

Exhibit A

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

ANCA ADAMS, individually and on behalf of all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMERICA’S TEST KITCHEN, INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. _____

Removal from:

Superior Court Division of the Trial
Court, Commonwealth of
Massachusetts

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441, and 1446, Defendant America’s Test Kitchen Inc. (“ATK”) hereby gives notice of removal of the action filed in the Superior Court Division of the Trial Court for Suffolk County, Commonwealth of Massachusetts captioned *Anca Adams v. America’s Test Kitchen, Inc.*, civil action number 2284-cv-01624-BLS2 (the “Action”), to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts. This Court has federal question jurisdiction over the Action because it purports to state a claim under the Video Privacy Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2710, and is therefore a “civil action[] arising under the . . . laws . . . of the United States,” 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), ATK provides the following statement of the grounds for removal:

BACKGROUND

1. On July 18, 2022, plaintiff Anca Adams (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself and a purported class, filed a complaint in the Action under docket No. 2284-cv-01624-BLS2 in Suffolk County Superior Court, Massachusetts naming ATK as the sole defendant (the “Complaint”).

2. ATK became aware of the Complaint on July 20, 2022, and ATK's counsel accepted electronic service of the Complaint on August 2, 2022..

3. The Complaint asserts one count against ATK, alleging a violation of the Video Privacy Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2710, resulting from the operations of ATK's website.

4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), copies of all process, pleadings, and orders served on ATK in the state court action are attached hereto as Exhibit A. A copy of the state court docket and all documents filed in the state court action is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

5. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391, 1441(a), and 1446(a) because the venue where the state court action was pending prior to removal is a state court within this federal district and division.

6. This Court has federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the Complaint's sole count alleges the violation of a federal law, and is therefore a "civil action[] arising under the . . . laws . . . of the United States." *Id.*

7. This Action is not an action with respect to which removal is prohibited pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1445.

I. THE COURT HAS FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION OVER THIS ACTION

8. A defendant may remove to federal court any civil action over which "the district courts of the United States have original jurisdiction." 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a).

9. Federal courts have jurisdiction over all "civil actions arising under the . . . laws . . . of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

10. The Complaint states one count against ATK for its purported "violations of the federal Video Privacy Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2710." Compl. at 1.

11. As alleged by the Complaint, the Video Privacy Protection Act is a federal law.

12. As a result, this Court has jurisdiction over the Action and removal is proper.

II. ALL OTHER REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS ARE SATISFIED

A. This Notice of Removal Is Timely

13. ATK became aware of the Complaint on July 20, 2022, and ATK's counsel accepted electronic service of the Complaint on August 2, 2022

14. ATK has not responded to the Complaint in state court.

15. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b)(1), this notice of removal is timely filed within 30 days of actual notice of the Complaint.

B. Notice

16. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), counsel for ATK certifies that, promptly after the filing of this Notice of Removal, they will give written notice thereof to Plaintiff's counsel and will file a copy of this Notice of Removal with the Suffolk County Superior Court.

17. Pursuant to District of Massachusetts Local Rule 81.1, counsel for ATK certifies that within 28 days after the filing of this Notice of Removal they will file certified or attested copies of the docket and all records or proceedings in the Suffolk County Superior Court action.

C. Filing Fee

18. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1914 and Local Rule 4.2, counsel for ATK certifies that they are paying the required filing fee in connection with filing this notice.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, ATK hereby removes this action from the Superior Court Division of the Trial Court for Suffolk County, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts.

Dated: August 15, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

Defendant America's Test Kitchen Inc.

By its attorneys,

/s/ Patrick T. Roath

Patrick T. Roath (BBO #690603)
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Prudential Tower, 800 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02199-3600
Telephone: (617) 951-7000
Patrick.Roath@ropesgray.com

Edward R. McNicholas (*pro hac vice*
application forthcoming)
Fran Faircloth (*pro hac vice* application
forthcoming)
ROPES & GRAY LLP
2099 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-6807
Telephone: (202) 508-4600
Edward.McNicholas@ropesgray.com
Fran.Faircloth@ropesgray.com

Exhibit A

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, ss

SUPERIOR COURT DEPARTMENT

Anca Adams, *individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,*

Plaintiff,

v.

