

1 DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES
STUART SEABORN (Bar No. 198590)
2 MELISSA RIESS (Bar No. 295959)
2001 Center Street, Fourth Floor
3 Berkeley, California 94704-1204
Telephone: (510) 665-8644
4 Facsimile: (510) 665-8511
sseaborn@dralegal.org
5 mriess@dralegal.org

6 CHAVEZ & GERTLER LLP
MARK A. CHAVEZ (Bar No. 90858)
7 NANCE F. BECKER (Bar No. 99292)
42 Miller Avenue
8 Mill Valley, California 94941
Telephone: (415) 381-5599
9 Facsimile: (415) 381-5572
mark@chavezgertler.com
10 nance@chavezgertler.com

11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

12
13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
14 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
15

17 INDEPENDENT LIVING RESOURCE
CENTER SAN FRANCISCO, a California
18 non-profit corporation, JUDITH SMITH, an
individual, JULIE FULLER, an individual,
19 SASCHA BITTNER, an individual, and
COMMUNITY RESOURCES FOR
20 INDEPENDENT LIVING, a California non-
profit corporation,

21 Plaintiffs,

22 v.

23 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Delaware
24 Corporation, RASIER, LLC, a Delaware
Corporation, and RASIER-CA, LLC, a
25 Delaware Corporation,

26 Defendants.
27
28

Case No. 3:18-cv-06503-RS

**AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR
INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY
RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT,
42 U.S.C. §§ 12181, et seq.**

CLASS ACTION

DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES
2001 CENTER STREET, FOURTH FLOOR
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94704-1204
(510) 665-8644

I. INTRODUCTION

1
2 1. Plaintiffs bring this action to remedy ongoing discrimination against people with
3 mobility disabilities who want to, but cannot, use the transportation service operated by Uber
4 Technologies, Inc. (“Uber”). Since launching its transportation service in San Francisco in July
5 2010, Uber has experienced explosive growth, has seized an ever-expanding market share from
6 taxi companies and is now a major provider of individual transportation services in the United
7 States. Uber’s success is based on the quality of its service, which provides users with reliable
8 on-demand transportation within minutes in over 600 cities worldwide. Unfortunately, in its
9 rapid growth into a multi-billion-dollar behemoth, Uber has not taken adequate steps to satisfy its
10 legal responsibility to provide the same reliable on-demand transportation service to individuals
11 who use wheelchair accessible vehicles (“WAVs”).

12 2. Uber purports to offer WAVs to users in the Bay Area through its UberWAV
13 button, but the reality is this button only provides riders second-class service – when it provides
14 service at all. Even when the service is available, the average wait time in San Francisco for
15 UberWAV is almost four times longer than for non-wheelchair accessible UberX. In Alameda
16 County, the wait time for a WAV is on average 12 times longer. Unlike all of Uber’s other
17 services, UberWAV does not offer the option of reserving a ride in advance.

18 3. Uber is one of the leading companies in the new “sharing economy.” It provides
19 on-demand rides to individuals through its network of over 2,000,000 drivers globally. The riders
20 pay Uber through Uber’s smart phone application with their credit cards, and Uber splits the
21 payments with its drivers. Uber’s phenomenal success and unparalleled growth pose an
22 existential threat to traditional taxi service, and Uber has invested heavily in what it considers to
23 be transportation technologies of the future, including autonomous vehicles. As a result Uber’s
24 market value has grown to over \$70 billion.¹

25 4. It appears that the future of on-demand transportation belongs to Uber and that,
26 unless forced to do so by this Court, Uber will exclude disabled individuals from that future. As
27

28 ¹ NY Times, “Uber and Lyft Charge Toward Potential I.P.O.s Next Year”,
<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/16/technology/uber-lyft-ipo.html> (Oct. 16, 2018).

1 detailed below, Uber’s acts and practices deny individuals who need wheelchair accessible
 2 vehicles equal access to the service it provides, and prevent them from obtaining the benefits of
 3 its service. Such conduct directly violates the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”), 42
 4 U.S.C. § 12101, *et seq.*

5 5. It is fully within Uber’s power to provide reliable and timely accessible service.
 6 Uber tightly controls all aspects of how both its drivers and riders use the service, mediating all
 7 payments, regulating the types of vehicles the drivers use, and offering financial incentives to
 8 ensure that there are enough drivers on the road to meet the demand for rides. Moreover, Uber is
 9 already providing widespread wheelchair accessible transportation in London and six other cities
 10 around the United Kingdom. Uber could similarly end its discrimination against people in the
 11 Bay Area who need wheelchair accessible vehicles if it chose to do so.

12 6. This litigation is intended to halt Uber’s ongoing discrimination against
 13 individuals with mobility disabilities. Plaintiffs seek injunctive and declaratory relief to redress
 14 Uber’s violations of the ADA and California law. Because Defendants’ practices adversely
 15 impact hundreds, if not thousands, of disabled individuals, Plaintiffs ask the Court to certify their
 16 claims for class treatment and to order relief that will benefit all members of the Class.

17 II. PARTIES

18 7. Plaintiff Independent Living Resource Center San Francisco (“ILRC”) is a
 19 disability rights organization in San Francisco, California, that advocates for people with
 20 disabilities and supports them in living independent and active lives. ILRC’s board, staff, and the
 21 consumers of its services include people with mobility disabilities who have been deterred from
 22 downloading and using Uber because of Uber’s failure to provide them with full and equal
 23 access to its service. Uber’s discriminatory policies and practices regularly impose economic
 24 harms on ILRC, frustrate the organization’s efforts to engage in its core advocacy work, and
 25 force it to divert resources that it needs to spend on other work. Plaintiff ILRC sues on behalf of
 26 itself, its consumers, board members, and staff, and in furtherance of its mission of ensuring that
 27 people with disabilities are fully integrated into the social and economic fabric of their
 28 communities.

1 8. Plaintiff Community Resources for Independent Living (“CRIL”) is a disability
2 rights advocacy and support organization located in Hayward, California. CRIL supports people
3 with disabilities in southern Alameda County to live independently, advocate for themselves, and
4 access services, programs, activities, resources, and facilities in the community. CRIL’s
5 consumers include individuals who use motorized wheelchairs and scooters and would use Uber
6 but for unavailability of wheelchair accessible Ubers. CRIL participates in advocacy on a variety
7 of issues affecting people with disabilities, including mobility and transportation. Uber’s
8 discriminatory policies and practices regularly impose economic harms on CRIL by frustrating
9 its efforts to engage in its core advocacy work, and by forcing it to divert resources that it needs
10 to spend on other work. Plaintiff CRIL sues on behalf of itself and its members, and in
11 furtherance of its mission of ensuring that people with disabilities receive full and equal access to
12 the services and facilities.

