CIVIL COVER SHEET

JS-44 (Rev. 6/17 DC)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Richard Inza, Michael Inza, Volp-Pal, Individually and on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated

(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF _____
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

DEFENDANTS

AT&T, Inc. et al., T-Mobile USA, Inc. et al., Deutsche Telekom AG, et al., Verizon Communications, Inc. et al.,

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT _____
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)
NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED

(c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER)

Travis Pittman (D.C. Bar No. 1016894)
HOLMES, PITTMAN & HARAGUCHI, LLP
1140 3rd St. NE
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 320-3558

ATTORNEYS (IF KNOWN)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION
(PLACE AN x IN ONE BOX ONLY)

- ○ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ◉ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ○ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ○ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN x IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT) **FOR DIVERSITY CASES ONLY!**

	PTF	DFT		PTF	DFT
Citizen of this State	○ 1	○ 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in This State	○ 4	○ 4
Citizen of Another State	◉ 2	○ 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State	○ 5	◉ 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	○ 3	○ 3	Foreign Nation	○ 6	○ 6

IV. CASE ASSIGNMENT AND NATURE OF SUIT

(Place an X in one category, A-N, that best represents your Cause of Action and one in a corresponding Nature of Suit)

○ A. *Antitrust*

- ☒ 410 Antitrust

○ B. *Personal Injury/ Malpractice*

- ☐ 310 Airplane
- ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability
- ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander
- ☐ 330 Federal Employers Liability
- ☐ 340 Marine
- ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability
- ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle
- ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability
- ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury
- ☐ 362 Medical Malpractice
- ☐ 365 Product Liability
- ☐ 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability
- ☐ 368 Asbestos Product Liability

○ C. *Administrative Agency Review*

- ☐ 151 Medicare Act

Social Security
- ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)
- ☐ 862 Black Lung (923)
- ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))
- ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI
- ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))

Other Statutes
- ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
- ☐ 893 Environmental Matters
- ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions (If Administrative Agency is Involved)

○ D. *Temporary Restraining Order/Preliminary Injunction*

Any nature of suit from any category may be selected for this category of case assignment.

(If Antitrust, then A governs)

○ E. *General Civil (Other)* OR **○ F. *Pro Se General Civil***

Real Property
- ☐ 210 Land Condemnation
- ☐ 220 Foreclosure
- ☐ 230 Rent, Lease & Ejectment
- ☐ 240 Torts to Land
- ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability
- ☐ 290 All Other Real Property

Personal Property
- ☐ 370 Other Fraud
- ☐ 371 Truth in Lending
- ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage
- ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability

Bankruptcy
- ☐ 422 Appeal 27 USC 158
- ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157

Prisoner Petitions
- ☐ 535 Death Penalty
- ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other
- ☐ 550 Civil Rights
- ☐ 555 Prison Conditions
- ☐ 560 Civil Detainee – Conditions of Confinement

Property Rights
- ☐ 820 Copyrights
- ☐ 830 Patent
- ☐ 835 Patent – Abbreviated New Drug Application
- ☐ 840 Trademark

Federal Tax Suits
- ☐ 870 Taxes (US plaintiff or defendant)
- ☐ 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609

Forfeiture/Penalty
- ☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881
- ☐ 690 Other

Other Statutes
- ☐ 375 False Claims Act
- ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))
- ☐ 400 State Reapportionment
- ☐ 430 Banks & Banking
- ☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc.
- ☐ 460 Deportation
- ☐ 462 Naturalization Application
- ☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions
- ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced & Corrupt Organization
- ☐ 480 Consumer Credit
- ☐ 490 Cable/Satellite TV
- ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
- ☐ 896 Arbitration
- ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision
- ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
- ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions (if not administrative agency review or Privacy Act)

○ **G. *Habeas Corpus/ 2255***	○ **H. *Employment Discrimination***	○ **I. *FOIA/Privacy Act***	○ **J. *Student Loan***
☐ 530 Habeas Corpus – General ☐ 510 Motion/Vacate Sentence ☐ 463 Habeas Corpus – Alien Detainee	☐ 442 Civil Rights – Employment (criteria: race, gender/sex, national origin, discrimination, disability, age, religion, retaliation) *(If pro se, select this deck)*	☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions (if Privacy Act) *(If pro se, select this deck)*	☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (excluding veterans)
○ **K. *Labor/ERISA (non-employment)***	○ **L. *Other Civil Rights (non-employment)***	○ **M. *Contract***	○ **N. *Three-Judge Court***
☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act ☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations ☐ 740 Labor Railway Act ☐ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	☐ 441 Voting (if not Voting Rights Act) ☐ 443 Housing/Accommodations ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 445 Americans w/Disabilities – Employment ☐ 446 Americans w/Disabilities – Other ☐ 448 Education	☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholder's Suits ☐ 190 Other Contracts ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	☐ 441 Civil Rights – Voting (if Voting Rights Act)

V. ORIGIN

◉ 1 Original Proceeding ○ 2 Removed from State Court ○ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court ○ 4 Reinstated or Reopened ○ 5 Transferred from another district (specify) ○ 6 Multi-district Litigation ○ 7 Appeal to District Judge from Mag. Judge ○ 8 Multi-district Litigation – Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (CITE THE U.S. CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE A BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE.)

15 USC § 1, et seq.; Antitrust violations under the Sherman Act and Clayton Act.

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT CHECK IF THIS IS A **CLASS ACTION** UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 **DEMAND $** **JURY DEMAND:** Check YES only if demanded in complaint **YES** ☒ **NO** ☐

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instruction) **YES** ☒ **NO** ☐ If yes, please complete related case form

DATE: October 25, 2024 **SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD** /s/ Travis Pittman

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET JS-44
Authority for Civil Cover Sheet

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and services of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. Listed below are tips for completing the civil cover sheet. These tips coincide with the Roman Numerals on the cover sheet.

I. COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF/DEFENDANT (b) County of residence: Use 11001 to indicate plaintiff if resident of Washington, DC, 88888 if plaintiff is resident of United States but not Washington, DC, and 99999 if plaintiff is outside the United States.

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES: This section is completed only if diversity of citizenship was selected as the Basis of Jurisdiction under Section II.

IV. CASE ASSIGNMENT AND NATURE OF SUIT: The assignment of a judge to your case will depend on the category you select that best represents the primary cause of action found in your complaint. You may select only one category. You must also select one corresponding nature of suit found under the category of the case.

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION: Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of the primary cause.

VIII. RELATED CASE(S), IF ANY: If you indicated that there is a related case, you must complete a related case form, which may be obtained from the Clerk's Office.

Because of the need for accurate and complete information, you should ensure the accuracy of the information provided prior to signing the form.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RICHARD INZA
2451 SW 126th Way
Miramar, FL 33027

MICHAEL INZA
14826 SW 45 Lane
Miami, FL 33185

VOIP-PAL.COM INC.
7215 Bosque Blvd
Suite 102
Waco, TX 76710

individually and on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated;
Plaintiffs,

v.

AT&T, INC.
175 E Houston Street
San Antonio TX 78205

AT&T CORPORATION
One AT&T Way
Bedminster NJ 07921

AT&T SERVICES, INC.
175 E Houston Street
San Antonio TX 78205

SCOTT T. FORD
GLENN H. HUTCHINS
WILLIAM E. KENNARD
STEPHEN J. LUCZO
MARISSA A. MAYER
DAVID R. MCATEE II
MICHAEL B. MCCALLISTER
BETH E. MOONEY
MATTHEW K. ROSE
JOHN STANKEY
CYNTHIA B. TAYLOR
LUIS A. UBIÑAS
175 E Houston Street
San Antonio TX 78205

CIVIL ACTION NO. _____

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Serve all above named AT&T Defendants on:
CT Corp System
1999 Bryan St.
Ste. 900
Dallas TX 75201-3136

T-MOBILE USA, INC
12920 Southeast 38th Street
Bellevue WA 98006

ANDRÉ ALMEIDA
MARCELO CLAURE
SRIKANT M. DATAR
SRINIVASAN GOPALAN
TIMOTHEUS HÖTTGES
DR. CHRISTIAN P. ILLEK
JAMES J. KAVANAUGH
RAPHAEL KÜBLER
THORSTEN LANGHEIM
DOMINIQUE LEROY
LETITIA A. LONG
MARK NELSON
MIKE SIEVERT
TERESA A. TAYLOR
KELVIN R. WESTBROOK
12920 Southeast 38th Street
Bellevue WA 98006

Serve all above named T-Mobile Defendants on:
Corporation Service Company
211 E. 7th Street
Suite 620
Austin TX 78701

DEUTSCHE TELEKOM AG
Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 140
Bonn, Germany 53113

TIMOTHEUS HÖTTGES
DR. FERRI ABOLHASSAN
BIRGIT BOHLE
SRINI GOPALAN
CHRISTIAN P. ILLEK
THORSTEN LANGHEIM

DOMINIQUE LEROY
CLAUDIA NEMAT
12920 Southeast 38th Street
Bellevue WA 98006

Serve all Deutsche Telekon AG Defendants on:
Corporation Service Company
211 E. 7th Street
Suite 620
Austin TX 78701

VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
140 West Street
New York NY 10013

Serve on:
Corporation Trust Company
Corporation Trust Center
1209 Orange Street
Wilmington DE 19801

CELLCO PARTNERSHIP dba VERIZON WIRELESS
One Verizon Way
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Serve on:
Corporation Trust Company
Corporation Trust Center
1209 Orange Street
Wilmington DE 19801

VERIZON SERVICES, CORP.
1717 Arch Street
21st Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Serve on:
CT Corporation System
1999 Bryan St.
Ste. 900
Dallas TX 75201-3136

VERIZON BUSINESS NETWORK SERVICES, INC.
22001 Loudin County Parkway

Ashburn VA 20147

Serve on:
CT Corporation System
1999 Bryan St.
Ste. 900
Dallas, TX 75201-3136

VITTORIO COLAO
SHELLYE L. ARCHAMBEAU
MARK T. BERTOLIN
ROXANNE S. AUSTIN
MELANIE L. HEALEY
LAXMAN NARASIMHAN
CLARENCE OTIS, JR.
DANIEL H. SCHULMAN
RODNEY E. SLATER
CAROL B. TOMÉ
VANDANA VENKATESH
HANS VESTBERG
GREGORY G. WEAVER
140 West Street
New York NY 10013
And
600 Hidden Ridge
Irving TX 75038
Serve on:
Corporation Trust Company
Corporation Trust Center
1209 Orange Street
Wilmington DE 19801
or
CT Corporation System
1999 Bryan St.
Ste. 900
Dallas TX 75201-3136

Defendants.

COMPLAINT-CLASS ACTION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREAMBLE

1. In many antitrust complaints, plaintiffs typically focus on one or two sections of the Sherman or Clayton Acts. This Class Action lawsuit, brought on behalf of approximately 373 million smartphone subscribers, is unprecedented in its scope because it exposes 14 distinct legal violations spanning across four major legal frameworks: the 1996 Telecommunications Act, antitrust laws, and the doctrine of negligence. This comprehensive legal approach challenges the Defendants as telecom giants who systematically abuse of legal frameworks to maintain market dominance and restrict competition.

2. The Defendants—AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom—exploit their dominant positions using a series of practices that collectively harm competition and stifle innovation. The Defendants have systematically violated have violated Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, the Sherman Act, and the Clayton Act for over six years with antitrust violations by deliberately withholding from both consumers and competition standalone (or unbundled) Voice over Wi-Fi calling and texting (also known as VoWi-Fi or "Wi-Fi Calling").

3. The Defendants—AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom—exploit their dominant positions using anticompetitive practices and anticonsumer practices—including tying arrangements, forced sales, and predatory pricing—have allowed the Defendants to maintain oligopolistic control over 97% of the U.S. smartphone mobile market. The Defendants' deliberate conduct has definitively harmed the telecommunications market generally, the markets for standalone (or unbundled) VoWi-Fi, and specifically VoIP-Pal and access to approximately 373 million subscribers of the Defendants in the United States. Their refusal to offer standalone VoWi-Fi, instead bundling it with more expensive cellular services, exemplifies their anti-competitive behavior.

INTRODUCTION

A. Introduction to VoWi-Fi

4. References to Wi-Fi Calling should be understood to refer to VoWi-Fi and should not be confused with traditional Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) services that use subscribers' computers, laptops, tablets, or Polycom/conference room devices or other Internet data-centric calling and messaging services offered by companies that employ over-the-top (OTT) applications like those from WhatsApp, Google, Microsoft installed on computers, laptops, tables, and even smartphones that can communicate Wi-Fi, cellular data networks, or any available wired or wireless connection to the Internet.

5. VoWi-Fi is a technology that allows users to make and receive voice calls and send and receive text messages using a Wi-Fi network instead of relying on a cellular connection. VoWi-Fi doesn't use cell towers or a cell phones data connection. It is built directly into a smartphone and integrated into the native phone dialer and messaging apps, **offering an integrated experience**. With VoWi-Fi, users can seamlessly make calls, send texts, and accessing their paid communication services even when they are outside of cellular network coverage, provided they have access to a Wi-Fi connection and the Internet. VoWi-Fi calls are routed through the Wi-Fi network (and thus the Internet) to the carrier's server, which then connects the call to the recipient, whether the recipient (or callee) is using a cellular network, a landline, or another VoWi-Fi connection. In general, a phone must be compatible with VoWi-Fi, and the mobile carrier must support it. Almost all smartphones nowadays offered by the Defendants from manufacturers such as Apple and Samsung are VoWi-Fi compatible.

B. VoWi-Fi vs Traditional VoIP

6. VoWi-Fi is often compared to traditional VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) calling. While both technologies use the Internet to transmit voice data, VoWi-Fi is integrated into the mobile network operator's infrastructure, meaning calls and texts made via VoWi-Fi are handled in the same way as traditional mobile voice calls and texts. Traditional VoIP services, like those offered by Google's Voice service, Meta's WhatsApp service, Microsoft's Skype service, or other third-party apps, are separate from the mobile operator and usually require specific apps to handle calls. VoWi-Fi, in contrast, doesn't need a third-party app. Thus, one key difference between VoWi-Fi and VoIP services such as WhatsApp or Skype is that VoWi-Fi uses the phone's native dialer and contact list. This means you can make and receive calls as if you were using the regular cellular network, without needing to open a separate app or remember to check for notifications. When a user dials a number, the phone automatically chooses between VoWi-Fi or cellular based on availability and signal strength, which makes it seamless for users.

7. App-based calling services like WhatsApp, Skype, or Viber rely on an Internet connection, typically Wi-Fi or mobile data, to make voice or video calls. However, unlike VoWi-Fi, these calls are not integrated into the phone's native calling functions. You must open the app, find the contact, and initiate the call within the app itself. VoWi-Fi, on the other hand, integrates directly into the operating system's dialer, making it as convenient as traditional cellular calls.

8. Another significant difference between VoWi-Fi and third-party calling apps is that VoWi-Fi is typically offered and supported by mobile carriers. This integration with the carrier allows VoWi-Fi calls to seamlessly switch between Wi-Fi and cellular networks during the call if the signal strength changes, ensuring an uninterrupted call experience. In contrast, app-based calls can drop or suffer from poor quality if the Wi-Fi signal weakens or if data connections fluctuate. A final but minor aspect of VoWi-Fi is its ability to support emergency services. Because VoWi-Fi is part

of the carrier's network infrastructure, emergency calls made over Wi-Fi can be routed to the nearest dispatch center with an accurate location, much like traditional cellular calls. This is a significant difference from app-based calling services like WhatsApp, which typically do not support emergency services and cannot reliably provide location data to emergency responders.

C. The Defendants Rely on Bundling VoWi-Fi with Cellular Calling and Texting Services

9. VoWi-Fi combines the convenience and reliability of traditional cellular calls with the flexibility of internet-based calling. It offers seamless integration with the phone's native dialer, ensures emergency service support, and provides high-quality calls even in areas with poor cellular coverage. While app-based calling services like WhatsApp or Skype appear to offer similar features, they require a separate interface and often do not integrate as smoothly into the phone's core functions.

10. As Wi-Fi coverage has expanded globally, VoWi-Fi has become an increasingly important and essential service not only for enhancing communication options for subscribers, but also for preserving the Defendants' dominance in global communications. The Defendants save significant costs with VoWi-Fi by **offloading network traffic** from their cellular networks to consumers' Wi-Fi networks. Consumers bear the cost of internet services required for VoWi-Fi, while the Defendants enjoy reduced spectrum and infrastructure expenditures. Yet, subscribers are not reimbursed, compensated, nor provided with lower costs for avoiding higher cost cellular services and using VoWi-Fi. Additionally, subscribers in locations with poor network signal, such as rural areas and basement apartments, whose calls are almost exclusively VoWi-Fi are required to pay bundled prices for traditionally cellular calling and texting they may never have a strong enough signal to use. The Defendants' offloading practices unfairly shift the cost burden onto the

subscribers, who must pay for their personal Wi-Fi networks while continuing to pay inflated prices for cellular services. By avoiding the costs of expanding their networks and instead using consumer Wi-Fi without offering a standalone service, the Defendants force consumers into expensive bundled packages.

D. Implications of Defendants' Bundling Practices on VoIP-Pal and Consumers

11. VoIP-Pal's know-how and patented technologies (such as found in U.S. Patent Nos. 8,542,815; 9,179,005; and 10,218,606) are also critical to the operation of VoWiFi services. VoIP-Pal's know-how and patented technologies enable the essential functionalities within the mobile carrier's telecommunications infrastructure, in particular what is known as the Enhanced Packet Core (or EPC), that make seamless connectivity and intelligent routing possible. VoWiFi is fundamentally different from the other VoIP apps discussed above, being tied to each carrier's implementation of an IP Multimedia Subsystem or IP Multimedia Core Network Subsystem (IMS), which is a telecommunications industry standardized architectural framework for delivering Internet Protocol (IP) multimedia services reliant on the Evolved Packet Core (EPC) infrastructure, which the Defendants control.

12. VoIP-Pal's know-how and patented technologies used in the deployment and functioning of VoWi-Fi also sets it apart from standard VoIP services. These patents focus on various aspects of routing voice and data communications over the Internet, often involving complex systems, like those used in the Defendants' networks each with millions of subscribers, that enable efficient and cost-effective calling, messaging, and other data communications services.

13. VoIP-Pal's classification patents (e.g., the '815 and '005 patents) are used every time a call or text message is sent, irrespective of whether the communication originates via a cellular tower or a Wi-Fi network. In particular, a Wi-Fi call or text needs to be classified, using information about

the caller, according to whether the destination of the call is an internal subscriber of the same carrier (in which case the call is routed internally), or an external subscriber (in which case the call is routed externally). This classification is performed at least in part by servers operated by the Defendants. This is because as currently practiced, Wi-Fi calls and texts are routed over the Internet back to the carriers' networks. In the case that there were a Wi-Fi only voice and text service provider, VoIP-Pal's classification patents would still be used by that provider. For example, a Wi-Fi only provider (like VoIP-Pal) would operate servers that would need to distinguish the destination of the communication as either one of its own subscribers or not. VoIP-Pal also owns call routing patents (e.g., the '606 patent) that are used in calling and text messaging (again irrespective of whether the communication originates via a cellular tower or a Wi-Fi network) to route internal calls and text messages between different nodes in a distributed system with multiple nodes where participants are associated with nodes.

14. This Class Action Antitrust Action focuses on the Defendants' anticompetitive and anticonsumer bundling practices with respective to their VoWi-Fi technology and their market dominating cellular calling and messaging services and the Defendants' unauthorized use of VoIP-Pal's technology and know-how to deploy VoWi-Fi (which is different from other non-VoWi-Fi but VoIP services from companies like Google, Meta, and Microsoft) anticompetitively and in an anticonsumer manner harming VoIP-Pal and approximately 373 million of the Defendants' subscribers.

DEFENDANT'S OPEN LETTER REVEALING TECHNICAL POSITION AND BAD FAITH CONDUCT

15. Introduction of Verizon's Open Letter (Exhibit A)

In a critical development, Verizon Communications Inc. issued an open letter, submitted as Exhibit A, which was not marked as "without prejudice." This letter contains significant technical admissions from Verizon and includes threats of legal sanctions and fees if VoIP-Pal does not withdraw the complaint. These tactics are a clear attempt to intimidate VoIP-Pal into abandoning its legitimate antitrust claims, demonstrating bad faith conduct.

16. Admissibility of Verizon's Open Letter Under Rule 801(d)(2)

Verizon's letter is included under Rule 801(d)(2) of the Federal Rules of Evidence, which provides that an admission by a party-opponent is not hearsay if it is relevant to the dispute. The letter includes technical admissions regarding their refusal to unbundle VoWi-Fi services, reflecting monopolistic practices central to this case, as well as intimidation tactics designed to coerce VoIP-Pal into withdrawing its legitimate antitrust claims. These admissions are admissible and form a key part of the antitrust violations presented in this complaint.

Legal precedents such as United States v. Nixon, 418 U.S. 683 (1974), and Federal Trade Commission v. Actavis, Inc., 570 U.S. 136 (2013), further bolster the admissibility of this letter. These rulings emphasize that communications revealing a party's legal position are admissible unless explicitly protected by privilege. In Nixon, the Supreme Court established that relevant communications must be disclosed unless a legitimate claim of privilege exists, and Actavis reinforced that communications in the context of legal disputes, including those revealing tactics or positions, may be highly relevant to litigation. Verizon's letter reveals both their technical stance and their intimidation tactics, which are directly pertinent to this case.

17. Verizon's Technical Admissions and Flawed Defense

This letter cements the technical arguments Verizon intends to rely on, which are now part of the record. These arguments, however, are fundamentally flawed and without merit, as demonstrated by VoIP-Pal's technical analysis. Any attempt by Verizon to alter these arguments later would

significantly weaken their credibility and expose further bad faith conduct before the court.

A. Verizon's Mischaracterization of Unrelated Litigation and Misleading Statements

18. In their letter, Verizon dedicates several paragraphs to discussing a separate patent litigation matter, filed by VoIP-Pal in June 2021 in the Western District of Texas (Case No. 6:21-cv-672-ADA). This case involved Mobile Gateway technology, which is unrelated to the current antitrust claims at issue in this litigation. VoIP-Pal never mentioned or asserted specific patent numbers in the original complaint; rather alleged that the Defendants unlawfully used Wi-Fi calling routing classifications to their advantage, excluding fair competition. By introducing the Mobile Gateway litigation, Verizon attempts to cherry-pick from VoIP-Pal's portfolio of 40 patents to confuse the issues at hand. The Mobile Gateway technology does not pertain to the Wi-Fi calling routing classification technology central to this case, making Verizon's reference irrelevant. This appears to be a clear effort to mislead the Court by conflating two distinct technical matters.

19.

Verizon's mischaracterization of the claim construction dispute is similarly misleading. Although the dispute was preliminarily decided, it remains unresolved. Verizon falsely claims that "neither VoIP-Pal nor their expert could identify any Verizon access code request message that included both elements." This is incorrect. A collection of transmissions that included both elements was identified. The real issue is whether these transmissions constitute an "access code request message" according to the claims, a question still under dispute. Even if Judge Albright denies VoIP-Pal's request for a rehearing, this does not mark the end of the matter. There is still the possibility of an appeal to the Federal Circuit, which has the authority to reverse the claim

construction ruling. Verizon's implication that the matter is settled is misleading.

20. Verizon also mischaracterizes the new complaint regarding the DID claims. It claims that VoIP-Pal is asserting the same patents that were declared invalid in the 2016 litigation. This is false. While certain claims were invalidated, the patents themselves were not declared invalid. The new complaint asserts claims that had never been asserted, challenged, or invalidated, and Verizon's statement is a clear misrepresentation of the facts.

E.

Bad Faith and Intimidation Tactics

21. Verizon's threats of sanctions and legal fees are clearly intended to coerce VoIP-Pal into abandoning its legitimate claims rather than addressing the merits of the case. This conduct constitutes bad faith as defined by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.,* 501 U.S. 32 (1991), where the Court held that parties acting in bad faith, including those who misuse litigation as a weapon of intimidation, can be sanctioned by the courts. Verizon's actions fit squarely within this definition of bad faith.

22. Additionally, the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roadway Express, Inc. v. Piper,* 447 U.S. 752 (1980) emphasizes that tactics aimed at obstructing the judicial process—such as threats of sanctions to intimidate plaintiffs—warrant sanctions. Verizon's letter is not just a procedural communication; it is an improper attempt to obstruct VoIP-Pal's legal right to pursue its antitrust claims. This conduct further demonstrates that Verizon seeks to manipulate the judicial process to avoid answering for their monopolistic practices.

Verizon's Weak Position and Flawed Technical Arguments in Their Open Letter

23. By sending this open letter without the "without prejudice" protection, Verizon has locked itself into the technical arguments outlined therein. These admissions are now part of the case record

and can be used by VoIP-Pal to demonstrate Verizon's flawed defense. Any attempt by Verizon to alter their technical arguments later in the proceedings would not only weaken their credibility but also expose their bad faith tactics to the court.

24. The importance of this legal positioning cannot be understated. Courts have consistently held that shifting technical defenses undermine a party's credibility, as seen in *Otter Tail Power Co. v. United States,* 410 U.S. 366 (1973). In this case, the defendant's monopolistic behavior and attempts to alter their technical defense were rejected, which mirrors the flawed strategy Verizon is attempting here.

1. Allegation of Stock Promotion and Lack of Good Faith Basis

25. **Verizon's Position**: Verizon claims that VoIP-Pal is using the lawsuit to promote its stock, pointing to previous litigation and asserting that the complaint is frivolous and lacks a good faith basis.

26. **VoIP-Pal's Response**: This allegation will be thoroughly disproven as baseless. VoIP-Pal's claims are backed by concrete legal and market evidence, demonstrating clear violations of antitrust laws by Verizon. VoIP-Pal has every right to pursue this litigation under antitrust principles, and the suggestion of stock promotion is a mere intimidation tactic intended to distract from the real issues. Courts have long recognized that antitrust claims are a legitimate legal strategy, as upheld in *Otter Tail Power Co. v. United States,* 410 U.S. 366 (1973), where a company defending against similar accusations was held liable for monopolizing a market.

2. Accusation of Failing to Plead Facts Implicating Verizon in Anticompetitive Conduct

27. **Verizon's Position**: Verizon argues that VoIP-Pal has failed to provide specific factual allegations tying it to anticompetitive conduct, claiming that Verizon competes with Google, Microsoft, and

Meta in the VoWi-Fi market.

28. **VoIP-Pal's Response**: Verizon's position here will also be disproven as inaccurate. VoIP-Pal will present detailed evidence that clearly implicates Verizon in monopolistic conduct within the carrier-based VoWi-Fi market. Google, Microsoft, and Meta, as over-the-top (OTT) service providers, do not compete in the same market. Carrier-based VoWi-Fi operates in a distinct regulatory and infrastructure market, which Verizon, alongside AT&T and T-Mobile, has effectively monopolized by bundling VoWi-Fi with cellular services, in clear violation of Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act.

3. Argument Against a "Shared Monopoly" and Claim of Robust Competition

29. **Verizon's Position**: Verizon asserts that the claim of a shared monopoly is erroneous and that the presence of competitors such as Google, Microsoft, and Meta prove robust competition.

30. **VoIP-Pal's Response**: The claim of robust competition will be shown to be fundamentally flawed. VoIP-Pal will prove that carrier-based VoWi-Fi is not in direct competition with OTT services like WhatsApp or Skype, as these services lack the infrastructure and regulatory control of the carriers. The Defendants have used their market dominance to stifle competition, and VoIP-Pal will demonstrate through market analysis and industry data that there is no real competition in the carrier VoWi-Fi market. Verizon, AT&T, and T-Mobile have effectively monopolized this market by bundling VoWi-Fi with cellular plans, preventing Standalone VoWi-Fi from being offered.

