically renew until consumers cancel. For years, Defendant
6 restricted the ways consumers could cancel their memberships, permitting
7 cancellation only through an online mechanism within Defendant’s website and
8 app that was difficult for consumers to find and complete. Consumers who
9 requested cancellation via this mechanism often have believed they canceled, but
10 Defendant continued to charge them anyway. Defendant routinely refused to
11 honor consumers’ cancellation requests that were not made through the online
12 mechanism. As a result, Defendant continued to charge tens of thousands of
13 consumers who requested cancellation or believed that their accounts had already
14 been canceled.

15 *Defendant Refused to Accept Cancellation Requests*
16 *by Telephone, Email or Web Form*

17 21. On its website and in its app, Defendant did not post a customer
18 service telephone number or email address that consumers could use to contact
19 Defendant to cancel their memberships.

20 22. Some consumers were able to find a telephone number for Defendant
21 by searching online, however. Consumers who called this number often were
22 unable to reach a customer service representative because of long wait times that
23 resulted in many consumers simply hanging up. For example, in each month from
24 October 2016 through April 2018, consumers who called the customer service line
25 had to wait an average of at least 10 minutes to talk with a customer service
26 representative. In December 2017, according to Defendant’s internal data, the
27 average wait time exceeded 30 minutes. By June 2017, the call-abandonment rate
28

1 resulting from these wait times had risen to more than 30 percent, which Defendant
2 acknowledged was “out of control.” By the end of 2017, 60 percent of all calls to
3 Defendant were abandoned without consumers reaching an ABCmouse
4 representative. In many instances, consumers who reached a customer service
5 representative were told that they could not cancel their memberships by phone,
6 and were instead directed to Defendant’s website or app to cancel.

7 23. Some consumers also were able to find an email address for
8 Defendant by searching online. Consumers who emailed Defendant to request
9 cancellation often were told that they could not cancel their memberships by email,
10 and were instead directed to Defendant’s website or app to cancel.

11 24. Numerous consumers submitted requests to cancel their memberships
12 through a web form found on Defendant’s website in the “Parent Home” page, by
13 clicking on “Customer Support” and then on a link labeled “Contact Us.” The
14 “Contact Us” form included a box in which consumers could type a message, and
15 many consumers used this box to notify Defendant they wanted to cancel their
16 memberships. However, instead of honoring these cancellation requests,
17 Defendant typically responded that, “A member’s account can only be cancelled
18 by that member on the site itself, not via email or any other means.” Defendant
19 claimed that requiring consumers to cancel through the site’s cancellation
20 mechanism “helps us to ensure that accounts are not cancelled unintentionally or
21 maliciously.” Defendant refused cancellation requests from more than 100,000
22 consumers in this way, instead redirecting them to Defendant’s website to cancel.

23 *Defendant Used a Hard-to-Find, Poorly Labeled*

24 *Online Cancellation Mechanism*

25 25. Consumers often had difficulty locating Defendant’s online
26 cancellation mechanism. To do so, consumers first had to go to the “My Account”
27 section of Defendant’s website, where there were three boxes labeled “Account
28

COMPLAINT


1 Information,” “Membership,” and “Billing.” Consumers were required to click on
2 the “Membership” box, which took them to a summary of their membership terms
3 and included a link to “Customer Support” at the bottom of the page. Clicking on
4 “Customer Support” would not take consumers to Defendant’s online cancellation
5 mechanism, but would send them to a series of frequently asked questions and the
6 “Contact Us” link described above. In the lower left corner of the Membership
7 screen, Defendant included a link in small, light colored font, to its “Cancellation
8 Policy.” Instead of the cancellation policy, however, this link took consumers to
9 Defendant’s online cancellation mechanism.

10 26. For years, consumers who wanted to cancel their memberships often
11 were unable to find this cancellation mechanism on Defendant’s site. Defendant
12 received complaints that consumers were unable to locate this online cancellation
13 mechanism, but Defendant did not take any steps to make this mechanism more
14 prominent or easier to locate. In September 2016, one of Defendant’s customer
15 support representatives noted that when Defendant directed consumers to its site to
16 cancel, the membership “never gets canceled by the customer and then we get
17 several more emails back or angry calls.”