13 9. Plaintiff Judith Smith is an individual residing in Alameda County. She uses a
14 motorized wheelchair and would use Uber but for the lack of reliable and timely wheelchair
15 accessible Ubers. Because Ms. Smith has heard about and witnessed the unavailability of the
16 service she has not downloaded Uber’s application because she knows that Uber’s WAV service
17 is frequently unavailable.

18 10. Plaintiff Julie Fuller is an individual residing in Alameda County. She uses a
19 motorized wheelchair and would use Uber but for the lack of reliable and timely wheelchair
20 accessible Ubers. She has learned that WAVs are not available through Uber from other
21 wheelchair users, and people she knows at ILRC. She has not downloaded Uber’s application
22 because she knows that Uber’s WAV service is frequently unavailable.

23 11. Plaintiff Sascha Bittner is an individual residing in San Francisco. She uses a
24 motorized wheelchair and would use Uber but for the lack of reliable and timely wheelchair
25 accessible Ubers. She has witnessed family members attempt to call wheelchair accessible Ubers
26 and knows that they are not reliably available. She would use Uber’s WAV service if she could
27 count on it for reliable door-to-door transportation.
28

1 12. Defendant Uber Technologies, Inc. (“Uber”²) is a for-profit corporation that
2 provides on-demand transportation services throughout California, including in Alameda and
3 San Francisco Counties. Uber is registered in Delaware and its principal place of business is San
4 Francisco, California.

5 13. Defendant Rasier, LLC (“Rasier”) is a for-profit corporation registered in
6 Delaware with its principal place of business in San Francisco, California. Rasier is a subsidiary
7 of Uber Technologies, Inc.

8 14. Defendant Rasier-CA, LLC (“Rasier”) is a for-profit corporation registered in
9 Delaware with its principal place of business in San Francisco, California. Rasier-CA, LLC is a
10 subsidiary of Uber Technologies, Inc.

11 III. JURISDICTION

12 15. Plaintiffs bring this action for declaratory and injunctive relief under the
13 Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12181, *et seq.* The Court has subject matter
14 jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 42 U.S.C. § 12188. The Court has
15 jurisdiction to issue declaratory relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2201 and to order further relief under 28
16 U.S.C. § 2202.

17 IV. VENUE

18 16. Venue is proper in the Northern District of California under 28 U.S.C. §§
19 1391(b)-(c) because Defendants’ principal place of business is in San Francisco, California, the
20 business practices at issue were conducted throughout California, including in San Francisco
21 County and Alameda County, liability arose in those counties, and events and conduct giving rise
22 to the violations of law asserted herein occurred in those counties. Plaintiffs Judith Smith and
23 Julie Fuller reside in Oakland, California, and Sascha Bittner resides in San Francisco. They
24 have suffered discrimination on the basis of their disabilities and been deterred from taking
25 advantage of the transportation service offered by Uber in Alameda County and San Francisco.
26 Plaintiff ILRC has its principal place of business in San Francisco, and has likewise suffered
27

28 _____
² The name “Uber” will be used to refer to all Defendants named in this Complaint.

1 injury there. Plaintiff CRIL has its principal place of business in Alameda County, and has
2 suffered injury there.

3 **V. INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

4 17. The appropriate division for this case is the San Francisco Division. Defendants'
5 principal place of business is in San Francisco and a substantial part of the acts or omissions,
6 including the business practices at issue in this case, were developed and implemented in San
7 Francisco.

8 **VI. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

9 18. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(2), Plaintiffs bring this action
10 on behalf of themselves and all other persons similarly situated. The Class consists of all
11 individuals in San Francisco County and Alameda County who are disabled because of a
12 mobility impairment, utilize wheelchairs and therefore use accessible transportation, and who
13 have been and continue to be deterred from using Uber's transportation service due to Uber's
14 discriminatory acts and practices. Excluded from the Class is any individual who has previously
15 utilized Uber and/or has downloaded the Uber application, and Uber's officers and employees.

16 19. Plaintiffs are unable to state the precise number of potential members of the
17 proposed Class. The Class numbers in the hundreds, if not thousands, and members of the Class
18 are sufficiently numerous and geographically diverse that joinder of all members is
19 impracticable.

20 20. There is a well-defined community of interest among the members of the
21 proposed Class in that there are questions of law and fact common to all of their claims. Those
22 common issues include, but are not limited to: whether Uber provides the transportation services
23 that Plaintiffs can use; and whether Uber has violated Title III of the ADA by failing to provide
24 equal access to its service to people who use wheelchairs and need WAVs.

25 21. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of, and not antagonistic to, the claims of all other
26 members of the Class because Uber conducted and continues to conduct its business in a manner
27 which caused, continues to cause, and will in the future cause all Class members to suffer the
28

DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES
2001 CENTER STREET, FOURTH FLOOR
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94704-1204
(510) 665-8644

1 same or similar injury. Plaintiffs, by advancing their claims, will also advance the claims of all
 2 other similarly-situated individuals.

3 22. Plaintiffs and their counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of
 4 absent Class members. There are no material conflicts between Plaintiffs' claims and those of
 5 absent Class members that would make class certification inappropriate. Plaintiffs' counsel are
 6 experienced in disability rights and class action litigation, and will vigorously assert Plaintiffs'
 7 claims and the claims of all Class members.

8 23. A class action is superior to other potential methods for achieving a fair and
 9 efficient adjudication of this controversy. Whatever difficulties may exist in the management of
 10 this case as a class action will be greatly outweighed by the benefits of the class action
 11 procedure, including but not limited to providing Class members with a method for the redress
 12 and prevention of their injuries and claims that could not, given the complexity of the issues and
 13 the nature of the requested relief, be pursued in individual litigation. Further, the prosecution of
 14 separate actions by the individual Class members, even if possible, would create a risk of
 15 inconsistent or varying adjudications and incompatible standards of conduct for the Defendant.

16 VII. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

17 24. Uber provides transportation services to members of the general public, including
 18 in San Francisco County and Alameda County.