4. Criticism of Group Pleading and Lack of Market Power Allegations

31. **Verizon's Position**: Verizon argues that group pleading is improper and that the complaint fails to attribute specific market power to Verizon or any single firm.

32. **VoIP-Pal's Response**: Verizon's argument regarding group pleading will also be addressed and

dismissed. VoIP-Pal will provide additional data and evidence detailing Verizon's dominant role in the telecommunications market. Verizon's market power is evident in its ability to bundle services and prevent consumer choice in VoWi-Fi. VoIP-Pal will show that Verizon's actions, in concert with AT&T and T-Mobile, have created a collective monopoly, violating antitrust laws. These actions are in direct contravention of the Clayton Act, and Verizon's conduct will be clearly tied to the anticompetitive behavior that harms consumers and stifles market entry for competitors.

5. Challenge to Sherman Act Section 1 Conspiracy Allegations

33. **Verizon's Position**: Verizon contends that the conspiracy claims under Sherman Act Section 1 are unsupported and that there is no evidence of a concerted agreement between the Defendants.

34. **VoIP-Pal's Response**: VoIP-Pal will provide compelling evidence of parallel conduct among Verizon, AT&T, and T-Mobile, supporting the existence of a concerted effort to monopolize the VoWi-Fi market. The Defendants have consistently engaged in uniform bundling practices and refused to offer Standalone VoWi-Fi, demonstrating a clear restraint of trade. Courts have repeatedly held that parallel conduct, when supported by contextual evidence, can establish conspiracy claims, as seen in *Interstate Circuit v. United States,* 306 U.S. 208 (1939). VoIP-Pal will demonstrate that the Defendants' actions align with these precedents**.**

6. Smear Campaign and Baseless Allegations Against VoIP-Pal

35. In addition to their flawed technical defense, Verizon has engaged in a smear campaign against VoIP-Pal, attempting to paint the company as a pump-and-dump market manipulator. These claims are entirely baseless and intended to divert attention from the core antitrust issues. By making these allegations, Verizon seeks to undermine VoIP-Pal's reputation in the hope of weakening its legal claims.

36. VoIP-Pal has voluntarily undergone financial audits and has never been subject to any regulatory investigations for improper financial practices. The allegations of market manipulation are a clear attempt by Verizon to shift the focus away from their anti-competitive conduct and onto irrelevant and unfounded claims. VoIP-Pal's financial status has no bearing on the merits of this case, which centers on the Defendants' collective monopolization of the VoWi-Fi market.

37. The smear campaign is nothing more than an attempt to distract the court from the substantive antitrust violations that Verizon, AT&T, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom have committed. VoIP-Pal's resort to litigation is not a business tactic; it is the only means by which it can protect its intellectual property and technology, which the Defendants have illegally deployed**.**

7. Antitrust Violations

38. This complaint addresses several antitrust violations, including breaches of the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The Defendants' unlawful bundling of VoWi-Fi with cellular services has restricted competition and prevented companies like VoIP-Pal from entering the market with Standalone VoWi-Fi services.

39. Sherman Act: The Defendants' conduct constitutes monopolization by limiting consumer access to Standalone VoWi-Fi and forcing the purchase of bundled services. This monopolization harms competition and prevents VoIP-Pal from introducing its Standalone VoWi-Fi services.

40. Clayton Act: The Defendants' acquisitions of multiple Mobile Virtual Network Operators (MVNOs) and smaller competitors have further entrenched their dominance in the telecommunications market, resulting in reduced competition and higher costs for consumers.

41. Telecommunications Act (Section 251): The Defendants have violated their obligations under the Telecommunications Act to provide unbundled access to services, thereby preventing competitors like VoIP-Pal from offering standalone services. This is an unlawful tying arrangement that

restricts market competition and consumer choice.

Legal and Technical Argument: Why Carrier VoWi-Fi and App-Based Wi-Fi Calling Are Not Competitors

42. Verizon has wrongly asserted that carrier VoWi-Fi services (offered by Verizon, AT&T, and T-Mobile) are in direct competition with Over-the-Top (OTT) services like WhatsApp. This assertion is a deliberate misrepresentation. VoIP-Pal has conducted a detailed technical review that proves that carrier VoWi-Fi and app-based VoIP services are in distinct markets and serve different purposes.

Defendant Carriers Do Not Provide a Separate App for Free VoWi-Fi

43. **Carrier VoWi-Fi**: Since calls and messages can be placed to any phone number on any network, VoWi-Fi is fully integrated with the public telecommunications infrastructure and subscribers' smartphones. The Defendant wireless carriers do not provide a separate app for making "free" VoWi-Fi calls.

44. **WhatsApp Wi-Fi Calling**: WhatsApp provides a separate application required to be installed on a user's device to make free calls and messages within its own ecosystem. Both parties to a call or text message must install and use the app.

45. **Why They Are Not Competitors**: Carrier VoWi-Fi is integrated with the subscriber's phone, the carrier's network, and the global telecommunications network, ensuring universal reach and emergency services. Carrier VoWi-Fi does not require a separate app, nor do the Defendants provide such an app for non-cellular calling plan subscribers to also make VoWi-Fi calls and participate in the global telecommunications network. WhatsApp is a closed, app-based system, that typically cannot participate in the global telecommunications network (or does so in a limited manner for an extra fee) and therefore cannot compete with carrier services in terms of utility,

scope, and pricing.

8. Subscriber Requirements

46. **Carrier VoWi-Fi**: The caller needs to be a subscriber to one of the carrier networks (AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile), and the call can reach anyone on any network, including landlines.

47. **WhatsApp Wi-Fi Calling**: Both the caller and callee must be WhatsApp users. The call cannot reach anyone not using the app, which severely limits its ecosystem.

48. **Why They Are Not Competitors**: Carrier VoWi-Fi enables universal connectivity across networks and device types, whereas WhatsApp operates within a closed ecosystem, limiting it to app-to-app communications. This fundamental difference ensures that WhatsApp is not a true competitor to carrier VoWi-Fi.

Network Requirements

49. **Carrier VoWi-Fi**: The caller **needs** to be on Wi-Fi. The callee **does not need** to be on Wi-Fi. The caller's phone can switch to cellular infrastructure if needed, ensuring the call connects if the caller is not on Wi-Fi. The caller's phone though cannot use mobile data if the caller is not on Wi-Fi.

50. **WhatsApp Wi-Fi Calling**: Both the caller and callee must be online, using Wi-Fi data, mobile data, or any wired or wireless Internet data connection to make the call.

51. **Why They Are Not Competitors**: Carrier VoWi-Fi is integrated into the phone to operate seamlessly between Wi-Fi and cellular networks, providing greater flexibility and reliability. WhatsApp is an additional app installed by the user on their phone and WhatsApp's dependency on internet access limits its scope and makes it unsuitable for broad communication needs, especially in areas with unreliable connectivity.

Interoperability Across Networks

52. **Carrier VoWi-Fi**: Calls can be placed to any phone number on any network, reflecting its full integration with the public telecommunications infrastructure.

53. **WhatsApp Wi-Fi Calling**: WhatsApp calls are restricted to within its own ecosystem, meaning both parties must use the app.

54. **Why They Are Not Competitors**: Carrier VoWi-Fi is integrated with the subscriber's phone, the carrier's network, and the global telecommunications network, ensuring universal reach and emergency services. WhatsApp is a closed, app-based system, and therefore cannot compete with carrier services in terms of utility and scope.

Weighing the Evidence: Why Carrier VoWi-Fi and WhatsApp Wi-Fi Calling Are Not Competitors

55. Verizon's open letter, now submitted as Exhibit A, reveals their technical stance and their intent to use intimidation as a tactic to stifle VoIP-Pal's legitimate claims. This letter, admissible under the Federal Rules of Evidence and supported by precedents such as *Hall v. Cole* and *Hicks v. Arthur*, serves as binding evidence of Verizon's technical arguments and their bad faith conduct.

56. By cementing these flawed technical arguments in the record, Verizon has severely limited its ability to modify its defense without losing credibility. This bad faith conduct, combined with their attempts to obstruct justice, strengthens VoIP-Pal's claims and justifies its inclusion as one of the lead plaintiffs in the Class Action.

57. Furthermore, this evidence supports VoIP-Pal's motion for coordination under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) and for Related Case Status under Local Rule 40.5, as the common technical and legal issues between VoIP-Pal's case and the Class Action make such coordination logical and necessary to prevent inconsistent rulings.

DEFENDANTS' TECHNICAL DEFENSE IS BASELESS: EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORTS STANDALONE VOWI-FI

58. Standalone (or unbundled) VoWi-Fi and separate (or unbundled) cellular calling and texting already have and do exist, with no need for any technical modifications. The Defendants—AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom—cannot rely on a perception of technical superiority to argue that such separations are unfeasible. Any technical argument in this instance to the contrary is unfounded and merely an attempt to confuse the issues as well as the public. The fact remains that the Defendants infrastructure is already in place, and both services—cellular services and VoWi-Fi services—are currently operational as "integrated" but not "integral" features within these networks.

A. Defendants are Technically Capable of Offering Standalone VoWi-Fi

59. The reality is simple: customer invoices already list cellular calling and texting separately from VoWi-Fi usage, proving that both services are already tracked independently in the Defendants' existing implementations of the respective technologies. The Defendants require no new software or hardware to implement standalone services. The Defendants' typical strength—using technical complexity as a shield—cannot be used in this case. The technical groundwork for separating these services is fully established, and a claim by the Defendants that separation is not viable is nothing more than a pretense to maintain their monopolistic practices.

60. The Defendants may be known for their sophisticated technical capabilities, however there simply is no justification for claiming that additional development is required. Courts have previously rejected similar technical defenses. *In United States v. Microsoft Corp.,* 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001), Microsoft argued that its exclusive dealings and product integration were technically necessary to improve its operating system's performance and that it would be difficult to separate

the operating system and the browser. However, the court dismissed this argument, finding that the justifications were merely a pretext for monopolistic practices. The same principle applies here.

61. The Defendants' claim that separating cellular services (the tying product analogous to Microsoft's Windows operating system) from VoWi-Fi (the tied product analogous to Microsoft's browser) is technically unfeasible serves only to mask their desire to maintain monopolistic control. Since VoWi-Fi is integrated with the subscriber's phone, the carrier's network, and the global telecommunications network, VoWi-Fi does not require a separate app, and the Defendants do not provide such an app for non-cellular calling plan subscribers to also make VoWi-Fi calls and participate in the global telecommunications network. The Defendants are not required to compete with other calling apps like that typically cannot participate in the global telecommunications network (or do so in a limited manner for an extra fee). Free apps like WhatsApp that charge for connections outside of their closed systems to the global telecommunications network are in a different class from, and in reality cannot compete with, VoWi-Fi integrated with subscribers smartphones in terms of utility, scope, and pricing (as VoWi-Fi is marketed as "free").

B. Plaintiffs Request Fair and Competitive Standalone VoWi-Fi

62. Plaintiffs are directly challenging the Defendants' current practice of bundling VoWi-Fi with cellular calling, texting, and mobile data, while deceptively advertising VoWi-Fi as a "free" or no-charge addon service. This practice forces consumers into purchasing additional services they may not need, thereby restricting competition and consumer choice. Plaintiffs propose restoration of fair and competitive alternatives, for example, one that allows subscribers the freedom to purchase standalone and unbundled VoWi-Fi for $6.50 per month for individual subscribers and

$20 per month for a family of four, unencumbered and unbundled from cellular services and mobile data.

63. This pricing structure allows consumers to choose VoWi-Fi without being compelled to buy unnecessary bundled services. The Defendants can continue to offer separate cellular calling, texting, and mobile data services, ensuring that subscribers can customize their plans based on **their** specific needs and not the pocket books of large companies. This antitrust class action directly addresses the antitrust breaches at the heart of this case by breaking the Defendants' unlawful tying practices. Plaintiffs ask for genuine market competition with VoWi-Fi, ensuring fair pricing for all subscribers, and encourages innovation and competition by enabling approximately 373 million smartphone users to have choice and opt for only the services they require. This unbundling not only enhances consumer choice but also reflects true market dynamics, moving away from the Defendants' monopolistic conduct and deceptive practices.

C. Plaintiffs Requests Consumer Choice and Essential Standalone VoWi-Fi Pricing

64. Plaintiffs are directly confronting the Defendants' exploitative practice of bundling VoWiFi with cellular calling, texting, and mobile data, while misleadingly advertising VoWiFi as a "free" service. This deceptive tactic forces consumers to purchase additional, often unnecessary services, reducing competition and denying consumer choice. Currently, individual subscribers are paying between $55 to $80 per month for these bundled services, while families of four typically face an average monthly cost of $200. Plaintiffs' proposed solution offers substantial savings, with Standalone VoWiFi available for just $6.50 per month for individuals and $20 per month for families—completely unbundled from cellular and data services.

65. These savings translate into real, tangible benefits for millions of American consumers, particularly for those facing financial pressures. Plaintiffs' alternative pricing structure directly

addresses this burden, allowing consumers to choose VoWiFi without being forced into expensive bundled plans that include services they may not need or use. This proposal provides a critical pathway for economic relief, especially for low-income families and underserved communities, who would otherwise be locked into high-priced contracts.

66. Additionally, Plaintiffs' plan promotes true consumer freedom by giving subscribers the ability to tailor their communications services to fit their specific needs. No longer will consumers be compelled to pay for cellular calling, texting, or mobile data that they do not require. This unbundling disrupts the Defendants' monopolistic control, breaking the cycle of forced purchases that limits market choice and restricts competition.

67. The broader market implications of this proposal are profound. By allowing 373 million smartphone users to select only the services they need, Plaintiffs' solution enhances competition across the telecommunications industry. Smaller providers will be encouraged to innovate and offer competitive alternatives, spurring dynamic market growth and reducing the market dominance currently enjoyed by the Defendants. This promotes a healthier, more competitive marketplace, free from the artificial barriers the Defendants have erected.

68. *Northern Pacific Railway Co. v. United States,* 356 U.S. 1 (1958) provides strong judicial backing for VoIP-Pal's challenge. The Supreme Court held that tying arrangements—where the sale of one product is conditioned on the purchase of another—are "unreasonable per se" under the Sherman Act. These arrangements, as the Court emphasized, harm competition and limit consumer choice. The Defendants' practice of tying VoWiFi to other services, such as cellular calling and mobile data, mirrors this precedent, violating fundamental antitrust laws and trapping consumers in overpriced bundles.

69. VoIP-Pal's proposal shatters these unlawful tying practices by offering consumers the freedom to

choose Standalone VoWiFi. The impact is twofold: it restores fairness to the marketplace and delivers immediate, significant financial benefits to consumers. This alternative ensures that competition thrives, consumers are empowered, and the Defendants' monopolistic conduct is dismantled—leading to a more vibrant, consumer-focused telecommunications market.

DEFENDANTS' CONDUCT HAS A DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT ON VULNERABLE POPULATIONS

70. For over six years, the Defendants have exploited their market dominance by forcing millions of consumers into costly bundled services. These practices have disproportionately affected several vulnerable populations.

71. Approximately 37.9 million Americans lived in poverty in 2022. These individuals are particularly burdened by rising costs for essential services, such as telecommunications. The inflated prices tied to these unnecessary bundles make it increasingly difficult for low-income households to afford basic communication services.

72. In 2023, about 54 million elderly individuals live on fixed incomes, many of whom struggle with the complexity and expense of bundled mobile service packages. These packages often include unnecessary features, adding further financial strain to elderly consumers who may only need limited services.

73. According to statistics, six in ten adults in the U.S. have at least one chronic disease, and four in ten have two or more. Reliable communication is critical for their healthcare needs, yet they are disproportionately affected by the high costs and limitations of bundled services that include features they do not require.

74. Residents of nursing homes and assisted living facilities, including 1.3 million people in nursing

homes and 800,000 in assisted living, often have limited autonomy over their service choices. Most of these facilities are equipped with Wi-Fi connectivity, making standalone Wi-Fi services an ideal and cost-effective option for these individuals. Yet, the Defendants' bundling practices deny them access to more affordable alternatives, significantly increasing their financial burden.

75. Economically disadvantaged families, which include 11.6% of U.S. families living below the poverty line in 2022, also struggle with the high costs and inflexible service options imposed by the Defendants. The financial pressure from these inflated service packages exacerbates the challenges faced by low-income families, making it difficult for them to manage their essential household expenses.

76. The Defendants' refusal to offer unbundled VoWi-Fi from cellular services, alongside the compulsory bundling of mobile data with cellular calling and texting, forces consumers into purchasing more expensive, full-service packages they may not need. This practice disregards the potential for more affordable standalone services that could meet the needs of many consumers at a fraction of the cost.

77. Standalone VoWi-Fi could be offered at an estimated cost of $6.50 per month, with a special package for a family of four for a total of $20 per month. By comparison, families of four are currently paying an average of $240 per month for services they do not necessarily need. The Defendants' strategy, therefore, not only limits consumer choice and flexibility but also places an unnecessary financial burden on consumers, particularly those who are most vulnerable to high pricing.

78. This is a clear example of how the Defendants' anti-competitive practices exploit their market power to maintain inflated prices and prevent consumers from accessing more cost-effective communication solutions. The Defendants have intentionally structured their offerings in a way

that stifles competition and innovation, ensuring that consumers are left with no choice but to pay for services they do not want or need.

79. The antitrust violations and unfair business practices perpetuated by the Defendants have led to the exploitation of vulnerable consumers, particularly those who are economically disadvantaged or lack access to competitive service options. These practices contribute to a widening digital divide, as low-income individuals and communities are disproportionately affected by the high costs of bundled services, limiting their access to essential communication technologies.

80. This situation exacerbates existing inequities within the telecommunications industry, where underserved populations—those already struggling financially—are forced to pay inflated prices for services they do not need. The Defendants' refusal to offer more affordable, standalone services entrenches these inequities and limits the ability of consumers to access critical digital services.

81. Several court precedents underscore the illegality of the Defendants' conduct, including:

82. *Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Technical Services, Inc.,* 504 U.S. 451 (1992): The Supreme Court ruled that Kodak's tying arrangements, which required consumers to purchase unnecessary services to access other products, violated antitrust laws. Similarly, the Defendants' bundling of VoWi-Fi with cellular services constitutes an illegal tying arrangement that restricts consumer choice and inflates prices.

83. *Jefferson Parish Hospital District No. 2 v. Hyde,* 466 U.S. 2 (1984): The Court held that tying arrangements, in which one product is conditioned upon the purchase of another, violate Section 1 of the Sherman Act. The Defendants' conduct mirrors this precedent by forcing consumers to buy cellular services to access VoWi-Fi, which could be offered as a standalone product.

84. *United States v. Microsoft Corp.,* 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001): The Court ruled that Microsoft's

bundling of its operating system with other software stifled competition and violated Section 2 of the Sherman Act. The Defendants' bundling practices in this case serve the same purpose, preventing competition by making it difficult for competitors like VoIP-Pal to offer standalone VoWi-Fi services.

85. *Northern Pacific Railway Co. v. United States,* 356 U.S. 1 (1958): This case established that tying arrangements, which restrict consumer choice and force the purchase of unwanted services, are inherently anticompetitive and violate Section 1 of the Sherman Act. The Defendants' bundling of VoWi-Fi and cellular services reflects these anticompetitive behaviors, limiting options for consumers and maintaining inflated prices.

86. The Defendants—AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom—have engaged in predatory bundling practices that constitute illegal tying arrangements in violation of the Sherman Act and Clayton Act. By deceptively bundling VoWi-Fi with costly cellular services, the Defendants have stifled competition, inflated prices, and deprived millions of consumers of more affordable communication options.

87. Their actions have disproportionately harmed vulnerable populations, including low-income families, the elderly, the chronically ill, and those in nursing homes or assisted living facilities, by forcing them to pay for services they do not need. The widening digital divide caused by these practices further entrenches inequities in access to essential communication services.

88. The Court should recognize the Defendants' anti-competitive conduct and provide relief to the affected consumers by addressing these antitrust violations and ensuring the availability of affordable, standalone VoWi-Fi services.

DEFENDANTS' CONDUCT DRAWS PARALLELS WITH THE GOOGLE ANTITRUST DECISION

A. Introduction

89. In both the ongoing *United States v. Google LLC,* No. 1:20-cv-03010 (D.D.C. filed Oct. 20, 2020), antitrust case and this Antitrust Class Action complaint, defining the relevant market is central to understanding the alleged anticompetitive practices. Market definition plays a crucial role in determining the scope of monopolistic behavior and the potential harm to competition and consumers. In the Google case, the relevant market has been defined as the online search and search advertising markets. Google's dominance in these markets, through its extensive control over search engine results and the advertising ecosystem, is at the heart of the U.S. government's case. The argument is that Google has maintained and extended its monopoly by engaging in exclusionary practices, effectively stifling competition and harming consumers.

90. Similarly, in the Antitrust Class Action complaint, the relevant markets include VoWi-Fi services, mobile data services, and their bundling with cellular calling and texting for smartphone subscribers. The complaint alleges that major telecommunications providers, including AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom, have conspired to monopolize these markets by bundling VoWi-Fi and mobile data services with traditional cellular calling and texting, thereby preventing the emergence of standalone services and stifling competition. The case also highlights the providers' use of exclusionary practices and predatory pricing to maintain their dominant market positions, further limiting consumer choice and innovation.

91. Both cases involve significant breaches of key antitrust laws, specifically the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act:

92. **Section 2 of the Sherman Act**: This section addresses monopolization, attempted

monopolization, and conspiracy to monopolize. Both Google and the telecommunications providers are accused of engaging in practices designed to maintain or achieve monopoly power, thereby restricting competition in their respective markets. The Antitrust Class Action complaint specifically argues that the bundling of VoWi-Fi and mobile data with traditional cellular services, along with exclusionary practices and predatory pricing, are clear examples of this unlawful behavior.

93. **Section 1 of the Sherman Act**: This section prohibits contracts, combinations, or conspiracies that unreasonably restrain trade. The Antitrust Class Action complaint alleges that the telecommunications providers' bundling practices constitute an unreasonable restraint of trade by effectively forcing consumers to purchase services they may not need, thereby limiting competition from standalone service providers.

94. **Section 7 of the Clayton Act**: This section prohibits mergers and acquisitions where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly. In the Google case, the government's argument extends to the company's practices that reinforce its monopoly in the search market. For the Antitrust Class Action complaint, the focus is on the impact of recent telecommunications mergers and acquisitions, including T-Mobile's purchase of Sprint and the latest acquisitions by the Defendants of numerous Mobile Virtual Network Operators (MVNOs). These acquisitions have further consolidated market power, diminished competition, and restricted consumer choices in the markets for VoWi-Fi, mobile data, and traditional cellular services.

95. These cases exemplify how dominant market players can use their positions to engage in practices that undermine competition, violate antitrust laws, and harm consumers. The outcome of these cases will have far-reaching implications for how monopolistic behavior is addressed and

regulated in both the digital and telecommunications sectors.

B. Enhanced Comparison to Google LLC Antitrust Decision

96. The Google decision serves as a critical precedent in addressing monopolistic practices within the digital realm, emphasizing the court's proactive stance against exclusionary tactics that stifle competition. In a manner strikingly similar to Google's actions, the Defendants in the Antitrust Class Action case have employed bundling strategies to entrench their dominance in the telecommunications market, thereby suppressing innovation and severely limiting consumer choice.

97. In the Google case, the court identified the harmful effects of exclusionary agreements that prevented competitors from gaining a meaningful foothold in the market. Similarly, the Defendants here have bundled VoWi-Fi and mobile data with cellular services, effectively eliminating the possibility of a competitive standalone market for these services. This practice not only mirrors the anti-competitive behavior condemned in the Google ruling but also exacerbates the situation by targeting essential services used daily by millions of consumers.

98. **Specific Consumer Harm**: The Defendants' actions have led to inflated costs for consumers, who are forced to pay for bundled services they may not need or want. This practice particularly disadvantages low-income populations, who are deprived of more affordable communication options that could otherwise be available through standalone VoWi-Fi or mobile data services. For instance, if standalone services were available, consumers could save an estimated X% per month, a significant financial relief that is currently being denied.

99. **Anticipating Counterarguments**: The Defendants might argue that bundling enhances service quality or is a standard industry practice. However, this justification falls flat when considering the broader market impact. Bundling artificially inflates prices and restricts consumer choice,

with no substantial benefit to the consumer that outweighs the competitive harm. The Google decision rejected similar justifications, recognizing them as thinly veiled attempts to maintain market dominance.

100. **Broader Implications**: A ruling in favor of the Plaintiff would not only rectify the specific competitive harms in this case but also set a precedent for future antitrust enforcement in the telecommunications and technology sectors. Just as the Google decision reshaped the landscape for digital markets, this case offers the court an opportunity to establish critical protections for consumers and competitors in an increasingly monopolized industry.

101. The parallels between the Defendants' conduct in this case and the practices condemned in the Google decision are not just coincidental but indicative of a broader pattern of anticompetitive behavior that demands judicial intervention. By applying the same rigorous antitrust principles from the Google case, the court can restore fair competition in the telecommunications market and protect consumer interests.

102. These anticompetitive practices are clearly demonstrated as parallel dealings to the five precedent cases, where court decisions have consistently condemned such behavior. The Court now faces an unprecedented opportunity to address these violations by holding the Defendants accountable under the Sherman and Clayton Acts. By doing so, the Court can restore balance to the telecommunications market, protect consumer rights, and set a global precedent for antitrust enforcement in the digital age. The Defendants' actions must be met with a decisive ruling that not only rectifies the specific harms in this case but also deters future anticompetitive behavior, ensuring that even the largest corporations adhere to the principles of fair competition.

DEFENDANTS' CONDUCT OF UNLAWFUL BUNDLING OF VOWI-FI SERVICES IN VIOLATION OF SECTION 251

103. The Defendants' unlawful bundling of VoWi-Fi services violates multiple provisions of Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and also breaches key sections of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. The Defendants have engaged in specific anticompetitive practices, such as tying, monopolization, and price discrimination, which restrict competition and harm consumers, including 373 million smartphone subscribers. Below is a detailed analysis of how these actions violate both telecommunications law and antitrust law.

A. Violation of Section 251(c)(3) – Duty to Provide Unbundled Access to Network Elements

104. Section 251(c)(3) of the Telecommunications Act requires incumbent carriers to provide unbundled access to network elements at just and reasonable rates. The purpose is to prevent incumbents from leveraging their control over essential infrastructure to stifle competition. In direct violation of this mandate, Defendants have tied VoWi-Fi to cellular service packages, preventing consumers from accessing VoWi-Fi as a standalone service.

1. Antitrust Laws (Sherman Act, Section 1 & 2)

105. **Tying Arrangements and Unreasonable Restraint of Trade**: Under **Section 1 of the Sherman Act**, tying occurs when a seller conditions the sale of one product (VoWi-Fi) on the purchase of a separate product (cellular services), thereby restraining trade. Here, consumers are compelled to buy both services together, even if they only need VoWi-Fi. This reduces competition by restricting consumer choice and preventing other providers, like VoIP-Pal, from offering standalone VoWi-Fi.

106. **Monopolization**: Under **Section 2 of the Sherman Act**, monopolization is illegal when a

company uses its market power to control both the tied and tying products, as Defendants have done with VoWi-Fi and cellular services. By leveraging their dominance in cellular services, the Defendants are using their monopoly power to control the VoWi-Fi market, excluding competitors and entrenching their market position.

107. Defendants' refusal to unbundle VoWi-Fi and offer it as a standalone service forces consumers to purchase more expensive cellular service packages. This denies smaller competitors and MVNOs the ability to offer standalone VoWi-Fi, significantly limiting market competition.

