

CANADA

PROVINCE OF QUÉBEC  
DISTRICT OF MONTREAL

NO: 500-06-001224-233

(Class Action)  
SUPERIOR COURT

---

VALERIE [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Applicant

v.

**UBER TECHNOLOGIES INC.**, legal person  
having its head office at 1515 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, California, 94158, U.S.A.

and

**UBER RASIER CANADA INC.**, legal person  
66 Wellington Street West, Suite 5300, TD  
Bank Tower, Toronto, Ontario, M5K 1E6

and

**UBER PORTIER CANADA INC.**, legal person  
66 Wellington Street West, Suite 5300, TD  
Bank Tower, Toronto, Ontario, M5K 1E6

and

**UBER CASTOR CANADA INC.**, legal person  
66 Wellington Street West, Suite 5300, TD  
Bank Tower, Toronto, Ontario, M5K 1E6

Defendants

---

**AMENDED APPLICATION TO AUTHORIZE THE BRINGING OF A CLASS ACTION**  
**(ARTICLES 571 AND FOLLOWING C.C.P.)**

---

**TO ONE OF THE HONOURABLE JUDGES OF THE SUPERIOR COURT, SITTING IN  
AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTREAL, YOUR APPLICANT STATES:**

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Applicant wishes to institute a class action on behalf of the following class, of which she is a member, namely:

**Class:**

All persons in Quebec who, after cancelling their Uber Ride or Uber Eats (or after Uber initiated the cancellation) [...] were charged any amounts by Uber that were not precisely indicated in the contract [...];

(hereinafter referred to as the “**Class**”)

## II. CONDITIONS REQUIRED TO AUTHORIZE THIS CLASS ACTION (S. 575 C.C.P.):

### A) THE FACTS ALLEGED APPEAR TO JUSTIFY THE CONCLUSIONS SOUGHT:

2. The Applicant is a consumer within the meaning of Quebec’s *Consumer Protection Act* (the “**C.P.A.**”);
3. The Defendants are collectively referred to herein as “Uber”;
4. The Applicant uses Uber’s platform for its “ride” service, its “Uber Eats” service and its “delivery service. A copy of Uber’s Terms and Conditions for these services is communicated in English and French *en liasse* as **Exhibit P-1**;
5. The Applicant shares her account with her son who is a minor and who also uses these services. It is the Applicant’s credit card that is linked to this account and the Applicant who pays for the Uber services (the contract within the meaning of article 2 C.P.A. is between the Applicant and the Defendants);
6. On November 26, 2022, at **7:26 p.m.**, the Applicant’s son ordered an Uber ride, which he decided to cancel a few minutes later at **7:29 p.m.**, without ever entering the vehicle or meeting the driver, as it appears from the email confirmation sent by Uber and the Uber receipt communicated *en liasse* as **Exhibit P-2**;
7. However, Uber charged the Applicant’s credit card the amount of \$5.75 because of this cancellation, without ever providing the services, as seen in Exhibit P-2;
8. To put this into context, this is the equivalent of ordering a taxi back in the day, changing your mind and then the taxi company demanding \$5.75 as a fixed fee or penalty for *not* using their service;
9. This cancellation fee charged by Uber is illegal for three (3) reasons;
10. First, Uber always charges \$5.75 (which was increased to \$6.90 after the initial filing of this action) as a cancellation fee for Uber rides, meaning that its policy is

to charge a fixed amount of charges, which violates section 13 al.1 C.P.A. that stipulates:

<p><b>13.</b> Any stipulation requiring the consumer, upon the non-performance of his obligation, to pay a stipulated fixed amount or percentage of charges, penalties or damages, other than the interest accrued, is prohibited.</p>	<p><b>13.</b> Est interdite la stipulation qui impose au consommateur, dans le cas de l'inexécution de son obligation, le paiement de frais, de pénalités ou de dommages, dont le montant ou le pourcentage est fixé à l'avance dans le contrat, autres que l'intérêt couru.</p>
--	--

11. Second, Uber's Terms and Conditions (Exhibit P-1) fail to specify the amount of the cost/*frais*, which violates section 12 C.P.A. that stipulates:

<p><b>12.</b> No costs may be claimed from a consumer unless the amount thereof is precisely indicated in the contract.</p>	<p><b>12.</b> Aucuns frais ne peuvent être réclamés d'un consommateur, à moins que le contrat n'en mentionne de façon précise le montant.</p>
---	---

12. Third, and as it appears from Exhibit P-1, the language used by Uber is also misleading because it says that Uber "*may*" charge a cancellation fee, when, its policy and practice is to always charge the same cancellation fee in those Uber Ride situations (indeed, in its email communicated as Exhibit P-2 Uber states: "*To compensate drivers for the inconvenience, a fee is charged if you cancel a request 2 minutes after a driver accepts your ride. If you need to cancel a ride request, do so before the grace period to avoid a fee*"):