19 25. Uber is not a broker or a middleman merely facilitating a transaction through a
 20 smart phone application. Instead, it provides transportation to its customers by recruiting and
 21 retaining a network of drivers who contractually agree to provide rides to Uber's customers in
 22 accordance with terms and conditions specified by Uber. Similarly, Uber's customers must enter
 23 into contracts with Uber to utilize its service on terms and conditions specified by Uber. In all
 24 material respects, including the financial terms, the transactions between the drivers and the
 25 customers are dictated, mediated, and controlled by Uber. There are no negotiations between
 26 Uber's drivers and its customers. And Uber takes the lion's share of the revenues generated in
 27 the transactions.
 28

1 26. Uber provides different levels of transportation service around the country. In San
2 Francisco and Alameda Counties, the company offers UberX, its basic rideshare option, Uber
3 POOL, a carpooling service, Uber Select and Uber Black, premium transportation services, and
4 UberXL and UberSUV, services limited to larger vehicles. In addition, it purports to offer Uber
5 Assist, a service in which the drivers have self-certified as being willing to assist riders with
6 mobility disabilities, and UberWAV, a car service option offering wheelchair accessible
7 vehicles.

8 27. Uber has created a genuinely new mode of transportation, generating both the
9 demand for rides and the supply of drivers by incentivizing both the riders and the drivers to
10 participate in the service. Without Uber, this new mode of transportation would not exist.

11 28. Moreover, Uber perceives itself as creating a new transportation service which
12 transcends the technology. Uber urges commuters to consider it a “daily transportation option” or
13 one that complements their use of other modes of transportation (“While public transportation is
14 still very much a necessity, research has found that Uber acts as an important complement for
15 commuters.”³) Uber has even compared itself to a utility (“Today we aspire to make
16 transportation as reliable as running water, everywhere and for everyone”⁴) and touted the ability
17 of its transportation service to tackle difficult public policy issues such as “congestion, pollution
18 and parking by getting more people into fewer cars.”⁵ In Uber’s own words: “Our work doesn’t
19 end with transporting people.”⁶ In the words of the Northern District of California: “Uber does
20 not simply sell software; it sells rides.” *O’Connor v. Uber Techs. Inc.*, 82 F. Supp. 3d 1133, 1141
21 (N.D Cal. 2015).

22
23
24 ³ Uber.com, How Uber Can Be a Daily Transit Option, <https://www.uber.com/newsroom/how-uber-can-be-a-daily-transportation-option/>, October 5, 2016.

25 ⁴ Uber.com, Celebrating Cities: A New Look and Feel for Uber,
26 <https://www.uber.com/newsroom/celebrating-cities-a-new-look-and-feel-for-uber-7/>, February 3,
2016.

27 ⁵ Travis Kalanick, Uber’s Plan to Get More People Into Fewer Cars,
28 https://www.ted.com/talks/travis_kalanick_uber_s_plan_to_get_more_people_into_fewer_cars,
February 2016.

⁶ Uber.com, Advanced Technology Group, <https://www.uber.com/info/atg/>

1 A. **Uber Discriminates Against Individuals With Mobility Disabilities By Failing**
 2 **To Provide Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles**

3 29. Uber purports to offer access to wheelchair accessible vehicles to users in the Bay
 4 Area. However, although the app includes an UberWAV button, the reality is that this button
 5 only provides riders second-class service – when it provides service at all.

6 30. When a wheelchair accessible Uber is available in San Francisco, the wait times
 7 for these vehicles are on average almost four times longer than for non-wheelchair accessible
 8 UberX. In Alameda County, the wait time for a WAV is on average 12 times longer. This is not
 9 an effective or viable component of Uber’s transportation system.

10 31. Plaintiffs tested a number of central locations around the Bay Area daily in
 11 September 2018 and October 2018. In Alameda County, a total of 60 tests during business hours
 12 reflected an average estimated wait time for an UberWAV of 29.7 minutes. In comparison, the
 13 average estimated wait times for an UberX in the same locations was 2.4 minutes. In other
 14 words, on average an UberWAV rider is told they will have to wait 12.4 times longer than an
 15 UberX rider. Some estimated wait times listed for UberWAVs were as long as 51 minutes. In
 16 only one test out of 60 did the estimated wait time for an UberWAV dip into the single digits (8
 17 minutes). In one instance, the app reflected that no WAVs were available. In San Francisco, the
 18 average estimated wait time for an UberWAV was 11.5 minutes, almost four times longer than
 19 the average for an UberX. UberWAV estimated wait times could reach as high as 21 minutes,
 20 whereas for an UberX at the same location, the estimated wait was 2 minutes.

21 32. The information above was based on testing of estimated wait times at central
 22 locations during business hours in the morning and the evening. Anecdotal reports of UberWAV
 23 use reflect that the service may be even more inadequate than the above information suggests.
 24 For example, an UberWAV user reported an occasion when she used UberWAV for the journey
 25 to an appointment. When she tried to request an UberWAV for the return journey, she received a
 26 message that no cars were available for two hours before she obtained confirmation that an
 27 UberWAV could take her. Once the ride was finally confirmed, she had to wait an additional 25
 28 minutes for the vehicle to arrive. This rider reported that about 50 percent of her requests for a

1 ride using Uber’s app yield a message that no cars are available. She has been reluctant to use
 2 UberWAV because of the risk of being stranded and unable to get transportation home. To make
 3 this risk worse, UberWAV does not offer the possibility of booking a vehicle in advance –
 4 although the option of advanced reservations is available for all of Uber’s other services.

5 33. Uber riders who use wheelchair accessible vehicles are also denied access to all
 6 but one of Uber’s transportation classes. Riders who use wheelchairs requiring lifts or ramps can
 7 only travel in an UberWAV. They cannot use Uber’s carpool service UberPOOL, its large
 8 vehicle services UberXL and UberSUV, and its deluxe vehicle services such as UberBLACK or
 9 UberSelect.

10 34. Uber has been sued in cities around the United States for its violation of disability
 11 laws by failing to provide wheelchair-accessible service, yet has continued its policy of denying
 12 that service. *See, e.g., Equal Rights Center v. Uber Technologies, Inc.*, No. 17-cv-01272 (D.D.C.
 13 filed 6/28/2017), *Access Living of Metropolitan Chicago v. Uber Technologies, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-
 14 09690 (N.D. Ill. Filed 10/13/2016), *Crawford v. Uber Technologies, Inc.*, No. 3:17-cv-02664-RS
 15 (N.D. Cal. Filed 5/9/2017), *Namismak v. Uber Technologies, Inc.*, No. 3:17-cv-06124-RS (N.D.
 16 Cal. Filed 10/26/2017), *Ramos v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, No. SA-14-CA-502-XR, 2015 WL 758087
 17 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 20, 2015).