2. Antitrust Laws (Clayton Act, Section 7)

108. **Substantial Lessening of Competition**: **Section 7 of the Clayton Act** prohibits business practices that substantially lessen competition. By refusing to unbundle VoWi-Fi, the Defendants prevent market entry by smaller competitors like VoIP-Pal, thereby reducing competition and harming consumer choice. This anticompetitive conduct results in fewer alternatives for consumers and artificially inflates prices.

109. **Impact on VoIP-Pal and Competition**: VoIP-Pal is excluded from offering affordable, standalone VoWi-Fi services, forcing consumers into higher-cost cellular plans. This exclusionary conduct stifles competition, allowing the Defendants to maintain their dominance in both the Wi-Fi and cellular service markets, violating both the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

110. **Precedent**: In *AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board,* 525 U.S. 366 (1999), the Supreme Court affirmed that carriers must unbundle essential services to promote competition. By refusing to comply with this ruling, the Defendants suppress competition in violation of Section 251(c)(3) and antitrust laws, as their actions represent both an unlawful tying arrangement and monopolistic behavior.

B. Impact of Section 251(b)(1) – Nondiscriminatory Access to Network Services

111. Section 251(b)(1) mandates that carriers provide nondiscriminatory access to their services, allowing competitors to resell these services fairly. By tying VoWi-Fi to cellular services, the Defendants have effectively denied smaller competitors the ability to offer VoWi-Fi as a standalone service, which limits market competition.

1. Antitrust Laws (Sherman Act, Section 2)

112. **Monopolistic Conduct**: Under **Section 2 of the Sherman Act**, monopolization occurs when a company uses its dominant position to prevent competition. Here, Defendants use their control over both Wi-Fi and cellular services to block MVNOs and other competitors from offering standalone VoWi-Fi. This monopolistic conduct not only reduces competition but also reinforces the Defendants' control over the telecommunications market.

113. **Discriminatory Access to VoWi-Fi**: By bundling VoWi-Fi with cellular services, the Defendants discriminate against smaller competitors by limiting their ability to offer VoWi-Fi on a standalone basis. This discrimination results in restricted access for competitors like VoIP-Pal, preventing them from providing consumers with more affordable options.

2. Antitrust Laws (Clayton Act, Section 7)

114. **Substantial Lessening of Competition**: The refusal to provide nondiscriminatory access to VoWi-Fi violates **Section 7 of the Clayton Act**, as it lessens competition by making it impossible for smaller competitors to enter the market. This conduct limits consumer choice and keeps prices artificially high, as consumers are forced into bundled cellular services they may not need.

115. **Impact on VoIP-Pal and Consumers**: This discriminatory practice harms VoIP-Pal by restricting its ability to compete in the market, and it also harms 373 million smartphone subscribers, who are denied access to standalone VoWi-Fi services that could reduce their monthly costs.

116. **Precedent**: Precedent: In **MCI Communications Corp. v. AT&T Co., 708 F.2d 1081 (7th Cir.**

1983), the court held that discriminatory practices in the telecommunications industry, such as denying competitors access to essential infrastructure, violate both antitrust laws and fair competition principles. Defendants' refusal to provide standalone VoWi-Fi services similarly violates Section 251(b)(1) and antitrust laws, impeding fair competition in the market.

C. Unbundling and Consumer Harm under Section 251(c)(4)(B)

117. Section 251(c)(4)(B) requires carriers to offer services for resale on reasonable and nondiscriminatory terms. Defendants' refusal to offer VoWi-Fi as a standalone service, instead bundling it with cellular services, forces consumers to pay for services they may not need, thereby inflating prices.

1. Antitrust Laws (Sherman Act, Section 1 & 2, Clayton Act, Section 7)

118. **Tying and Price Inflation**: Under **Section 1 of the Sherman Act**, the forced bundling of VoWi-Fi with cellular services constitutes an unlawful tying arrangement, where consumers are required to purchase both services, even if they only want one. This practice inflates prices and reduces competition, as consumers are denied the opportunity to purchase standalone VoWi-Fi at a lower cost.

119. **Monopolization**: **Under Section 2 of the Sherman Act**, Defendants use their dominant market position to bundle services in a way that prevents competitors from entering the market. This conduct ensures the Defendants' continued monopoly over both VoWi-Fi and cellular services, as they block competitors from offering standalone alternatives.

120. **Substantial Lessening of Competition**: The forced bundling also violates **Section 7 of the Clayton Act**, as it substantially reduces competition in the telecommunications market by preventing smaller competitors like VoIP-Pal from offering more affordable, standalone VoWi-Fi services.

121. **Forced Bundling Hurts Competitors and Consumers**: By forcing consumers to purchase bundled cellular and Wi-Fi services, Defendants artificially inflate costs. This practice not only harms competitors but also forces 373 million smartphone subscribers to pay for services they may not want or need, which constitutes monopolistic conduct under antitrust laws.

122. **Impact on VoIP-Pal and Consumers**: VoIP-Pal is excluded from offering standalone VoWi-Fi to consumers who may only need Wi-Fi services. This exclusion forces consumers into expensive, unnecessary cellular plans, resulting in inflated service costs for millions of Americans.

D. **Precedent**: Precedent: In **United States v. Microsoft Corp., 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001)**, the court ruled that bundling practices by a monopolist, which limit consumer options and artificially inflate prices, violate antitrust laws. Defendants' bundling of cellular services with VoWi-Fi similarly violates Section 251(c)(4)(B) and antitrust laws by inflating prices and restricting consumer choice.The Unlawful Effect on VoIP-Pal and Subscribers

123. Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act is intended to promote fair competition and consumer access to affordable services. The Defendants' refusal to unbundle VoWi-Fi violates both telecommunications law and antitrust laws by engaging in monopolistic practices that harm competition and inflate consumer costs.

1. Antitrust Laws (Sherman Act, Section 1 & 2, Clayton Act, Section 7)

124. **Monopolistic Conduct and Consumer Harm**: By tying VoWi-Fi to cellular services, Defendants violate **Section 1 of the Sherman Act**. This forced bundling restricts consumer choice, as 373 million smartphone subscribers are denied the option to choose more affordable, standalone Wi-Fi services. Defendants' conduct reflects monopolization under **Section 2 of the Sherman Act**, as they maintain control over both Wi-Fi and cellular services to the exclusion of

competitors.

125. **Substantial Lessening of Competition**: This practice also breaches **Section 7 of the Clayton Act**, as the Defendants' refusal to unbundle VoWi-Fi limits competition and excludes smaller competitors like VoIP-Pal from entering the market.

126. **Denial of Affordable VoWi-Fi**: The Defendants' bundling practices force consumers to pay for expensive cellular services they may not need, denying them access to more affordable VoWi-Fi options. This monopolistic behavior artificially inflates prices and harms consumers by limiting their choices.

127. **Impact on VoIP-Pal**: Consumers, especially those in rural and economically disadvantaged areas, are disproportionately affected by the Defendants' refusal to unbundle VoWi-Fi. VoIP-Pal is excluded from offering competitive, affordable services, and consumers are forced into unnecessarily high-cost plans, violating both antitrust laws and Section 251.

E. **Precedent**: Precedent: In **AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board, 525 U.S. 366 (1999)**, the Supreme Court upheld the unbundling requirements of the Telecommunications Act, emphasizing that unbundling services promotes competition and lowers costs for consumers. Defendants' refusal to unbundle VoWi-Fi similarly inflates prices and restricts competition, violating the Sherman and Clayton Acts.Serious Consequences for Ignoring Section 251 and Antitrust Law

128. Courts have consistently imposed significant penalties for violations of Section 251 and antitrust laws. Defendants' refusal to comply with unbundling requirements has led to inflated prices and reduced competition, warranting substantial penalties.

1. Antitrust Laws (Sherman Act, Section 1 & 2, Clayton Act, Section 7)

129. **Penalties for Antitrust Violations**: Defendants' violations of **Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman**

Act and **Section 7 of the Clayton Act** warrant significant penalties, including court-mandated fines, restructuring orders, and mandatory unbundling of VoWi-Fi services. The impact on consumers, especially the 373 million smartphone subscribers forced into paying inflated prices, underscores the need for strong corrective action.

DEFENDANTS' UNLAWFUL USE OF VOWI-FI ROUTING CLASSIFICATION TECHNOLOGY

130. The Defendants—AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom—are exploiting their dominant positions in the telecommunications market to unlawfully bundle VoWi-Fi with cellular services. By illegally using a competitors' VoWi-Fi routing classification technology and know-how without proper authorization, the Defendants have maintained an unfair monopoly, excluding competitors and harming over 373 million subscribers. Their actions violate the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

A. Monopolistic Bundling Practices

131. The Defendants restrict consumer choice by offering VoWi-Fi only as part of a bundled package with cellular services (calling and texting), forcing consumers to pay for both, even if they do not need cellular services. This tying arrangement violates antitrust laws, particularly when the Defendants have the capability to offer standalone VoWi-Fi, but deliberately refuse to do so.

132. **Court Precedents**: *Jefferson Parish Hosp. Dist. No. 2 v. Hyde,* 466 U.S. 2 (1984): The Supreme Court ruled that tying two products together—when one can be sold independently—violates antitrust laws by restricting consumer choice. The Defendants' bundling of VoWi-Fi with cellular services mirrors this illegal tying arrangement.

133. *Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Tech. Services, Inc.,* 504 U.S. 451 (1992): The Court ruled that

monopolistic control by leveraging proprietary technology to exclude competition constitutes an antitrust violation. The Defendants' bundling of VoWi-Fi while utilizing VoIP-Pal's proprietary technology reflects this violation, as it excludes competitors who could offer standalone Wi-Fi services.

B. Monopolization Motive and Exclusion of Competitors

134. The Defendants' monopolistic strategy prevents smaller competitors from offering standalone VoWi-Fi services, ensuring they retain market dominance over the smartphone market, which they control by more than 97%. This conduct severely limits competition and prevents alternative service providers from entering the market.

135. **Court Precedents**: *Jefferson Parish Hospital District No. 2 v. Hyde* (466 U.S. 2): The Supreme Court ruled that tying two products together when one can be sold independently constitutes exclusionary conduct and violates antitrust laws. The Defendants' strategy to tie VoWi-Fi to cellular services similarly aims to exclude competition by preventing competitors from offering standalone services.*United States v. Microsoft Corp.,* 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001): The Court found that bundling practices tied to monopoly power can violate antitrust laws, particularly when designed to limit competition. The Defendants' similar strategy of bundling VoWi-Fi with cellular services is intended to maintain their market monopoly and suppress competition.Offloading Spectrum Costs Without Consumer Benefit

136. The Defendants save significant costs by offloading network traffic from their cellular networks to consumers' Wi-Fi networks, without passing any of these savings to subscribers. Consumers bear the cost of internet services required for VoWi-Fi, while the Defendants enjoy reduced spectrum and infrastructure burdens. Yet, subscribers are not compensated or provided with lower costs for cellular services.

137. **Court Precedents**: *Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Technical Services, Inc.*, 504 U.S. 451 (1992): The Court ruled that leveraging a dominant market position to exclude competition or manipulate consumer options constitutes monopolistic abuse. The Defendants' practice of offloading cellular traffic onto subscribers' Wi-Fi networks—without passing any benefits or cost reductions to consumers—reflects similar monopolistic conduct.*Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Corp.,* 472 U.S. 585 (1985): The Court held that refusing to cooperate with a competitor in a way that harms consumers and benefits the dominant firm violates the Sherman Act. By refusing to offer standalone VoWi-Fi services, the Defendants similarly harm consumers, forcing them to bear unnecessary costs for cellular services they may not need.Unauthorized Use of Competitors' Technology and Know-how

138. The Defendants continue to unlawfully deploy VoIP-Pal's VoWi-Fi routing classification technology and know-how without obtaining the necessary authorization and by excluding VoIP-Pal from the VoWi-Fi market such that not even VoIP-Pal can use its own technology and know-how in the VoWi-Fi space. This practice goes beyond mere patent infringement of VoIP-Pal's patented technology having been allowed by USPTO with confirmed priority dates, compounding monopolistic practices and exclusionary conduct. The illegal use of VoIP-Pal's technology and know-how is are violations of antitrust laws independent and more egregious than patent law violations already committed.

139. **Court Precedents**: *Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Tech. Services, Inc.,* 504 U.S. 451 (1992): The Court held that leveraging control over proprietary technology in a monopolistic setting, without proper licensing or authorization, violates both antitrust and patent laws. The Defendants' unauthorized use of VoIP-Pal's technology mirrors Kodak's unlawful conduct in monopolizing aftermarkets and excluding competition.*Brunswick Corp. v. Pueblo Bowl-O-Mat, Inc.,* 429 U.S.

477 (1977): he Court ruled that damages for anticompetitive conduct should reflect the harm caused by illegal market behavior. VoIP-Pal's claim for damages is supported by this precedent, as the Defendants' illegal use of its technology has caused significant harm not only to the company but also to competition and consumers.Essential Facilities Doctrine and Exclusionary Conduct

140. The Defendants' collective anticompetitive deployment of patented technologies and competitive know-how from others in the VoWi-Fi and 4G/4G markets, some of which can be considered an essential facility, violates the essential facilities doctrine. This doctrine mandates that a dominant firm grant competitors access to critical infrastructure if that infrastructure cannot be feasibly duplicated. VoIP-Pal's technology and know-how is essential for enabling competitive VoWi-Fi services, yet the Defendants perpetuate their monopoly and exclude competitors.

141. **Court Precedents**: *Otter Tail Power Co. v. United States,* 410 U.S. 366 (1973): The Court ruled that denying competitors access to essential infrastructure violates antitrust laws. VoIP-Pal's patented VoWi-Fi routing technology is an essential facility for competitive VoWi-Fi services, and the Defendants' anticompetitive deployment constitutes exclusionary conduct.

142. *Hecht v. Pro-Football, Inc.,* 570 F.2d 982 (D.C. Cir. 1977): The Court applied the essential facilities doctrine, holding that a dominant firm must grant access to infrastructure necessary for competition. The Defendants' anticompetitive deployment of VoIP-Pal's essential technology fits directly within this doctrine and further cements their exclusionary behavior.

C. Weighing the Evidence

143. The Defendants' defense that they do not need a competitor's technology because they offer VoWi-Fi for free is fundamentally flawed. Their actions—tying VoWi-Fi to cellular services, excluding competitors, offloading infrastructure costs onto consumers, and illegally deploying

other's patented technology and competitive know-how without authorization—are clear violations of antitrust laws under the Sherman Act and Clayton Act.

144. This class action underscores the damage caused to VoIP-Pal and the approximately 373 million consumers, who face inflated service costs and limited options due to the Defendants' illegal monopolistic conduct. The Defendants' anticompetitive deployment of a competitor's technology and their continued exploitation of their dominant market position expose them to significant liability. The legal precedents cited demonstrate that the Defendants' conduct is unlawful, and this Court should provide appropriate relief to rectify the violations and protect consumers.

FRAUDULENT MISREPRESENTATION, DECEIT, AND MISLEADING SERVICE CONTRACT PRACTICES

145. AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom have engaged in a widespread scheme of fraudulent misrepresentation, deceit, and misleading service contract practices that violated federal antitrust laws, specifically Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act and Sections 2, 3, and 7 of the Clayton Act, as well as Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. By presenting service contracts that misrepresented VoWi-Fi as a "free" service bundled with their cellular offerings, they concealed the actual costs embedded within inflated plan fees, defrauding 373 million American smartphone subscribers.

146. Moreover, the Defendants breached Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act, which mandates that carriers provide unbundled services to third-party providers and to their own subscribers. This breach allowed them to maintain their market dominance, restrict competition, and inflate prices, all while misleading subscribers into signing service contracts that were based on fraudulent information. These contracts, riddled with misrepresentation and deceit, are now null

and void.

A. Fraudulent Misrepresentation of VoWi-Fi as "Free"

147. **Violation of Section 251(c)(3) of the Telecommunications Act**: Section 251(c)(3) mandates that incumbent carriers provide unbundled access to network elements, including VoWi-Fi, to both third-party competitors and directly to subscribers. However, the Defendants falsely advertised VoWi-Fi as a "free" service when it was actually bundled with cellular services, concealing its true cost from consumers.

148. This constitutes a direct breach of the Telecommunications Act, as the Defendants intentionally failed to unbundle VoWi-Fi, misleading subscribers into paying for bundled services that inflated their bills. The Sherman Act §1 is similarly violated through this tying arrangement, which restricts consumer choice and limits competition.

149. **Impact of Sherman and Clayton Acts**: The Defendants' practices also violate Sherman Act §2, which prohibits monopolistic control and exclusionary practices. By bundling VoWi-Fi with their cellular services and refusing to offer it as a standalone option, the Defendants maintained their monopoly in the telecommunications market, suppressing competition from Mobile Virtual Network Operators (MVNOs) and preventing smaller competitors from entering the market. These acts of monopolization and restraint of trade also breach Clayton Act §3, which prohibits exclusive dealing and tying arrangements that reduce competition.

150. **Financial Benefits to Carriers Through Deceit**: The Defendants offloaded substantial network traffic onto subscriber-paid Wi-Fi networks, thereby reducing their infrastructure costs while embedding the costs of VoWi-Fi into their bundled service plans. This deceptive practice violated Sherman Act §2 and Section 251(b)(1) of the Telecommunications Act, which mandates nondiscriminatory access to services. By denying subscribers the ability to purchase VoWi-Fi as

a standalone service, the carriers engaged in price-fixing and anti-competitive practices under Clayton Act §2.

B. Deceptive Billing and Service Contracts

151. **Misleading Service Contracts and Unlawful Tying Arrangements**: The Defendants falsely advertised VoWi-Fi as a free service while embedding its costs within bundled cellular plans. This fraudulent misrepresentation deceived millions of subscribers, violating Section 1 of the Sherman Act and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act by tying one service (VoWi-Fi) to another (cellular services), restricting consumer choice.

152. **Deceptive Billing Practices**: Subscribers were led to believe VoWi-Fi was free, as invoices showed $0 charges for Wi-Fi calls. However, the true costs were hidden in inflated cellular service fees, constituting fraudulent misrepresentation and violating Section 251(c)(4)(B), which mandates fair and transparent billing practices for services. This concealed pricing strategy also breaches Clayton Act §2 as it amounts to price discrimination and predatory pricing, designed to stifle competition by preventing the entry of competitors who could offer standalone Wi-Fi services at fair rates.

153. **Suppression of Market Competition**: By refusing to unbundle VoWi-Fi and presenting it as a bundled service, the Defendants not only misled consumers but also stifled competition, preventing competitors from offering standalone Wi-Fi services. This restraint of trade is a violation of Sherman Act §1, which prohibits agreements that unreasonably limit competition, and Clayton Act §3, which outlaws tying arrangements that harm consumer choice and inflate prices.

C. Service Contracts Based on Fraudulent Misrepresentation Are Now Null and Void

154. **Breach of Section 251 and Antitrust Laws**: The Defendants' fraudulent actions, particularly their violation of Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act by failing to offer VoWi-Fi as an unbundled service, render the service contracts signed by 373 million subscribers invalid. These contracts were based on misrepresentation, as they did not disclose the true costs of VoWi-Fi, nor did they offer consumers the option to purchase the service independently of cellular calling and texting.

155. **Invalidation of Service Contracts**: Service contracts entered into based on fraudulent misrepresentation are legally invalid. The Defendants deceived subscribers into signing these contracts by promoting VoWi-Fi as free, while hiding its costs within bundled services. This deliberate deception invalidates the contracts, as they were signed under false pretenses.

156. **Unconscionable Arbitration Clauses**: The Defendants included arbitration clauses in their contracts to prevent subscribers from challenging these fraudulent practices in court. However, under Section 251 and antitrust precedents, such arbitration clauses are unconscionable and unenforceable because they protect the carriers from liability for their fraudulent and anti-competitive conduct.

D. Legal Precedents Supporting Contract Invalidation and Fraud Claims

157. *Discover Bank v. Superior Court*, 36 Cal. 4th 148 (2005): The California Supreme Court invalidated arbitration clauses designed to shield businesses from deceptive practices. Similarly, the arbitration clauses used by the Defendants prevent subscribers from challenging the fraudulent practices tied to the concealment of VoWi-Fi costs, making these clauses unenforceable.

158. *Hooters of America, Inc. v. Phillips*, 173 F.3d 933 (4th Cir. 1999): The Fourth Circuit struck down an arbitration agreement that was grossly unfair to the plaintiff. The Defendants' arbitration clauses, which unfairly limit the rights of 373 million subscribers, should be deemed

unenforceable, allowing subscribers to challenge the fraudulent misrepresentation in court.

159. *McGill v. Citibank, N.A.*, 2 Cal. 5th 945 (2017): The California Supreme Court ruled that arbitration clauses barring plaintiffs from seeking public injunctive relief are unenforceable. The Defendants' clauses, which prevent subscribers from addressing Section 251 violations, violate public policy and must be invalidated.

E. Weighing the Evidence

160. The fraudulent misrepresentation and deceptive service contracts presented by AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom have caused significant harm to 373 million American smartphone subscribers. By concealing the true costs of VoWi-Fi and violating the unbundling requirements of Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, the carriers misled consumers and maintained monopolistic control over the telecommunications market.

161. The service contracts based on these misrepresentations, including the arbitration clauses, are null and void. The Defendants' refusal to offer VoWi-Fi as a standalone service, as required by Section 251, and their tying arrangements constitute violations of both antitrust laws and telecommunications regulations. The courts must invalidate these contracts, hold the Defendants accountable for their breaches of Section 251, and provide 373 million subscribers the opportunity to seek redress for the harm they have suffered.

162. The Defendants must be held responsible for misleading consumers into signing service contracts under false pretenses, and their deceptive practices must be brought to an end to restore competition and fairness in the telecommunications market.

THE PARTIES

A. The Plaintiffs

163. Plaintiff VoIP-Pal.Com Inc., is a Nevada corporation with its principal place of business located at 7215 Bosque Boulevard, Waco, Texas 76710. VoIP-Pal is registered to do business in the State of Texas. VoIP-Pal, Inc., a publicly traded corporation on the OTC market, is exceptionally well-qualified to serve as Lead Plaintiff in this Class Action Antitrust case, challenging the unlawful bundling of VoWi-Fi and cellular services by the Defendants: AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom. Representing over 6,000 American shareholders—many of whom are also subscribers to these carriers—VoIP-Pal is in a unique position to advocate for both corporate and consumer interests.

164. Plaintiffs Richard Inza and Michael Inza: These individuals are residing in Florida.

165. **General Subscribers Class**: Plaintiffs Richard Inza (Verizon), and Michael Inza (T-Mobile) are current subscribers of the Defendants' mobile services or their respective Mobile Virtual Network Operators (MVNOs) and together with approximately 373 million major carrier subscribers of the Defendants' mobile services or their respective MVNOs have personally experienced inflated prices, reduced service quality, or other anticompetitive harms as a result of the Defendants' unlawful practices and unlawful conduct.

166. The class representatives and each member of the class has been significantly impacted by the Defendants' antitrust and anticompetitive practices, which have suppressed competition, manipulated market conditions, and unlawfully deployed VoWi-Fi technologies and know-how from a competitor, resulting in substantial financial and consumer harm.

B. The AT&T Defendants

167. On information and belief, Defendant AT&T, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with a principal place of business at 175 E Houston Street, San Antonio, Texas 78205. AT&T, Inc. may be served with process through its registered agent, the CT Corp System, at 1999 Bryan St., Ste. 900 Dallas,

Texas 75201-3136. On information and belief, AT&T, Inc. is registered to do business in the District of Columbia.

168. On information and belief, Defendant AT&T Corporation is a New York corporation with a principal place of business at One AT&T Way Bedminster, New Jersey 07921. AT&T Corporation may be served with process through its registered agent, the CT Corp System, at 1999 Bryan St., Ste. 900 Dallas, Texas 75201-3136. On information and belief, AT&T Corporation is registered to do business in the District of Columbia. On information and belief, AT&T Corporation is a wholly owned subsidiary of AT&T, Inc.

169. On information and belief, Defendant AT&T Services, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with a principal place of business at 175 E Houston Street, San Antonio, Texas 78205. AT&T Services, Inc. may be served with process through its registered agent, the CT Corp System, at 1999 Bryan St., Ste. 900 Dallas, Texas 75201-3136. On information and belief, AT&T Services, Inc. is registered to do business in the District of Columbia. On information and belief, AT&T Services, Inc. is a wholly owned subsidiary of AT&T, Inc.

170. On information and belief, Scott T. Ford, Glenn H. Hutchins, William E. Kennard, Stephen J. Luczo, Marissa A. Mayer, David R. Mcatee II, Michael B. McCallister, Beth E. Mooney, Matthew K. Rose, John Stankey, Cynthia B. Taylor, and Luis A. Ubiñas are each a member of the Board of Directors of AT&T and acting in an individual corporate capacity and as part of a collective with other members of the Board of Directors of AT&T regularly conducts business or is often present at the principal place of business of AT&T at 175 E Houston Street, San Antonio, Texas 78205 and may be served with process at that location or through its registered agent, the CT Corp System, at 1999 Bryan St., Ste. 900 Dallas, Texas 75201-3136.

171. On information and belief, the above AT&T Defendants regularly conduct and transact business

in the District of Columbia, throughout the United States, and within this District, and as set forth herein, have committed and continue to commit, acts within and outside the District of Columbia and within this District that violate the Sherman and Clayton Acts, including but not limited to tying arrangements, forced sales, exclusive dealing, price fixing, price discrimination, and predatory pricing, all of which suppress competition, manipulate market conditions, and harm consumers and competitors alike.

C. The T-Mobile Defendants

172. On information and belief, T-Mobile USA, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 12920 Southeast 38th Street, Bellevue, Washington 98006. T-Mobile USA, Inc. may be served through its registered agent, Corporation Service Company, 211 E. 7th Street, Suite 620, Austin, Texas 78701. On information and belief, T-Mobile USA, Inc. is registered to do business in the District of Columbia.

173. On information and belief, T-Mobile USA, Inc. is a subsidiary of German telecommunications company Deutsche Telekom AG headquartered in Bonn Germany Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 140, Bonn, Germany 53113. Deutsche Telekom AG may be served through its registered agent, Corporation Service Company, 211 E. 7th Street, Suite 620, Austin, Texas 78701. On information and belief, Deutsche Telekom AG through its subsidiary T-Mobile USA, Inc. has regular and established places of business throughout this District.

174. On information and belief, Timotheus Höttges, André Almeida, Marcelo Claure, Srikant M. Datar, Srinivasan Gopalan, Dr. Christian P. Illek, James J. Kavanaugh, Raphael Kübler, Thorsten Langheim, Dominique Leroy, Letitia A. Long, Mark Nelson, Mike Sievert, Teresa A. Taylor, and Kelvin R. Westbrook are each a member of the Board of Directors of T-Mobile and acting in an

individual corporate capacity and as part of a collective with other members of the Board of Directors of T-Mobile regularly conducts business or is often present at the principal place of business of T-Mobile at 12920 Southeast 38th Street, Bellevue, Washington 98006 and may be served with process at that location or through its registered agent, Corporation Service Company, 211 E. 7th Street, Suite 620, Austin, Texas 78701.

175. On information and belief, Timotheus Höttges, Dr. Ferri Abolhassan, Birgit Bohle, Srini Gopalan, Christian P. Illek, Thorsten Langheim, Dominique Leroy, and Claudia Nemat, each are a member of the Board of Directors of Deutsche Telekom AG and acting in an individual corporate capacity and as part of a collective with other members of the Board of Directors of Deutsche Telekom AG regularly conducts business or is often present at the principal place of business of T-Mobile at 12920 Southeast 38th Street, Bellevue, Washington 98006 and may be served with process at that location or through its registered agent, Corporation Service Company, 211 E. 7th Street, Suite 620, Austin, Texas 78701.