<p>You may elect to cancel your request for transportation services from a Third Party Provider at any time prior to such Third Party Provider's arrival, in which case <b>you may be charged a cancellation fee.</b> (Exhibit P-1)</p>	<p>Vous pouvez choisir d'annuler votre demande de services de transport d'un Fournisseur tiers à tout moment avant l'arrivée du Fournisseur tiers, auquel cas <b>des frais d'annulation peuvent vous être facturés.</b> (Exhibit P-1)</p>
---	---

13. The declaration reproduced in the preceding paragraph is misleading within the meaning of ss. 215, 219 and 228 C.P.A. because it is not that Class member "*may*" be charged, but *will* be charged;

14. Also, Uber never expressly mentions the amount of the cancellation fee anywhere in its contract, or even on its website. For instance, in the help section of its website, Uber repeats variations of the above and, shockingly, adds that a fee will also be charged if the driver cancels, Applicant disclosing the webpages *en liasse* as **Exhibit P-3**;

- 14.1 As such, Applicant is entitled to claim, on her behalf and on behalf of all Class Members, damages or a refund in the amount of the \$5.75 unlawfully charged by Uber pursuant to section 272(c) CPA;
15. Applicant is also entitled to claim punitive damages from Uber, in amount to be determined on the merits, because Uber is very well aware of its obligations under the C.P.A. and they have already been sanctioned in other jurisdictions concerning this specific clause and practice;
16. For instance, the Australian authorities fined Uber \$21 million for this reason, as it appears from the December 7, 2022 article titled “*Uber fined \$21 million over false cancellation fee message, inflated taxi prices*”, communicated as **Exhibit P-4**;
17. On December 7, 2022, Uber even publicly acknowledged its misleading cancellation practice by stating publicly on its website the following (<https://www.uber.com/en-AU/newsroom/uber-accc-settlement-finalised/>), as it appears from **Exhibit P-5**:

“We apologise to our riders for the mistakes we made, and we have since proactively made changes to our platform based on the concerns raised with us. This includes discontinuing the UberTAXI option in 2020 **and changing our cancellation messaging to make it clear exactly when cancellation charges will or will not apply**, so that riders always have certainty”.
18. The above is an admission by Uber that its terms and conditions are misleading. Yet, Uber continues to operate in Quebec with complete disregard for its own declarations and for the C.P.A., which is of public order;
19. It is also worth noting that when Uber cancels a ride or delivery, it of course does not pay a cancellation penalty or otherwise compensate its customers, thereby confirming the asymmetric and unfair nature of the impugned cancellation charge;
20. Applicant hereby claims compensatory damages or a refund in the amount of \$5.75 on her behalf and on behalf of every Class member per charge;
21. The Applicant also claims, on her behalf and on behalf of all Class members, punitive damages in an amount to be determined, for what can only be qualified as an intentional breach and egregious misconduct on Uber’s part;
22. A condemnation in punitive damages is appropriate given that Uber is aware of the legal issues, have publicly admitted that they were wrong, but continue to profit from this illegal practice for their financial gain and to the detriment of consumers;
- 22.1 Indeed, since the original filing of this action on February 21, 2023, Uber defiantly refused to update its contract to include the cancellation costs (Exhibit P-1) and, in

fact, increased the cancellation price from \$5.75 to \$6.90, which is the same cost every time a Class Member cancels an Uber ride;

23. Uber is a publicly traded company (NYSE: UBER) with a \$70 billion market cap and its patrimonial situation is significant;
24. Applicant's damages are a direct result of Uber' misconduct. In the circumstances, the Applicant is entitled to ask the Court to condemn Uber to both compensatory damages (or a refund) and punitive damages, in amounts to be determined on the merits, as well as for injunctive relief ordering Uber to cease the prohibited practice;

**B) THE CLAIMS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE CLASS RAISE IDENTICAL, SIMILAR OR RELATED ISSUES OF LAW OR FACT:**

25. The questions of fact and law raised and the recourse sought by this Application are identical with respect to each member of the Class, namely:
  - a) By charging a cancellation fee, does Uber violate Title I of the CPA (ss. 12 or 13), and, if so, are Class members entitled to a refund, compensatory or punitive damages pursuant to s. 272 CPA?
  - b) By charging a cancellation fee, does Uber violate Title II of the CPA (ss. 215, 219 and 228), and, if so, are Class members entitled to a refund, compensatory or punitive damages pursuant to s. 272 CPA?
  - c) Should an injunctive remedy be ordered to prohibit Uber from continuing to perpetrate its unfair, false, misleading, and/or deceptive conduct, as well as its concealment of important facts?
  - d) Did Uber act in bad faith?
  - e) When does prescription start for Class members and what is the effect of Uber's perpetuation of the misrepresentation on the starting point of prescription?