18 35. Although Uber exercises substantial control over drivers to incentivize them to
 19 drive for Uber and to drive at particular times, there is no indication that Uber is doing anything
 20 to incentivize drivers to drive wheelchair accessible Ubers. It has previously admitted that it is
 21 doing nothing: “[Uber] doesn’t treat Drivers who have or want WAVs any differently than it
 22 treats other Divers [sic].” *BCID v. Uber, SDNY*, Case No. 1:17-cv-06399-NRB, Dkt 35 (Defts’
 23 Mot. to Dismiss, December 8, 2017 at 7). Just as it has intentionally flouted regulation and law
 24 enforcement in other contexts⁷, Uber has intentionally avoided complying with anti-

25
 26 ⁷ See, e.g., N.Y. Times, *How Uber Deceives the Authorities Worldwide*,
 27 <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/03/technology/uber-greyball-program-evade-authorities.html>,
 28 March 3, 2017; The Recorder, *Former Uber CLO Salle Yoo Named in Reports of Tool Meant to
 Evade Foreign Authorities*,
<https://www.law.com/therecorder/sites/therecorder/2018/01/12/former-uber-clo-salle-yoo-named-in-reports-of-tool-meant-to-evade-foreign-authorities/>,
 January 12, 2018; Eric Newcomer, *Uber Pushed the Limits of the Law. Now Comes the Reckoning*, Bloomberg.com,

1 discrimination laws by failing to make full and equal access to Uber’s transportation service a
2 reality through UberWAV.

3 **B. Uber’s Discrimination Results In Real Harm**

4 36. Uber’s failure to make accessible vehicles reliably available through its service
5 denies people who use wheelchairs access to on-demand transportation that could drastically
6 improve their lives, enabling them to travel to a wider variety of destinations without having to
7 rely on transportation via expensive taxis, unreliable paratransit, and limited public transit. It
8 would enable them to travel spontaneously, without having to schedule transportation hours or
9 even days in advance. Unfortunately, Plaintiffs and members of the class are excluded from these
10 benefits, and suffer real harm as a result.

11 37. People who use wheelchairs face the denigrating experience of being denied a
12 basic service that is available to all other paying customers. Even when an UberWAV vehicle is
13 technically available, because so few exist, there are typically frequent and lengthy delays.
14 People who use wheelchairs and use UberWAV must contend with missed appointments, being
15 late for events, and the risk of being stranded far from other transportation options because they
16 are unable to secure an UberWAV for their return journeys.

17 38. Due to distances between destinations in the Bay Area and the severe limitations
18 of public transportation and paratransit, many people with disabilities must use private
19 transportation services to travel from one place to another. The private options are severely
20 lacking as well. Wheelchair accessible taxis are rare or nonexistent. Paratransit is extremely
21 unreliable and often requires lengthy waits.

22 39. As described below, the lack of effective access to this new mode of
23 transportation means that Plaintiffs may lose employment opportunities or jobs to those with
24 access to more reliable transportation, and may experience social isolation and other harms—not
25 least the stigma associated with not being part of what Uber calls the mainstream “way the world
26 moves.”

27
28 <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2017-10-11/uber-pushed-the-limits-of-the-law-now-comes-the-reckoning>, October 11, 2017.

1 **C. Judith Smith**

2 40. Plaintiff Judith Smith lives and works in Oakland, California. She uses a
3 motorized wheelchair because of mobility disabilities.

4 41. Ms. Smith would and could use Uber if she knew she could count on it for
5 service. She has a smartphone, but she has not downloaded Uber's app. Early in Uber's existence
6 she was excited by the prospect of finding transportation more easily but she quickly learned
7 from friends and colleagues about the lack of accessible vehicles on Uber. Since then, she has
8 watched numerous people attempt to call a wheelchair accessible Uber, and none has ever
9 succeeded. As a result of such incidents, she has concluded it would be futile to download the
10 app.

11 42. Ms. Smith is the Founder and Artistic Director Emerita of Axis Dance Company,
12 a group of contemporary dancers with and without physical disabilities. Several members of the
13 company, including Marc Brew, the group's Artistic Director, use power wheelchairs. Ms. Smith
14 and her colleagues frequently share their frustrations about their transportation options, and
15 specifically about their inability to access the convenience of Uber. For example, Mr. Brew
16 shared the following frustrating experience from his visit to the Bay Area in 2017.

17 43. Mr. Brew attended a dance performance at Berkeley's Zellerbach Hall. After the
18 performance, Mr. Brew needed to get home, but it was after midnight and he had missed the last
19 BART train. There were no accessible vehicles on Uber, and all of his friends who had vehicles
20 with wheelchair lifts were either out of town or asleep. Stranded, and with his chair nearly out of
21 power, he ultimately decided to roll to the home of a friend, who was kind enough to put him up
22 for the night.

23 44. There are many situations in which Ms. Smith would use Uber if WAVs were
24 available. For example, one evening in 2017, Ms. Smith was in San Francisco's Mission District
25 and wanted to go home to Oakland. The battery on her power wheelchair was running low, and if
26 she could have called an Uber to pick her up, she could have made it home without the stress of
27 running out of power. Instead, she rolled to the 16th Street and Mission BART station, but the
28 elevator there was broken. As she rolled to the 24th Street station, the battery on her chair reached

1 critical levels. She managed to get to her train, but by the time she arrived in Oakland, her
2 battery was so depleted that she could not independently roll up the ramp of her home and had to
3 ask a neighbor to assist her.

4 45. If they were accessible to her, Ms. Smith would call Ubers in exactly the same
5 way as would someone who does not use a wheelchair accessible vehicle. She would order Ubers
6 to and from the airport, when she is out late at night, when she wants to travel to high-density
7 places like San Francisco where parking is limited, or to places that are far from public
8 transportation, in inclement weather, or when health reasons prevent her from driving.

9 46. In these situations, Ms. Smith is left without any alternative transportation and
10 therefore must stay at home or suffer arduous transportation delays and other indignities from not
11 having access to the same service as Uber users who do not use accessible vehicles.

12 **D. Julie Fuller**

13 47. Plaintiff Julie Fuller lives in Oakland, California. She has mobility and vision
14 disabilities and uses a motorized wheelchair. She has a smartphone but has not downloaded the
15 Uber app because she has heard from other wheelchair users that there are no wheelchair
16 accessible Ubers. For example, she has discussed this issue at a weekly support group she
17 attends. The other members of her support group, most of whom use motorized wheelchairs,
18 have shared their frustrations with being unable to access Ubers. She has also volunteered at
19 ILRC, attended programming at ILRC, and has discussed the unavailability of wheelchair
20 accessible Ubers with Jessie Lorenz, ILRC's former executive director.