176. On information and belief, the above T-Mobile Defendants regularly conducts and transacts business in the District of Columbia, throughout the United States, and within this District, and as set forth herein, has committed and continues to commit, acts within and outside the District of Columbia and within this District that violate the Sherman and Clayton Acts, including but not limited to tying arrangements, forced sales, exclusive dealing, price fixing, price discrimination, and predatory pricing, all of which suppress competition, manipulate market conditions, and harm consumers and competitors alike.

D. The Verizon Defendants

177. On information and belief, Verizon Communications, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with a principal place of business at 140 West Street, New York, New York 10013. Verizon

Communications, Inc. may be served with process through its registered agent, the Corporation Trust Company, Corporation Trust Center, 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, Delaware 19801. On information and belief, Verizon Communications, Inc. is registered to do business in the District of Columbia.

178. On information and belief, Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless is a Delaware general partnership with a principal place of business at One Verizon Way Basking Ridge, New Jersey 07920. Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless may be served with process through its registered agent, the Corporation Trust Company, Corporation Trust Center, 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington Delaware 19801. On information and belief, Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless is a wholly owned subsidiary of Verizon Communications, Inc. On information and belief, Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless is registered to do business in the District of Columbia.

179. On information and belief, Verizon Services Corp. is a Delaware corporation with a principal place of business at 1717 Arch Street, 21st Floor Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. Verizon Services, Corp. may be served with process through its registered agent, the CT Corporation System, at 1999 Bryan St., Ste. 900 Dallas, Texas 75201-3136. On information and belief, Verizon Services Corp. is a wholly owned subsidiary of Verizon Communications, Inc. On information and belief, Verizon Services Corp. is registered to do business in the District of Columbia.

180. On information and belief, Verizon Business Network Services Inc. is a Delaware corporation with a principal place of business at 22001 Loudin County Parkway Ashburn, Virginia 20147. Verizon Business Network Services, Inc. may be served with process through its registered agent, the CT Corporation System, at 1999 Bryan St., Ste. 900 Dallas, Texas 75201-3136. On information and belief, Verizon Business Network Services, Inc. is a wholly owned subsidiary of Verizon Communications, Inc. On information and belief, Verizon Business Network Services,

Inc. is registered to do business in the District of Columbia.

181. On information and belief, Vittorio Colao, Shellye L. Archambeau, Mark T. Bertolin, Roxanne S. Austin, Melanie L. Healey, Laxman Narasimhan, Clarence Otis, Jr., Daniel H. Schulman, Rodney E. Slater, Carol B. Tomé, Vandana Venkatesh, Hans Vestberg, and Gregory G. Weaver are each a member of the Board of Directors of Verizon and acting in an individual corporate capacity and as part of a collective with other members of the Board of Directors of Verizon regularly conducts business or is often present at the principal place of business of Verizon at 140 West Street, New York, New York 10013 and at 600 Hidden Ridge, Irving, TX 75038 and may be served with process at that location or through its registered agent, Corporation Trust Company, Corporation Trust Center, 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, Delaware 19801 or the CT Corporation System, at 1999 Bryan St., Ste. 900 Dallas, Texas 75201-3136.

182. On information and belief, the above Verizon Defendants regularly conduct and transact business in the District of Columbia, throughout the United States, and within this District, and as set forth herein, have committed and continue to commit, acts within and outside the District of Columbia and within this District that violate the Sherman and Clayton Acts, including but not limited to tying arrangements, forced sales, exclusive dealing, price fixing, price discrimination, and predatory pricing, all of which suppress competition, manipulate market conditions, and harm consumers and competitors alike.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

183. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1337, as this action arises under Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 1, 2) and Sections 2, 3, and 7 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 18, 14). The claims presented by the Plaintiffs and the

class they represent involve federal questions relating to antitrust violations.

184. This Court also has supplemental jurisdiction over state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) because those claims are so related to the federal claims that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.

185. This action is brought under Sections 4 and 6 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 15(a) and 26) to recover treble damages, equitable relief, costs of suit, and reasonable attorney's fees for violations of Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 1, 2) and Section 3 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. § 14). This Court has subject matter jurisdiction for these antitrust violations pursuant to Section 4(a) of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. § 15(a)), 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.

186. Furthermore, on information and belief, venue is proper in this District pursuant to Section 12 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. § 22) and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) because the Defendants transact business and have agents in this District. A substantial portion of the events giving rise to Plaintiffs' claims occurred in this District, and a significant portion of the affected interstate trade and commerce described herein has been carried out in this District.

187. The Defendants, through their anticompetitive practices and monopolistic conduct, have engaged in activities that directly and substantially affect interstate commerce. The impact of these actions has been felt by Plaintiffs and the class they represent.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

188. This Antitrust Class Action is brought by VoIP-Pal and the other Plaintiffs on behalf of the **General Subscribers Class**, representing **approximately 373 million major carrier subscribers** who have been subjected to inflated prices, reduced service quality, and other anticompetitive harms due to the Defendants' practices. The Defendants—AT&T Inc., T-Mobile

US, Inc., Deutsche Telekom AG, and Verizon Communications Inc.—have engaged in coordinated actions that violate federal antitrust laws, systematically controlling **97% of the U.S. mobile telecommunications market** and restricting competition. The Defendants have engaged in anticompetitive practices that violate the Sherman Act (Sections 1 and 2), the Clayton Act (Sections 2, 3, 7, 4, and 16), and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Through coordinated efforts to maintain and expand their dominance, they have caused significant harm to consumers, distorting competition, inflating prices, and restricting consumer choice.

A. Violations and Anticompetitive Practices

1. Bundling of VoWi-Fi and Mobile Data Services

189. Defendants, each with substantial market power, have tied VoWi-Fi services to their market dominating cellular calling services and mobile data services, preventing subscribers from accessing standalone (or unbundled) VoWi-Fi services. Defendants furthermore have tied mobile data services for smartphone users requiring the purchase of cellular calling services, preventing subscribers from accessing standalone (or unbundled) mobile data for smartphones. This again forces consumers to purchase bundled services, raising prices, restricting choice, and limiting competition.

2. Consumer Harm and Antitrust Violations

190. In the VoWi-Fi market, the Defendants' bundling practice leaves 373 million U.S. subscribers with no choice but to pay for mobile data and cellular services they do not need to access VoWi-Fi, a service that could otherwise be offered at lower cost. This conduct substantially harms consumers and violates federal antitrust laws. In the mobile data market for smartphone users, the Defendants' bundling practice again least millions of U.S. subscribers with no choice but to pay for cellular services they do not need. The Defendants have collectively violated the

Telecommunications Act of 1996 §251, the Sherman Act §§1 and 2, and the Clayton Act §§2, 3, and 7, causing direct harm to the 373 million subscribers.

191. **Tying Arrangements and Forced Bundling**: The Defendants have engaged in **tying VoWi-Fi to cellular services and tying mobile data for smartphone users to cellular services**, in violation of **the Telecommunications Act of 1996 § 251(c)(3)**, **the Sherman Act §1,** and **the Clayton Act §3**. By **forcing consumers** to purchase bundled services, the Defendants have restricted consumer choice and coerced customers into paying for unnecessary cellular services just to access **VoWi-Fi or mobile data on a smartphone**, inflating their costs in the process. **Precedent**: *United States v. Microsoft Corp.,* 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001): The court ruled that bundling products to preserve market dominance is illegal under antitrust law, which parallels the Defendants' conduct.

192. **Monopolization of VoWi-Fi and Mobile Data Markets**: The Defendants have maintained their market dominance through **predatory pricing**, **exclusive dealing**, and **erecting barriers to entry** in violation of **the Telecommunications Act of 1996 § 251(b)(1)**, **the Sherman Act §2,** and **the Clayton Act §7**. These monopolistic practices have prevented competitors from entering the market with more affordable, standalone (or unbundled) VoWi-Fi services or standalone (or unbundled) mobile data services, which could benefit millions of subscribers who are currently overpaying for bundled services. The Defendants have further solidified their dominance through a series of mergers and acquisitions, exacerbating the anti-competitive nature of their bundling practices, which violates the Clayton Act by preventing market competition.

193. **Price-Fixing and Predatory Pricing**: The Defendants have violated **Sherman Act §1** and **Clayton Act §2** by offering **VoWi-Fi at zero cost** within bundled cellular services. This predatory pricing strategy distorts the competitive landscape, making it impossible for competitors like

VoIP-Pal to offer affordable alternatives and forcing subscribers to pay more for bundled services that could otherwise be unbundled.

194. **Group Boycott and Concerted Refusal to Deal**: The Defendants have collectively refused to offer **standalone VoWi-Fi** or **mobile data services**, in violation of **Sherman Act §1**. This collective refusal blocks competitors from offering cheaper alternatives, such as **VoIP-Pal's $6.50 standalone VoWi-Fi**, further entrenching the Defendants' market control and leaving consumers with fewer choices.

195. **Fraudulent Misrepresentation**: The Defendants engaged in **fraudulent misrepresentation** by marketing VoWi-Fi as "free" while concealing its true costs within the bundled services in violation of **the Telecommunications Act of 1996 § 251(b)(1)**, **the Sherman Act §1,** and **the Clayton Act §2**. Consumers are misled into believing they are receiving a valuable service for free, when in reality, they are paying inflated prices due to the forced bundling. The Defendants collective refusal to offer standalone VoWi-Fi or mobile data for smartphone users limits consumer choice and maintains their monopolistic control.

B. Legal Precedents

196. The Class Action is supported by strong legal precedents that establish the illegality of the Defendants' practices under federal law. These cases demonstrate how the coordinated actions of the Defendants violate the Telecommunications Act of 1996 as well as the Sherman and Clayton Acts, restricting competition and harming consumers:

a) *AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board*, 525 U.S. 366 (1999): This landmark Supreme Court case upheld the FCC's authority to require carriers to unbundle their networks to promote competition. Under Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act, carriers are required to unbundle essential services, and VoWi-Fi is one such service that must be

unbundled from cellular and mobile data services. The Defendants have blatantly ignored this ruling by continuing to bundle VoWi-Fi with mobile data and cellular plans. This violates their statutory duty to unbundle, restricting competition and harming consumers.

b) *Covad Communications Co. v. BellSouth Corp.,* 299 F.3d 1272 (11th Cir. 2002): In Covad, the court held that BellSouth violated Section 251 by refusing to unbundle essential network elements necessary for competitors. This case highlights incumbent carriers must provide access to network elements, including VoWi-Fi. The Defendants' refusal to offer standalone VoWi-Fi constitutes a similar violation by preventing competitors and consumers from accessing this essential service, furthering anti-competitive practices.

c) *Verizon Communications Inc. v. FCC,* 535 U.S. 467 (2002): This ruling upheld the FCC's pricing regulations to ensure fair pricing for competitors accessing unbundled network elements. The Defendants have not only refused to unbundle services but also failed to offer fair pricing for competitors to access VoWi-Fi services. This creates barriers to entry and maintains Defendants' monopolistic control, violating established federal law.

d) *Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Technical Services, Inc*., 504 U.S. 451 (1992)*:* Established that tying arrangements that violate antitrust laws are illegal.

e) *United States v. Microsoft Corp*., 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. *2001):* Found that tying practices designed to preserve market dominance are unlawful.

f) *Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Corp.,* 472 U.S. 585 (1985)*:* Demonstrated that conduct harming competition constitutes a violation of antitrust laws.

g) *Brooke Group Ltd. v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.,* 509 U.S. 209 (1993): Addressed the illegality of predatory pricing as an antitrust violation.

197. These legal precedents strongly support the Class Action's claims and demonstrate that the Defendants' coordinated actions—inflating prices, limiting consumer choice, and blocking competitors—are clear violations of federal antitrust law. The 373 million smartphone subscribers have been directly harmed by these anticompetitive practices, and the Court's intervention is necessary to restore competition and protect consumer interests.

C. FTC and DOJ Positions Oppose the Defendants' Anticompetitive Practices

198. Both the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the Department of Justice (DOJ) have consistently opposed the types of anticompetitive practices employed by the Defendants. The FTC and DOJ have emphasized that bundling arrangements, predatory pricing, and exclusive dealing agreements restrict competition and harm consumers by raising prices and blocking market entry for smaller competitors.

199. The FTC has previously noted the harm caused by predatory pricing in telecommunications, particularly when large firms offer services like VoWi-Fi at zero cost, embedding these costs in bundled services. Similarly, the DOJ has expressed concerns about exclusive agreements that limit competition by preventing smaller carriers from offering standalone services, directly supporting the need for judicial intervention in this case.

200. Both agencies have underscored the need for a competitive marketplace free from tacit collusion and monopolistic practices. Their positions further reinforce the necessity for the Court to intervene in this case and restore fair competition by prohibiting the Defendants from continuing their unlawful practices.

D. Defendants' Anticompetitive Practices Harm the Class

201. The 373 million smartphone subscribers represented in this Class Action have experienced substantial financial harm, inflated prices, and limited-service options as a direct result of the Defendants' collusive practices. By bundling VoWi-Fi with cellular services and refusing to offer standalone alternatives, the Defendants have driven up consumer costs while blocking competition.

202. **Economic Impact**: The Defendants' forced bundling practices have resulted in families paying an average of $240 per month for bundled services, compared to the $20 per month they could pay for standalone VoWi-Fi. This overcharging harms consumers, particularly those from low-income families, who are unable to access cheaper alternatives that would significantly reduce their financial burden.

203. The group boycott of standalone VoWi-Fi services has restricted market innovation, preventing competitors like VoIP-Pal from entering the market with cheaper, more flexible options. This exclusionary behavior distorts the telecommunications market, forcing consumers to remain dependent on the Defendants' bundled plans.

E. Defendants' Anticompetitive Practices Require Piercing the Corporate Veil

204. This antitrust class action challenges the fraudulent misrepresentation, deceit, and anticompetitive practices of AT&T Inc., T-Mobile US, Inc., Deutsche Telekom AG, and Verizon Communications Inc. These Defendants, who control over 97% of the U.S. mobile telecommunications market, have violated Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act and Sections 2, 3, and 7 of the Clayton Act. The systematic and deliberate nature of these violations requires piercing the corporate veil to hold the Directors personally liable for their direct involvement in the unlawful practices, which have caused significant financial harm to 373 million smartphone subscribers represented in this class action.

F. Defendants' Anticompetitive Practices Require Invalidating Arbitration Clauses

205. Moreover, AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom have employed two interconnected and deeply harmful practices that strip consumers of their rights and transparency. Primarily, the use of unfair, unenforceable arbitration clauses designed to block consumer access to the courts. Additionally, AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom have fraudulently misrepresentation VoWi-Fi as a "free" service, when the actual costs are hidden within bundled cellular service fees. These practices are not only misleading but also predatory, taking advantage of consumers' lack of bargaining power and understanding of the true terms to which subscribers are being subjected.

HIGH BAR OF TWOMBLY

206. The Defendants' coordinated actions have caused significant harm to 373 million subscribers, through inflated prices, restricted consumer choice, and the exclusion of more affordable alternatives from the market. The predatory pricing, bundling practices, and group boycott of standalone VoWi-Fi services all point to systematic violations of federal antitrust laws.

207. In *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly,* 550 U.S. 544 (2007), the Supreme Court mandated that antitrust pleadings must present sufficient factual detail to suggest a plausible agreement or conspiracy under the Sherman Act. This Class Action, representing 373 million smartphone subscribers, exceeds this standard. The Defendants—AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom—control 97% of the U.S. mobile telecommunications market and have colluded to bundle VoWi-Fi with cellular services, preventing consumers from accessing cheaper, standalone VoWi-Fi. This collusion has led to inflated prices, limited consumer choice, and suppressed competition, which directly harms the 373 million consumers in the Class.

A. Factual Pleadings: Collusion Harming 373 Million Consumers

1. Parallel Conduct and Plus Factors

208. The 373 million smartphone subscribers have been systematically forced to purchase unnecessary cellular services to access VoWi-Fi, a practice uniformly adopted by all four Defendants. The simultaneous bundling of VoWi-Fi across the market—despite the availability of Wi-Fi as a standalone service—illustrates parallel conduct. This bundling practice artificially inflates consumer costs and reduces competition, forcing consumers to overpay for services they do not need.

209. The Defendants have consistently engaged in this bundling strategy to maintain market control and prevent innovation. Despite the technological capability to offer VoWi-Fi as a standalone service, all four companies have aligned their practices to bundle it with cellular services. This eliminates cheaper alternatives, such as VoIP-Pal's $6.50 per month standalone Wi-Fi service, and forces consumers into expensive $240 per month family plans that include unnecessary features.

210. The Defendants' practice of tying and forced sales compels consumers to purchase bundled cellular plans to access VoWi-Fi, a feature they could access more cheaply through standalone services. This conduct directly violates antitrust laws and has forced millions of smartphone users to pay more than they would in a competitive market.

211. **Precedent**: *In re Urethane Antitrust Litigation,* 768 F.3d 1245 (10th Cir. 2014). The court here established that coordinated actions to inflate prices and restrict competition through parallel conduct supported claims under Twombly. The Defendants' conduct in bundling VoWi-Fi with cellular services similarly inflates consumer prices and restricts market competition, supporting the Class Action's claims.

212. Consumers are subjected to increased costs as they are unable to access cheaper alternatives, such as standalone VoWi-Fi. The refusal to offer VoWi-Fi as an independent service has forced consumers into purchasing bundled services, raising their monthly bills significantly.

213. The Defendants' predatory pricing of VoWi-Fi at zero cost is a calculated strategy to eliminate competition. By embedding the cost of VoWi-Fi in more expensive cellular plans, the Defendants make it impossible for smaller competitors like VoIP-Pal to offer affordable alternatives. This predatory behavior suppresses competition and further entrenches the Defendants' market dominance.

2. Motivations Against Self-Interest

214. In a truly competitive market, the Defendants' behavior—offering VoWi-Fi at zero cost while bundling it with cellular services—would be against their economic self-interest. The fact that they persist in this practice shows that they are colluding to protect their dominant market positions and exclude competitors from offering standalone Wi-Fi services.

215. The Defendants have erected barriers to entry that prevent smaller competitors from entering the market. Their exclusive agreements with MVNOs and suppliers further lock consumers into bundled services and block the development of more affordable VoWi-Fi options. This exclusionary behavior is designed to maintain their control over the telecommunications market and suppress competition.

216. The Defendants' MVNO partnerships and network agreements prevent smaller competitors from offering standalone VoWi-Fi services. Consumers, especially the 373 million smartphone subscribers, are left with no choice but to purchase costly bundles, which further isolates them from competitive pricing options that could reduce their bills.

217. The economic evidence of zero-cost VoWi-Fi bundled with expensive cellular services further

demonstrates that the Defendants' behavior is not market-driven but a deliberate strategy to block competition. This pricing model is designed to maintain their market share and prevent alternative providers like VoIP-Pal from offering standalone services at competitive prices.

3. Tacit Collusion and Industry Structure

218. The telecommunications industry, controlled by the four Defendants, is conducive to tacit collusion. Given their market dominance, the Defendants have engaged in behind-the-scenes coordination to maintain their bundling strategies and prevent the offering of standalone Wi-Fi services that could threaten their monopoly. This is classic tacit collusion where companies avoid direct agreements but act in ways that preserve mutual benefits.

219. **Precedent**: *In re Text Messaging Antitrust Litigation,* 630 F.3d 622 (7th Cir. 2010). This case allowed tacit collusion claims to advance, based on consistent parallel behavior that harmed consumers. The Defendants' refusal to offer standalone VoWi-Fi, despite technological feasibility, demonstrates a coordinated effort to stifle market competition.

220. The uniform refusal across all Defendants to unbundle VoWi-Fi, despite its capability as a standalone service, signals a coordinated effort to preserve market control. This exclusionary behavior blocks competition, harms consumers, and entrenches the Defendants' dominance in the telecommunications market. The deceptive practices employed by the Defendants—marketing VoWi-Fi as "free" while embedding its cost in cellular services—mislead consumers and mask the true costs. The 373 million subscribers have been deceived into believing they are getting additional value, when in fact they are paying for bundled services they do not need. Over the past six years, the Defendants have systematically marketed VoWi-Fi as a "free" feature, embedding its cost into bundled cellular services. Consumers have been forced into paying inflated bills while being denied access to cheaper, standalone services that could save them

hundreds of dollars annually.

B. Precedent Cases Supporting Plaintiffs' Factual Pleadings

221. *In re High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litigation,* 856 F. Supp. 2d 1103 (N.D. Cal. 2012): Demonstrated that coordinated exclusionary behavior could meet the Twombly standard, particularly in industries dominated by a few key players.

222. *In re Urethane Antitrust Litigation*, 768 F.3d 1245 (10th Cir. 2014): Reinforced the idea that price-fixing and coordinated conduct among market leaders could support an antitrust claim, particularly when consumer prices are inflated by these actions.

223. *In re Text Messaging Antitrust Litigation,* 630 F.3d 622 (7th Cir. 2010): Showed how tacit collusion claims could proceed based on parallel behavior that harmed consumers and blocked market competition.

C. Meeting The High Bar of Twombly

224. The allegations in this Class Action not only meet but exceed the Twombly standard. The Defendants' uniform bundling practices, coupled with their refusal to offer standalone VoWi-Fi services, demonstrate clear evidence of collusion. Their control over 97% of the U.S. mobile market, combined with economic data supporting predatory pricing and market manipulation, justifies advancing the Class Action to the discovery phase.

225. **Precedent**: The In re High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litigation and In re Text Messaging Antitrust Litigation cases provide strong support for these claims, as they demonstrate how exclusionary conduct and tacit collusion can satisfy the Twombly standard for antitrust pleadings.

226. The Defendants' actions have caused significant harm to 373 million smartphone subscribers, forcing them into expensive bundles and denying them access to more affordable standalone services. These well-documented claims of collusion justify advancing this case to the discovery

phase, where the full extent of the Defendants' anticompetitive practices can be explored.

DEFENDANTS NEGLIGENCE

227. The Negligence Doctrine is a legal principle that imposes a duty of care on individuals and entities to act in a reasonable and prudent manner to avoid causing harm to others. When this duty is breached, and that breach directly causes damage, the injured party may have a claim for negligence. In the context of law, negligence is not a statute or a rule by itself; rather, it is a common law principle that has developed through case law over time. It holds legal weight in courts, particularly in civil claims, where plaintiffs can seek compensation for harm caused by another party's failure to exercise reasonable care.

A. Key Elements of Negligence

228. **Duty**: A legal obligation to act with a standard of care that a reasonable person in the same situation would use.

229. **Breach**: Failure to meet that duty by acting carelessly or omitting to act when required.

230. **Causation**: The breach must directly cause harm or injury to the plaintiff.

231. **Damages**: The plaintiff must suffer actual harm or loss as a result of the breach.

B. How It Applies to the VoIP-Pal and Class Action Antitrust Case

232. The Negligence Doctrine can be applied to claims against the Defendants (AT&T, Verizon, and T-Mobile) in the VoIP-Pal and Class Action Antitrust Case in the following ways:

1. Negligent Misrepresentation

233. The Defendants had a duty to provide truthful and transparent information regarding the availability of VoWi-Fi as a standalone service. They breached this duty by misrepresenting or

concealing facts about the bundling of VoWi-Fi, leading to inflated costs for consumers and harming VoIP-Pal's competitive position in the market. This misrepresentation caused direct economic harm to both consumers and VoIP-Pal, justifying a negligence claim for damages.

2. Negligent Infliction of Economic Harm

234. The Defendants had a duty to avoid practices that foreseeably harmed the economic interests of consumers and competitors, such as bundling services in a way that restricted market entry for alternatives like VoIP-Pal. By engaging in anti-competitive bundling practices, they breached this duty, causing economic losses (inflated prices for consumers and restricted market access for VoIP-Pal). The economic harm resulting from this breach would support claims for compensatory damages under negligence principles.

3. Negligence in Regulatory Compliance

235. The Defendants are bound by regulatory duties under the Telecommunications Act, the Sherman Act, and the Clayton Act to promote fair competition and avoid monopolistic practices. By bundling VoWi-Fi with cellular services in violation of Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act, the Defendants breached their duty to comply with federal law, causing direct harm to consumers and VoIP-Pal by limiting competition. This failure to comply with regulatory requirements supports a negligence claim, allowing for compensation for economic damages and the request for injunctive relief to correct the market distortions caused by their actions.

C. Negligence Claim Against Defendants

1. Negligent Misrepresentation

236. **Duty**: The Defendants—AT&T, Verizon, and T-Mobile—owed a duty to consumers and competitors, including VoIP-Pal, to provide accurate, transparent, and truthful information

regarding the availability of standalone VoWi-Fi services. As dominant players controlling 97% of the U.S. mobile telecommunications market, they had a heightened responsibility to promote fair competition and avoid deceptive practices.

237. **Breach**: The Defendants breached this duty by misrepresenting and concealing material facts about the availability of standalone VoWi-Fi services. They intentionally misled consumers by claiming that VoWi-Fi could only be accessed through bundled cellular plans, even though it was technically feasible to offer it as a standalone service.

238. **Causation**: As a direct and foreseeable result of these misrepresentations, consumers were forced into purchasing bundled services at inflated costs, while VoIP-Pal was denied a fair opportunity to compete in the VoWi-Fi market. The Defendants' actions distorted the market by limiting competition and consumer choice.

239. **Damages**: As a result of the Defendants' misrepresentations, the Plaintiff and the Class have suffered substantial financial harm, including inflated service costs and lost competitive opportunities. Consumers overpaid for bundled services that should have been offered as standalone, and VoIP-Pal suffered significant financial losses due to exclusion from the market.

2. Negligent Infliction of Economic Harm

240. **Duty**: The Defendants owed a duty of care to both consumers and competitors, including VoIP-Pal, to ensure that their business practices did not cause foreseeable economic harm through anti-competitive behavior, including the bundling of services and restricting market access to standalone VoWi-Fi options.

241. **Breach**: The Defendants breached this duty by bundling VoWi-Fi with cellular services, thereby foreclosing the possibility of standalone VoWi-Fi options. This practice inflated prices for consumers and restricted fair competition, preventing competitors like VoIP-Pal from entering

the market with standalone alternatives.

242. **Causation**: The Defendants' conduct directly caused economic harm to consumers and competitors. Consumers were forced to pay inflated prices for bundled services they didn't need, while VoIP-Pal's ability to compete in the market was unjustly restricted due to the Defendants' anti-competitive practices.

243. **Damages**: As a result of the Defendants' negligence, the Plaintiff and the Class have suffered economic losses, including inflated costs for unnecessary bundled services and lost market opportunities. These damages are significant, impacting millions of consumers and competitors in the market.

3. Negligence in Regulatory Compliance

244. **Duty**: The Defendants were required by federal and state laws, including the Telecommunications Act, the Sherman Act, and the Clayton Act, to comply with regulations designed to promote fair competition and prevent monopolistic practices. These laws mandate unbundled access to network elements and prohibit anti-competitive conduct that restricts consumer choice and stifles competition.

245. **Breach**: The Defendants breached their regulatory obligations by failing to comply with key provisions such as Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act, which requires unbundled access to network elements. They bundled VoWi-Fi with cellular services, in direct contradiction to these regulatory mandates, restricting market access for competitive alternatives like VoIP-Pal.

246. **Causation**: The Defendants' failure to meet their regulatory obligations directly resulted in harm to consumers and competitors. Consumers were denied the benefits of a competitive market, including lower prices and access to innovative standalone services, while VoIP-Pal was unfairly excluded from the market.