18 *Defendant’s Online Cancellation Mechanism Confused, Misdirected, and*
19 *Frustrated Consumers Requesting Cancellation*

20 27. Even those consumers who were able to locate the cancellation path
21 through the “Cancellation Policy” on Defendant’s website still had difficulty
22 canceling because the path did not clearly inform consumers how to cancel and
23 instead required consumers to navigate several pages of promotions and links that,
24 when clicked, directed consumers away from the cancellation path without
25 warning.
26
27
28


28. The first screen in the path often appeared as depicted below.



29. Although this was the first screen of Defendant's online cancellation path, it did not tell consumers that they had arrived at the correct place to cancel their memberships. Indeed, nowhere on this screen did the word cancellation, or any variation of it, appear. Instead, this screen promoted ABCmouse's availability across several devices. The only way for consumers to continue along Defendant's cancellation path was by clicking the button labeled "No Thanks, Continue" in the lower right-hand corner of the screen. Clicking this button would lead consumers to a series of other screens promoting additional ABCmouse features.

30. Defendant often labeled buttons on these screens with vague and inconsistent descriptions, leaving many consumers confused about how to successfully complete Defendant's cancellation path. For example, on one screen, depicted below, Defendant asked consumers to provide a reason for canceling, invited consumers to "contact our Customer Support team" through a link, and displayed buttons labeled "Back Home," "No Thanks, I'll Wait," and "Continue."

COMPLAINT




31. Consumers who clicked the “Customer Support” link or the “Back Home” or “No Thanks, I’ll Wait” buttons would be removed from the cancellation path and would remain enrolled, often without their knowledge or consent.

32. The only way to continue along the cancellation path was to provide a reason for canceling and then click “Continue.” But doing that took consumers to another screen, where Defendant attempted to persuade consumers not to cancel. For example, as shown below, a consumer who indicated “My Child Is Not Interested” as a reason for cancellation would be presented with a screen, labeled “Before You Go...,” and relaying a message that “many children love visiting the Aquarium, Hamster, Zoo, Farm, and the Shopping areas of our site,” along with links to those areas:



15 33. On this “Before You Go...” screen, consumers who clicked any of the
16 five links to other areas of Defendant’s site or on the “Back Home” or “No Thanks,
17 I’ll Wait” links would be removed from the cancellation path and would remain
18 enrolled, often without their knowledge or consent.

19 34. Consumers who pressed “Continue” on this screen were not canceled
20 but were taken to still another screen, as shown below, prompting consumers to
21 “Learn More” about an opportunity to “Upgrade” their memberships.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



35. Consumers who clicked on the “Learn More” link would again be removed from the cancellation path. Defendant prompted these consumers to enter their passwords and click “Submit” on a popup that, in small print, stated that consumers would be billed. Defendant charged consumers who entered their passwords immediately for an additional twelve-month ABCmouse membership. Many consumers reported that they remained enrolled in this way without their knowledge or consent.

36. Consumers who clicked on the “Back Home” or “No Thanks, I’ll Wait” link on this screen would again be removed from the cancellation path and would remain enrolled in their existing membership at the existing price, often without their knowledge or consent.

37. In total, Defendant displayed along the cancellation path between six and nine screens that consumers were required to navigate to cancel their memberships. None of these screens informed consumers of the total number of screens along the cancellation path or how many screens remained before their

1 memberships would be canceled. Consumers could not skip ahead or cancel
2 without visiting each screen. Each screen included multiple links and buttons that,
3 if pressed, would take consumers out of the cancellation path and maintain their
4 memberships.

5 38. Defendant failed to provide a simple cancellation mechanism by
6 which consumers could stop recurring charges. Defendant's cancellation
7 mechanism was not disclosed on its product order or confirmation pages, nor in the
8 confirmation emails consumers receive for their online transactions. Additionally,
9 it was much more difficult to cancel a membership and Defendant's recurring
10 charges than it is to sign up for the membership and to initiate the recurring
11 charges.