21 48. Every Wednesday, Ms. Fuller attends weekly support group sessions in North
22 Berkeley. The drive from her house in Oakland to the support group is approximately 15
23 minutes. However, in order to get to the sessions, Ms. Fuller leaves an hour early to catch a ride
24 on BART or AC Transit. She leaves the group early so that she does not have to travel home
25 while it is dark, as she has impaired vision and feels unsafe when she is on the street in her chair
26 at night.

27 49. Because she feels vulnerable when she is out at night, Ms. Fuller also misses other
28 evening events, such as social gatherings, as well as her neighborhood council, which meets one

1 evening a month at the library a few blocks away from her house. Similarly, when it rains, she
 2 stays at home because she does not want to risk waiting outside in the rain for prolonged periods
 3 to avoid damage to her chair. If she were able to rely on door-to-door transportation from Uber,
 4 she would be able to attend these events.

5 50. Ms. Fuller is planning to visit her brother, sister-in-law and new baby nephew in
 6 Ohio in November 2018. If she knew that UberWAVs were reliably available, she would plan to
 7 take one to the airport, but she has decided not to use Uber because she is concerned that a
 8 vehicle will not be available to take her, or that delays could cause her to miss her flight.

9 **E. Sascha Bittner**

10 51. Sascha Bittner lives in San Francisco, California. She uses a motorized
 11 wheelchair because she has mobility disabilities. Ms. Bittner does not have a smartphone but has
 12 witnessed family and friends attempt to order a wheelchair accessible vehicle through the app
 13 only to find that no vehicles are available. Ms. Bittner has attended programming at ILRC.

14 52. For example, in January 2017, Ms. Bittner participated in the Women's March
 15 with her family in San Francisco. Her family would have used a wheelchair accessible Uber to
 16 get to the march, but none was available. Instead, the family engaged in a time consuming ballet
 17 of pickups and drop offs to avoid the crowds and limited parking.

18 53. Ms. Bittner campaigns for fair wages for in-home care workers and attends events
 19 around the Bay Area and the state related to this work. She also participates in workshops at
 20 ILRC. She often relies on her stepfather, Bruce Joseph, to drive her in the family's accessible
 21 van. However just as often, going out to routine events such as regular medical appointments or
 22 meetings becomes an all-day ordeal, when she builds in time for delays and disruptions on public
 23 transit. Paratransit is routinely hours behind schedule. For example, she was hours late to a 9:30
 24 appointment for which she scheduled paratransit pickup two hours early. She is often left out of
 25 spontaneous social gatherings because she can't simply call an Uber like everyone else to get
 26 there and come pick her up when it is over.

27 54. The lack of reliably available wheelchair accessible Ubers excludes Ms. Bittner
 28 from an on-demand door-to-door service that is available to people who do not use wheelchairs,

1 and which would greatly improve Ms. Bittner’s ability to live an active life. Ms. Bittner would
 2 use Uber if she could count on its services being accessible to her.

3 **F. Independent Living Resource Center San Francisco**

4 55. Independent Living Resource Center San Francisco (“ILRC”) is a disability rights
 5 organization in San Francisco, California, that advocates for people with disabilities and supports
 6 them in living independent and active lives. ILRC’s board, staff, and the consumers of its
 7 services include people with mobility disabilities who have been deterred from downloading and
 8 using Uber because of Uber’s failure to make accessible service reliably available to them.
 9 Uber’s discriminatory policies and practices regularly impose economic harms on ILRC,
 10 frustrate its efforts to engage in its core advocacy work, and force it to divert resources that it
 11 needs to spend on other work. Additionally, many members of its board, staff and constituency
 12 are harmed by Uber’s discriminatory failure to make its service equally accessible to people who
 13 need WAVs.

14 56. In recent decades, ILRC has worked to ensure that transportation options are
 15 available to people with disabilities. The continued inaccessibility of Uber transportation is thus
 16 an issue of concern for ILRC. ILRC has expended time and resources on advocacy work to
 17 improve access, including expanding transportation options, for disabled residents of San
 18 Francisco. This work has included advocacy and engagement with a wide variety of entities
 19 including the San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation Agency, the Mayor’s Office on
 20 Disability, and San Francisco Paratransit. For example, ILRC has worked with BART to ensure
 21 that all aspects of the system, from paying the fare to riding the train, are accessible to people
 22 with disabilities, and has advocated for BART to incorporate accessible design principles in its
 23 selection of its new train cars.

24 57. On the issue of ride-sharing services specifically, ILRC has been monitoring the
 25 growth of these services, and engaging in advocacy work to encourage ride-sharing services to
 26 provide wheelchair accessible vehicles. ILRC has devoted staff time and resources to conducting
 27 a survey to collect information about the experiences of people with disabilities using rideshare
 28 services, to aid them in their advocacy efforts. It has participated in public engagement processes

1 by the San Francisco Mayor’s Office on Disability and the Metropolitan Transportation Agency
 2 regarding the availability of on-demand transportation to people with disabilities in San
 3 Francisco. This includes efforts to increase the availability of accessible transportation provided
 4 by rideshare companies such as Uber.

5 58. ILRC itself has been injured as a direct result of Uber’s failure to provide a
 6 service that is accessible to people who use wheelchair accessible vehicles. ILRC’s interests are
 7 adversely affected because it must expend resources, as it has done in its organizing and
 8 advocacy efforts, advocating for its constituents who are harmed by Uber’s policies and
 9 practices. ILRC has suffered injury in the form of diversion of these resources and frustration of
 10 its mission.

11 59. Some of ILRC’s staff and board have mobility disabilities, use power
 12 wheelchairs, and therefore use a wheelchair accessible vehicle if they are traveling in a car. For
 13 example, ILRC Community Organizer Fiona Hinze uses a motorized wheelchair. Uber would
 14 provide her an additional option to commute to work or to off-site meetings, speaking
 15 engagements, and other important work-related events. Without the option of a reliable,
 16 convenient on-demand mode of transportation, she is often late, gets stuck in inclement weather,
 17 or is vulnerable to outages on public transportation. Each such instance imposes a direct
 18 economic harm on ILRC, in the form of lost employee work-time and productivity.

19 60. Additionally, one or more members of ILRC or consumers of ILRC’s services,
 20 including Sascha Bittner, have been injured as a direct result of Uber’s discriminatory policies
 21 and practices and would have standing to sue in their own right. ILRC can bring this action on
 22 behalf of its members because the interests at stake are germane to the organization’s purpose
 23 and only injunctive and declaratory relief are requested, which do not require the participation of
 24 individual members in the lawsuit.