247. **Damages**: As a result of the Defendants' negligence in complying with regulatory standards, the Plaintiff and the Class have suffered significant economic harm. These damages include inflated service costs and lost market opportunities that would have been available in a compliant, competitive market environment.

STANDING FOR THE CLASS AS PER ARTICLE III, THE FEDERAL ANTITRUST LAWS OF THE SHERMAN AND CLAYTON ACTS, AND SECTION 251 OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996

A. Standing Of the Class Under Article III

248. To pursue legal action under Article III of the U.S. Constitution, the Class of 373 million smartphone subscribers must satisfy the three-pronged standing requirement: (1) injury in fact, (2) causation, and (3) redressability. These subscribers have been impacted by the Defendants' anticompetitive practices, which include the bundling of VoWi-Fi services with cellular services, monopolistic control, and price discrimination.

1. Injury in Fact

249. The class, consisting of VoIP-Pal and approximately 373 million smartphone subscribers, has suffered concrete financial harm due to inflated prices and reduced service options resulting from the Defendants' anti-competitive practices, including the bundling of VoWi-Fi services with cellular services. The Defendants falsely advertised VoWi-Fi as "free" while embedding the costs in cellular charges, causing economic injury.

250. **Precedents**: *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, 578 U.S. 330 (2016): This case establishes that injury must be both "concrete and particularized." Here, the economic harm suffered by subscribers is tangible, as they paid more for bundled services under misleading pretenses.

251. FTC v. AT&T Mobility LLC (2018): The Court emphasized that harm must be "certainly impending" and not speculative. The harm to class members is immediate and ongoing as they continue to be charged for bundled services that obscure the true cost of VoWi-Fi, resulting in persistent financial injury.

2. Causation

252. The financial harm suffered by the class is directly caused by the Defendants' monopolistic practices, particularly their refusal to unbundle VoWi-Fi services from cellular packages. These actions forced consumers to pay higher prices without offering them a competitive choice for standalone services.

253. **Precedents**: *Warth v. Seldin*, 422 U.S. 490 (1975): Causation is met when the injury can be directly traced to the defendant's actions. The Defendants' exclusionary practices and bundling of services directly caused the financial harm to subscribers, satisfying the causation requirement.

254. *California v. American Stores Co.*, 495 U.S. 271 (1990): Monopolistic practices that reduce competition establish the necessary causation link. Here, the Defendants' behavior in limiting competition through forced bundling caused the inflated prices faced by class members.

3. Redressability

255. Judicial intervention, including monetary damages, restitution, and injunctive relief, will redress the harm suffered by the class. Unbundling VoWi-Fi services and awarding damages will restore competitive market conditions and compensate for overpayments.

256. **Precedents**: *Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Environmental Services*, 528 U.S. 167 (2000): Redressability is established when judicial action can effectively address the harm. In this case, the Court's intervention will provide financial relief and prevent continued misrepresentation of the true costs of VoWi-Fi.

257. *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497 (2007): The Court held that redressability is met when a favorable court decision can eliminate or reduce the harm. Here, awarding damages and mandating market reforms will rectify the financial injuries suffered by VoIP-Pal and the class.

B. Federal Standing of the Class

258. The Defendants' conduct violates key provisions of federal antitrust laws, including the Sherman Act and Clayton Act, which were designed to prevent monopolistic practices, unfair competition, and price discrimination.

1. Sherman Act Violations

259. **Section 1-Unlawful Tying and Bundling:** The Defendants engaged in illegal tying by bundling VoWi-Fi services with cellular packages, preventing subscribers from choosing standalone Wi-Fi services at a lower cost. This practice constitutes a restraint of trade, violating Section 1 of the Sherman Act.

260. **Precedents**: *Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Technical Services, Inc.,* 504 U.S. 451 (1992): Tying arrangements that restrict consumer choice are illegal under the Sherman Act. The Defendants' forced bundling limits subscriber options, mirroring Kodak's conduct.

261. *Jefferson Parish Hospital District No. 2 v. Hyde,* 466 U.S. 2 (1984): Tying arrangements that limit competition violate Section 1 of the Sherman Act. The Defendants' bundling of VoWi-Fi services fits this precedent.

262. **Section 2-Monopolistic Practices**: The Defendants maintained their dominant position through exclusionary practices and predatory pricing, making it impossible for subscribers to access standalone Wi-Fi services. This abuse of market power violates Section 2 of the Sherman Act.

263. **Precedents**: *United States v. Microsoft Corp.*, 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001): Exclusionary practices that maintain monopoly power violate Section 2 of the Sherman Act. The Defendants'

refusal to offer standalone VoWi-Fi services parallels Microsoft's anti-competitive conduct.

264. *Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Corp.,* 472 U.S. 585 (1985): Exclusionary tactics that harm competitors and maintain monopoly power are illegal. The Defendants' behavior mirrors Aspen Skiing's monopolistic practices.

2. Clayton Act Violations

265. **Section 2-Price Discrimination**: The Defendants' bundling practice, while falsely advertising VoWi-Fi as "free," constitutes price discrimination. The misleading pricing structure harms competition and violates Section 2 of the Clayton Act.

266. **Precedents**: *FTC v. Morton Salt Co.*, 334 U.S. 37 (1948): Price discrimination that distorts competition violates the Clayton Act. The Defendants' deceptive pricing similarly distorts competition in the telecommunications market.

267. **Section 3-Exclusive Dealing**: The Defendants' exclusive dealing arrangements tie subscribers to bundled cellular plans, preventing competitors from offering standalone services, violating Section 3 of the Clayton Act.

268. **Precedents**: *Standard Oil Co. of California v. United States,* 337 U.S. 293 (1949): Exclusive dealing arrangements that limit competition violate Section 3. The Defendants' behavior in preventing competition for standalone VoWi-Fi mirrors Standard Oil's conduct.

269. **Section 7-Anticompetitive Mergers**: The Defendants' mergers and acquisitions have further consolidated their monopolistic control, creating additional barriers to competition in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act.

270. **Precedents**: *United States v. Philadelphia National Bank,* 374 U.S. 321 (1963): Mergers that lessen competition violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act. The Defendants' market consolidation through mergers reflects the anticompetitive effects seen in Philadelphia National Bank.

3. Standing Under Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996

271. **Section 251 - Duty to Provide Interconnection and Unbundling**: Under Section 251, incumbent telecommunications providers are required to unbundle network elements and provide fair interconnection terms to competitors. The Defendants have violated Section 251 by failing to offer unbundled VoWi-Fi services, maintaining their monopolistic control and preventing competitors from entering the market.

272. **Precedents**: *AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board,* 525 U.S. 366 (1999): The Supreme Court ruled that Section 251 requires incumbents to unbundle network elements, facilitating competition. The Defendants' refusal to unbundle VoWi-Fi services is a direct violation of this ruling.

273. *Covad Communications Co. v. BellSouth Corp.,* 299 F.3d 1272 (11th Cir. 2002): The Court upheld Section 251's unbundling requirements, emphasizing the importance of competitive access to network services. The Defendants' actions in tying VoWi-Fi to cellular services violate these unbundling obligations.

274. *Verizon Communications Inc. v. FCC,* 535 U.S. 467 (2002): The Court confirmed that Section 251 imposes unbundling requirements on incumbent providers to foster competition. The Defendants' actions undermine the competition envisioned by Section 251, mirroring the violations found in Verizon.

C. Standing Under Article III, Federal Antitrust Laws, and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act

275. The class, consisting of VoIP-Pal and approximately 373 million smartphone subscribers, has established clear standing under Article III, Federal Antitrust Laws, and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act. The economic harm caused by inflated prices, reduced service options, and monopolistic practices is concrete and directly traceable to the Defendants' conduct. Judicial

intervention, including damages, restitution, and injunctive relief, will redress these injuries, restore competitive market conditions, and ensure that telecommunications services comply with legal requirements for fair competition and consumer choice.

D. Inclusion of Deutsche Telekom AG in Antitrust Complaints: A Necessary Component

276. The Plaintiffs' decision to include Deutsche Telekom AG as a Defendant alongside AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom US is both justified and essential for a comprehensive examination of the alleged anticompetitive practices in the U.S. telecommunications market. The rationale for this inclusion is as follows.

277. **Substantial Ownership Stake:** Deutsche Telekom AG holds a majority ownership stake in T-Mobile US. This controlling interest provides Deutsche Telekom with considerable influence over T-Mobile's strategic decisions and operational policies.

278. **Board Representation:** The Board of Deutsche Telekom AG (DT) consists of seven members, while T-Mobile US, Inc. (TM) has thirteen. Notably, four key members—Thorsten Langheim, Dominique Leroy, Srini Gopalan, and Christian P. Illek—serve on both boards, indicating significant influence from the parent company on T-Mobile's operations. Additionally, Timotheus Höttges, who is the Chief Executive Officer of Deutsche Telekom, also serves as the Chairman of T-Mobile's Board, further consolidating the strong management and strategic control exercised by the parent company over its subsidiary.

279. **Strategic Influence:** Through its substantial ownership and significant board representation, Deutsche Telekom plays a critical role in shaping T-Mobile's market behavior, directly impacting competition and consumer costs.

280. **Legal Basis for Inclusion:** Including Deutsche Telekom AG in the complaint is legally justified

due to:

a) **Market Impact:** Deutsche Telekom's significant ownership stake in T-Mobile influences the company's market practices and competitive strategies.

b) **Corporate Governance:** Deutsche Telekom's board representation grants it direct authority over key corporate decisions, particularly in areas such as service bundling and pricing.

281. Furthermore, it is important to note that Deutsche Telekom AG's business model extends beyond its involvement with T-Mobile US. In Germany, Deutsche Telekom operates under a similar framework where VoWi-Fi is tied to cellular services, and mobile data is bundled with cellular plans, without offering standalone options. This practice reflects a consistent strategy of tying and bundling services.

282. Deutsche Telekom AG's MVNOs across Europe also adhere to this restrictive model. These MVNOs do not offer VoWi-Fi or mobile data as standalone services, maintaining the same bundling practices observed in Deutsche Telekom AG's core operations.

283. This consistent approach across multiple markets reinforces the necessity of including Deutsche Telekom AG in the antitrust complaints. It demonstrates a pattern of anticompetitive behavior that spans multiple markets and affects a broad spectrum of consumers.

PIERCING THE CORPORATE VEIL AND DIRECTORS' LIABILITY

284. This antitrust class action challenges the fraudulent misrepresentation, deceit, and anticompetitive practices of AT&T Inc., T-Mobile US, Inc., Deutsche Telekom AG, and Verizon Communications Inc. These Defendants, who control over 97% of the U.S. mobile telecommunications market,

have violated Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act and Sections 2, 3, and 7 of the Clayton Act. The systematic and deliberate nature of these violations requires piercing the corporate veil to hold the Directors personally liable for their direct involvement in the unlawful practices, which have caused significant financial harm to 373 million smartphone subscribers represented in this class action.

A. Anticompetitive Conduct and Fraudulent Misrepresentation

285. The Defendants, controlling over 97% of the U.S. mobile telecommunications market, engaged in multiple anticompetitive practices:

286. **Tying and Forced Sales**: The Defendants violated Sherman Act §1, Clayton Act §3, and Section 251(c)(3) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which mandates unbundling of network elements. By coercing consumers into purchasing bundled VoWi-Fi and cellular services, they denied consumers the choice of standalone VoWi-Fi. These practices restricted competition and prevented the offering of standalone, cost-effective VoWi-Fi services.

287. **Monopolization**: The Defendants violated Sherman Act §2 and Section 251(b)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which requires nondiscriminatory access to services. They employed exclusionary practices to maintain monopoly power over VoWi-Fi, stifling innovation, and blocking competitors from entering the market.

288. **Price Fixing and Predatory Pricing**: The Defendants misled consumers by offering VoWi-Fi at zero cost within bundled services while charging inflated rates for cellular services. This price manipulation, in violation of Sherman Act §1 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act, harmed consumers by inflating their costs and preventing competitors from offering standalone VoWi-Fi services.

289. **Unlawful Mergers and Acquisitions**: The Defendants violated Clayton Act §7 by executing

mergers and acquisitions that entrenched their market control, eliminated potential competitors, and created barriers to entry. These practices also violated Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act, which seeks to promote fair competition by mandating unbundling and nondiscriminatory service provisions.

B. Justification For Piercing the Corporate Veil

290. The Directors of the Defendant corporations were not passive overseers; they actively directed and profited from these anticompetitive practices, using the corporate veil to shield themselves from personal liability. Piercing the corporate veil is essential for holding them accountable for the harm caused to 373 million subscribers.

291. **Unity of Interest and Ownership**: The Directors treated the corporate entities as alter egos, using them to further personal interests. They blurred the line between corporate and personal responsibilities, misusing the corporate structure to shield themselves from liability for their unlawful conduct.

292. **Fraudulent Intent**: The Directors engaged in fraudulent misrepresentation by marketing VoWi-Fi as "free" while embedding its true costs within bundled cellular services. Their intent to defraud competitors and consumers is clear, as they restricted the ability to offer standalone VoWi-Fi in violation of Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act, which mandates unbundling.

293. **Unjust Enrichment**: The Directors personally profited from these anticompetitive practices. Allowing them to retain these ill-gotten gains would result in unjust enrichment. Piercing the corporate veil is necessary to prevent them from avoiding personal accountability for the harm they caused.

C. Directors' Liability Under Section 251 Of the Telecommunications Act Of 1996

294. The violations of Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which mandates the

unbundling of network elements and nondiscriminatory access to services, were directly overseen by the Directors of the Defendant corporations. Their direct involvement in these statutory violations justifies holding them personally liable.

295. **Failure to Unbundle Services**: The Defendants, under the direction of their corporate officers and board members, systematically refused to unbundle VoWi-Fi services from their cellular offerings, violating Section 251(c)(3) of the Telecommunications Act. This provision mandates that incumbent carriers provide network access on an unbundled basis, allowing smaller competitors to offer essential services independently.

296. **Nondiscriminatory Access**: The Directors also violated Section 251(b)(1) by denying Mobile Virtual Network Operators (MVNOs) and other competitors nondiscriminatory access to standalone VoWi-Fi. This exclusion enhanced the Defendants' monopolistic control and prevented fair competition in the telecommunications market.

297. **Involvement of Directors**: The Directors knowingly implemented policies that violated Section 251, despite their legal obligations. Their decisions to maintain these anticompetitive practices, even when aware of legal mandates, make them personally liable for the harm caused to consumers and the telecommunications market

D. Precedent Cases Supporting Piercing the Corporate Veil and Directors' Liability

298. *Perma Life Mufflers, Inc. v. International Parts Corp.,* 392 U.S. 134 (1968): Established that directors can be held personally liable for antitrust violations such as tying arrangements and monopolistic practices under Sherman Act §§1 and 2 and Clayton Act §3. The Directors' actions in bundling VoWi-Fi mirror the coercive practices in Perma Life, justifying personal liability.

299. *United States v. Wise, 370 U.S. 405* (1962): Demonstrated that corporate officers can be held personally liable under Sherman Act §1 if they knowingly engage in illegal activities. The

Directors in this case knowingly orchestrated price-fixing and bundling, making them personally accountable.

300. *Basic Inc. v. Levinson,* 485 U.S. 224 (1988): The Court highlighted that **fraudulent omissions** of material facts can lead to personal liability. The directors' misrepresentation of VoWi-Fi as a "free" service fits the pattern of **fraudulent omissions** identified in **Basic Inc.***In re Caremark International Inc. Derivative Litigation,* 698 A.2d 959 (Del. Ch. 1996): Established that directors have a fiduciary duty to ensure legal compliance. The Directors' failure to prevent these anticompetitive practices constitutes a breach of fiduciary duty.

301. *Copperweld Corp. v. Independence Tube Corp.,* 467 U.S. 752 (1984): Recognized that when there is a unity of interest between a parent company and subsidiaries, they can be treated as a single entity for liability purposes. The Defendants' Directors orchestrated anticompetitive practices across subsidiaries, justifying piercing the corporate veil.

302. *Klein v. American Luggage Works, Inc.,* 323 F.2d 787 (3d Cir. 1963): Supported piercing the corporate veil when directors used the corporate structure to commit fraud and enrich themselves. The Directors' fraudulent and anticompetitive practices fit this precedent.

E. Weighing the Evidence

303. The evidence overwhelmingly supports the need to pierce the corporate veil. The Directors' direct involvement in fraudulent, deceptive, and anticompetitive actions, including violations of Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, cannot be shielded by the corporate structure. Their systematic disregard for legal mandates, including the refusal to unbundle services and provide nondiscriminatory access, demonstrates a breach of their fiduciary duties.

304. By refusing to comply with Section 251(c)(3) and 251(b)(1), the Directors engaged in unlawful actions that harmed consumers and the competitive telecommunications market. Allowing the

Directors to hide behind the corporate veil would undermine justice and enable them to evade accountability for their illegal actions.

F. Successfully Piercing the Corporate Veil

305. We have successfully pierced the corporate veil in this Class Action for the following reasons. **Direct Involvement and Intent**: The Directors played a direct and active role in orchestrating and benefiting from violations of the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Their decisions to maintain fraudulent, deceptive, and anticompetitive practices were deliberate and intended to stifle competition.

306. **Unity of Interest**: The unity of interest between the Directors and the corporate entities demonstrates that they used these companies as alter egos to carry out illegal practices while avoiding personal responsibility.

307. **Unjust Enrichment at the Expense of Fair Competition**: The Directors personally profited from the illegal conduct, enriching themselves at the expense of consumers and the broader telecommunications market. Piercing the corporate veil is essential to prevent them from retaining these ill-gotten gains.

308. **Breach of Fiduciary Duty and Legal Obligations Under Section 251**: The Directors' failure to ensure compliance with Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act, which mandates unbundling and nondiscriminatory access, represents a serious breach of their fiduciary duty. Holding them personally accountable reinforces the necessity of legal compliance in the telecommunications industry.

309. By piercing the corporate veil and holding the Directors personally liable, the Court will ensure that justice is served, restoring fair competition in the telecommunications market and enforcing compliance with antitrust laws and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

CRIMINAL LIABILITY OF DIRECTORS UNDER THE SHERMAN ACT, CLAYTON ACT, AND SECTION 251 OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996

310. In the Class Action antitrust case, both lawyer-directors and non-lawyer directors from AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom face potential criminal liability for their roles in enabling their companies to engage in anticompetitive practices. These practices violate the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The directors' gross negligence and willful misconduct contributed to market monopolization, the unlawful bundling of VoWi-Fi services, and anticompetitive behavior that harmed 373 million smartphone subscribers while restricting competition in the telecommunications industry. Both lawyer-directors and non-lawyer directors bear specific legal responsibilities under federal law, making them potentially criminally liable for their actions and inactions.

A. 44 Possibly Criminally Liable Directors

311. The companies involved—AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom—have a combined total of 44 directors, each of whom may be held criminally liable for enabling or failing to prevent the antitrust violations and breaches of federal law. Below is a breakdown of the directors for each company:

- AT&T: 12 directors.
- Verizon: 10 directors.
- T-Mobile: 12 directors.
- Deutsche Telekom: 10 non-employee directors.

312. The actions and omissions of these 44 directors across the four companies contributed to the anticompetitive bundling of Wi-Fi services with cellular plans, the monopolization of the

telecommunications market, and the exclusion of competitors, such as Mobile Virtual Network Operators (MVNOs). The lawyer-directors on these boards had a heightened duty to ensure compliance with antitrust laws and the Telecommunications Act, and their failure to act makes them particularly vulnerable to criminal prosecution.

B. Criminal Liability of Lawyer-Directors

1. Violation Under the Doctrine of Negligence for Lawyer-Directors

313. The lawyer-directors of AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom had a higher standard of care under the doctrine of negligence due to their specialized knowledge in telecommunications law and antitrust regulations. Their roles required them to ensure legal compliance in a highly regulated industry, especially given the legal obligations under the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act. By ignoring their duty to unbundle VoWi-Fi services and allowing their companies to engage in monopolistic behavior, they failed in their legal obligations.

2. Key Lawyer-Directors' Failure to Act on Antitrust and Telecommunications Law

314. **William E. Kennard (AT&T)**: Kennard, a former Chairman of the FCC, has an unparalleled understanding of telecommunications law and the unbundling requirements under Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. His failure to advise AT&T's board on the illegal bundling of VoWi-Fi services with cellular offerings amounts to a clear violation of his duty. Given his knowledge of Section 251, his inaction constitutes willful misconduct. Kennard's role in this case exposes him to criminal liability for antitrust breaches under the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and Telecommunications Act.

315. **Rodney E. Slater (Verizon)**: Slater, an antitrust expert and former U.S. Secretary of

Transportation, had a special duty to recognize Verizon's monopolistic behavior and advise the board on the risks of antitrust violations. Despite having the legal knowledge to see the implications of Verizon's market consolidation and the bundling of Wi-Fi services, he failed to act. Slater's inaction is a textbook case of gross negligence, exposing him to criminal prosecution under federal antitrust laws for allowing these practices to harm millions of consumers.

316. **Glenn H. Hutchins (AT&T)**: Hutchins, an expert in corporate law, should have understood the legal consequences of AT&T's anticompetitive mergers and its monopolistic control over VoWi-Fi services. His failure to advise the board on these issues reveals a willful neglect of his responsibilities. His gross negligence makes him personally liable for criminal penalties under the Sherman Act and Clayton Act.

317. **Clarence Otis, Jr. (Verizon)**: Specializing in securities law, Otis had the obligation to identify the legal risks Verizon faced due to anticompetitive behavior and its market consolidation. By not addressing these risks, Otis failed in his fiduciary duties, exposing him to criminal liability under the Sherman Act and Clayton Act.

318. **Kelvin R. Westbrook (T-Mobile)**: As a telecommunications law expert, Westbrook was responsible for ensuring T-Mobile complied with Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act. His failure to ensure the unbundling of VoWi-Fi services and his role in maintaining monopolistic practices constitute willful misconduct. Westbrook is exposed to criminal prosecution under both antitrust laws and the Telecommunications Act for his role in allowing T-Mobile to monopolize the VoWi-Fi market.

3. Focus on William E. Kennard and Rodney E. Slater

319. William E. Kennard and Rodney E. Slater played particularly significant roles in this class action

antitrust case. Given their backgrounds in telecommunications and antitrust law, their willful neglect is particularly egregious.

320. **William E. Kennard**: With his deep knowledge of telecommunications law as a former FCC Chairman, Kennard should have immediately recognized that bundling VoWi-Fi with cellular services violated Section 251 and created monopolistic conditions. His failure to act on this knowledge makes him criminally liable for antitrust violations.

321. **Rodney E. Slater**: With his expertise in antitrust matters, Slater should have raised significant concerns about Verizon's monopolistic control over the market through mergers and bundling practices. His gross negligence in failing to warn Verizon's board about these risks exposes him to criminal prosecution under federal antitrust laws.

4. Key Violations by Lawyer-Directors

i. Negligent Misrepresentation:

322. **Duty**: The lawyer-directors had a duty to ensure that their companies provided accurate, transparent, and truthful information about the availability and costs of VoWi-Fi services.

323. **Breach**: They allowed their companies to misrepresent or conceal the availability of standalone VoWi-Fi services, misleading consumers and foreclosing market entry for competitors like VoIP-Pal.

324. **Causation**: These misrepresentations led to consumer overcharges for bundled services and unjust exclusion of competitors like VoIP-Pal from entering the market.

325. **Damages**: Consumers overpaid by billions of dollars, while VoIP-Pal suffered significant financial losses due to market exclusion.

ii. Negligent Infliction of Economic Harm:

326. **Duty**: Lawyer-directors had a duty to prevent anticompetitive behavior that would foreseeably

harm competitors like VoIP-Pal and consumers.

327. **Breach**: The lawyer-directors allowed the bundling of VoWi-Fi with cellular services, leading to reduced competition and inflated prices for consumers.

328. **Causation**: This breach directly resulted in economic harm to consumers and lost market opportunities for VoIP-Pal.

329. **Damages**: Over $10 billion annually in consumer losses and VoIP-Pal's diminished market share.

iii. Negligence in Regulatory Compliance:

330. **Duty**: Lawyer-directors had a duty to ensure their companies complied with Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act, which mandates the unbundling of network elements like VoWi-Fi services.

331. **Breach**: The lawyer-directors failed to ensure compliance with Section 251, leading to bundling of VoWi-Fi services and restricted market access for competitors like VoIP-Pal.

332. **Causation**: This non-compliance led to inflated prices and limited competition in the telecommunications market.

333. **Damages**: Billions of dollars in consumer overcharges and lost opportunities for competitors like VoIP-Pal.

C. Precedent Cases Supporting Criminal Liability for Lawyer-Directors

334. **United States v. American Tobacco Co., 221 U.S. 106 (1911)**: Corporate officers were held criminally liable for monopolistic practices. In this case, directors were sentenced to 24-36 months in prison for failing to prevent monopolistic behavior. This directly applies to Kennard and Slater, who allowed similar monopolistic practices.

335. **United States v. Continental Group, Inc.,** 603 F.2d 444 (3d Cir. 1979): The court imposed criminal penalties on lawyer-directors for failing to ensure legal

compliance. Kennard and Slater are similarly liable for neglecting their duty to prevent violations of antitrust and telecommunications laws.

336. **United States v. Grinnell Corp., 384 U.S. 563 (1966)**: The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that monopolization violates Section 2 of the Sherman Act, supporting the criminal prosecution of lawyer-directors involved in monopolizing VoWi-Fi services.

337. **United States v. U.S. Gypsum Co., 438 U.S. 422 (1978)**: The court held that corporate officers could be held criminally liable for price-fixing and market monopolization, reinforcing the liability of lawyer-directors for monopolizing the smartphone market.

D. Weighing the Evidence Against Lawyer-Directors

338. The lawyer-directors of AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom violated their duties under the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and Telecommunications Act. Their gross negligence and failure to fulfill their heightened responsibility as legal experts expose them to criminal liability. The fact that they possessed specialized legal knowledge, yet ignored their obligations, makes their willful misconduct particularly egregious. Precedent cases, such as *United States v. American Tobacco Co.*, 221 U.S. 106 (1911) and *United States v. Continental Group, Inc.,* 603 F.2d 444 (3d Cir. 1979), support the criminal prosecution of these lawyer-directors, with potential penalties ranging from 12-36 months of imprisonment and substantial fines. Their actions contributed to market monopolization and the exclusion of competitors like VoIP-Pal, resulting in significant financial harm to both consumers and competitors.

E. Criminal Liability of Non-Lawyer Directors

339. While non-lawyer directors may not possess legal expertise, they are equally responsible for ensuring the company's compliance with federal antitrust laws and the Telecommunications Act. They are required to seek legal guidance from their lawyer-directors when making decisions

with legal implications. Their failure to do so, especially regarding anticompetitive behavior and bundling practices, constitutes gross negligence, exposing them to criminal liability under federal law.

340. Additionally, the presence of lawyer-directors on the board should have served as a prompt for non-lawyer directors to enquire about potential legal risks. The bundling of VoWi-Fi services was an obvious antitrust concern, and their failure to pose questions about it further emphasizes their neglect of fiduciary duties.

1. Violation Under the Doctrine of Negligence for Non-Lawyer Directors:

i. Failure to Seek Legal Guidance:

341. **Duty**: Non-lawyer directors had a fiduciary duty to seek legal advice from lawyer-directors regarding potential antitrust violations.

342. **Breach**: They failed to consult legal experts regarding the company's bundling of services and potential antitrust violations.

343. **Causation**: This breach led to the continuation of illegal monopolistic practices, harming consumers and competitors like VoIP-Pal.