**C) THE COMPOSITION OF THE CLASS**

26. The composition of the Class makes it difficult or impracticable to apply the rules for mandates to take part in judicial proceedings on behalf of others or for consolidation of proceedings;
27. Applicant presumes that Uber has an important number of customers who were unlawfully charged the cancellation fee, including for its "ride" service, its "Uber Eats" service and its "delivery service". While unaware of the total number of Class members who are included in the Class, she estimates that it is likely in the hundreds of thousands (and some Class members were charged multiple times);
28. The names and addresses of all persons included in the Class are not known to the Applicant, however, are all in the possession of Uber;

29. Class members are numerous and are dispersed across the province;
30. These facts demonstrate that it would be impractical, if not impossible, to contact each and every Class member to obtain mandates and to join them in one action;
31. In these circumstances, a class action is the only appropriate procedure for all of the members of the Class to effectively pursue their respective rights and have access to justice without overburdening the court system;

**D) THE CLASS MEMBER REQUESTING TO BE APPOINTED AS REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF IS IN A POSITION TO PROPERLY REPRESENT THE CLASS**

32. The Applicant requests that she be appointed the status of representative plaintiff for the following main reasons:
  - a) She is a member of the Class and has a personal interest in seeking the conclusions that she proposes herein;
  - b) She is competent, in that she has the potential to be the mandatary of the action if it had proceeded under article 91 of the *Code of Civil Procedure*;
  - c) Her interests are not antagonistic to those of other Class members;
33. The Applicant adds that she participated in the filing of the present application and has a good understanding of the legal issue;
34. She is taking this action so that she and all Class members can be compensated (including by way of refunds of the cancellation charges), to hold Uber accountable and so Uber modifies its practice;

**III. DAMAGES**

35. Uber has breached several obligations imposed on it by legislation in Quebec, notably:
  - a) Quebec's C.P.A., including sections 12, 13, 215, 219, and 228, thus rendering section 272 applicable;
  - b) The failure to perform its contractual obligations in good faith, contrary to article 6, 7 and 1375 C.C.Q. and the Supreme Court of Canada's decisions.
36. In light of the foregoing, the following damages may be claimed against Uber:
  - a) compensatory damages or refunds in the aggregate of the cancellation fees unlawfully charged by Uber for its "ride" service, "Uber Eats" service and its "delivery service"; and
  - b) punitive damages in an amount to be determined on the merits for the breach of obligations imposed pursuant to s. 272 C.P.A.;

#### IV. NATURE OF THE ACTION AND CONCLUSIONS SOUGHT

37. The action that the Applicant wishes to institute on behalf of the members of the Class is an action in damages and injunctive relief;
38. The conclusions that the Applicant wishes to introduce by way of an originating application are:
  1. **GRANT** the Plaintiff's action against Defendants;
  2. **ORDER** the Defendants to cease from continuing their unfair, false, misleading, and/or deceptive conduct, as well as their concealment of important facts;
  3. **CONDEMN** the Defendants, solidarily, to pay to the members of the Class an amount to be determined in compensatory damages (by way of refunds in the aggregate amount of the cancellation fees unlawfully charged by Uber for its "ride" service, "Uber Eats" service and its "delivery service"), and **ORDER** collective recovery of these sums;
  4. **CONDEMN** the Defendants, solidarily, to pay to the members of the Class an amount to be determined in punitive damages, and **ORDER** collective recovery of these sums;
  5. **CONDEMN** the Defendants, solidarily, to pay interest and the additional indemnity on the above sums according to law from the date of service of the *Application to Authorize the Bringing of a Class Action*;
  6. **ORDER** the Defendants, solidarily, to deposit in the office of this Court the totality of the sums which forms part of the collective recovery, with interest and costs;
  7. **ORDER** that the claims of individual Class members be the object of collective liquidation if the proof permits and alternately, by individual liquidation;
  8. **CONDEMN** the Defendants, solidarily, to bear the costs of the present action including the cost of notices, the cost of management of claims and the costs of experts, if any, including the costs of experts required to establish the amount of the collective recovery orders;

#### V. PRESCRIPTION

39. In the present case, Uber should not be entitled to claim the benefit of prescription because they misled – and continue to mislead – Class members about the existence of the fee (see Exhibit P-1 for an example as recent as February 21, 2023);
40. It appears that these misrepresentations have been ongoing since the inception of Uber's services in the province of Quebec;

41. Uber is now the largest ride sharing service in the country, and where a professional reassures the client, the Court of Appeal has stated that the prescription starts at the moment when the confidence breaks. Applying this reasoning by analogy to the present case, most Class members are still unaware of the ongoing false representations and it is respectfully submitted that prescription should only start running once Uber ceases the unlawful practice;

## VI. JURISDICTION

42. The Applicant requests that this class action be exercised before the Superior Court in the district of Montreal, because she is a consumer and resides in this district.