25 **G. Community Resources for Independent Living**

26 61. Community Resources for Independent Living (“CRIL”) is a group located in
 27 Hayward, California. CRIL supports people with disabilities in southern Alameda County to live
 28 independently, advocate for themselves, and access services, programs, activities, resources, and

1 facilities in the community. Uber's discriminatory policies and practices harm CRIL and its
2 members, frustrate its efforts to engage in its core advocacy work, and force it to divert resources
3 that it needs to spend on other work. Additionally, many members of its board, staff and
4 constituency are harmed by Uber's discriminatory policies and practices.

5 62. One of the many services CRIL provides to its constituent community is training
6 in how to use public transportation, including BART, AC Transit, paratransit, and rideshare.
7 CRIL employs two travel trainers in its Hayward office. The travel trainers assist people with
8 disabilities to become comfortable using a variety of modes of transportation and learn about the
9 accommodations that are provided to make these modes accessible to people with disabilities.
10 The lack of wheelchair accessible Ubers deprives CRIL's members of an important
11 transportation option. Additionally, to address the lack of wheelchair accessible vehicles in the
12 area, a situation that would be dramatically improved if Uber provided timely and reliable WAV
13 service, CRIL started a van share program, through which it makes available two wheelchair
14 accessible vans via Getaround, a peer-to-peer car share portal.

15 63. CRIL also advocates on a variety of issues affecting people with disabilities,
16 including mobility and transportation. For example, it provided feedback to BART's design team
17 to help BART ensure that its new train cars will be fully accessible to people with all kinds of
18 disabilities.

19 64. CRIL itself has been injured as a direct result of Uber's failure to provide a
20 service that is accessible to people who use wheelchair accessible vehicles. CRIL's interests are
21 adversely affected because it must expend resources, as it has done in its organizing and
22 advocacy efforts, advocating for its constituents who are harmed by Uber's policies and
23 practices. CRIL has suffered injury in the form of diversion of these resources and frustration of
24 its mission.

25 65. Many of CRIL's staff, constituency, and board have mobility disabilities, use
26 power wheelchairs, and therefore use a wheelchair accessible vehicle if they are traveling in a
27 car. For example, board member Chris Finn uses a motorized wheelchair. He has not
28 downloaded Uber's app, but would do so if he knew he could count on Uber to provide him with

1 transportation to his appointments, including events at CRIL. Currently he relies on getting rides
 2 from friends, and on BART, AC Transit, and paratransit to get around, but using these modes of
 3 transportation is limiting. Taking paratransit is often an all-day event because of severe delays.
 4 Additionally, when the weather is bad, if he does not have transportation already arranged Mr.
 5 Finn must sometimes stay at home to avoid damage to his power wheelchair, which means
 6 having to miss events, including his duties as a board member of CRIL. Having access to Uber's
 7 on-demand transportation would make a variety of activities more accessible to Mr. Finn,
 8 including job opportunities, social gatherings, and events, would save him a huge amount of time
 9 going about his daily routine, and enable him to get around more freely and spontaneously.

10 66. Additionally, Mr. Finn has been injured as a direct result of Uber's discriminatory
 11 policies and practices and would have standing to sue in his own right, as would other members
 12 of CRIL. CRIL can bring this action on behalf of its members because the interests at stake are
 13 germane to the organization's purpose and only injunctive and declaratory relief are requested,
 14 which do not require the participation of individual members in the lawsuit.

15 **H. Uber Controls the Transportation Service it has Created**

16 67. Uber has created a revolutionary new mode of on-demand transportation that has
 17 changed the way millions of Americans get around – so much so that the word “Uber” has
 18 become synonymous with convenient, reliable, timely, on-demand transportation. Sometimes
 19 Uber distances itself from the fundamental role it has played in creating this system by
 20 describing itself as merely a broker or middleman, facilitating connections between drivers and
 21 riders which might happen anyway. Nothing could be further from the truth. Uber has created
 22 and controls its transportation system in every material respect.

23 **I. Uber Controls The Drivers And Vehicles**

24 68. Uber has created an on-demand transportation service which enables a rider to
 25 order a car from anywhere in most urban areas and reliably be picked up within minutes and
 26 taken to a specific destination, without having to exchange cash. Uber has carefully created this
 27 service by recruiting and retaining a network of drivers who enter into contracts with Uber
 28 agreeing to provide rides to Uber's customers under terms and conditions determined by Uber.

1 Uber has also carefully cultivated a base of customers by offering them reassurances about the
 2 safety and reliability of Uber’s transportation. For example Uber runs regular background checks
 3 on its drivers⁸, requires a standard vehicle safety inspection⁹, monitors the ratings that its drivers
 4 receive¹⁰, and offers drivers incentives to ensure that there are enough vehicles on the road to
 5 meet passenger demand.¹¹

6 69. Individuals who wish to drive for Uber must undergo a driving record check,
 7 background check, present their driver’s license, vehicle registration, and driver’s insurance.
 8 Uber sets standards for which makes, models, and age of vehicle can be driven in the Uber
 9 network. These standards are detailed – but nowhere do they mention wheelchair accessible
 10 vehicles. Models must be at least 2002 or later, and in many cases Uber requires much more
 11 recent models. *See* Uber, Vehicle Requirements San Francisco Bay Area,
 12 <https://www.uber.com/drive/san-francisco/vehicle-requirements>. Uber also sets standards for
 13 which makes, models, and age of vehicle can be driven for each class of Uber vehicle, such as
 14 UberSUV, UberXL, Uber Select and UberBLACK.

15 70. Uber also makes vehicles available to drivers through partnerships with
 16 dealerships that offer rental and lease-to-own options to assist its drivers in obtaining vehicles
 17 with which to provide Uber transportation services. *See* Uber, Vehicle Requirements, San
 18 Francisco Bay Area, <https://www.uber.com/drive/san-francisco/vehicle-requirements/> (“And if
 19 you don’t have a car, we can help you get one.”).

20 71. Uber even exercises control over the engineering and manufacture of vehicles for
 21 its service. Uber touts its “Advanced Technology Group,” a team that includes hardware and
 22 product design engineers. Its goals include “transforming the way the world moves” and
 23 “developing long-term technologies that advance Uber’s mission of bringing safe, reliable
 24

25 ⁸ CNN.com, “Uber tightens driver background checks,”
 26 <https://money.cnn.com/2018/04/12/technology/uber-safety-update/index.html?iid=EL>, April 12,
 2018.

27 ⁹ Uber.com, *Vehicle Inspections*, <https://www.uber.com/drive/san-francisco/inspections/>

28 ¹⁰ Uber.com, *Star Ratings*, <https://www.uber.com/drive/resources/how-ratings-work/>

¹¹ Uber Help, *What is surge?*, <https://help.uber.com/h/e9375d5e-917b-4bc5-8142-23b89a440eec>.

1 transportation to everyone, everywhere.” This work includes self-driving cars and trucks, but not
 2 wheelchair-accessible vehicles. *See Uber, Advanced Technologies Group,*
 3 <https://www.uber.com/info/atg/>.

4 72. Through its driver contract, Uber dictates whether, when, where, and how
 5 frequently drivers choose to offer rides in Uber vehicles. Uber exercises exclusive control over
 6 termination of Uber drivers, and routinely terminates drivers for several reasons, including for
 7 poor ratings from customers or discriminatorily refusing to provide service to customers.

8 73. Uber controls which trip requests it transmits to each of its drivers.

9 74. Uber requires that its drivers meet or exceed the estimated time-of-arrival that
 10 Uber generates and provides to each customer.

11 75. Uber limits drivers to shifts of no more than 12 hours, preventing drivers who
 12 have driven for long stints from using the app for six hours to prevent dangerous driver fatigue.¹²

13 76. Uber requires that Uber drivers refrain from smoking while providing Uber
 14 services.

15 77. Uber prohibits its drivers from discriminating against people based on race,
 16 religion, national origin, disability, sexual orientation, sex, marital status, gender identity, age or
 17 any other characteristic protected under applicable federal or state law.

18 78. In addition, Uber instructs Uber drivers that the share of trip requests that they
 19 accept through Uber’s app should be consistently high, and that Uber drivers may not accept
 20 street hails from potential passengers.

21 79. Uber controls the safety and quality of the service the drivers provide by closely
 22 monitoring its drivers. It issues training and directives concerning other requirements to Uber
 23 drivers.

24 80. Uber records many details about the demand-responsive transportation services
 25 that its drivers provide, including for each trip: (1) the pickup location, (2) the time of pickup, (3)
 26 the drop off location, (4) the time of drop off, (5) the distance traveled, (6) the trip route, (7) the
 27

28 ¹² Uber.com, “Another Step to Prevent Drowsy Driving,”
<https://www.uber.com/newsroom/drowsydriving/>, February 12, 2018.

1 trip duration, and (8) the customer's identity. Uber employees who supervise drivers have easy
2 access to this data.

3 81. Uber monitors its Uber drivers' performance by asking customers for written
4 feedback, including a driver "rating" of between 1 and 5, via the app, after every ride that a
5 driver provides, and Uber routinely follows up with customers who express dissatisfaction. Uber
6 regularly terminates or suspends Uber drivers whose average customer rating falls below a
7 certain threshold.

8 82. In addition, Uber maintains general commercial liability insurance to cover claims
9 concerning incidents that occur while drivers are providing Uber transportation services.

10 83. Uber tightly controls payment for its Uber transportation services.

11 84. Uber controls the fare charged for each trip through an algorithm which takes
12 account of the distance traveled and duration of the trip, along with the intensity of demand for
13 rides at the time of the ride request.

14 85. Uber controls the supply of drivers by encouraging them to work at particular
15 times (by increasing fares when there is increased demand), by offering them financial rewards
16 for accumulating a large number of trips, and by providing them with information about where
17 they are likely to get more trips or preferential fares. Uber exerts control over how many vehicles
18 provide its service at a given time through carefully calibrated adjustments in its service's
19 financial incentives. For example, Uber's "surge" pricing imposes additional charges during
20 high-demand times to "make sure those who need a ride can get one." *See* Uber Help, *What is*
21 *surge?*, <https://help.uber.com/h/e9375d5e-917b-4bc5-8142-23b89a440eec>.

22 **J. Uber Controls Who Can Ride In An Uber and How**

23 86. In addition to carefully controlling the drivers, Uber also controls who may use
24 Uber's transportation service. In order to use Uber, customers must download Uber's app and
25 create an account, which requires them to agree to Uber's terms of service. The customer can
26 then order a ride for themselves or someone else. The entire ride is mediated by Uber from start
27 to finish. A rider could request an Uber, travel to their destination, and pay for it, all without ever
28 speaking to the driver.

1 87. To call an Uber, the customer opens the Uber app, selects which class of vehicle
2 they want and then submits a request to Uber for a vehicle through the app, either for their own
3 use or for other passengers.

4 88. Uber then identifies a close, available Uber vehicle and then notifies the requester
5 either by text message or the Uber app that a driver has been assigned. The notification includes
6 the driver's name, customer rating, phone number, vehicle license plate number, make and
7 model of the vehicle, and the driver's estimated time of arrival. If the customer submitted a
8 desired trip destination, then Uber will provide a fare estimate. The customer can then track the
9 location of the Uber as the driver navigates to the customer's identified pick-up address. The
10 driver and customer can communicate with each other through Uber's app.

11 89. Once the Uber arrives, the Uber app notifies the customer, and they and any other
12 associated passengers may then board the vehicle. The driver then begins the trip in the Uber
13 software app and proceeds to the desired destination. If the requesting customer submitted the
14 destination address, the app will supply the driver with turn-by-turn directions to the desired
15 destination

16 90. When the Uber arrives at the desired destination, the driver ends the trip in the
17 Uber's app. Uber then charges the customer's credit card for the trip fare. No cash is
18 exchanged. Uber allows the rider and the driver to provide ratings of each other in the app after
19 the ride has concluded.

20 91. Fares for Uber's transportation services are based on the duration and distance of
21 each trip and other factors such as demand at the time and place of the ride, as determined by
22 Uber's algorithms. Uber keeps a percentage of each fare.

23 92. Uber compensates its Uber drivers based on the duration and distance of the trips
24 that they provide to customers. Payments are not transferred directly from customers to drivers;
25 rather, Uber collects and holds customer payments, deducts fees, and then later transfers money
26 to drivers. Customers who dispute the fare for a particular trip must contact Uber customer
27 service representatives to request an adjustment to their fares.
28

1 93. Uber closely monitors and controls interactions between Uber drivers and
2 customers.

3 94. In the San Francisco Bay Area, Uber purports to offer the full range of classes of
4 Uber transportation service to the public. Customers can order an Uber at any time of day and in
5 any part of the Bay Area, selecting from a wide range of options including luxury vehicles,
6 standard vehicles, large vehicles, or carpools, which enable them to ride with strangers for a
7 reduced fare. Although Uber advertises UberWAV in the Bay Area, Defendants have chosen not
8 to make wheelchair accessible Ubers available in the same reliable and timely manner as their
9 services for riders who do not need wheelchair accessible Ubers.

