Clerk of the Superior Court
*** Electronically Filed ***
M. Bouise, Deputy
9/24/2020 10:55:49 AM
Filing ID 12035966

Craig J. Rosenstein, Esq. (024766)
ROSENSTEIN LAW GROUP, PLLC
6929 North Hayden Road, Suite C4-410
Scottsdale, Arizona 85250
Telephone: (480) 248-7666
Facsimile: (480) 946-0681
Attorney for Plaintiff

ARIZONA SUPERIOR COURT

MARICOPA COUNTY

JANE DOE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

TRAVIS PAUL GRANT and MARIEL LIZETTE GRANT, husband and wife; KYLE DAVID GRANT and JANE DOE GRANT, husband and wife, and XYZ Corporations,

Defendants.

Case No. CV2020-055202

VERIFIED COMPLAINT
(Tier Two)

Jury Trial Demanded

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff resides in Maricopa County, Arizona.

2. Defendants are mugshot website operators who reside in, and operate businesses in, Florida. Defendants own and operate mugshot websites including www.rapsheets.org, www.rapsheetz.com, www.bailbondsearch.com, www.bailbondshq.com, and www.publicpolicerecord.com (the "Websites") as defined by A.R.S. § 44-790(4). Pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-7902(A), Defendants transact business in Arizona.

3. Venue and jurisdiction are proper in this Court.

4. Based on the characteristics of this action, this case should be assigned Tier 2 pursuant to Rule 26.2(b)(2).

5. The damages in this case are not liquidated, but they are no less than $50,000 and no more than $74,000.

6. On October 20, 2018, the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office (the "Sheriff's Office") arrested Plaintiff for suspicion of violating Arizona law.

7. Following the arrest, the Sheriff's Office photographed Plaintiff. The Sheriff's Office made the photograph (the "Mugshot") publicly available on a government website.

8. Defendant's Websites are privately-owned, publicly-available websites that post mugshots and other criminal justice information about various people without their consent, who have been arrested. The Websites generate income and Defendants utilize the Websites for commercial purposes and pecuniary gain.

9. Since at least October 20, 2018, Defendants, without Plaintiff's permission, consent or authorization, published Plaintiff's criminal justice records (the "Records") and Mugshot on the Websites.

10. Despite Plaintiff's multiple demands that Defendants remove this information, Defendants refuse to do so.

11. The public nature of the Websites and public availability of Plaintiff's Mugshot and Records has and continues to cause harm to Plaintiff, including unwanted publicity and ramifications for Plaintiff's employment.

COUNT ONE

(Violation of A.R.S. §§ 44-7901-7902)

12. Defendants published Plaintiff's Mugshot and Records on a publicly available internet website in violation of A.R.S. §§ 44-7901-7902.

13. As a result, Plaintiff suffered damages that she will prove at trial, which are no less than $50,000 and no more than $74,000.

COUNT TWO

(Misappropriation of Name and Likeness)

14. Defendants appropriated Plaintiff's name and likeness for pecuniary gain to increase revenue for its Websites.

15. Plaintiff is easily identified from the publication of the Mugshot and Records on the Websites.

16. Defendants benefited from the publication because the publication of mugshots and criminal records for pecuniary gain is the Websites' very purpose.

17. As a result, Plaintiff suffered damages that she will prove at trial, which are no less than $50,000 and no more than $74,000.

COUNT THREE

(False Light)

18. Defendants gave publicity to a matter in an easily accessible public forum concerning Plaintiff that places Plaintiff in a false light. Specifically, by posting the Mugshot and Records, Defendants' websites imply that Plaintiff did something wrong and is guilty of a crime.

19. Plaintiff did not consent, authorize, or agree that Defendants could post this information about her.

20. The false light in which Plaintiff was placed would be highly offensive to a reasonable person.

21. Defendants know or recklessly disregarded the false light in which Plaintiff is placed due to the publication of the Mugshot and Records on the Websites.

22. As a result, Plaintiff suffered damages that she will prove at trial, which are no less than $50,000 and no more than $74,000.

COUNT FOUR

(Injunctive Relief)

23. Defendants' unauthorized publication of Plaintiff's Mugshot and Records has wrongfully caused Plaintiff continued and unwanted publicity that places her in a false light.

24. Every day that the Mugshot and Records remain posted on the Websites continue to harm Plaintiff's reputation and good name.

25. Plaintiff's remedies at law are inadequate.

26. Public policy favors an injunction in this matter requiring Defendants to remove the Mugshot and corresponding criminal justice records.

27. Injunctive relief is necessary to prevent further harm and will not disrupt the status quo.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

THEREFORE, Plaintiff requests the following relief:

A. An Order granting Plaintiff an injunction and directing that Defendants immediately remove the Mugshot and Records.

B. Compensatory damages or statutory damages in an amount no less than $50,000 and no more than $74,000.

C. Any further relief, in equity, which the Court deems appropriate.

DATED: September 24th, 2020.

ROSENSTEIN LAW GROUP, PLLC

By: /s/CriagRosenstein
Craig J. Rosenstein, Esq.
Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

STATE OF ARIZONA)
)
COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

JANE DOE, deposes and says as follows:

1. I am the Plaintiff in the above-entitled action.

2. I have read and know the contents of the foregoing Complaint.

3. The information contained in the Complaint is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Jane Doe
JANE DOE, PLAINTIFF

9-22-20
Date