12 39. Moreover, unbeknownst to many consumers, canceling their
13 memberships did not cancel all charges associated with their accounts. Many
14 consumers who enrolled in Defendant's "Assessment Center" found that they
15 continued to be charged for the Assessment Center even after canceling their
16 ABCmouse memberships. Many of these consumers found that, even once they
17 realized they needed to separately cancel their Assessment Center membership,
18 they could not do so because Defendant had deactivated their login credentials
19 when they canceled their ABCmouse memberships. Thus, for at least seven
20 months, consumers complained to Defendant that they did not understand that
21 canceling their ABCmouse memberships would not also cancel the Assessment
22 Center membership.

23 *Defendant's Restrictive Cancellation Practices*

24 *Resulted in Unauthorized Charges*

25 40. From 2015 to at least 2018, tens of thousands of consumers
26 complained to Defendant that they were unable to cancel their ABCmouse
27 memberships or that they did cancel their memberships but nevertheless were
28

COMPLAINT

1 charged after cancellation. For example, one consumer complained that “Your
2 website will not allow me to cancel my subscription. . . . I have gone through all the
3 ridiculous questions about a dozen times, and the site does not allow me to finish
4 the cancellation.” Another consumer, who had attempted to cancel an ABCmouse
5 membership multiple times, complained, “I cancelled this account 3 times I
6 had to request 2 ACH returns to get my money back after twice correctly
7 cancelling my account including multiple emails and phone calls to
8 abcmouse.com.” In November 2017, Defendant’s Vice President of Customer
9 Support wrote to Defendant’s COO, two Vice Presidents of Marketing, President
10 of Production, and Senior Director of Operations, noting a “dramatic increase in
11 the amount of [customer support] tickets as well as the amount of phone calls”
12 received by Defendant, and identifying consumer “confusion and/or inability to
13 find and complete the cancellation on-line” as a “constant that has generated the
14 large majority of all tickets since my arrival.”

15 41. At least thousands of consumers complained about incurring
16 unauthorized charges related to the Assessment Center even after canceling their
17 base membership. Defendant tracked customer complaints related to this subject
18 under the heading, “Customer Suggestion: Assessment Subscription should not
19 require separate cancellation.” Instead of fixing the issue, however, Defendant
20 developed and used a template customer support response stating, “We
21 investigated this matter and discovered that although your ABCmouse subscription
22 was cancelled, your subscription to the Assessment Center subscription [sic] had
23 not been cancelled. Please note that your subscription and the Assessment Center
24 add-on are separate features that require individual cancellation.”

25 42. For years, Defendant recognized that its cancellation path was long,
26 confusing, and not the “easy” process Defendant promised. For example, as early
27 as 2015, in internal communications, Defendant acknowledged that the
28

1 “Cancellation Path is too long,” that the “Cancellation process is confusing,” and
2 that an ABCmouse membership was “not easy to cancel like advertised.” That
3 same year, Defendant’s Senior Director of Operations wrote:

4 To improve customer experience / satisfaction, . . . I’d take a look at
5 the impact of reducing the number of clicks in the online cancellation
6 flow. I believe there are 8-9 clicks required currently, in order for a
7 customer to successfully end their subscription.

8 43. Instead of simplifying the cancellation mechanism, however,
9 Defendant created a customer support response script to respond to complaints
10 from consumers who were billed after believing they had canceled. Thus, for
11 several years, consumers who complained about billing after cancellation would
12 receive an email from Defendant saying, “We show that you attempted to cancel
13 the subscription, but did not successfully complete the process.” Defendant did not
14 offer to cancel consumers’ memberships, but sent them back to the online
15 cancellation path.

16 44. Rather than take steps to make it easier for consumers to cancel their
17 memberships, Defendant often made it more difficult. In April 2016, Defendant
18 added two screens to the cancellation mechanism, which, Defendant found,
19 resulted in a “lower cancellation percentage.” In May 2017, after Defendant’s
20 Senior Design Director reported that, according to the customer support
21 department, “the cancellation path is too hard to get to and get through,” Defendant
22 changed its Parent Dashboard, including to make the “Cancellation Policy” link
23 *less prominent*. Defendant later concluded that as a result of this change,
24 cancellations “decreased by approximately 10%-15%.” In June 2017, shortly after
25 this change was made, the same Senior Design Director reported that “the decrease
26 of cancellation % of those entering the Parents Section to completion of the
27 cancellation path.”