10 **K. Uber Discriminates Against People Who Need Wheelchair Accessible Ubers.**

11 95. Uber provides a valuable transportation alternative to millions of Bay Area
12 residents, allowing people to more easily travel to work, social events, community engagements,
13 appointments, and other destinations, yet Uber excludes people with mobility disabilities from
14 these same benefits of its convenient transportation.

15 96. Uber could end its discrimination against people who use wheelchair accessible
16 vehicles if it chose to do so. In fact it has already begun providing wheelchair accessible Ubers in
17 several major cities. For example, in London, Uber began providing wheelchair accessible Ubers
18 in 2016 through a service called UberACCESS.¹³ It rolled out this service to six more U.K. cities
19 the following year.¹⁴

20 97. Closer to home, Uber has made UberWAVs available in Philadelphia, rolling out
21 a fleet of wheelchair accessible vehicles in June of 2017.¹⁵

22
23
24 ¹³ Uber.com, “Introducing uberWAV: transportation for everyone, everywhere in London,”
<https://newsroom.uber.com/uk/ldnwav/>, May 10, 2016.

25 ¹⁴ Uber.com, “Forward-facing, forward thinking: introducing uberACCESS,”
<https://www.uber.com/en-GB/blog/uber-access-2/>, March 23, 2017; TheNextWeb.com, “Uber’s
26 wheelchair-accessible uberACCESS service launches in four new UK markets,”
[https://thenextweb.com/insider/2017/07/14/ubers-wheelchair-accessible-uberaccess-service-
27 launches-four-new-uk-markets/](https://thenextweb.com/insider/2017/07/14/ubers-wheelchair-accessible-uberaccess-service-launches-four-new-uk-markets/), July 14, 2017.

28 ¹⁵ Philly.com, “Uber and Lyft’s wheelchair access grows, with room to improve,”
[http://www.philly.com/philly/business/transportation/ubers-wheelchair-accessibility-grows-with-
room-for-improvement-20170706.html](http://www.philly.com/philly/business/transportation/ubers-wheelchair-accessibility-grows-with-room-for-improvement-20170706.html), July 6, 2017.

1 104. Title III of the ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in the full
2 and equal enjoyment of specified public transportation services provided by private entities
3 primarily engaged in the business of transporting people and whose operations affect commerce.
4 42 U.S.C. § 12184.

5 105. Plaintiffs and all members of the class are persons with “disabilities” entitled to
6 protection under the ADA.

7 106. Plaintiffs and members of the putative class, including members of Plaintiffs
8 ILRC and CRIL or participants in their services such as Plaintiffs Julie Fuller and Sascha Bittner,
9 are aware of Defendants’ unlawful actions, and their knowledge of this discrimination has
10 deterred them from using Uber’s transportation service. Moreover, Plaintiffs and members of the
11 putative class, including members of Plaintiffs ILRC and CRIL and participants in their services
12 such as Plaintiff Sascha Bittner, have been and continue to be denied access to Uber’s
13 transportation service on occasions when a friend or colleague has attempted to order an Uber
14 ride for them and found there are no wheelchair accessible Ubers available.

15 107. Public transportation is defined to mean “transportation by bus, rail, or any other
16 conveyance (other than by aircraft) that provides the general public with general or special
17 service (including charter service) on a regular and continuing basis.” 42 U.S.C. § 12181(10).

18 108. Defendants provide specified public transportation services within the meaning of
19 the term under Title III on a regular and continuing basis.

20 109. Title III of the ADA also prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in the
21 full and equal enjoyment of services provided by places of public accommodations. 42 U.S.C.
22 § 12182.

23 110. Defendants operate a public accommodation subject to Title III’s
24 nondiscrimination requirements. 42 U.S.C. §§ 12181, 12182.

25 111. Defendants operate a “travel service” as defined by 42 U.S.C. § 12181.

26 112. Defendants’ operations affect interstate commerce, including by providing
27 transportation across state lines.
28

DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES
2001 CENTER STREET, FOURTH FLOOR
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94704-1204
(510) 665-8644

1 113. Defendants discriminate against Plaintiffs and members of the putative class by
2 denying them full and equal enjoyment of Uber’s goods, services, facilities, privileges,
3 advantages, and/or accommodations in violation of Title III of the ADA. Defendants have failed
4 to make reasonable modifications to their policies, practices, or procedures, provide auxiliary
5 aids and services, and remove barriers in order to afford full and equal access to their service to
6 Plaintiffs and members of the putative class.

7 114. Therefore, Plaintiffs are entitled to injunctive relief remedying the discrimination
8 under 42 U.S.C. § 12188. Unless the Court issues injunctive relief to halt Uber’s unlawful
9 practices, Plaintiffs will continue to suffer irreparable harm.

10 115. Plaintiffs are also entitled to reasonable attorneys’ fees, costs, and expenses.

11 116. WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for relief as set forth below.

12 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 Declaratory Relief on Behalf of Plaintiffs

14 117. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all foregoing and subsequent allegations as
15 though fully set forth herein.

16 118. An actual controversy exists between the parties. Plaintiffs contend, and are
17 informed and believe that Defendants deny, that by failing to adopt policies and practices that
18 make WAVs available through its service, Defendants are failing to comply with applicable
19 laws, including but not limited to Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §§
20 12181, *et seq.*

21 119. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time in order that the
22 parties may know their respective rights and duties and act accordingly.

23 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for the relief set forth below.

24 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

25 Based on the foregoing, Plaintiffs respectfully pray for relief as follows:

26 1. For an order certifying this case as a class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
27 Procedure 23(b)(2), and appointing Plaintiffs as the representatives of the Class and their counsel
28 as Class Counsel;

DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES
2001 CENTER STREET, FOURTH FLOOR
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94704-1204
(510) 665-8644

1 2. For an order finding and declaring that the acts and practices of Uber as set forth
 2 herein are unlawful, unfair, and violate the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12181,
 3 *et seq.*;

4 3. For a permanent injunction pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42
 5 U.S.C. §§ 12181, *et seq.*, to ensure that individuals who use wheelchairs, including Plaintiffs, are
 6 able to use Uber’s service on a basis that is full and equal to that which is available to other
 7 members of the general public;


8 4. For an award of attorneys’ fees, costs and expenses incurred in the filing and
 9 prosecution of this action, as authorized by 42 U.S.C. §12188; and

10 5. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

11
 12 DATED: January 10, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

13
 14 DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES

15
 16 
 17 _____
 18 Stuart Seaborn
 19 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES
 2001 CENTER STREET, FOURTH FLOOR
 BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94704-1204
 (510) 665-8644

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28