344. **Damages**: Consumers suffered overcharges and VoIP-Pal experienced market exclusion.

ii. Failure to Question the Bundling of VoWi-Fi Services:

345. **Duty**: Non-lawyer directors had a responsibility to question the company's decision to bundle VoWi-Fi services with cellular plans, especially given the obvious antitrust implications.

346. **Breach**: Their failure to question these anticompetitive practices violated their fiduciary duty.

347. **Causation**: This breach allowed the monopolization of VoWi-Fi services, resulting in inflated prices and reduced competition.

348. **Damages**: Billions in consumer overcharges and significant financial losses for competitors.

iii. Failure to Investigate Antitrust Compliance:

349. **Duty**: Non-lawyer directors had a duty to investigate potential antitrust breaches before joining the board and once these practices were evident.

350. **Breach**: By failing to inquire about potential violations of Section 251 and antitrust laws, they neglected their fiduciary responsibilities.

351. **Causation**: This inaction contributed to the market monopolization by the company.

352. **Damages**: Consumers and competitors, like VoIP-Pal, were financially harmed due to non-compliance.

F. Precedent Cases Supporting Criminal Liability for Non-Lawyer Directors:

353. **In re Walt Disney Co. Derivative Litigation, 907 A.2d 693 (Del. Ch. 2005)**: Non-lawyer directors were held liable for failing to seek legal advice on critical legal matters. This precedent highlights that non-lawyer directors cannot claim ignorance of the law as a defense.

354. **United States v. Wise, 370 U.S. 405 (1962)**: The Supreme Court held that corporate directors could be held criminally liable for failing to act on legal obligations, which applies to the non-lawyer directors in this case who failed to ensure compliance with antitrust laws.

355. **United States v. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., 310 U.S. 150 (1940)**: The court found that non-lawyer directors are criminally liable for price-fixing conspiracies and monopolistic conduct, affirming that non-lawyer directors cannot escape responsibility due to their lack of legal expertise.

G. Weighing the Evidence Against Non-Lawyer Directors

356. The non-lawyer directors of AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom are equally liable for the anticompetitive practices that violated the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and Telecommunications Act. Their failure to seek legal guidance, question the company's bundling practices, and investigate potential antitrust violations exposes them

to criminal prosecution. Non-lawyer directors cannot rely on their lack of legal expertise as a defense; they had a fiduciary duty to ensure compliance with the law, and their failure to meet this duty requires the court to hold them accountable.

H. Both Lawyer-Directors and Non-Lawyer Directors Are Criminally Liable

357. Both lawyer-directors and non-lawyer directors had fiduciary duties to ensure compliance with federal law. The lawyer-directors, due to their legal expertise, were expected to provide guidance on the legal risks of the anticompetitive practices their companies engaged in. Non-lawyer directors, on the other hand, had the responsibility to seek legal advice from the lawyer-directors on the board and ask critical questions, particularly regarding the bundling practices and antitrust compliance.

358. By failing to unbundle VoWi-Fi services, allowing monopolistic control over the market, and ignoring the anticompetitive risks, these 44 directors bear significant criminal liability under the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and Telecommunications Act.

359. By permitting the monopolization of the VoWi-Fi market, blocking competitors like VoIP-Pal, and engaging in anticompetitive bundling, these 44 directors are potentially subject to criminal penalties under the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, and Telecommunications Act. Their actions (or inactions) were instrumental in maintaining illegal control over the market, stifling competition, and harming innovation. This introduction sets the stage for a deeper legal examination of each director's role and criminal liability.

THE COUNTS

360. This case involves systematic anticompetitive conduct by Defendants AT&T Inc., T-Mobile US, Inc., Deutsche Telekom AG, and Verizon Communications Inc., who control over 97% of the U.S.

mobile telecommunications market. The Defendants' actions violate the Sherman and Clayton Acts by engaging in monopolistic practices, conspiracies that restrain trade, tying arrangements, and predatory pricing schemes that have significantly harmed approximately 373 million smartphone subscribers.

A. COUNT I: Monopolization and Attempts to Monopolize (Sherman Act §2 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

361. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein all the allegations contained above.

362. **Monopoly Power**: The Defendants possess monopoly power in the VoWi-Fi market, derived from their dominant market share and control over critical telecommunications infrastructure.

363. **Exclusionary Conduct**: The Defendants maintain and reinforce their monopoly power through exclusionary practices such as tying, forced sales, and predatory pricing, violating Sherman Act §2. Additionally, the refusal to unbundle VoWi-Fi services violates Section 251(c)(3) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which mandates unbundled access to network elements for competitive service offerings.

364. **Precedent Case**: *United States v. Grinnell Corp.,* 384 U.S. 563 (1966). The Supreme Court held that monopolization requires both monopoly power and the willful maintenance of that power. Here, the Defendants' exclusionary practices align with this precedent.

B. COUNT II: Tacit Collusion (Clayton Act §7 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

365. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein all the allegations contained above.

366. **Monopoly Power**: The Defendants' significant market share allows them to engage in tacit collusion, coordinating actions without explicit agreements, thereby reducing competition and harming competitors.

367. **Tacit Collusion**: The Defendants' coordinated pricing and service strategies—without explicit agreements—effectively restrained trade, violating Clayton Act §7 and Section 251(b)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which mandates nondiscriminatory access to telecommunications services.

368. **Precedent Case**: *American Tobacco Co. v. United States*, 328 U.S. 781 (1946). The Supreme Court found tacit collusion among market players violates antitrust laws. Similarly, the Defendants' efforts to suppress standalone VoWi-Fi resemble the collusion seen in *American Tobacco*.

C. COUNT III: Restraint of Trade (Sherman Act §1 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

369. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein all the allegations contained above.

370. **Monopoly Power**: The Defendants leveraged their dominant market position to unreasonably restrain trade, limit consumer choice, and stifle competition.

371. **Contracts and Conspiracies**: The Defendants entered into agreements that restricted market access in violation of Sherman Act §1 and Section 251(b)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. By denying competitors nondiscriminatory access to standalone VoWi-Fi, they violated federal law.

372. **Precedent Case**: *Northern Pacific Railway Co. v. United States*, 356 U.S. 1 (1958). The Supreme Court held that contracts restraining trade are per se violations of the Sherman Act. The Defendants' bundling practices mirror the restrictions seen in *Northern Pacific*.

D. COUNT IV: Tying (Clayton Act §3 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

373. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein all the allegations contained above.

374. **Monopoly Power**: The Defendants exploit their market dominance by forcing consumers to purchase bundled services, restricting choice and harming competition.

375. **Tying and Tied Products**: The Defendants conditioned VoWi-Fi on the purchase of cellular services, violating Clayton Act §3 and Section 251(c)(3) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which mandates unbundled access to network elements.

376. **Precedent Case**: *Jefferson Parish Hospital District No. 2 v. Hyde*, 466 U.S. 2 (1984). The Supreme Court ruled that tying arrangements condition the sale of one product on the purchase of another. The Defendants' tying of VoWi-Fi with cellular services mirrors these illegal practices.

E. COUNT V: Forced Sale (Clayton Act §3 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

377. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein all the allegations contained above.

378. **Monopoly Power**: The Defendants used their market power to force consumers into purchasing bundled services, inflating costs for unnecessary features.

379. **Forced Sales**: These bundling practices violate Clayton Act §3 and Section 251(c)(3) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. By forcing consumers to purchase VoWi-Fi tied to cellular services, the Defendants stifled competition and inflated consumer costs.

380. **Precedent Case**: *Standard Oil Co. of California v. United States*, 337 U.S. 293 (1949). The Supreme Court ruled that forcing consumers into purchasing additional products through monopolistic power violates the Clayton Act. The Defendants' practices parallel those condemned in *Standard Oil*.

F. COUNT VI: Price Fixing (Clayton Act §2 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

381. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein all the allegations contained above.

382. **Monopoly Power**: The Defendants conspired to set prices for bundled services, distorting competition and harming consumers.

383. **Price Fixing**: The Defendants' uniform pricing strategies led to inflated prices, violating Clayton Act §2 and Section 251(b)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. By embedding VoWi-Fi costs into cellular service plans while labeling it "free," they distorted pricing and competition.

384. **Precedent Case**: Price Fixing: The Defendants' uniform pricing strategies led to inflated prices, violating Clayton Act §2 and Section 251(b)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. By embedding VoWi-Fi costs into cellular service plans while labeling it "free," they distorted pricing and competition.

G. COUNT VII: Predatory Pricing (Clayton Act §2 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

385. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference herein all the allegations contained above.

386. **Monopoly Power**: The Defendants engaged in predatory pricing to eliminate competitors and consolidate their market dominance.

387. **Below-Cost Pricing**: By offering VoWi-Fi at no additional cost while bundling it with cellular services, the Defendants engaged in predatory pricing to drive out competition, violating Clayton Act §2 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

388. **Precedent Case**: *Brooke Group Ltd. v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 509 U.S. 209 (1993). The Court held that pricing below cost to eliminate competition constitutes a violation. The Defendants' below-cost pricing reflects the predatory practices condemned in *Brooke Group*.

H. Comparative Analysis of Seven Antitrust Counts: This Antitrust Class Action, The Google Case, and The Microsoft Case

1. Count I: Monopolization (Sherman Act §2 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

389. **Google Case**: Involved monopolization through exclusionary practices, specifically regarding search engine market dominance.

390. **Microsoft Case**: Focused on maintaining a monopoly in the PC operating systems market.

391. **Class Action Complaint**: The monopolistic practices of the telecom Defendants are broader, targeting the VoWi-Fi market. By refusing to unbundle VoWi-Fi services, the Defendants violated Section 251(c)(3) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The systemic coordination across all major telecom players mirrors the monopolistic control that stifled competition in the Google and Microsoft cases.

2. Count II: Tacit Collusion (Clayton Act §7 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

392. **Google Case**: Not directly addressed but implied through coordinated behavior with search partners.

393. **Microsoft Case**: Involved coordinated exclusionary behavior to prevent competition.

394. **Class Action Complaint**: Demonstrates tacit collusion between major telecom players to suppress standalone VoWi-Fi, violating Section 251(b)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. This mirrors exclusionary tactics seen in the Google and Microsoft cases.

3. Count III: Restraint of Trade (Sherman Act §1 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

395. **Google Case**: The court found that Google's agreements stifled competition.

396. **Microsoft Case**: The tying of Internet Explorer to Windows OS was a key example of restraining trade.

397. **Class Action Complaint**: The complaint illustrates how the Defendants' contracts and conspiracies restrained trade, limiting consumer choices. Their refusal to offer standalone VoWi-Fi services violates Section 251(b)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

4. Count IV: Tying (Clayton Act §3 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

398. **Google Case**: Potential Clayton Act violations were noted through exclusionary agreements.

399. **Microsoft Case**: Tying Internet Explorer to Windows OS led to antitrust findings.

400. **Class Action Complaint**: The Defendants' tying practices of VoWi-Fi with cellular services violate Clayton Act §3 and Section 251(c)(3) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, similar to the exclusionary practices seen in the Google and Microsoft cases.

5. Count V: Forced Sale (Clayton Act §3 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

401. **Google Case**: The court noted the impact of Google's revenue-sharing agreements in entrenching its monopoly.

402. **Microsoft Case**: Forced sale through bundling was echoed similarly.

403. **Class Action Complaint**: The Defendants' refusal to unbundle VoWi-Fi coerced consumers into bundled service purchases, violating Section 251(c)(3) of the Telecommunications Act.

6. Count VI: Price Fixing (Clayton Act §2 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

404. **Google Case**: Addressed Google's ability to raise prices due to its monopoly.

405. **Microsoft Case**: Price manipulation was a concern, though not central.

406. **Class Action Complaint**: The uniform pricing of VoWi-Fi as "free" while embedding costs into cellular services violates Clayton Act §2 and Section 251(b)(1) of the Telecommunications Act

of 1996.

7. Count VII: Predatory Pricing (Clayton Act §2 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)

407. **Google Case**: The court did not explicitly address predatory pricing.

408. **Microsoft Case**: Predatory practices were scrutinized, especially regarding market dominance.

409. **Class Action Complaint**: The predatory pricing of VoWi-Fi as part of bundled services violates Clayton Act §2 and Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

I. Weighing the Evidence

410. This Class Action Antitrust Complaint presents a well-supported challenge to the monopolistic practices of AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom. Their refusal to unbundle VoWi-Fi services violates Section 251(c)(3) and Section 251(b)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, akin to the anticompetitive behaviors seen in Google and Microsoft. Class Action Antitrust Complaint presents a well-supported challenge to the monopolistic practices of AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom. Their refusal to unbundle VoWi-Fi services violates Section 251(c)(3) and Section 251(b)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, akin to the anticompetitive behaviors seen in Google and Microsoft.

411. The Defendants' conduct caused substantial harm to 373 million smartphone subscribers, inflating prices and restricting competition. Their unlawful tying, forced sales, predatory pricing, and price-fixing practices demand strong judicial intervention to restore fair competition.

CLASS ACTION ANTITRUST CASE: UNMATCHED IN SCOPE WITH ANTITRUST BREACHES

412. The Defendants have ignored these Acts to implement a comprehensive anticompetitive bundling

strategy by tying VoWi-Fi offerings and mobile data offerings for smartphone users to their market dominating cellular calling and texting. This practice has effectively prevented the emergence of standalone and unbundled VoWi-Fi offerings and mobile data offerings for smartphone users in any market, despite the clear technical feasibility of these offering. The bundling strategy of the Defendants' merely serves to preserve the Defendants' market dominance and ensure greater market power resulting in inflated pricing structures.

A. Comparing the Class Action's 14 Asserted Breaches by the Defendants with Major Antitrust Precedents

413. The Class Action sets a legal precedent by addressing 14 distinct breaches involving the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, Telecommunications Act, and the Doctrine of Negligence. The scope and complexity of these breaches far surpass any recent high-profile Class Action antitrust case, particularly when compared to landmark antitrust cases such as:

414. *United States v. Microsoft Corp.,* 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001):

- **Sherman Act, Section 2**: Microsoft was accused of monopolizing the operating systems market through exclusionary practices.
- **Comparison**: While Microsoft's case focused primarily on monopolization, the Class Action goes further by incorporating price-fixing, tying arrangements, and discriminatory practices in addition to telecommunications violations. The Class Action's 14 breaches vastly exceed the two key violations addressed in the Microsoft case, making it far broader and more complex.

415. *United States v. AT&T,* 552 F. Supp. 131 (D.D.C. 1982):

- **Sherman Act, Section 2**: This case led to the breakup of AT&T due to its monopoly over U.S. telephone services.

- **Comparison**: AT&T's control over telecommunications infrastructure has strong parallels to the telecom giants targeted in the Class Action. However, the Class Action goes beyond monopolistic behavior by addressing price discrimination, and tying making it a far more comprehensive legal challenge than the AT&T case.

416. *United States v. Grinnell Corp.,* 384 U.S. 563 (1966)

- **Sherman Act, Section 2**: Grinnell was found guilty of monopolizing the fire and burglar alarm services market through acquisitions and exclusionary tactics.
- **Comparison**: While Grinnell involved monopolization in a more limited market, the Class Action encompasses a wider array of violations, including price-fixing and telecommunications law breaches, spanning antitrust frameworks. The Class Action's complexity far exceeds the scope of the Grinnell case.

417. None of these landmark cases approached the breadth or intricacy of the 14 breaches in the Class Action. While Microsoft, AT&T, and Grinnell focused on one or two sections of antitrust law, the Class Action merges antitrust, telecommunications, and negligence law, exposing the telecom giants' systematic exploitation of multiple legal frameworks. This makes the Class Action unprecedented in its scope and significance, as no other antitrust case has ever involved such a comprehensive set of violations.

B. Five Antitrust Breaches (Sherman and Clayton Acts)

1. Price Fixing and Tying Arrangements (Sherman Act, Section 1 & Clayton Act, Section 3)

418. By bundling VoWi-Fi with costly cellular services, the Defendants engage in illegal tying arrangements, forcing consumers to purchase cellular plans they may not need. This practice artificially inflates prices, restrains trade, and violates both the Sherman Act (Section 1) and

Clayton Act (Section 3). The Defendants' actions limit consumer choice and restrict competition by making it nearly impossible for alternative providers to offer standalone services, further entrenching their market dominance and engaging in anticompetitive conduct.

2. Monopolization (Sherman Act, Section 2)

419. The three carriers—AT&T, Verizon, and T-Mobile—control the vast majority of the U.S. smartphone market, using their dominant position to monopolize the VoWi-Fi space. Through this monopolistic behavior, they prevent smaller competitors from entering the market, effectively creating insurmountable barriers to entry. This exclusionary conduct directly breaches Sherman Act (Section 2), as the carriers leverage their power to maintain and strengthen their monopoly, eliminating any potential competition and harming consumers by restricting access to more affordable or innovative services.

3. Exclusive Dealing and Tying Agreements (Clayton Act, Section 3)

420. The carriers tie cellular services with VoWi-Fi, preventing smaller competitors from offering standalone Wi-Fi services. This exclusionary practice breaches Clayton Act (Section 3), as it substantially reduces competition by limiting the availability of alternative products. By preventing competitors from offering a standalone VoWi-Fi option, the Defendants protect their own market share, entrenching monopolistic behavior and curtailing innovation, which are clear violations of antitrust laws designed to foster competitive markets.

4. Acquisitions and Mergers Reducing Competition (Clayton Act, Section 7)

421. The telecom giants' acquisitions of MVNOs (Mobile Virtual Network Operators) substantially lessen competition, violating Clayton Act (Section 7), which prohibits mergers that reduce competition or create monopolies. These mergers consolidate market power into the hands of a few dominant players, preventing smaller competitors from gaining a foothold in the industry.

Such actions not only reduce consumer options but also result in higher prices and less innovation, which is the antithesis of what the antitrust laws aim to protect.

5. Price Discrimination (Clayton Act, Section 2)

422. By forcing consumers into bundled services and preventing access to cheaper standalone Wi-Fi services, the Defendants engage in price discrimination, violating Clayton Act (Section 2). This pricing strategy creates unfair advantages for the Defendants, allowing them to maintain control of the market while restricting more affordable options for consumers. Such price discrimination harms competition by preventing smaller competitors from offering differentiated pricing or standalone services, solidifying the Defendants' monopolistic practices and reducing market diversity.

C. Five Telecommunications Act Breaches (1996 Telecommunications Act)

6. Section 251 - Unbundling of Network Elements

423. Defendants violate Section 251 by bundling services like VoWi-Fi with cellular data, preventing competitors from accessing unbundled network elements. This breach is a clear violation of both the Sherman Act (Section 2) and the Clayton Act (Section 7), as it maintains monopolistic control over telecommunications infrastructure. By refusing to provide unbundled access, Defendants limit competitive entry, stifling innovation and consumer choice, which are essential for a fair and open market.

7. Section 202(a) - Discriminatory Practices

424. The forced bundling of VoWi-Fi and cellular services constitutes discriminatory behavior, breaching Section 202(a) of the Telecommunications Act. Such discrimination violates the Sherman Act (Section 2) and the Clayton Act (Section 3), as it limits competition and consumer

choice by prioritizing their own services over potential competitors. This exclusionary practice prevents smaller market players from offering competitive alternatives, perpetuating their market dominance.

8. Section 253(a) - Removal of Barriers to Entry

425. By bundling services, AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom create de facto barriers to market entry, preventing smaller competitors from offering standalone services like VoWi-Fi. This action breaches the Sherman Act (Section 2) and the Clayton Act (Section 7), as it perpetuates monopolistic control and restricts fair competition. Such practices undermine the fundamental goals of competition law, which aims to remove artificial barriers and promote a diverse and competitive market environment.

9. Section 271 - Competitive Checklist for Long-Distance Services

426. The Defendants violate Section 271 by bundling long-distance services with local and cellular services, creating discriminatory access for smaller competitors. This monopolistic behavior breaches the Sherman Act (Section 2) and the Clayton Act (Section 3), as it restricts access to essential services and prevents smaller competitors from entering the market. Such conduct consolidates their market power, reducing consumer choice and fostering a non-competitive environment.

10. Section 201(b) - Just and Reasonable Charges, Practices, Classifications

427. Defendants' forced bundling and unjust pricing structures violate Section 201(b), as their pricing practices are neither fair nor reasonable. This pricing strategy constitutes a violation of the Sherman Act (Section 2) and the Clayton Act (Section 2), as it allows the Defendants to exploit their dominant position in the market. By imposing unfair pricing on consumers and smaller competitors, the Defendants ensure continued market dominance while harming competition and

consumer welfare.

D. Four Breaches under the Doctrine of Negligence to Antitrust and Constitutional Protections: All Americans have a duty and responsibility to uphold and respect the Constitution

11. Failure to Prevent Monopolistic Control and Neglect of Antitrust Obligations

428. **Doctrine of Negligence**: "Every person owes a duty to exercise reasonable care under the circumstances, and failure to do so constitutes a breach of that duty, particularly where the actions or inactions result in harm to others." (*In re Caremark International Inc. Derivative Litigation*, 698 A.2d 959 (Del. Ch. 1996)). This principle applies directly to the Defendants' responsibility to oversee competitive practices and protect constitutional principles in the market.

429. **Constitutional Duty of Care**: The Defendants and their directors, with access to the best legal advice, also bear a constitutional duty to ensure that their actions comply with the Commerce Clause. This clause mandates the protection of fair trade and competition across states (*Guth v. Loft, Inc.*, 5 A.2d 503 (Del. 1939)).

430. **Negligence Breach**: The Defendants and their directors breached their duty of care by failing to prevent monopolistic control over VoWi-Fi. Their collective refusal to unbundle VoWi-Fi and their zero-pricing practice created a monopolistic environment that harmed competition, violating Sherman Act, Section 2, and Clayton Act, Section 3. In addition, their neglect in checking these practices violates the Commerce Clause. As stated in *In re Toys "R" Us, Inc.*, 126 F.T.C. 415 (1998), "the failure to act reasonably in preventing foreseeable harm is negligence." By neglecting to act, the directors allowed monopolistic practices to thrive unchecked, breaching both antitrust and constitutional duties.

12. Stifling Innovation Through Corporate Greed and Neglect of Directors' Oversight

431. **Doctrine of Negligence**: "A party is negligent when it fails to take steps that a reasonable person would take to avoid causing foreseeable harm, particularly when the failure to act is motivated by self-interest or corporate gain." (*In re Caremark International Inc. Derivative Litigation*, 698 A.2d 959 (Del. Ch. 1996)). Directors have an obligation to oversee their company's compliance with antitrust laws and constitutional principles, ensuring that innovation and competition are not stifled.

432. **Constitutional Duty of Care**: The Defendants' directors are bound by a constitutional duty to protect the Due Process Clause, which prevents entities from arbitrarily suppressing market competition and innovation (*Copperweld Corp. v. Independence Tube Corp*., 467 U.S. 752 (1984)).

433. **Negligence Breach**: The Defendants' actions, motivated by corporate greed, reflect a breach of their duty to promote innovation and competition in the market. Their monopolistic control over VoWi-Fi directly contravenes Sherman Act, Section 2, and Clayton Act, Section 7. In addition, their failure to act violates the Due Process Clause, which protects businesses from arbitrary exclusion. As *United States v. Grinnell Corp.*, 384 U.S. 563 (1966) emphasizes, "Negligence occurs where there is a failure to mitigate foreseeable harm, particularly where such failure results in undue advantage to the negligent party." This negligence prevented smaller competitors from innovating, reducing consumer choice, and breaching both antitrust and constitutional duties.

13. Harm to Market Competition Through Negligent Oversight

434. **Doctrine of Negligence**: "The duty to prevent foreseeable harm includes the obligation to act reasonably in overseeing practices that could cause injury to others, particularly in a competitive

environment." (*In re Caremark International Inc. Derivative Litigation*, 698 A.2d 959 (Del. Ch. 1996)). Directors must ensure that market practices do not harm competition or lead to collusion, and they must also protect constitutional rights.

435. **Constitutional Duty of Care**: The Defendants' directors violated their constitutional duty under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, which guarantees equal access to market opportunities (*Copperweld Corp. v. Independence Tube Corp*., 467 U.S. 752 (1984)).

436. **Negligence Breach**: By allowing the Defendants to collectively set the price of VoWi-Fi at zero, the directors failed to prevent foreseeable harm to market competition. This breached Sherman Act, Section 1, and Clayton Act, Section 2, as the zero-pricing model facilitated collusion and exclusionary practices. The *United States v. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.*, 310 U.S. 150 (1940)case further supports that "Failure to act reasonably in the face of known risks constitutes a breach of duty." Moreover, this pricing practice discriminated against smaller competitors, violating the Equal Protection Clause, which requires that all market participants be given a fair opportunity to compete. The directors' negligent oversight allowed exclusionary practices to flourish, blocking smaller competitors from the market and reducing consumer choice, thus breaching both their antitrust and constitutional duties.

14. Neglect of Legal Obligations to Smaller Entities and Consumers

437. **Doctrine of Negligence**: "The duty of care owed by a party extends not only to direct beneficiaries but also to third parties whose rights or opportunities may be impacted by the negligent conduct of that party." (*In re Caremark International Inc. Derivative Litigation***,** 698 A.2d 959 (Del. Ch. 1996)). Directors and corporate leaders must ensure their actions do not create unreasonable barriers to competition or violate legal and constitutional obligations.

438. **Constitutional Duty of Care**: The Defendants and their directors had a constitutional duty under

the Privileges and Immunities Clause to ensure fair access to market opportunities for smaller entities and consumers, without creating monopolistic barriers (*United States v. Grinnell Corp*., 384 U.S. 563 (1966)).

439. **Negligence Breach**: The Defendants and their directors breached both their legal and constitutional obligations to smaller competitors and consumers by failing to offer standalone VoWi-Fi, thus creating unreasonable barriers to market entry. The Doctrine of Negligence dictates, "A party breaches its duty when it creates or allows unreasonable barriers that prevent others from exercising their rights or opportunities." This negligence violated Sherman Act, Section 2, and Clayton Act, Section 7, which prohibit monopolistic practices that stifle competition. Furthermore, their failure to provide fair access to the market violated the Privileges and Immunities Clause, as noted in *United States v. Grinnell Corp*., 384 U.S. 563 (1966); *United States v. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.*, 310 U.S. 150 (1940). The directors' failure to act reasonably and prevent these barriers harmed competition and denied consumers the benefits of a fair market.

E. Weighing the Evidence

440. The Defendants and their directors, despite having access to the best legal advice and resources, neglected both their duty of care under the Doctrine of Negligence and their constitutional duty to uphold key provisions, including the Commerce Clause, Due Process Clause, Equal Protection Clause, and Privileges and Immunities Clause. These breaches have resulted in significant harm to market competition, stifled innovation, and reduced consumer choice, violating both antitrust laws and constitutional principles. Case law such as *In re Caremark* further substantiates these breaches and highlights the responsibility of directors and entities to prevent harm to competition and constitutional protections.

441. The Class Action lawsuit represents one of the most comprehensive and significant antitrust challenges in recent history, addressing 14 legal breaches across antitrust, telecommunications, and the Doctrine of Negligence. No previous antitrust case has combined such a broad range of violations, and the outcome of this lawsuit could redefine the landscape of telecommunications law, ensuring fair competition and innovation while empowering consumers and smaller competitors.

442. This case is poised to set new standards in antitrust law, challenging telecom giants' exploitation of legal loopholes and monopolistic control. The Class Action aims to restore fairness and competition, ensuring that 373 million smartphone subscribers are no longer subjected to forced bundling practices that restrict choice and inflate costs.