28 COMPLAINT

1 45. According to Defendant’s own data and records, from 2015 to 2018,
2 hundreds of thousands of consumers who visited Defendant’s online cancellation
3 path or otherwise contacted Defendant to cancel nevertheless remained subscribed.

4 46. It was only after the FTC issued a Civil Investigative Demand to
5 Defendant Age of Learning that the company modified its online cancellation
6 mechanism. However, despite its modifications, Defendant’s cancellation
7 mechanism continued to be located within a link to Defendant’s “Cancellation
8 Policy;” continued to contain multiple screens that consumers had to navigate in
9 order to cancel; continued to provide consumers with multiple links that if clicked,
10 would take them out of the cancellation path without warning; and required as
11 many as seven clicks to complete. Thus, consumers continued to complain that
12 Defendant did not honor their cancellation requests.

13 47. Even though Defendant knew of consumer confusion regarding its
14 membership terms and cancellation mechanism, Defendant’s stated policy was that
15 it did “not provide full or partial refunds.” Thus, Defendant’s restrictive refund
16 policies compounded the consumer injury caused by its misleading memberships
17 and its failure to provide a simple cancellation mechanism.

18 48. Based on the facts and violations of law alleged in this Complaint, the
19 FTC has reason to believe that Defendant is violating or is about to violate laws
20 enforced by the Commission because, among other things: Defendant engaged in
21 its unlawful acts and practices repeatedly over a period of at least three years;
22 Defendant continued its unlawful acts or practices despite knowledge of tens of
23 thousands of complaints; Defendant modified its unlawful conduct only after
24 receiving a Civil Investigative Demand from the FTC; and Defendant remains in
25 the business of selling negative-option online educational services and maintain the
26 means, ability, and incentive to resume its unlawful conduct.

27
28 COMPLAINT

1 **VIOLATIONS OF THE FTC ACT**

2 49. Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), prohibits “unfair or
3 deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce.”

4 50. Misrepresentations or deceptive omissions of material fact constitute
5 deceptive acts or practices prohibited by Section 5(a) of the FTC Act.

6 51. Acts or practices are unfair under Section 5 of the FTC Act if they
7 cause or are likely to cause substantial injury to consumers that consumers cannot
8 reasonably avoid themselves and that is not outweighed by countervailing benefits
9 to consumers or competition. 15 U.S.C. § 45(n).

10 **COUNT I**

11 **Misrepresentation of Easy Cancellation**

12 52. In numerous instances in connection with the advertising, marketing,
13 promotion, offering for sale, or sale of its online educational service, Defendant
14 has represented, directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, that it is easy
15 for consumers to cancel their ABCmouse memberships.

16 53. In truth and in fact, in numerous instances in which Defendant has
17 made the representation set forth in Paragraph 52, it has not been easy for
18 consumers to cancel their memberships.

19 54. Therefore, the making of the representations as set forth in Paragraph
20 52 is false and misleading, and constitutes a deceptive act or practice in violation
21 of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

22 **COUNT II**

23 **Deceptive Failure to Disclose Automatic Renewal Terms**

24 55. In numerous instances in connection with the advertising, marketing,
25 promotion, offering for sale, or sale of its online educational service, Defendant
26 has represented, directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, that it is
27 offering a six- or twelve-month membership to its service.

28 COMPLAINT

1 an opportunity to fairly compete with one another for consumers' business."
2 Section 2 of ROSCA, 15 U.S.C. § 8401.

3 62. Section 4 of ROSCA, 15 U.S.C. § 8403, generally prohibits charging
4 consumers for goods or services sold in transactions effected on the Internet
5 through a negative option feature, as that term is defined in the Commission's
6 Telemarketing Sales Rule ("TSR"), 16 C.F.R. § 310.2(w), unless the seller: (a)
7 clearly and conspicuously discloses all material terms of the transaction before
8 obtaining the consumer's billing information; (b) obtains the consumer's express
9 informed consent before making the charge; and (c) provides simple mechanisms
10 to stop recurring charges. *See* 15 U.S.C. § 8403.

11 63. The TSR defines a negative option feature as: "in an offer or
12 agreement to sell or provide any goods or services, a provision under which the
13 consumer's silence or failure to take an affirmative action to reject goods or
14 services or to cancel the agreement is interpreted by the seller as acceptance of the
15 offer." 16 C.F.R. § 310.2(w).

16 64. As described above, Defendant advertises and sell services to
17 consumers through a negative option feature as defined by the TSR. *See* 16 C.F.R.
18 § 310.2(w).

19 65. Under Section 5 of ROSCA, 15 U.S.C. § 8404, a violation of ROSCA
20 is a violation of a rule promulgated under Section 18 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C.
21 § 57a, and therefore constitutes an unfair or deceptive act or practice in or affecting
22 commerce in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

23 **COUNT IV**

24 **Violation of ROSCA**

25 66. In numerous instances, in connection with the selling of goods or
26 services on the Internet through a negative option feature, Defendant has failed to:
27
28

COMPLAINT

- 1 a) clearly and conspicuously disclose all material terms of the
2 negative option feature of the transaction before obtaining the
3 consumer's billing information;
- 4 b) obtain the consumer's express informed consent to the negative
5 option feature before charging the consumer's credit card, debit
6 card, bank account, or other financial account for the
7 transaction; or
- 8 c) provide simple mechanisms for a consumer to stop recurring
9 charges for products to the consumer's credit card, debit card,
10 bank account, or other financial account.

11 67. Defendant's practices as set forth in Paragraph 66 are a violation of
12 Section 4 of ROSCA, 15 U.S.C. § 8403, and are therefore a violation of a rule
13 promulgated under Section 18 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 57a, 15 U.S.C.
14 § 8404(a), and therefore constitute an unfair or deceptive act or practice in
15 violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

16 **CONSUMER INJURY**

17 68. Consumers are suffering, have suffered, and will continue to suffer
18 substantial injury as a result of Defendant's violations of the FTC Act and
19 ROSCA. In addition, Defendant has been unjustly enriched as a result of its
20 unlawful acts or practices. Absent injunctive relief by this Court, Defendant is
21 likely to continue to injure consumers, reap unjust enrichment, and harm the public
22 interest.

23 **THIS COURT'S POWER TO GRANT RELIEF**

24 69. Section 13(b) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), empowers this Court
25 to grant injunctive and such other relief as the Court may deem appropriate to halt
26 and redress violations of any provision of law enforced by the FTC. The Court, in
27 the exercise of its equitable jurisdiction, may award ancillary relief, including
28

COMPLAINT

1 rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, and
2 the disgorgement of ill-gotten monies, to prevent and remedy any violation of any
3 provision of law enforced by the FTC.

4 70. Section 19 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 57b, and ROSCA authorize
5 this Court to grant such relief as the Court finds necessary to redress injury to
6 consumers resulting from Defendant's violations of ROSCA, including the
7 rescission or reformation of contracts, and the refund of money.

8 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

9 Wherefore, Plaintiff FTC, pursuant to Sections 13(b) and 19 of the FTC Act,
10 15 U.S.C. §§ 53(b) and 57b, and ROSCA, and the Court's own equitable powers,
11 requests that the Court:

12 A. Award Plaintiff such preliminary injunctive and ancillary relief as
13 may be necessary to avert the likelihood of consumer injury during the pendency
14 of this action and to preserve the possibility of effective final relief;

15 B. Enter a permanent injunction to prevent future violations of the FTC
16 Act and ROSCA by Defendant;

17 C. Award such relief as the Court finds necessary to redress injury to
18 consumers resulting from Defendant's violations of the FTC Act and ROSCA,
19 including rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies
20 paid, and the disgorgement of ill-gotten monies; and

21 D. Award Plaintiff the costs of bringing this action, as well as such other
22 and additional relief as the Court may determine to be just and proper.

23
24
25
26
27
28
COMPLAINT

Respectfully submitted,

ALDEN F. ABBOTT
General Counsel



Dated: September 1, 2020

MATTHEW H. WERNZ
JOANNIE T. WEI
Federal Trade Commission
Midwest Region
230 South Dearborn Street, Suite 3030
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 960-5596 [Wernz]
(312) 960-5607 [Wei]
mwernz@ftc.gov
jwei@ftc.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

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

COMPLAINT