AMERICA'S TEST KITCHEN, INC. a
Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

Case No.:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff Anca Adams, individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated persons (“Plaintiff”), brings this action against America’s Test Kitchen, LLC (“America’s Test Kitchen” or “Defendant”) for its violations of the federal Video Privacy Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2710 (“VPPA” or “the Act”). Plaintiff’s claims arise from Defendant’s practice of knowingly disclosing to a third party, Meta Platforms, Inc., formerly known as Facebook, Inc. (“Facebook”), “personally identifiable information” (“PII”) about the videos Plaintiff and similarly situated subscribers obtain from Defendant’s websites and applications (collectively “websites”). Plaintiff’s allegations are made on personal knowledge as to Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s own acts and upon information and belief as to all other matters.

NATURE OF THE CASE

1. This is a consumer privacy class action against America’s Test Kitchen, for disclosing its digital subscribers’ identities and the specific video materials they obtained from Defendant’s website to Facebook, in violation of the VPPA.

2. America’s Test Kitchen is “engaged in the business . . . of rental, sale, or delivery of prerecorded video cassette tapes or similar audiovisual materials,” thus bringing it within the VPPA’s definition of “video tape service provider.” 18 U.S.C. § 2710(a)(4). Specifically, America’s Test Kitchen operates a digital subscription service where subscribers may view the company’s cooking videos, among other cooking resources.

3. The VPPA prohibits “video tape service providers,” such as America’s Test Kitchen, from “knowingly disclos[ing]” consumers’ PII, including “information which identifies a person as having requested or obtained specific video materials or services from a video tape service provider.”

4. America’s Test Kitchen violates the VPPA by disclosing the specific videos its subscribers have requested or obtained to Facebook. Defendant discloses this information to Facebook using the “Facebook Pixel” or “Pixel”—a snippet of programming code America’s Test Kitchen chose to install on its websites that sends information to Facebook. In this case, the information shared with Facebook includes the subscriber’s Facebook ID (“FID”) coupled with the title of the video that the subscriber watched on the America’s Test Kitchen website.

5. A subscriber’s FID is a unique sequence of numbers linked to that individual’s Facebook profile. Entering “facebook.com/[FID]” into a web browser returns the Facebook profile of that particular person. Thus, the FID identifies a person more precisely than a name.

6. America’s Test Kitchen discloses the subscriber’s FID and viewing content to Facebook together in a single transaction. Because the subscriber’s FID uniquely identifies an individual’s Facebook account, Facebook—or any other person—can use the FID to quickly and easily locate, access, and view a particular subscriber’s corresponding Facebook profile. In

simplest terms, the Pixel installed by Defendant captures and discloses to Facebook what video a specific subscriber viewed on the America's Test Kitchen website.

7. On behalf of themselves and all similarly situated America's Test Kitchen subscribers, Plaintiff seeks an order enjoining America's Test Kitchen from further unauthorized disclosures of subscribers' PII; awarding liquidated damages in the amount of \$2,500 per violation, attorneys' fees, and costs; and granting any other preliminary or equitable relief the Court deems appropriate.

PARTIES

8. Plaintiff Anca Adams is a citizen and resident of the State of New York.

9. In the two years before this action was filed, Plaintiff used her Internet-connected device and web-browsing software ("browser") installed on that device to visit and watch video content on Defendant's website.

10. Defendant America's Test Kitchen is a Delaware Corporation with its headquarters in Massachusetts at 21 Drydock Ave., Ste. 210E Boston, MA 02110. America's Test Kitchen is registered to do business in Massachusetts.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

11. This Court has personal jurisdiction over America's Test Kitchen because it regularly conducts business throughout Massachusetts and has its principal place of business at 21 Drydock Ave., Ste. 210E Boston, MA 02110. M.G.L. c. 223A, § 2; M.G.L. c. 223A, § 3.

12. Venue is appropriate in this Court because America's Test Kitchen's principal place of business is in Suffolk County and the acts or conduct giving rise to the cause of action asserted herein took place in Suffolk County. M.G.L. c. 223, § 1.

COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. Background of the VPPA

13. With certain exceptions that are inapplicable here, the VPPA prohibits “a video tape service provider,” from “knowingly disclos[ing], to any person, personally identifiable information concerning any consumer of such provider[.]” 18 U.S.C. § 2710(b)(1).

14. The VPPA was passed in 1988 for the explicit purpose of protecting the privacy of individuals’ and their families’ video rental, purchase, and viewing data. Leading up to its enactment, members of the United States Senate warned that “[e]very day Americans are forced to provide to businesses and others personal information without having any control over where that information goes.” S. Rep. No. 100-599 at 7-8 (1988).

15. While these statements were true in 1988 when the VPPA was passed, the importance of legislation like the VPPA in the modern era of datamining is more pronounced than ever before. During a recent Senate Judiciary Committee meeting, “The Video Privacy Protection Act: Protecting Viewer Privacy in the 21st Century,” Senator Patrick Leahy emphasized that point by stating: “While it is true that technology has changed over the years, we must stay faithful to our fundamental right to privacy and freedom. Today, social networking, video streaming, the ‘cloud,’ mobile apps and other new technologies have revolutionized the availability of Americans’ information.”¹

16. In this case, Defendant chose to deprive Plaintiff and the Class members of that right by systematically disclosing their PII to Facebook.

¹ The Video Privacy Protection Act: Protecting Viewer Privacy in the 21st Century, Senate Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law, <https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/meetings/the-video-privacy-protection-act-protecting-viewer-privacy-in-the-21st-century>.

B. America's Test Kitchen Designed its Website to Disclose Users' PII, Including Video Viewing Activity, to Facebook.

17. America's Test Kitchen operates a website in the U.S. accessible from a desktop and mobile device at <https://www.americastestkitchen.com/>.

18. In programing its website, America's Test Kitchen installed the Facebook Pixel, thus making the knowing choice to track subscribers' PII and send it to Facebook.

19. America's Test Kitchen allows consumers to become digital subscribers to its cooking videos and content through its website. To subscribe, the consumer must provide his or her name, email address, billing address, and credit- or debit-card information.

20. After completing the subscription process and gaining access to Defendant's videos, America's Test Kitchen discloses to Facebook, through the Facebook Pixel, the FID of the subscriber and the specific video the subscriber viewed.

C. How America's Test Kitchen Discloses Digital Subscribers' PII.

21. Businesses like Defendant have the option of installing the Facebook Pixel on their websites. Doing so enables the business to collect information about how users interact with the business's website, such as whether they initiate purchases on the website, what items they look at, and, relevant here, the content the users view on a particular webpage.

22. The Facebook Pixel is a unique string of code businesses can embed on their websites allowing them to track consumers' actions and report the actions back to Facebook.

23. The Pixel can follow a consumer to different websites and across the Internet even after clearing of browser history.

24. The Pixel allows Facebook to build detailed profiles about a website's users as those users browse the web, so targeted advertisements can be served upon the users.²

25. To take advantage of advertising and information services offered by Facebook, Defendant programmed the America's Test Kitchen website to include a Facebook Pixel.

26. When an America's Test Kitchen subscriber watches videos on Defendant's website, the Pixel installed by Defendant sends to Facebook certain information about the viewer and what the viewer watched. Specifically, America's Test Kitchen sends to Facebook the video content name, its URL, and the subscriber's FID.

27. An FID is a unique and persistent identifier that Facebook assigns to each of its users. With it, anyone can look up the user's unique Facebook profile. Simply put, with only an FID and the video content name and URL—all which Defendant knowingly provides to Facebook—any ordinary person could learn the identity of the digital subscriber and the specific video or media content she requested on the America's Test Kitchen website.

28. Defendant could easily program its website so this information is not disclosed to Facebook.

29. At all relevant times, Defendant knew that the Facebook Pixel disclosed PII to Facebook. This is evidenced from, among other things, the functionality of the Pixel, including that the Pixels' sharing of information with Facebook enabled Defendant's website to show targeted advertising to its digital subscribers based on the content those digital subscribers had viewed on the website, including videos.

² The Markup, *How We Built a Meta Pixel Inspector*. <https://themarkup.org/show-your-work/2022/04/28/how-we-built-a-meta-pixel-inspector> (accessed 6/22/22).

30. As relevant here, America’s Test Kitchen disclosed to Facebook the video title and FID in a single transmission, through the Facebook Pixel as depicted below³:




Figure 1

31. In this example, Jane Vppa is watching Defendant’s video entitled “Italian Pasta Salad.”

³ For the purposes of demonstrating in this Complaint America’s Test Kitchen’s practice of sharing consumers personally identifying information, an exemplary account for “Jane Vppa” was created and utilized.

32. The FID is displayed in the “c_user” code. In this example the code is 100082948383940:




Figure 2

33. In this example, the disclosure of the FID is coupled with the title of the video the subscriber watched along with the URL for the video:




Figure 3

34. Any person can specifically identify the user viewing the “Italian Pasta Salad” video by simply entering “facebook.com/100082948383940” into their search bar:




Figure 4

35. Upon pressing enter or search, the following page automatically appears:




Figure 5

36. America's Test Kitchen violates the VPPA by knowingly disclosing subscribers' FIDs, together with their viewing content, to Facebook.

PLAINTIFF-SPECIFIC ALLEGATIONS

37. Plaintiff Anca Adams is an America's Test Kitchen subscriber and a Facebook user. She has been an America's Test Kitchen subscriber since 2016.

38. Ms. Adams consistently paid America's Test Kitchen a subscription fee each year since 2016.

39. Ms. Adams watched video content through her America's Test Kitchen subscription many times in the two years preceding the filing of this action.

40. Plaintiff has had a Facebook account since approximately 2004. America's Test Kitchen disclosed to Facebook her FID coupled with the title of the videos she watched and the URLs to access those videos.

41. Each time Defendant disclosed her PII to Facebook, it violated her rights under the VPPA.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

42. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit under the Rules 23(a) and (b) of the Massachusetts Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of the following Class:

All persons in the United States who subscribed to America's Test Kitchen, viewed video content on a website or application operated by America's Test Kitchen, and used Facebook during the time Facebook's Pixel was active on America's Test Kitchen.

43. The "Class Period" is from July 13, 2020, to the present.

44. Excluded from the Class is Defendant, any controlled person of Defendant, as well as the officers and directors of Defendant and the immediate family members of any such person. Also excluded is any judge who may preside over this cause of action and the immediate family members of any such person. Plaintiff reserves the right to modify, change, or expand the Class definition based upon discovery and further investigation.

45. **Numerosity:** The Class consists of at least hundreds of individuals, making joinder impractical.

46. **Commonality and Predominance:** Common questions of law and fact exist with regard to the claim and predominate over questions affecting only individual Class members.

Questions common to the Class include:

- A. Whether America's Test Kitchen knowingly disclosed Plaintiff's and Class members' PII to Facebook;
- B. Whether America's Test Kitchen's conduct violates the Video Privacy Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2710; and

C. Whether America’s Test Kitchen should be enjoined from disclosing Plaintiff’s and Class members’ PII.

47. **Typicality:** Plaintiff’s claims are typical of the claims of the Class members in that Plaintiff, like all Class members, has been injured by America’s Test Kitchen’s misconduct—disclosing consumers’ PII to Facebook.

48. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff has retained counsel with substantial experience in prosecuting complex litigation and class actions, including privacy-protection cases. Plaintiff does not have any interests antagonistic to those of the Class.

49. **Superiority:** A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce America’s Test Kitchen to comply with federal law. Moreover, because the amount of each individual Class member’s claim is small relative to the complexity of the litigation, and because of America’s Test Kitchen’s financial resources, Class members are unlikely to pursue legal redress individually for the violations detailed in this complaint. A class action will allow these claims to be heard where they would otherwise go unheard because of the expense of bringing individual lawsuits, and provides the benefits of adjudication, economies of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court.

CAUSE OF ACTION
Violation of the Video Privacy Protection Act
18 U.S.C. § 2710

50. Plaintiff incorporates and realleges the above factual allegations by reference.

51. The VPPA prohibits a “video tape service provider” from knowingly disclosing “personally identifying information” concerning any “consumer” to a third-party without the

“informed, written consent (including through an electronic means using the Internet) of the consumer.” 18 U.S.C. § 2710.

52. As defined in 18 U.S.C. § 2710(a)(4), a “video tape service provider” is “any person, engaged in the business, in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of rental, sale, or delivery of prerecorded video cassette tapes or similar audiovisual materials[.]” America’s Test Kitchen is a “video tape service provider” as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 2710(a)(4) because it is engaged in the business of delivering audiovisual materials that are similar to prerecorded video cassette tapes and those sales affect interstate or foreign commerce.

53. As defined in 18 U.S.C. § 2710(a)(1), a “‘consumer’ means any renter, purchaser, or subscriber of goods or services from a video tape service provider.” As alleged above, Plaintiff and Class members are subscribers to Defendant’s service of providing video content. Thus, Plaintiff and Class members are “consumers” under this definition.

54. As defined in 18 U.S.C. § 2710(a)(3), “‘personally identifiable information’ includes information which identifies a person as having requested or obtained specific video materials or services from a video tape service provider.”

55. America’s Test Kitchen knowingly disclosed Plaintiff’s and Class members’ PII—specifically, their FIDs and the title and URL of the videos they requested or obtained—to Facebook.

56. This information constitutes personally identifiable information under 18 U.S.C. § 2710(a)(3) because it identified Plaintiff and each Class member to Facebook as an individual who viewed Defendant’s video content, including the specific video materials watched on Defendant’s website. Indeed, anyone with an FID could identify the individual associated with it simply by entering “facebook.com/[FID]” into a web browser.

57. Defendant never obtained from Plaintiff, or any Class member informed, written consent. More specifically, Defendant never obtained from Plaintiff or any Class member informed, written consent in a form distinct and separate from any form setting forth other legal or financial obligations of the consumer; Defendant never obtained from Plaintiff or any Class member informed, written consent that, at the election of the consumer, was given at the time the disclosure is sought or was given in advance for a set period of time, not to exceed two years or until consent is withdrawn by the consumer, whichever is sooner; and Defendant never provided an opportunity, in a clear and conspicuous manner, for Plaintiff or any Class member to withdraw consent on a case-by-case basis or to withdraw consent from ongoing disclosures, at the consumer's election. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 2710(b)(2).

58. Defendant's disclosures were made knowingly, as it programmed the Facebook Pixel into its website code, knowing that Facebook would receive video titles and the subscriber's FID when a subscriber watched a video.

59. By disclosing Plaintiff's and Class members' PII, America's Test Kitchen violated Plaintiff's and Class members' statutorily protected right to privacy in their video-watching habits. 18 U.S.C. § 2710(c).

60. As a result of these violations, America's Test Kitchen is liable to Plaintiff and Class members.

61. On behalf of herself and all members of the Class, Plaintiff seeks to enjoin Defendant's disclosures of PII; liquidated damages in the amount of \$2,500 per Class member; reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; and all other preliminary or equitable relief the Court deems appropriate. 18 U.S.C. § 2710(c)(2)(A).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, respectfully requests that the Court:

- i. Certify this case as a class action, and appoint Plaintiff as Class Representative and the undersigned attorneys as Class Counsel;
- ii. Enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff and the Class;
- iii. Enjoin Defendant's future disclosures of Plaintiff's and Class members' PII;
- iv. Award Plaintiff and Class members liquidated damages they are entitled to under the VPPA;
- v. Award Plaintiff and Class members pre- and post-judgment interest as provided by law;
- vi. Award Plaintiff and Class members reasonable litigation expenses and attorneys' fees as permitted by law; and
- vii. Award such other and further relief as the Court deems necessary and appropriate.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Massachusetts Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Plaintiff demands a trial by jury of all issues triable as of right.

Dated: July 13, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Elizabeth Ryan

Elizabeth Ryan (BBO No. 549632)

BAILEY & GLASSER LLP

176 Federal Street, 5th Floor

Boston, MA 02110

(617) 439-6730

(617) 951-3954 Fax

eryan@baileyglasser.com

Joseph Henry (Hank) Bates, III
(*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
CARNEY BATES & PULLIAM, PLLC
519 W. 7th Street
Little Rock, AR 72201
(501) 312-8500
(501) 312-8505 Fax
hbates@cbplaw.com

Exhibit B

2284CV01624 Adams, Anca vs. America's Test Kitchen, Inc.

- Case Type:
- Business Litigation
- Case Status:
- Open
- File Date
- 07/18/2022
- DCM Track:
- B - Special Track (BLS)
- Initiating Action:
- Other Complex Commercial Actions
- Status Date:
- 07/18/2022
- Case Judge:
-
- Next Event:
-

[All Information](#) [Party](#) [Docket](#) [Disposition](#)

Party Information

Adams, Anca
- Plaintiff

Alias

Party Attorney

- Attorney
- Ryan, Esq., Elizabeth A
- Bar Code
- 549632
- Address
- Bailey and Glasser LLP
- 176 Federal St
- 5th Floor
- Boston, MA 02110
- Phone Number
- (617)439-6730

[More Party Information](#)

America's Test Kitchen, Inc.
- Defendant

Alias

Party Attorney

[More Party Information](#)

Docket Information

| <u>Docket Date</u> | <u>Docket Text</u> | <u>File Ref Nbr.</u> | <u>Image Avail.</u> |
|--------------------|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 07/18/2022 | Complaint electronically filed. | 1 | Image |
| 07/18/2022 | Civil action cover sheet filed. | 2 | Image |
| 07/21/2022 | General correspondence regarding Notice of Acceptance into Business Litigation Session. This case is assigned to BLS 2 (dated 7/19/22) notice sent 7/21/11 | 3 | Image |
| 07/26/2022 | Docket Note: One summon by mail | | |

Case Disposition

| <u>Disposition</u> | <u>Date</u> | <u>Case Judge</u> |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Pending | | |

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service 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. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Anca Adams

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Unknown (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Elizabeth Ryan, Bailey & Glasser LLP; Hank Bates, Carney Bates & Pulliam, PLLC

DEFENDANTS

America's Test Kitchen Inc.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant New Castle County, DE (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

Patrick T. Roath, Ropes & Gray LLP

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff, 2 U.S. Government Defendant, 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party), 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)

- Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, PTF DEF, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

Table with columns: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, CIVIL RIGHTS, TORTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES. Includes various legal categories like Personal Injury, Property Damage, Labor, etc.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding, 2 Removed from State Court, 3 Remanded from Appellate Court, 4 Reinstated or Reopened, 5 Transferred from Another District, 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer, 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a); 18 U.S.C. § 2710

Brief description of cause:

Removal from state court of complaint purporting to bring a class action claim for violation of Video Privacy Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2710

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ 2,500 / member CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: [X] Yes [] No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

August 15, 2022 /s/ Patrick T. Roath, Ropes & Gray LLP

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

1. Title of case (name of first party on each side only) Anca Adams v. America's Test Kitchen, Inc.

2. Category in which the case belongs based upon the numbered nature of suit code listed on the civil cover sheet. (See local rule 40.1(a)(1)).

- I. 160, 400, 410, 441, 535, 830*, 835*, 850, 880, 891, 893, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT.
- II. 110, 130, 190, 196, 370, 375, 376, 440, 442, 443, 445, 446, 448, 470, 751, 820*, 840*, 895, 896, 899.
- III. 120, 140, 150, 151, 152, 153, 195, 210, 220, 230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 360, 362, 365, 367, 368, 371, 380, 385, 422, 423, 430, 450, 460, 462, 463, 465, 480, 485, 490, 510, 530, 540, 550, 555, 560, 625, 690, 710, 720, 740, 790, 791, 861-865, 870, 871, 890, 950.
*Also complete AO 120 or AO 121. for patent, trademark or copyright cases.

3. Title and number, if any, of related cases. (See local rule 40.1(g)). If more than one prior related case has been filed in this district please indicate the title and number of the first filed case in this court.

4. Has a prior action between the same parties and based on the same claim ever been filed in this court?
YES NO

5. Does the complaint in this case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affecting the public interest? (See 28 USC §2403)

YES NO

If so, is the U.S.A. or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party?

YES NO

6. Is this case required to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuant to title 28 USC §2284?

YES NO

7. Do all of the parties in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ("governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule 40.1(d)).

YES NO

A. If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside?

Eastern Division Central Division Western Division

B. If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside?

Eastern Division Central Division Western Division

8. If filing a Notice of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If yes, submit a separate sheet identifying the motions)

YES NO

(PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT)

ATTORNEY'S NAME Patrick T. Roath

ADDRESS Ropes & Gray LLP, 800 Boylston St., Boston, MA 02199

TELEPHONE NO. 617-235-4674