### FOR THESE REASONS, MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT:

1. **GRANT** the present Application;
2. **AUTHORIZE** the bringing of a class action in the form of an originating application in damages and injunctive relief;
3. **APPOINT** the Applicant the status of representative plaintiff of the persons included in the Class herein described as:

All persons in Quebec who, after cancelling their Uber Ride or Uber Eats (or after Uber initiated the cancellation) [...] were charged any amounts by Uber that were not precisely indicated in the contract [...];

or any other class to be determined by the Court.

4. **IDENTIFY** the principle questions of fact and law to be treated collectively as the following:
  - a) By charging a cancellation fee, does Uber violate Title I of the CPA (ss. 12 or 13), and, if so, are Class members entitled to a refund, compensatory or punitive damages pursuant to s. 272 CPA?
  - b) By charging a cancellation fee, does Uber violate Title II of the CPA (ss. 215, 219 and 228), and, if so, are Class members entitled to a refund, compensatory or punitive damages pursuant to s. 272 CPA?
  - c) Should an injunctive remedy be ordered to prohibit Uber from continuing to perpetrate its unfair, false, misleading, and/or deceptive conduct, as well as its concealment of important facts?
  - d) Did Uber act in bad faith?



- e) When does prescription start for Class members and what is the effect of Uber's perpetuation of the misrepresentation on the starting point of prescription?
5. **IDENTIFY** the conclusions sought by the class action to be instituted as being the following:
1. **GRANT** the Plaintiff's action against Defendants;
  2. **ORDER** the Defendants to cease from continuing their unfair, false, misleading, and/or deceptive conduct, as well as their concealment of important facts;
  3. **CONDEMN** the Defendants, solidarily, to pay to the members of the Class an amount to be determined in compensatory damages (by way of refunds in the aggregate amount of the cancellation fees unlawfully charged by Uber for its "ride" service, "Uber Eats" service and its "delivery service"), and **ORDER** collective recovery of these sums;
  4. **CONDEMN** the Defendants, solidarily, to pay to the members of the Class an amount to be determined in punitive damages, and **ORDER** collective recovery of these sums;
  5. **CONDEMN** the Defendants, solidarily, to pay interest and the additional indemnity on the above sums according to law from the date of service of the *Application to Authorize the Bringing of a Class Action*;
  6. **ORDER** the Defendants, solidarily, to deposit in the office of this Court the totality of the sums which forms part of the collective recovery, with interest and costs;
  7. **ORDER** that the claims of individual Class members be the object of collective liquidation if the proof permits and alternately, by individual liquidation;
  8. **CONDEMN** the Defendants, solidarily, to bear the costs of the present action including the cost of notices, the cost of management of claims and the costs of experts, if any, including the costs of experts required to establish the amount of the collective recovery orders;
6. **DECLARE** that all members of the Class that have not requested their exclusion, be bound by any judgement to be rendered on the class action to be instituted in the manner provided for by the law;
7. **FIX** the delay of exclusion at thirty (30) days from the date of the publication of the notices to Class members, date upon which the members of the Class that have not exercised their means of exclusion will be bound by any judgement to be rendered herein;

8. **ORDER** the publication of a notice to the members of the Class in accordance with article 579 C.C.P. within sixty (60) days from the judgement to be rendered herein by e-mail to each Class member, to their last known e-mail address, with the subject line "Notice of a Class Action";
9. **THE WHOLE** with costs including publication fees.

Montreal, October 28, 2024

Montreal, October 28, 2024

*(s) Renno Vathilakis Inc.*

---

**RENNO VATHILAKIS INC.**

Mtre Michael E. Vathilakis

Attorney for the Applicant

145 St. Pierre Street, Suite 201

Montréal, Québec, H2Y 2L6

Telephone: (514) 937-1221

Fax: (514) 221-3334

Email: [mvathilakis@renvath.com](mailto:mvathilakis@renvath.com)

*(s) LPC Avocats*

---

**LPC AVOCATS**

Mtre Joey Zukran

Attorney for the Applicant

276 Saint-Jacques Street, Suite 801

Montréal, Québec, H2Y 1N3

Telephone: (514) 379-1572

Telecopier: (514) 221-4441

Email: [jzukran@lpclex.com](mailto:jzukran@lpclex.com)