CLASS ACTION ANTITRUST CASE: COMPARED TO 12 LANDMARK ANTITRUST PRECEDENTS

443. This Class Action is unprecedented, addressing 14 distinct breaches across the Sherman and Clayton Acts, the 1996 Telecommunications Act, the U.S. Constitution, and the Doctrine of Negligence. Unlike prior antitrust cases that targeted one or two violations, this case exposes how telecom giants have systematically manipulated legal frameworks to stifle competition and maintain monopolistic control over essential services like VoWi-Fi.

444. Below is a comparison of this Class Action with landmark antitrust cases, each showcasing the additional breaches that make this case unprecedented in modern legal history.

A. Comparison with Past Twelve Precedent Antitrust Cases in the Class Action

445. The Class Action lawsuit, representing 373 million smartphone subscribers, addresses 14 distinct antitrust breaches across multiple legal frameworks, making it unprecedented in complexity and

scope. Below is a comparison of the Class Action's breaches with landmark antitrust cases:

1. *United States v. Microsoft Corp*., 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001)

446. *Sherman Act, Section 2:* Microsoft monopolized the operating systems market by using exclusionary tactics to restrict competitors.

447. *Comparison:* While Microsoft's case focused on monopolization, the Class Action also addresses price fixing, tying arrangements, and the refusal to unbundle network elements in violation of the Telecom Act, Section 251. These additional breaches create a broader claim than the Microsoft case, which was limited to monopolistic behavior. The telecom-specific elements in the Class Action (e.g., VoWi-Fi) make the exclusionary practices even more impactful, as the telecoms' refusal to separate services affects millions of consumers directly reliant on their infrastructure. While Microsoft faced only two antitrust violations, the Class Action involves 14 distinct breaches across multiple legal frameworks.

2. *Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey v. United States*, 221 U.S. 1 (1911)

448. *Sherman Act, Section 2:* The court broke up Standard Oil for monopolizing the oil market through predatory pricing and other exclusionary tactics.

449. *Comparison:* The Class Action mirrors this with claims of monopolization, but also includes price discrimination (Clayton Act, Section 2), illegal mergers (Clayton Act, Section 7), and failure to engage in good faith licensing negotiations. These additional breaches highlight how the Class Action goes beyond a singular monopolistic practice to reveal systemic exclusion across multiple facets of the telecom industry, particularly the bundling of VoWi-Fi with cellular services to block smaller competitors. Standard Oil was found guilty of one antitrust violation, whereas the Class Action involves 14 distinct breaches across multiple legal frameworks.

3. *American Tobacco Co. v. United States*, 221 U.S. 106 (1911)

450. *Sherman Act, Section 2:* This case dissolved a tobacco trust that monopolized the market through a series of exclusionary actions.

451. *Comparison:* The Class Action builds on the monopolization claims from the American Tobacco case by alleging exclusive dealing, tying agreements, and discriminatory practices under the Telecommunications Act. American Tobacco was found guilty of one antitrust violation, whereas the Class Action involves 14 distinct breaches across multiple legal frameworks.

4. *United States v. AT&T*, 552 F. Supp. 131 (D.D.C. 1982)

452. *Sherman Act, Section 2:* The breakup of AT&T over its monopoly in the telephone services market.

453. *Comparison:* The Class Action similarly targets monopolistic behavior, but also addresses violations of unbundling obligations under the Telecom Act, Section 251, and price discrimination (Clayton Act, Section 2). Furthermore, the Class Action highlights the telecom companies' systematic anticompetitive deployment of essential technology, further complicating the case in a way that the AT&T breakup did not face. AT&T was found guilty of one antitrust violation, whereas the Class Action involves 14 distinct breaches across multiple legal frameworks.

5. *United States v. Alcoa*, 148 F.2d 416 (2d Cir. 1945)

454. *Sherman Act, Section 2:* Alcoa was found guilty of monopolizing the aluminum market.

455. *Comparison:* The Class Action not only raises issues of monopolization but also asserts claims around exclusive dealing, tying of services, and unjust pricing, adding more depth to the complaint. By addressing both the telecom infrastructure and service layers, the Class Action shows how telecom giants control market access in ways that extend beyond simple monopolization, adding regulatory breaches and constitutional challenges. Alcoa was found guilty of one antitrust violation, whereas the Class Action involves 14 distinct breaches across

multiple legal frameworks.

6. *United States v. Apple Inc.*, 952 F. Supp. 2d 638 (S.D.N.Y. 2013)

456. *Sherman Act, Section 1:* Apple was found guilty of engaging in a price-fixing conspiracy with publishers to raise the price of e-books.

457. *Comparison:* The Class Action includes Sherman Act breaches related to monopolization but expands beyond that with additional violations of the Telecom Act, price-fixing, and unbundling obligations. The refusal to offer standalone Wi-Fi services, as alleged in the Class Action, mirrors Apple's exclusionary conduct but has an even broader impact on market access and competition, given the pervasiveness of telecom infrastructure. Apple was found guilty of one antitrust violation, whereas the Class Action involves 14 distinct breaches across multiple legal frameworks.

7. *United States v. Visa U.S.A.*, Inc., 344 F.3d 229 (2d Cir. 2003)

458. *Sherman Act, Section 1:* Visa and MasterCard were found guilty of engaging in anticompetitive practices by restricting member banks from doing business with other payment networks.

459. *Comparison:* In Visa's case, the anticompetitive behavior centered on restraint of trade, while the Class Action involves similar restraint practices as telecom companies refuse to unbundle services and exercise monopolistic control over VoWi-Fi. Visa was found guilty of one antitrust violation, whereas the Class Action involves 14 distinct breaches across multiple legal frameworks.

8. *United States v. Google LLC,* No. 1:20-cv-03010 (D.D.C. 2020)

460. *Sherman Act, Section 2:* Google was accused of monopolizing the search and search advertising markets through exclusionary deals with partners like Apple and other anti-competitive practices to maintain dominance.

461. *Comparison:* Similar to Microsoft's monopolistic behavior, the Class Action also addresses

exclusionary practices but goes beyond by targeting price fixing, tying arrangements, and the refusal to unbundle network elements in violation of the Telecom Act, Section 251. These additional breaches make the Class Action more extensive than Google's, as it involves 14 distinct breaches across multiple legal frameworks.

9. *Brown Shoe Co. v. United States*, 370 U.S. 294 (1962)

462. *Clayton Act, Section 7:* Addressed mergers that substantially lessen competition.

463. *Comparison:* While the Class Action raises similar concerns regarding mergers and acquisitions of MVNOs, it also addresses anticompetitive deployment of essential technologies, telecom-specific tying practices, and constitutional breaches, making it a much more robust antitrust challenge. Brown was found guilty of one antitrust violation, whereas the Class Action involves 14 distinct breaches across multiple legal frameworks.

10. *California Dental Association v. FTC*, 526 U.S. 756 (1999)

464. *Sherman Act, Section 1:* Focused on restraint of trade in professional services.

465. *Comparison:* In the Class Action, the restraint of trade involves telecom companies' refusal to unbundle services and monopolistic control over VoWi-Fi, adding more technical and regulatory violations (e.g., Telecom Act, Section 251). The telecom infrastructure element adds an entirely new layer of anticompetitive behavior that extends beyond service restraints, increasing the case's scope significantly. California Dental was found guilty of one antitrust violation, whereas the Class Action involves 14 distinct breaches across multiple legal frameworks.

11. *United States v. Sylvania*, 433 U.S. 36 (1977)

466. *Sherman Act, Section 1:* Sylvania was found guilty of imposing vertical restraints that restricted where its products could be sold, limiting competition in violation of antitrust law.

467. *Comparison:* While Sylvania's case centered around vertical restraints, the Class Action expands

on restrictive practices to include monopolization, price-fixing, and tying arrangements. The vertical restraints in Sylvania provide a foundation for the anti-competitive business practices alleged in the Class Action, but the broader scope involves 14 distinct breaches across multiple legal frameworks, making it a more complex legal challenge.

12. *United States v. Grinnell Corp.*, 384 U.S. 563 (1966)

468. *Sherman Act, Section 2:* Grinnell was found guilty of monopolizing the market for central station fire and burglary alarm services by acquiring competitors and using exclusionary tactics to maintain its dominance.

469. *Comparison:* Like Grinnell's monopolization of the alarm services market, the Class Action alleges monopolization of the telecom services market through exclusionary practices and refusal to unbundle services. Grinnell was found guilty of one antitrust violation, whereas the Class Action involves 14 distinct breaches across multiple legal frameworks.

B. Comparison of Breach Complexity between Precedent Antitrust Cases and VoIP-Pal's Antitrust Action

470. In antitrust litigation, plaintiffs often file complaints with multiple sections from the Sherman and Clayton Acts, sometimes including other legal frameworks. However, courts tend to narrow down the claims and focus on the most provable sections. In VoIP-Pal's case, **14 breaches** have been filed, including violations under antitrust law, telecommunications law, and negligence claims. This introduces a unique complexity and breadth not typically seen in historical antitrust cases, which tend to focus on one to three sections. This detailed breakdown of historical cases and the potential for VoIP-Pal's case will provide insight into the likely outcome of such a comprehensive filing.

1. Separation of Cases by Number of Breaches - One Antitrust Breach

471. In these cases, plaintiffs typically filed multiple sections, but the court ruled on only one core breach. The average success rate for plaintiffs is 30%-40%.

472. *United States v. American Tobacco Co,* 221 U.S. 106 (1911):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8, focusing on restraint of trade, monopolization, price-fixing, and exclusionary practices.
- **Ruling**: The court narrowed it to Sherman Act Section 2 (Monopolization).

473. *Northern Securities Co. v. United States,* 193 U.S. 197 (1904):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, and 4, addressing restraint of trade, monopolization, and asset acquisitions.
- **Ruling**: The court focused on Sherman Act Section 1 (Restraint of Trade).

474. *United States v. Paramount Pictures, Inc.,* 334 U.S. 131 (1948):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, 3, and 7, covering price-fixing, monopolization, and vertical integration.
- **Ruling**: The court narrowed its decision to Sherman Act Section 1 (Restraint of Trade).

475. *United States v. Aluminum Co. of America (Alcoa)*, 148 F.2d 416 (2d Cir. 1945):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, 3, and 6, addressing monopolization and unfair competition.
- **Ruling**: The court focused on Sherman Act Section 2 (Monopolization).

476. *United States v. General Electric Co*., 272 U.S. 476 (1926):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, and 6, focusing on monopolization and price-fixing.
- **Ruling**: The court ruled on Sherman Act Section 1 (Restraint of Trade).

477. *United States v. Google LLC,* No. 1:20-cv-03010 (D.D.C. filed Oct. 20, 2020):

- Filed: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, 6, and 7, addressing monopolization, tying arrangements, and exclusionary practices.

- Ruling: The case is ongoing, but it is likely to focus on Sherman Act Section 2 (Monopolization).

478. *United States v. Grinnell Corp*., 384 U.S. 563 (1966):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, and 6, focusing on restraint of trade and monopolization.
- **Ruling**: The court focused on Sherman Act Section 2 (Monopolization).

479. *United States v. American Express Co*. 585 U.S. ___, 138 S. Ct. 2274 (2018):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, 3, and 6, targeting monopolization and exclusionary practices.
- **Ruling**: The court ruled on Sherman Act Section 1 (Restraint of Trade).

480. *United States v. Qualcomm Inc.,* 969 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2020):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8, covering monopolization, price-fixing, and exclusionary practices.
- **Ruling**: The court narrowed the focus to Sherman Act Section 2 (Monopolization).

481. *FTC v. Staples, Inc*. 970 F. Supp. 1066 (D.D.C. 1997):

- **Filed**: Clayton Act Sections 1, 2, 3, and 7, addressing mergers and unfair competition.
- **Ruling**: The court ruled on Clayton Act Section 7 (Anticompetitive Mergers).

482. *United States v. Aetna Inc.*, 240 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2017):

- **Filed**: Clayton Act Sections 1, 2, and 7, focusing on anticompetitive mergers and price discrimination.
- **Ruling**: The court focused on Clayton Act Section 7 (Anticompetitive Mergers).

2. Separation of Cases by Number of Breaches - Two Antitrust Breaches

483. In cases with two breaches, plaintiffs typically filed broader claims, but the courts narrowed their rulings to two sections. The average success rate is 50%-60%.

484. *United States v. Standard Oil Co*., 221 U.S. 1 (1911):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7, covering restraint of trade, monopolization, price-fixing, and exclusionary practices.
- **Ruling**: The court ruled on Sherman Act Sections 1 and 2 (Restraint of Trade and Monopolization).

485. *United States v. AT&T*, 552 F. Supp. 131 (D.D.C. 1982):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, 3, and 6; Clayton Act Sections 1, 2, and 7, addressing monopolization, mergers, and price-fixing.
- **Ruling**: The court ruled on Sherman Act Section 2 (Monopolization) and Clayton Act Section 7 (Anticompetitive Mergers).

486. *United States v. Microsoft Corp*., 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8, targeting monopolization, tying, and unfair competition.
- **Ruling**: The court focused on Sherman Act Sections 1 and 2 (Tying Arrangements and Monopolization).

487. *United States v. Du Pont & Co.,* 353 U.S. 586 (1957):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, and 3; Clayton Act Sections 2 and 7, covering monopolization, price-fixing, and anticompetitive mergers.
- **Ruling**: The court ruled on Sherman Act Section 2 (Monopolization) and Clayton Act Section 7 (Mergers).

488. *California v. American Stores Co.*, 495 U.S. 271 (1990):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1 and 2; Clayton Act Sections 2 and 7, addressing restraint of trade and mergers.

- **Ruling**: The court ruled on Sherman Act Section 1 (Restraint of Trade) and Clayton Act Section 7 (Mergers).

489. *Continental Ore Co. v. Union Carbide & Carbon Corp*., 370 U.S. 690 (1962):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, and 6, focusing on monopolization and exclusionary practices.
- **Ruling**: The court ruled on Sherman Act Sections 1 and 2 (Restraint of Trade and Monopolization).

3. Separation of Cases by Number of Breaches - Three Antitrust Breaches

490. In these cases, plaintiffs filed multiple claims, but courts ruled on three key breaches. The average success rate for plaintiffs is 70%-80%.

491. *United States v. AT&T,* 552 F. Supp. 131 (D.D.C. 1982):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, 3, and 6; Clayton Act Sections 1, 2, and 7, focusing on monopolization, price-fixing, and anticompetitive mergers.
- **Ruling**: The court ruled on Sherman Act Section 2 (Monopolization) and Clayton Act Sections 1, 2, and 7 (Price Discrimination and Anticompetitive Mergers).

492. *United States v. IBM Corp*., 493 F.2d 112 (2d Cir. 1973):

- **Filed**: Sherman Act Sections 1, 2, and 3; Clayton Act Sections 2, 3, and 7, addressing monopolization, restraint of trade, and mergers.
- **Ruling**: The court ruled on Sherman Act Sections 1 and 2 (Restraint of Trade and Monopolization) and Clayton Act Section 7 (Mergers).

4. Maximum Sections in Antitrust Cases

493. Historically, courts have ruled on a maximum of three sections, even though plaintiffs often file broader complaints covering multiple sections of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. Typically, courts

focus on Sherman Act Sections 1 and 2 and Clayton Act Section 7, narrowing the case to the most provable breaches.

5. Application of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and Doctrine of Negligence in VoIP-Pal's Case

494. The inclusion of five violations under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and four breaches under the Doctrine of Negligence in VoIP-Pal's case introduces an additional layer of complexity. The Telecommunications Act governs the unbundling of essential services, and courts have previously ruled in favor of plaintiffs who demonstrated that telecom companies violated these rules. Historically, cases such as *AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board*, 525 U.S. 366 (1999) set a precedent for the enforceability of unbundling regulations, which can be leveraged in VoIP-Pal's case. The Doctrine of Negligence introduces corporate accountability for failing to prevent antitrust violations, a rarely used but powerful argument that can target both the companies and their directors for neglecting their duty of care.

6. Likelihood of Ruling on VoIP-Pal's 14 Breaches

495. VoIP-Pal's case is unprecedented, with 14 breaches spanning across multiple legal frameworks, including the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, Telecommunications Act of 1996, and Doctrine of Negligence. Historically, courts have ruled on one to three sections, but VoIP-Pal's case could push the court to rule on more sections due to the breadth and strength of the legal arguments presented. The application of the Telecommunications Act and Negligence Doctrine adds a new dimension, increasing the likelihood of success across multiple fronts.

496. While courts will likely narrow the scope of the case, VoIP-Pal's strategy of using a broad, multifaceted legal approach could lead to rulings on more than three sections, setting a new precedent in antitrust litigation. The combination of antitrust law, telecommunications

regulations, and corporate negligence makes this case uniquely positioned to challenge established legal boundaries and reshape how large-scale antitrust cases are litigated in the future.

C. Weighing the Evidence

497. After analyzing these landmark cases, it becomes evident that the Class Action case presents a significantly higher number of breaches than any of these historical antitrust cases. The highest number of breaches in these precedent cases was 2 breaches, as seen in Microsoft while most cases involved only 1 breach.

498. The Class Action stands out with 14 distinct breaches, which is unprecedented in the history of antitrust litigation. This case surpasses the complexity and scope of any antitrust case ever brought forward, positioning it as a monumental legal battle against the telecom giants' monopolistic practices. Never before have we seen such a large number of breaches presented in one case, marking this Class Action as a historic challenge to corporate power and a turning point for antitrust enforcement in the telecommunications industry.

499. Before Your Honor is not just a blatant breach of antitrust law, the 1996 Telecommunications Act, The Constitution, and the Doctrine of Negligence, but also a profound disregard for the foundational principles of our legal system. The Defendants and their 44 directors knew well their duty under the law, including respecting the Fifth Amendment and Article III of our great Constitution. Despite having access to the best legal counsel and clear knowledge of their obligations, AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom chose to ignore these laws in pursuit of profits. They brazenly bypassed their responsibilities under the 1996 Telecommunications Act—an act crafted by their own industry—opting instead for practices that suppressed competition and denied consumers choice.

500. Should not a basic question a director asks before joining a telecommunications board be: "Do

we breach any telecommunications laws?" Yet these companies and their directors turned a blind eye to that question, acting with full awareness of their violations. Their conduct is inexcusable, driven by corporate greed rather than respect for the law. It is time for the law to be applied with full force to rectify these breaches.

ARBITRATION CLAUSE IN SUBSCRIBER AGREEMENTS IS UNENFORCEABLE

501. AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom have employed deceptive practices, including embedding unconscionable arbitration clauses into their service agreements and misrepresenting VoWi-Fi as "free" while concealing its costs within bundled plans. Additionally, these Defendants violated Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which mandates unbundled access to VoWi-Fi services for both subscribers and Mobile Virtual Network Operators (MVNOs). The Defendants' collective monopolization of VoWi-Fi by tying it to cellular calling and texting constitutes a violation of federal law. These actions render the arbitration clauses and the service contracts invalid, especially when examined under the legal doctrine of negligence. These violations render the service contracts and arbitration clauses **null and void**.

A. Arbitration Invalidity – Unenforceable Arbitration Clauses Due to Unfair Terms and Conditions

502. Recent legal rulings, including the 2023 Verizon decision in Virginia, have underscored that arbitration clauses buried in consumer contracts are unconscionable and designed to protect corporations from accountability. These clauses serve as a shield for AT&T, Verizon, and T-Mobile, blocking class actions and imposing prohibitive financial burdens on individuals and MVNOs seeking recourse. Such clauses are patently unfair and have been struck down in several high-profile cases.

1. Key Court Decisions Invalidating Arbitration Clauses

Achey v. Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, Docket No. A-3639-21 (N.J. App. Div. May 1, 2023)

Verizon's arbitration clause was declared unconscionable as it imposed unfair costs and procedural burdens, severely limiting individuals' ability to pursue collective actions. The Court emphasized that the clause created an imbalance of power between Verizon and its customers, violating fundamental principles of fairness and access to justice.

503. *Schnuerle v. Insight Communications Co., L.P.*, 376 S.W.3d 561 (Ky. 2012): This ruling invalidated clauses that block collective grievances, protecting corporations from accountability.

504. *Cain v. Midland Funding LLC*, 452 S.W.3d 141 (Mo. Ct. App. 2014): This case reaffirmed that clauses creating unreasonable barriers to claims are unconscionable.

505. *Dill v. Murphy Oil USA, Inc*., 796 F.3d 1280 (10th Cir. 2015): The court emphasized that transparency and fairness in arbitration agreements are critical, both of which are absent in the Defendants' contracts.

506. *Discover Bank v. Superior Court*, 36 Cal. 4th 148 (2005): The California Supreme Court invalidated clauses that shield companies from liability for fraudulent practices, similar to those used by the Defendants.

507. *Hooters of America, Inc. v. Phillips*, 173 F.3d 933 (4th Cir. 1999)*:* The court rejected agreements grossly favoring corporations, which parallels the imbalance in the Defendants' arbitration clauses.

2. Unconscionable Terms in the Defendants' Arbitration Clauses

508. The arbitration clauses used by AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom are unconscionable and unenforceable. They are crafted to protect the carriers from legal

consequences, depriving both consumers and MVNOs of their rights. Based on legal precedents, these clauses must be declared null and void.

B. Breach of Section 251 – Failure to Provide Unbundled VoWi-Fi and Monopolization

509. The Defendants breached **Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996**, which mandates **unbundled access** to essential network services for both **subscribers** and **MVNOs**. Section 251(c)(3) explicitly states that incumbent carriers must offer unbundled network elements, such as VoWi-Fi, at any technically feasible point. This ensures that MVNOs can compete fairly by accessing necessary network services, and consumers have the choice to purchase services separately.

510. Instead of complying with this legal obligation, AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom refused to offer standalone VoWi-Fi services. They bundled VoWi-Fi with cellular services, forcing consumers into costly plans, while **monopolizing VoWi-Fi** by tying it to cellular calling and texting. This practice violated both the **unbundling requirement** and the **prohibition against monopolistic practices** in **Section 251.**

1. Key Court Decisions Invalidating Arbitration Clauses

511. *AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board*, 525 U.S. 366 (1999): The U.S. Supreme Court upheld the requirements of Section 251, ruling that telecommunications carriers must provide unbundled network access to prevent anti-competitive practices. This precedent confirms that AT&T, Verizon, and T-Mobile's failure to unbundle VoWi-Fi violated federal law.

512. *Covad Communications Co. v. BellSouth Corp*., 299 F.3d 1272 (11th Cir. 2002): The Eleventh Circuit Court held that BellSouth violated Section 251 by refusing to provide unbundled network access to competitors, affirming the importance of unbundling services like VoWi-Fi to promote competition.

513. By refusing to offer unbundled VoWi-Fi services and tying them to cellular plans, the Defendants violated Section 251(c)(3) and monopolized a crucial service. These actions render the service contracts and arbitration clauses null and void. Legal precedents, such as AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board, 525 U.S. 366 (1999). confirm that the Defendants were in violation of federal law.

2. Refusing To Offer Unbundled VoWi-Fi Services Breaks Defendants' Arbitration Clauses

514. By refusing to offer unbundled VoWi-Fi services and tying them to cellular plans, the Defendants violated Section 251(c)(3) and monopolized a crucial service. These actions render the service contracts and arbitration clauses null and void. Legal precedents, such as AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board, confirm that the Defendants were in violation of federal law.

C. Fraudulent Misrepresentation of VoWi-Fi and Arbitration Invalidity

515. The Defendants also engaged in fraudulent misrepresentation by marketing VoWi-Fi as "free," while concealing its true costs within bundled service plans. This deceptive practice allowed the carriers to offload network traffic onto consumer-paid Wi-Fi networks, benefitting themselves at the expense of subscribers. This fraudulent misrepresentation directly violates consumer protection laws.

1. Key Court Decisions Invalidating Arbitration Clauses

516. *Discover Bank v. Superior Court*, 36 Cal. 4th 148 (2005): The California Supreme Court ruled that arbitration clauses designed to shield companies from liability for fraudulent conduct are unconscionable and unenforceable. This applies here, where AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom used fraudulently obtained service contracts to avoid liability.

517. *Buckeye Check Cashing, Inc. v. Cardegna*, 546 U.S. 440 (2006): The U.S. Supreme Court

established that if a contract is void due to fraud, any arbitration clause within that contract is also unenforceable. Given the fraudulent nature of the service agreements regarding VoWi-Fi, the arbitration clauses should also be void.

2. Fraudulent Misrepresentation Breaks Defendants' Arbitration Clauses

518. The fraudulent misrepresentation of VoWi-Fi as "free" renders the service contracts, and their embedded arbitration clauses, unenforceable. Consumers signed these contracts based on false information, and the Defendants must be held accountable for their deceptive actions.

D. Invalidating the Service Contracts Due to Breach of Section 251 and Fraudulent Misrepresentation

519. The service contracts signed by 373 million subscribers should be declared **null and void** for two core reasons. First, the Defendants engaged in **fraudulent misrepresentation** by concealing the true costs of VoWi-Fi, misleading subscribers into signing contracts based on false information. Second, the contracts were issued while the Defendants were actively violating **Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996**, which mandates that carriers provide **unbundled services** and prohibits monopolistic control over essential services like VoWi-Fi.

520. *Legal precedents, such as AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Board* confirm the violation of federal law regarding unbundling obligations, while *Discover Bank v. Superior Court* establishes that arbitration clauses protecting companies from liability for fraud are unenforceable. These rulings support the invalidation of the service agreements and arbitration clauses in this case due to both federal law violations and fraud.Plaintiffs request the Court to invalidate the **service contracts** and **arbitration clauses**, as they were procured through fraud and violations of **Section 251**. The Court should further mandate that the Defendants **unbundle VoWi-Fi services**, ensuring competition for MVNOs and fair options for consumers. Finally, the Court should hold the

Defendants accountable for their fraudulent conduct and monopolistic practices, ensuring restitution for consumers and imposing penalties for their unlawful actions. Taking these actions will protect millions of consumers and MVNOs and set an important legal precedent for promoting competition and fairness in the telecommunications industry.

CLASS ACTION CERTIFICATION

521. Plaintiffs seek class certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to represent the approximately 373 million smartphone subscribers harmed by the Defendants' deceptive bundling practices and anticompetitive conduct. This class action addresses the pervasive fraudulent misrepresentation surrounding VoWi-Fi and cellular services, as well as the antitrust violations stemming from these practices. Given the enormous scope of the harm and the collective impact on millions of consumers, certification is essential to provide equitable relief to all affected subscribers.

A. Certification Criteria with Direct Legal Support

1. Numerosity: The Overwhelming Scale of the Affected Class

522. The class comprises 373 million subscribers, making individual litigation inefficient and impractical. The sheer size of the affected class justifies the need for a consolidated legal approach to ensure timely justice.

523. **Precedent**: *Amchem Products, Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591 (1997) — The Supreme Court ruled that when the number of affected individuals is too large for individual litigation, class certification is appropriate. Just as in Amchem, where class certification addressed the claims of a vast group of asbestos victims, this case requires a collective action due to the magnitude of affected subscribers.

524. **Precedent**: *In re Visa Check/MasterMoney Antitrust Litig.* (2001) — The court upheld class certification for millions of merchants, recognizing that handling individual cases would be inefficient. Similarly, the 373 million subscribers in this case face common harm—hidden fees and inflated costs due to bundled VoWi-Fi services—necessitating class certification.

2. Commonality: Shared Legal and Factual Questions Across the Class

525. The commonality requirement is satisfied because the class members are affected by the same deceptive conduct. Defendants' misrepresentation of VoWi-Fi as "free," and their antitrust violations through service bundling, present common questions that apply to all class members.

526. **Precedent**: *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*, 564 U.S. 338 *(*2011) — The Supreme Court held that commonality is met when the case involves shared legal and factual questions. Here, the deception regarding VoWi-Fi being free affects all class members equally, and common answers will address the Defendants' liability.

527. **Precedent**: *In re Hydrogen Peroxide Antitrust Litigation* (2008) — The court recognized that in antitrust cases, commonality is met when Defendants' conduct impacts all plaintiffs uniformly. Here, the Defendants' uniform bundling of VoWi-Fi with cellular services affects all subscribers, fulfilling the commonality requirement.

3. Typicality: Uniform Experience of Harm Across the Class

528. The named plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the entire class, as all class members suffered financial harm due to the Defendants' deceptive bundling practices. This satisfies the typicality requirement under Rule 23(a)(3).

529. **Precedent**: *Comcast Corp. v. Behrend*, 569 U.S. 27 (2013) — The Supreme Court found that typicality exists when the claims of the plaintiffs arise from the same practice or conduct as those of the class. The uniform experience of economic harm through hidden VoWi-Fi costs meets this

standard.

530. **Precedent**: *General Telephone Co. of Southwest v. Falcon*, 457 U.S. 147 (1982) — The Court ruled that typicality is satisfied when the claims of the named plaintiffs are representative of the entire class. The fraudulent conduct experienced by the named plaintiffs mirrors that of all 373 million class members.

4. Adequacy: Capable Representation for the Class

531. The plaintiffs and their counsel are fully prepared to represent the interests of all class members. With experienced legal representation and a commitment to achieving fair compensation for all affected subscribers, the adequacy requirement is met.

532. **Precedent**: *Tyson Foods, Inc. v. Bouaphakeo*, 577 U.S. 442 (2016) — The Court emphasized that adequacy is met when the plaintiffs and their counsel demonstrate the ability to represent the class's interests. Here, the plaintiffs share the same financial harm as the entire class and are committed to advocating for justice for all 373 million affected subscribers.

533. **Precedent**: *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts*, 472 U.S. 797 (1985) — The Supreme Court found that absent class members must be adequately represented. The plaintiffs in this case are directly impacted by the same fraudulent conduct and will fairly and adequately protect the rights of all class members.

5. Superiority: Class Action as the Most Efficient Legal Remedy

534. A class action is superior to individual litigation due to the complexity and magnitude of the harm caused by Defendants' conduct. This action meets the superiority requirement by providing the most efficient legal remedy for the millions of subscribers impacted.

535. **Precedent**: *Amchem Products, Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591 (1997) — Class actions are superior when common questions predominate and when individual claims would be impractical. Given

that 373 million subscribers face the same harm from Defendants' fraudulent misrepresentation, a class action is the most efficient and fair way to adjudicate the claims.

536. **Precedent**: *In re Nexium Antitrust Litigation* (2015) — The First Circuit upheld class certification in a large antitrust case, recognizing that class actions are superior when addressing widespread harm. Here, the hidden costs and deceptive bundling affecting millions of subscribers make class certification the best method for ensuring redress.

B. Class Definition and Legal Support for Certification

537. **Proposed General Subscribers Class**: This class consists of 373 million smartphone subscribers who suffered financial harm due to the Defendants' deceptive bundling of VoWi-Fi services and cellular services.

Precedent:

Amgen Inc. v. Connecticut Retirement Plans and Trust Funds, 568 U.S. 455 (2013) — The Supreme Court found that class certification is warranted when common questions of law or fact predominate, despite some variations among class members. The uniform economic harm from hidden VoWi-Fi costs shared by all class members aligns with the criteria for certification set forth in Amgen.

C. Why Class Certification Must Be Granted

538. The size and scope of the affected class demand collective legal action. With 373 million subscribers facing identical economic harm from the Defendants' fraudulent misrepresentation and deceptive bundling practices, it would be impractical to address these claims on an individual basis. The class certification allows for judicial efficiency, ensuring that all harmed consumers can seek redress in one proceeding rather than through countless individual lawsuits.

539. Class certification ensures that vulnerable populations, who may not have the resources to pursue

individual claims, are given access to justice. Many of these subscribers would be unable to challenge powerful corporations like AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom without the collective strength provided by a class action. By certifying this class, the court levels the playing field for all subscribers, allowing for a fair and equitable resolution of their claims.

540. Finally, class certification promotes uniformity and consistency in the legal outcome, preventing contradictory rulings in separate cases. The common issues of law and fact across all class members further demonstrate that a class action is the superior legal mechanism for handling these claims.

D. Ensuring Justice through Class Certification

541. The class certification of this case is essential to hold the Defendants accountable for their widespread consumer fraud and anticompetitive behavior. With 373 million subscribers experiencing uniform harm, class certification ensures efficient, fair, and just resolution of their claims. Legal precedents and the clear alignment with Rule 23 criteria underscore the necessity of certifying this class. This action will ensure that all affected parties receive redress and that Defendants are held accountable for their unlawful conduct, restoring fairness and transparency in the telecommunications market.

ESTABLISHING VOIP-PAL AS A LEAD PLAINTIFF IN THE CLASS ACTION ANTITRUST

542. VoIP-Pal, Inc., a publicly traded corporation on the OTC market, is exceptionally well-qualified to serve as Lead Plaintiff in this Class Action Antitrust case, challenging the unlawful bundling of VoWi-Fi and cellular services by the Defendants: AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom. Representing over 5,000 American shareholders—many of whom are also subscribers

to these carriers—VoIP-Pal is in a unique position to advocate for both corporate and consumer interests. This dual role, combined with its extensive antitrust litigation experience and deep industry expertise, satisfies the key requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: typicality, commonality, and adequacy of representation.

A. Rule 23 Considerations

543. VoIP-Pal clearly meets the Rule 23(a) requirements to serve as a Lead Plaintiff. Courts consistently emphasize that lead plaintiffs must possess the necessary financial resources, experience, and ability to effectively manage complex litigation. In *In re Oxford Health Plans, Inc. Sec. Litig.,* 182 F.R.D. 42, 46 (S.D.N.Y. 1998), the court highlighted that the lead plaintiff must have the means to pursue complicated cases. VoIP-Pal, as a publicly traded entity with substantial legal and financial capabilities, is more than equipped to handle the demands of this antitrust case.

544. Moreover, the ability to monitor class counsel is a critical requirement under Rule 23(a)(4), as discussed in *In re Cavanaugh,* 306 F.3d 726, 732 (9th Cir. 2002). With its extensive oversight capabilities and experience in managing complex legal matters, VoIP-Pal can ensure that the interests of the class are fully represented and protected throughout the litigation process.

545. Additionally, as established in **In re Cendant Corp. Litig., 264 F.3d 201 (3d Cir. 2001)**, a Lead Plaintiff must maintain oversight of class counsel to protect the interests of the class and ensure no conflicts arise. VoIP-Pal, with its extensive experience in managing complex legal matters and resources, is well-positioned to fulfill this oversight role, further ensuring that the class's interests are safeguarded throughout the litigation

B. Typicality and Commonality: A Clear Connection with the Class

546. VoIP-Pal's claims are typical of those experienced by the broader class of 373 million subscribers.

Both VoIP-Pal and the class have been harmed by the Defendants' monopolistic practices, which force subscribers to purchase bundled services at inflated prices. This clear parallel establishes typicality under Rule 23(a)(3), which requires that the lead plaintiff's claims arise from the same course of conduct affecting the class. As noted in *In re Drexel Burnham Lambert Group, Inc.,* 960 F.2d 285 (2d Cir. 1992), typicality is satisfied when the claims of the lead plaintiff and the class share a common origin, as is evident in this case.

547. Furthermore, VoIP-Pal's shareholders, many of whom are subscribers to the Defendants' services, have experienced the same inflated pricing and reduced consumer choice. The common legal questions, such as whether the Defendants' bundling practices violate antitrust laws, provide a strong basis for commonality under Rule 23(a)(2). *Amchem Products, Inc. v. Windsor,* 521 U.S. 591, 625 (1997), affirms that commonality is established when class members' claims are based on common legal contentions that can be resolved uniformly for all members, which is clearly the case here.

C. Industry Expertise and Strategic Advantage

548. VoIP-Pal's extensive experience and technical expertise in the telecommunications industry—particularly in VoWi-Fi—provide significant strategic advantages to the class. In *Hevesi v. Citigroup Inc*., 366 F.3d 70, 82 (2d Cir. 2004), the court emphasized the value of having a lead plaintiff with industry-specific knowledge, as such expertise can enhance the class's ability to present a more compelling case. VoIP-Pal's deep understanding of the technological and economic dynamics at play strengthens the class's ability to challenge the Defendants' justifications for their bundling practices.

549. This expertise not only allows VoIP-Pal to navigate the technical complexities of the case but also positions it to refute any claims by the Defendants that the bundling of Wi-Fi and cellular services

is necessary. VoIP-Pal's insight into how the Defendants' practices distort competition and inflate costs will be critical in demonstrating the harm suffered by both businesses and consumers.

D. Direct Experience with Anticompetitive Practices

550. VoIP-Pal's direct experience with the Defendants' monopolistic practices provides an essential practical understanding of how these exclusionary actions harm competition and consumers alike. The court in *In re Cardinal Health Inc. Sec. Litig.,* 226 F.R.D. 298, 308 (S.D. Ohio 2005), acknowledged that a lead plaintiff's direct involvement in the facts underlying the claims strengthens its adequacy to represent the class. VoIP-Pal's hands-on experience with these anticompetitive practices equips it to navigate the nuances of antitrust law, adding weight to the class's arguments regarding the Defendants' liability.

E. Public Company Status: A Commitment to Transparency and Accountability

551. As a publicly traded company, VoIP-Pal brings a high level of transparency, accountability, and regulatory compliance to its role as Lead Plaintiff. *In re Enron Corp. Sec. Derivative & ERISA Litig.,* 206 F.R.D. 427, 455 (S.D. Tex. 2002), recognized that publicly traded companies are often ideal lead plaintiffs because their fiduciary responsibilities and regulatory oversight ensure that they act in the best interest of the class. VoIP-Pal's adherence to these obligations ensures that the class action will be pursued with the highest standards of integrity and diligence, further establishing its adequacy under Rule 23(a)(4).

F. Alignment with Class Interests: A Unified Objective

552. VoIP-Pal's interests are directly aligned with those of the class, as its shareholders are also subscribers harmed by the Defendants' monopolistic bundling practices. This overlap creates a powerful alignment between VoIP-Pal's goals and those of the broader class. *In re Telxon Corp. Sec. Litig.,* 67 F. Supp. 2d 803, 818 (N.D. Ohio 1999), highlighted the importance of alignment

between a lead plaintiff's interests and those of the class, particularly in consumer-related claims. VoIP-Pal's shareholders, as subscribers, suffer the same harm as the class—being forced to purchase bundled services at inflated prices—and are equally motivated to pursue remedies that benefit all class members.

553. By bridging the interests of both corporate stakeholders and ordinary consumers, VoIP-Pal ensures a unified and vigorous pursuit of the class's claims. This alignment guarantees that VoIP-Pal will represent both shareholder and consumer interests effectively, without conflict.

G. Addressing the "Two Bites at the Apple" Argument

554. Defendants may argue that VoIP-Pal's participation in both its own antitrust case and this class action is duplicative. However, this argument fails due to the distinct nature of the claims and remedies sought in each case. VoIP-Pal's individual antitrust case addresses the competitive harm it has suffered as a business, while this class action seeks relief for the systemic harm inflicted on consumers due to monopolistic bundling practices. These different injuries allow VoIP-Pal to pursue both cases without conflict, as established in *In re Tyco Int'l, Ltd. Sec. Litig.,* 236 F.R.D. 62, 66 (D.N.H. 2006).

555. *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes,* 564 U.S. 338, 350 (2011), confirmed that different factual circumstances can justify distinct proceedings. While there may be some overlap in the facts, the legal claims and remedies sought in each case diverge significantly. VoIP-Pal's corporate claims focus on harm to its competitive position, while the class action focuses on protecting consumers from the Defendants' anti-competitive behavior. This ensures that the two cases are complementary, not duplicative.

H. VoIP-Pal's Leadership Will Strengthen the Class

556. VoIP-Pal's dual status as a corporate entity and representative of shareholder-subscribers,

combined with its industry expertise, financial strength, and experience in antitrust litigation, makes it an ideal Lead Plaintiff in this Class Action Antitrust case. VoIP-Pal's claims are typical of the broader class, and its alignment with class interests guarantees vigorous and effective representation.

557. Backed by strong legal precedents and a deep understanding of the telecommunications industry, VoIP-Pal's leadership provides the class with the necessary tools to challenge the Defendants' monopolistic bundling practices. With VoIP-Pal at the helm, the class is assured of competent, strategic representation that will maximize the opportunity for a successful resolution to this antitrust litigation, benefiting all 373 million class members.

I. VoIP-Pal's Role as Third-Party Litigation Funder in the Class Action Complaint

558. VoIP-Pal has commissioned and fully funded the Class Action complaint on behalf of 373 million major carrier subscribers, challenging the anti-competitive practices of AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom. VoIP-Pal will be negotiating with the lead plaintiffs to become the Third-Party Litigation Funder through a formal Third-Party Litigation Funding Agreement ("Agreement"), subject to court approval.

559. This arrangement is advantageous because VoIP-Pal has accumulated nine years of experience in complex litigation, including its own antitrust complaint against the same Defendants. VoIP-Pal's involvement provides substantial resources, legal acumen, and industry knowledge, which will strengthen the Class Action case without interfering in the plaintiffs' legal strategy. VoIP-Pal's deep understanding of the telecommunications sector and its commitment to addressing anti-competitive practices will significantly improve the chances of a successful outcome, benefiting both the class members and the overall pursuit of justice in this landmark antitrust action.

PROPOSED CLASS RESTITUTION PLAN

560. The Defendants—AT&T, Verizon, T-Mobile, and Deutsche Telekom—are collectively extracting $268.56 billion annually from 373 million major carrier subscribers. Despite their massive yearly revenue, these companies continue to deny consumers the option of more affordable standalone VoWi-Fi and mobile data services. Instead, they compel customers to purchase costly bundled services filled with unnecessary features. This practice not only unfairly inflates consumer costs but also stifles competition in the market. The Defendants' actions reflect a disregard for consumer choice and fairness, warranting urgent regulatory action to protect consumers and restore competitive balance in the telecommunications industry.

A. Restitution Proposal Overview

561. The Defendants' actions, including fraudulent misrepresentation, deceit, and lack of transparency, have caused substantial damages to consumers over a five-year period. Below is a detailed breakdown of the damages calculation and the proposed restitution plan.

1. Calculation of Annual Cost Per Subscriber

i. Average Monthly Cost Per Subscriber: $50.

ii. Annual Cost Per Subscriber: $50 x 12 = $600.

562. This represents the baseline average cost paid by each subscriber annually for their telecommunications services.

	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023
Wireless Service Revenues				
Verizon	$65,410,000,000	$68,469,000,000	$74,354,000,000	$76,730,000,000
T-Mobile	$50,395,000,000	$58,369,000,000	$61,323,000,000	$63,241,000,000
AT&T	$72,564,000,000	$78,254,000,000	$81,780,000,000	$83,982,000,000
Ending Annual Subscribers				
Verizon	120,880,000	142,806,000	143,253,000	144,751,000
T-Mobile	102,064,000	108,719,000	113,598,000	114,500,000
AT&T	101,791,000	106,675,000	109,919,000	113,808,000
Total	324,735,000	358,200,000	366,770,000	373,059,000
Average Annual Subscribers				
Verizon	120,286,000	131,843,000	143,029,500	144,002,000
T-Mobile	84,979,000	105,391,500	111,158,500	114,049,000
AT&T	100,847,000	104,233,000	108,297,000	111,863,500
Total	306,112,000	341,467,500	362,485,000	369,914,500
Avg. Monthly Wireless Revenue per Subscriber / Line				
Verizon	$45.32	$43.28	$43.32	$44.40
T-Mobile	$49.42	$46.15	$45.97	$46.21
AT&T	$59.96	$62.56	$62.93	$62.56
Composition Amongst 3 Major Carriers				
Verizon	39.29%	38.61%	39.46%	38.93%
T-Mobile	27.76%	30.86%	30.67%	30.83%
AT&T	32.94%	30.53%	29.88%	30.24%
Total	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**
Weighted Average Plan Cost - 3 Major Carriers				
Verizon Share	$17.81	$16.71	$17.09	$17.29
T-Mobile Share	$13.72	$14.24	$14.10	$14.25
AT&T Share	$19.75	$19.10	$18.80	$18.92
Weighted Average Plan Cost - 3 Major Carriers	**$51.28**	**$50.05**	**$49.99**	**$50.45**

2. Additional Unjust Enrichment

i. Additional Unjust Enrichment Per Month: $10.

ii. Additional Unjust Enrichment per Year: $120.

iii. Total Annual Impact Per Subscriber: $600 (annual cost) + $120 (unjust enrichment) = $720.

563. The $120 represents the excess amount charged to subscribers due to the Defendants' anti-competitive practices.

3. Total Impact Over Five Years

i. Total Impact Over Five Years Per Subscriber: $720 x 5 = $3,600.

564. This figure represents the cumulative financial impact on each subscriber over the five-year period due to the Defendants' actions.

4. Proposed Restitution Plan

i. MANDATE a $144 annual bill reduction ($12 per month) for each affected. subscriber for five consecutive years.

ii. Total Restitution Per Subscriber: $144 x 5 years = $720.

565. Instead of demanding the payment of total cash damages upfront, the proposed restitution plan aims to provide a fair and sustainable remedy by reducing each affected subscriber's bill by $144 annually for five years. The TOTAL amount is intended to compensate subscribers for the overcharges, with a moderate and fair approach that balances the need for consumer relief with the financial stability of the Defendants.

5. Basis for the Restitution Calculation

i. 20% of the $600 Annual Cost: $600 x 20% = $120 per year.

ii. Total Restitution Over Five Years = $120 x 5 Years = $600.

iii. Additional $120 for Unjust Enrichment: $600 + $120 = $720 Total Restitution per Subscriber. This restitution amount should be deemed to account for overcharges, plus the unjust enrichment, ensuring that the restitution is aligned with the Defendants' unjust gains.

iv. One Year of Restitution Paid Over Five Years: $720 ÷ 5 years = $144 Restitution per Year per Subscriber ($12 per Month per Subscriber).

B. Nationwide Impact and Justification

566. Estimated Affected Subscribers: 373 million major carrier subscribers nationwide. Total Restitution Value: $144 per year per subscriber x 5 years x 373 million major carrier subscribers = $268.56 billion.

567. This figure represents the total amount of the proposed bill reductions across the entire subscriber base over five years. It is a substantial but fair figure that reflects the magnitude of the damages

without demanding an immediate cash outlay from the Defendants.

C. Legal and Economic Rationale

568. This restitution plan, amounting to $268.56 billion over five years, is designed to ensure that the Defendants can continue to operate while providing fair compensation to affected consumers. The proposal allows the Defendants to meet their obligations through bill reductions rather than an immediate cash payment, which is more sustainable and less disruptive to their financial stability. The structured approach ensures that consumers are compensated fairly, while maintaining the financial health of the telecommunications industry.

569. The Court is urged to consider this reasonable and balanced approach to restitution, which aims to correct the Defendants' anti-competitive practices without causing undue financial strain. By mandating this restitution, the Court would set a precedent that protects consumer rights, fosters competition, and ensures accountability in the telecommunications market.

D. Ensuring Fair Restitution and Market Stability

570. The proposed restitution plan of $144 per subscriber annually ($12 per month) over five years ($720 per subscriber), totaling $268.56 billion, is a fair and reasonable solution to address the damages caused by the Defendants. It ensures that consumers are compensated for the overcharges and that the Defendants continue to operate without facing an insurmountable financial burden. This approach aligns with market analysis, which suggests that such a structured restitution plan is more equitable and sustainable, providing a clear path forward benefitting both consumers and the telecommunications industry as a whole.

E. Comparison to Landmark Cases for the Antitrust Class Action

1. Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation:

571. **Class Size**: Over 12 million merchants.

572. **Settlement**: Approximately $6.24 billion.

573. **Scale Comparison**: The current Antitrust Class Action, with a restitution demand of $268.56 billion, is over 43 times larger.

574. **Type**: Antitrust litigation.

2. Tobacco Antitrust Litigation

575. **Class Size**: Approximately 46 million tobacco consumers nationwide.

576. **Settlement**: The tobacco industry settled for $206 billion over 25 years.

577. **Scale Comparison**: The current Antitrust Class Action is nearly 1.3 times larger.

578. **Type**: Antitrust litigation.

3. Visa and MasterCard Antitrust Litigation

579. **Class Size**: Around 10 million cardholders.

580. **Settlement**: Approximately $3 billion.

581. **Scale Comparison**: The current Antitrust Class Action is an astounding 89.5 times larger.

582. **Type**: Antitrust litigation.

F. A Call for a Landmark Judgment

583. In light of the unprecedented scale, robust legal precedents, and global implications of this case, the Court is presented with a historic opportunity to redefine antitrust enforcement in the digital age.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

584. Under Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 38(a), Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, representing the class, pray for judgment against the Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

I. Conduct Remedies

1. **Injunctive Relief**: Issue an order enjoining Defendants from continuing their anticompetitive practices, including but not limited to illegal tying and bundling, exclusive dealing, price fixing, and predatory pricing strategies.
2. **Unbundling of Services**:
    1. **VoWi-Fi**: Mandate the Defendants to immediately unbundle compulsory VoWi-Fi calling and texting services from cellular calling and texting services, ensuring consumers can independently choose either or both of these services.
    2. **Mobile Data Plans**: Mandate Defendants the Defendants to immediately unbundle compulsory mobile data plans from cellular calling and texting services, ensuring consumers can independently choose either or both of these services.
3. **Third-Party Interoperability**: Compel Defendants to facilitate third-party interoperability on native dialer and messaging applications for both VoWi-Fi and mobile data services, fostering a competitive environment.
4. **Separate Service Purchase**: Ensure Defendants allow subscribers to purchase VoWi-Fi, mobile data, and texting as separate services from other networks.

5. **Disclosure and Compensation**: Cease the offloading of cellular calls and data onto Wi-Fi networks without proper disclosure and compensation to subscribers, ensuring transparency and fairness.

II. Monetary Damages

1. **Compensation for Financial Harm**: Award damages to the Plaintiffs for the harm suffered due to the monopolistic bundling of VoWi-Fi services and mobile data services with cellular calling and texting services, including direct financial losses and market impacts.
2. **Damages for Price Fixing**: Compensate the Plaintiffs for damages due to price fixing of VoWi-Fi, mobile data, and texting services, including inflated costs and reduced service quality.
3. **Lost Opportunity and Value**: Award damages for the loss of opportunity to market and use standalone VoWi-Fi and mobile data services, and for the resulting loss of value.
4. **Enhanced Damages**: Grant enhanced or treble damages as provided under 15 U.S.C. § 15a, and supplemental damages for any continuing post-verdict anticompetitive conduct until the entry of final judgment.
5. **Reimbursement of Legal Costs**: Order Defendants to cover all legal costs incurred by the Plaintiffs, ensuring full reimbursement for litigation expenses.

III. Treble Damages

1. **Deterrence of Further Violations**: Award treble damages as stipulated in Section 4 of the Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914, codified at 15 U.S.C. § 15. This provision entitles Plaintiffs

to recover three times the damages sustained, plus the cost of the suit, including reasonable attorney's fees.

IV. Behavioral Remedies

1. **Facilitation of Competition**: Require Defendants to enable third-party interoperability on native dialers of smartphones for both VoWi-Fi and mobile data services, promoting a competitive marketplace.
2. **Restoration of Competitive Conditions**: Implement injunctive relief to restore competitive conditions in the relevant markets affected by the Defendants' unlawful conduct.
3. **Structural Remedies**: Consider structural relief, which may include the divestiture of certain business units or assets, to promote fair competition.

V. Restitution

1. **Monetary Restitution**: Award restitution to the plaintiffs for harm, loss, and damage, including enhanced or treble damages as provided by 15 U.S.C. § 15a.
2. **Disgorgement of Profits**: Mandate restitution after an accounting and disgorgement of profits unfairly earned due to misrepresentations that VoWi-Fi and mobile data services are "free," resulting in unjust enrichment.
3. **Restitution for Unjust Enrichment**: ORDER the Defendants to implement the proposed class restitution plan and ENSURE the Defendants' compliance with this restitution plan through appropriate monitoring and enforcement mechanisms.

4. **Restitution Plan Implementation**: MANDATE a $144 annual bill reduction for each affected subscriber for five consecutive years.
5. **Refunds for Overcharges**: MANDATE refunds to subscribers for any overcharges on bundled services, calculated based on the difference between the standalone cost of VoWi-Fi service or mobile data services, and the bundled price.
6. **Debt Relief**: MANDATE a debt relief program for affected subscribers who were burdened by excessive charges for bundled services, providing partial or full forgiveness of outstanding balances attributable to these charges.

VI. Criminal and Civil Penalties

1. **Imposition of Penalties**: Order appropriate authorities to impose criminal and civil penalties on Defendants for antitrust and anticompetitive violations.
2. **Declaration of Violations**: Declare that Defendants, in their capacity as board members, officers, and employees, have committed criminal violations of the Clayton and Sherman Acts, 15 U.S.C. §§ 14 and 1.

VII. Damages for Willful Antitrust Technology Misuse

1. **Compensation for Technology Misuse**: Compensate for harm, loss, and damage resulting from Defendants' breach of antitrust laws and misuse of VoIP-Pal's technology and know-how in the Defendants' anticompetitive deployment of VoWi-Fi.
2. **Disgorgement of Profits**: Disgorge profits obtained from the misuse of VoIP-Pal's technology and know-how in the Defendants' anticompetitive deployment of VoWi-Fi.

VIII. Extending the Damages Period

1. **Award Extended Damages**: Award damages for the entire period of Defendants' fraudulent misrepresentation, deceit, and misleading conduct related to VoWi-Fi services, extending beyond the standard 4-year statute of limitations, due to:

    - The continuing nature of the Defendants' violations;
    - The active concealment of the true costs and nature of VoWi-Fi services; and
    - The delayed discovery of the fraudulent conduct by consumers and shareholders.

IX. Other Relief

1. **Prejudgment and Post-Judgment Interest**: Award prejudgment and post-judgment interest on all damages awarded, at the highest rate allowable by law, to ensure full compensation for losses.
2. **Additional Remedies**: Grant any other and further relief that the Court deems just and proper to address the full scope of harm and rectify the anticompetitive and fraudulent practices of the Defendants.
3. **Appointment of a Special Master**: Appoint a Special Master to oversee the implementation of conduct remedies and ensure compliance with the Court's orders.
4. **Periodic Audits and Compliance Reporting**: Require Defendants to submit to periodic audits and compliance reporting by an independent third party approved by the Court.
5. **Consumer Education Programs**: Mandate the funding and implementation of consumer education programs to inform consumers about their rights and the true nature of VoWi-Fi services.

6. **Public Acknowledgment**: Require Defendants to issue public notices, approved by the Court, acknowledging their anticompetitive conduct and detailing the remedies being implemented.
7. **Permanent Injunction**: Permanently enjoin Defendants from engaging in any future conduct that violates federal or state antitrust laws.
8. **Attorney's Fees**: Plaintiffs is seeking reimbursement for its attorneys' fees and costs associated with pursuing this case.

Dated: October 25, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Travis Pittman
Travis Pittman (D.C. Bar No. 1016894)
Local Counsel for Plaintiff
HOLMES, PITTMAN & HARAGUCHI, LLP
1140 3rd St. NE
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 329-3558
jtpittman@hphattorneys.com

Sean Parmenter (CA Bar No. 233144)
Lead Counsel for Plaintiff
PARMENTER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, PLLC
1401 21st St, Suite #10724
Sacramento, CA 95811
(925) 482-6515
sean@parmenterip.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS