

MAR 16 2018

Case No. S241434  
**IN THE SUPREME COURT  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Jorge Navarrete Clerk

---

Deputy

EDUARDO DE LA TORRE and LORI SAYSOURIVONG,  
individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  
*Plaintiffs/Petitioners,*

v.

CASHCALL, INC.,  
*Defendant/Respondent,*

---

On Certified Questions from The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit  
Pursuant to California Rule of Court 8.548  
Ninth Circuit Case Nos. 14-17571, 15-15042

---

**PETITIONERS' CONSOLIDATED ANSWER TO AMICUS CURIAE BRIEFS IN  
SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT**

---

JAMES C. STURDEVANT (SBN 94551)  
jsturdevant@sturdevantlaw.com  
THE STURDEVANT LAW FIRM  
A Professional Corporation  
4040 Civic Center Drive, Suite 200  
San Rafael, CA 94903  
Telephone: (415) 477-2410  
Facsimile: (415) 492-2810

STEVEN M. TINDALL (SBN 187862)  
smt@classlawgroup.com  
ANDRE M. MURA (SBN 298541)  
amm@classlawgroup.com  
GIBBS LAW GROUP LLP  
505 14th Street, Suite 1110  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Telephone: (510)350-9700  
Facsimile: (510) 350-9701

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs/ Petitioners  
(Additional Counsel for Plaintiffs/Petitioners listed on the following page)*

Case No. S241434  
**IN THE SUPREME COURT  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

---

EDUARDO DE LA TORRE and LORI SAYSOURIVONG,  
individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  
*Plaintiffs/Petitioners,*

v.

CASHCALL, INC.,  
*Defendant/Respondent,*

---

On Certified Questions from The United States Court of Appeals for the  
Ninth Circuit  
Pursuant to California Rule of Court 8.548  
Ninth Circuit Case Nos. 14-17571, 15-15042

---

**PETITIONERS' CONSOLIDATED ANSWER TO AMICUS CURIAE  
BRIEFS IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT**

---

JAMES C. STURDEVANT (SBN  
94551)  
jsturdevant@sturdevantlaw.com  
THE STURDEVANT LAW FIRM  
A Professional Corporation  
4040 Civic Center Drive, Suite 200  
San Rafael, CA 94903  
Telephone: (415) 477-2410  
Facsimile: (415) 492-2810

STEVEN M. TINDALL (SBN  
187862)  
smt@classlawgroup.com  
ANDRE M. MURA (SBN 298541)  
amm@classlawgroup.com  
GIBBS LAW GROUP LLP  
505 14th Street, Suite 1110  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Telephone: (510)350-9700  
Facsimile: (510) 350-9701

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs/ Petitioners  
(Additional Counsel for Plaintiffs/Petitioners listed on the following page)*

JESSICA RIGGIN (SBN 281712)  
jriggin@rukinhyland.com  
RUKIN HYLAND LLP  
1939 Harrison St., Ste. 290  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Telephone: (415) 421-1800  
Facsimile: (415) 421-1700

DAMON M. CONNOLLY (SBN  
139779)  
damon@damonconnollylaw.com  
LAW OFFICES OF DAMON M.  
CONNOLLY  
1000 4<sup>TH</sup> Street, #600  
San Rafael, CA 94901  
Telephone: (415) 256-1200

ARTHUR D. LEVY (SBN 95659)  
arthur@yesquire.com  
LAW OFFICE OF ARTHUR D.  
LEVY  
1814 Franklin Street, Suite 1040  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Telephone: (415) 702-4551  
Facsimile: (415) 814-4080

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**INTRODUCTION..... 1**

**ARGUMENT..... 2**

**I. CRITICISMS OF THE UNCONSCIONABILITY DOCTRINE ARE IRRELEVANT BECAUSE THE LEGISLATURE HAS ALREADY DETERMINED THAT THE DOCTRINE APPLIES TO EXCESSIVE INTEREST RATES.....2**

**II. THE CLAIMS OF UNCONSCIONABILITY IN THIS CASE ARE NOT VAGUE OR AMBIGUOUS AND DO NOT REQUIRE THE COURTS TO ENGAGE IN “ECONOMIC POLICYMAKING.” ..... 11**

**III. APPLYING THE UNCONSCIONABILITY DOCTRINE TO CASHCALL’S LOANS WOULD NOT IMPAIR ACCESS TO NEEDED CREDIT..... 15**

**IV. CALIFORNIA’S UCL AUTHORIZES AFFIRMATIVE RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS OF PREDICATE STATUTES..... 21**

**CONCLUSION..... 23**

## TABLE OF AUTHORITES

### Cases

<i>Baltazar v. Forever 21, Inc.</i> , (2016) 62 Cal.4th 1237 .....	13
<i>Bank of the West v. Superior Court</i> , (1992) 2 Cal.4th 1254 .....	22
<i>Cel-Tech Communications v. Los Angeles Cellular Telephone Co.</i> , (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 163 .....	12, 22
<i>Kwikset Corp. v. Superior Court</i> , (2011) 51 Cal. 4th 310 .....	22
<i>Mcghee v. Arkansas State Board of Collection</i> , (Ark. 2008) 289 S.W.3d 18 .....	17
<i>Perdue v. Crocker Nat'l Bank</i> , (1985) 38 Cal.3d 913 .....	5, 7, 14
<i>Rose v. Bank of America, N.A.</i> , (2013) 57 Cal.4th 390 .....	21
<i>Solus Industrial Innovations, LLC v. Superior Court</i> , (2018) 4 Cal.5th 316 .....	22
<i>Sonic-Calabasas A, Inc. v. Moreno</i> , (2013) 57 Cal. 4th 1109 .....	13

*State ex rel. King v. B&B Inv. Grp., Inc.,*

(N.M. 2014) 329 P.3d 658..... 16

*Stop Youth Addiction v. Lucky Stores,*

(1998) 17 Cal.4th 553 ..... 22

*Tennessee Valley Auth. v. Hill,*

(1978) 437 U.S. 153 ..... 4

**Statutes**

10 U.S.C. § 987 ..... 18

Civil Code section 1670.5..... passim

Fin. Code, § 23035..... 16

Fin. Code, §§ 22000..... 1, 16

Financial Code section 22302..... passim

Financial Code section 22303 ..... 3

Financial Code §§ 23000 ..... 16

Health & Safety Code, §§ 127400-127462..... 10

**Rules**

California Rule of Court 8.548 ..... 1

Court Rule 33.1(d) ..... 25

**Regulations**

32 CFR, Part 232..... 18

**Other Authorities**

*Cost-Benefit Analysis of Financial Regulations: A Response to Criticisms,*  
(2015) 124 Yale L. J. Forum 246. (CJAC Brief p. 24.) ..... 18

*Interest Rate Caps, State Legislation and Public Opinion: Does the Law  
Reflect the Public’s Desires?,* (Jan. 2014) 89 Chicago-Kent L. Rev.  
115 ..... 25

*Rate Regulation at the Crossroads of Usury and Unconscionability,*  
(1994) 31 Hous. L. Rev. 721 ..... 8

Senate Bill 447 ..... 8

Uniform Consumer Credit Code § 5.108 ..... 5

## INTRODUCTION

The two amicus curiae briefs<sup>1</sup> in support of Respondent CashCall, Inc., seek to convince this Court that it would be wise policy to permit lenders to charge excessive interest rates on loans of \$2500 or more that are governed by the California Finance Lenders Law. (Fin. Code, §§ 22000 *et seq.*; all undesignated statutory references are to this Code.) These amici argue that lenders are already highly regulated; that authorizing courts to declare interest rates unconscionable would subject lenders to vague standards; and that judicial application of California’s settled law of unconscionability will leave both lenders and consumers worse off.

These arguments are not only wrong, they are misdirected. The California Legislature has already expressly granted courts the authority to determine whether a loan contract specifying an excessive interest rate on a loan of \$2500 or more can render the loan unconscionable. The plain language of Sections 22302 and 22303 demonstrates this legislative intent, and the legislative history confirms it. The policy arguments of CashCall’s amici cannot eradicate the statutory text.

/ / /

/ / /

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs refer to the brief in support of CashCall submitted by the Civil Justice Association of California and the California Chamber of Commerce as the “CJAC Brief,” and the brief in support of CashCall submitted by the California Financial Service Providers Association, Financial Service Centers of America, Community Financial Services Association of America and Online Lenders Alliance as the “CFSP Brief.”



## ARGUMENT

### I. **CRITICISMS OF THE UNCONSCIONABILITY DOCTRINE ARE IRRELEVANT BECAUSE THE LEGISLATURE HAS ALREADY DETERMINED THAT THE DOCTRINE APPLIES TO EXCESSIVE INTEREST RATES.**

CashCall's amici devote considerable attention to criticizing the unconscionability doctrine as unsuitable to govern interest rates, and they suggest that access to credit will be diminished if lenders cannot charge excessive interest rates on loans of \$2500 or more. First, these criticisms are directly refuted by Plaintiffs' amici, who include the Center for Responsible Lending. (*See* Ctr. for Responsible Lending *et al.* Br. p. 37.) Even more critically, however, the California Legislature rejected these criticisms of the unconscionability doctrine when it “expressly directed courts to engage in unconscionability analysis *three times*: (a) in enacting Civil Code section 1670.5; (b) in amending the [Consumers Legal Remedies Act] to prohibit unconscionable consumer contracts; and (c) in enacting Financial Code section 22302.” (Cal. Attorney General Br. 25-26 (emphasis in original); *see id.* at p. 15 (noting the Legislature “rejected the contention that unconscionability is too vague”).)

As for the narrow issue of statutory interpretation before this Court, neither of CashCall's amici says much. The brief of the California Financial Service Providers Association, Financial Service Centers of America, Community Financial Services Association of America, and Online Lenders Alliance (together, “CFSP”) simply assumes that Section 22302 does not apply to the loans

at issue here. Hence, its discussion of “extensive regulation” of the loans in question under federal and state law fails even to mention Section 23302 as a form of regulation. (CFSP Br. pp. 14-17.)

For its part, the Civil Justice Association of California and the California Chamber of Commerce (together, “CJAC”) suggest it would be absurd to read Section 22302 to authorize courts to determine that interest rates are unconscionable. (*See* CJAC Br. p. 12.) To the contrary, applying the plain meaning of Section 22302 yields no absurd result. It would simply recognize that the unconscionability doctrine applies to consumer finance lenders—just as it does *all other* lenders. (Cal. Attorney General Br. p. 18.)

CJAC also reads Section 22302 to apply to all loan terms except interest rates. (CJAC Br. p. 12.) But the language of Section 22302 does not support that reading (Petitioners’ Reply Br. p. 10)—a conclusion also reached by the California Attorney General.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The Attorney General agrees with Petitioners that Section 22302 applies to interest rates. In a footnote, however, the Attorney General misunderstands Petitioners to say “that a hypothetical loan for less than \$2,500 with an interest rate under the limits in the Financial Code section 22303 could never be unconscionable.” (Cal. Attorney General Br. p. 16 n.4). In this hypothetical, Plaintiffs had in mind the approach stated in the Uniform Commercial Credit Code. *Cf.* Uniform Consumer Credit Code § 5.108, comment 6 (“Subsection (8) prohibits a finding that a charge or practice expressly permitted by this Act is in itself unconscionable. However, even though a practice or charge is authorized by this Act, the *totality* of a particular creditor’s conduct or loan terms may show that the practice or charge is part of an unconscionable determination. Therefore, in determining unconscionability, the creditor’s total conduct, including that part of

Contrary to the approach of CashCall’s amici, an “appraisal of the wisdom or unwisdom of a particular course consciously selected by the [Legislature] is to be put aside in the process of interpreting a statute. Once the meaning of an enactment is discerned . . . the judicial process comes to an end.” (*Tennessee Valley Auth. v. Hill* (1978) 437 U.S. 153, 194.). That meaning is discerned by the statutory text, and it is confirmed by legislative history. In section 22302, the Legislature declared that section 1670.5 “applies to the provisions of a loan contract that is subject to this division,” and nowhere did it exempt “interest rates” from such “provisions.” In doing so, the Legislature reaffirmed that the unconscionability doctrine applies to excessive interest rates, and it “strengthen[ed]” penalties for lenders that charge unconscionable interest. (Cal. Attorney General Br. p. 15.) This is consistent with the Legislature’s longstanding view that the unconscionability doctrine may be applied to govern consumer contracts and financial products, and that courts are well-equipped to determine unconscionability.

CashCall’s amici nevertheless claim that applying the unconscionability statute to CashCall’s loans would authorize judicial rate caps. (CFSP Br. p. 28.) To the contrary, unconscionability is a far broader and more searching consumer protection doctrine. Unlike simple rate caps, the unconscionability doctrine applies to *all* loan terms, including, but not limited to interest rates, and requires

---

his conduct which is in accordance with the provisions of this Act, may be considered.”) (emphasis added).

courts to examine loan terms factually, in their commercial setting and according to their practical effect, under the well-recognized standards the courts have long established. (Ctr. for Responsible Lending *et al.* Br. pp. 4-7, 9-22.)

As this Court has recognized in discussing the “price unconscionability doctrine,”<sup>3</sup> unconscionability “regulate[s] not only the sale of bank services but the sale of groceries, automobiles, furniture or medical services.” (*Perdue v. Crocker Nat’l Bank* (1985) 38 Cal.3d 913, 943.) Petitioners are unaware of any industry or transaction the Legislature or the courts have exempted from section 1670.5 since its enactment nearly 40 years ago. Neither CashCall nor its amici cite any such exemptions. By enacting Section 23302, the Legislature eliminated any doubt that by lowering the rate caps, it was not granting an unconscionability exemption to the subprime installment lending industry. This Court should reject the industry’s attempt to obtain from this Court what the Legislature has denied.

CJAC asks “Why, one should reasonably ask of such an interpretation, would the Legislature set detailed rates for loans under \$2500 while setting no maximum interest rate charges for loans above that amount, but delegate to the judiciary unbridled authority to set whatever rates it feels under the circumstances is ‘conscionable’ or ‘unconscionable’?” (CJAC Br. p. 13.) The Department of Corporations answered this question in its Enrolled Bill Report in 1985, confirming that although it was lowering the interest-rate ceiling it was also

---

<sup>3</sup> Cal. Attorney General Br. pp. 8-13; Consumer Amici Brief pp. 7-12.

*“preserving the consumer protection provisions of all laws.”* (CashCall RJN Ex. 4 (p. 76 of 90.) (emphasis added).) These “consumer protection provisions” included the unconscionability doctrine expressly invoked in Section 22302. This statutory construction of the relationship between Sections 22302 and 22303 is reasonable, consistent, and readily reconciles the two provisions. It is controlling. (Petitioner’s Opening Br. p. 7; Cal. Attorney General Br. pp. 15-19.)<sup>4</sup>

CJAC also asks “And why would the financial lending community support a bill — SB 447 (1985), which it indisputably did — that delegated such immense, uncabined authority to courts to enjoin and order restitution or disgorgement to all borrowers who entered into loan contracts above \$2500?” (CJAC Br. pp. 13-14.) The legislative history, however, shows that the original bill was amended on July 15, 1985 to add new section 23302 in response to the Attorney General’s objection that the industry’s version of the bill failed to protect borrowers against “exorbitant rates.” (Petitioners’ RJN Ex. “D”.) The intent of the Legislature is revealed by the statute the Legislature actually passed, not by what the “lending community” might be supposed to have supported.

CashCall’s amici echo CashCall’s central theme that by imposing rate caps on loans below \$2500, the Legislature intended to leave interest on other consumer loans under the CFL to the free market. (Respondent’s Answer Br. pp.

---

<sup>4</sup> Contrary to CJAC, this approach also makes good sense. Whereas lenders can structure loans so as to “skirt” specific regulations, “unconscionability is more resistant to evasion.” (Bender, *Rate Regulation at the Crossroads of Usury and Unconscionability* (1994) 31 Hous. L. Rev. 721, 739.)

28-29.) These amici claim there is a “highly competitive” market for subprime installment loans in California. (CFSP Br. pp. 11-13; CJAC Br. pp. 17-19.)

Even if there were a competitive market for these loans, however, that does not exempt the loans from the unconscionability statute. This Court has provided perhaps the best rebuttal to amici’s claim that “free market” transactions are exempt from the unconscionability law:

Defendant also argues that underlying both the 1980 and 1982 Acts is the philosophy that service charges as well as interest rates should be set by market forces, not government regulation. Defendant’s argument mistakes the purpose of the provisions of state law at issue here [including § 1670.5]. Those provisions are part of the common law governing *all* commercial transactions; they regulate not only sale of bank services but the sale of groceries, automobiles, furniture or medical services. The duty of good faith and fair dealing, *and protection against unconscionable contracts*, has never been thought incompatible with a free and competitive market. *Defendant is really asking for a market free of those restraints against oppression and overreaching applicable to all other commercial operations.*

(*Perdue*, 38 Cal. 3d at 943 (emphasis added).)

Amici’s assertions of a competitive market are nevertheless unsubstantiated by the record. The DBO report CFSP cites in support of this claim, in fact, does not evidence competition in this particular market. (CFSP Br. pp. 11-12; *see also* CJAC Br. pp. 18-19.) The 2016 DBO Report shows that state-licensed lenders made 400,000 unsecured loans in the \$2,500-5,000 range in 2016, and that 60% of those had APRs of 100% or higher. But the CBO reports do not report the number of different lenders that made these loans, what relative market shares were, or otherwise indicate whether the market was competitive, monopolistic, or

oligopolistic. Loan volume, standing alone, does not establish whether a market is concentrated or competitive because there could be many lenders or few; the DBO reports simply do not say.

In any event, the evidentiary record in the District Court demonstrated that CashCall was the only significant source of such loans during the class period in this case, 2004-2011. (See Suppl. Excerpts of Record (“SER”), 1-SER-pp. 16-17, 181-184; 10-SER-pp. 2505-2506; 2508-2509; 11-SER-2719.) Indeed, CashCall’s CFO testified that during the class period that CashCall had a “unique” product and faced “no competitors:”

*Q. You state that, “It’s a unique product offering [CashCall’s \$2,500 installment loan] with high customer demands.” Why did you feel it’s a unique product offering?*

*A. There’s still no other product out there that is an installment loan that’s based on a simple interest calculation, no prepayment penalty. It distinguishes itself amongst — it’s not a payday loan, it’s not a normal bank loan, it’s the niche in between.*

*Q. What other companies have occupied that niche with CashCall?*

*A. I believe the last point of the page says, “No competitors.”*

*Q. Oh, okay. Is that still the case?*

*A. There --*

MR. COHEN: Objection; calls for a legal conclusion and speculation. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: *There are some minor players in the space that are offering installment-based loans.*

Q. BY MR. LEVY: When did they come into the space?

A. I don't recall. It would have been after this point. After the market came back [that is, after the close of the class period in July 2011].

(10-SER-pp. 2508-2509 (emphasis added).)

CFSP asserts that the triple-digit interest rates “are tempered by consumers’ ability to go elsewhere.” (CFSP Br. p. 13.) Yet CFSP asserts, without support, that “[s]ubprime borrowers rely on the challenged loans because they lack alternatives.” (*Id.* at p. 18.) In opposing CashCall’s summary judgment motion, Petitioners showed that payday loans, tax refund anticipation loans, auto title loans, pawnshop loans, etc., are not comparable to CashCall’s \$2,500 installment loans because they are not unsecured loans with loan amounts and maturities comparable to CashCall’s loans. (Petitioners’ Ninth Circuit Reply Br. pp. 35-36.) This lack of alternatives, coupled with CashCall’s market dominance during the class period from June 2004 through mid-July 2011, establishes an oligopolistic market in which CashCall was able to dictate loan terms and interest rates. (*Id.* at pp. 35-36, 45-46.)



CFSP argues that “the risk of judicially imposed caps would force borrowers into worse options” (CFSP Br. p. 21), such as paying bills late, bouncing checks with accompanying NSF fees, bank account closures, utility service interruption, and foregoing needed medical treatment<sup>5</sup> (*Id.* at pp. 21-24). CFSP, however, ignores that by lending to subprime borrowers at 96% and 135% interest rates payable over 42 and 36 months, CashCall converted low- or non-interest-bearing debt into unaffordable debt, costing 3-4 times the amount borrowed. (Excerpts of Record (“ER”) 111; SER 23, 280-281, 352, 1482, 1493-1494.)

CashCall applied a 35-40% “acceptable default rate” in underwriting its \$2,500 loans, and the actual default rate during the class period was nearly half, 45%. (SER 21, 290-291, 492-493, 2425-2427, 2435-2437, 2443-2445, 2450-2451.) CashCall loans subjected defaulting borrowers to the same economic hardships CFSP claims to bemoan—paying other bills late to appease CashCall, incurring NSF fees to CashCall and bank accounts due to CashCall’s squeeze on their bank accounts (exacerbated by CashCall’s requirement that borrowers authorize CashCall to take payments electronically directly from the borrower’s bank accounts), bank account closures due to drainage by CashCall, and potentially unpaid utility bills. (*See generally* Petitioners’ Opening Br. p. 4.)

---

<sup>5</sup> California requires hospitals and other health care providers to provide discounted “charity care” low-income consumers and a payment plan. (Health & Safety Code, §§ 127400-127462.)

Amici's arguments boil down to the assertion that it is better policy for consumers to be burdened with unconscionable loans—loading unaffordable debt on already financially distressed individuals and families, and subjecting them to aggressive collection activity from CashCall, bank account sweeps, and CashCall's negative credit reporting that makes it even more difficult to qualify for new credit—than to have no loans at all (which is by no means a necessary, nor even a likely, result of Petitioners' position). By enacting section 22302, the Legislature rejected Amici's suggested abdication of the courts' traditional role in determining unconscionable practices. CashCall's amici are the ones urging “economic policy” on the courts.

**II. THE CLAIMS OF UNCONSCIONABILITY IN THIS CASE ARE NOT VAGUE OR AMBIGUOUS AND DO NOT REQUIRE THE COURTS TO ENGAGE IN “ECONOMIC POLICYMAKING.”**

Both CJAC and CFSP assert that the class claims of unconscionability in this case are vague, ambiguous, or both. For example, CJAC asserts that the “standard of unconscionability” itself is “vague and amorphous.” (CJAC Br. p. 22; *see generally* pp. 22-26.) CFSP characterizes the Court's role in assessing unconscionable contracts as “ad hoc judicial second-guessing of interest rates,” to create the ruse of uncertainty for lenders. (CFSP Br. pp. 17-18.)

Amici make no principled attempt to ascertain the intent of the Legislature in enacting sections 22302 and 22303. Instead, they invite this Court to disregard that intent entirely by suggesting that the Legislature acted unwisely in subjecting

interest rates to judicial scrutiny under section 1670.5. (CFSP Br. pp. 17-18; CJAC Br. pp. 22-26.) Amici’s “economic policymaking” arguments are thinly-veiled requests for this Court to simply ignore section 22302 on policy grounds.

Nevertheless, amici’s arguments are unsupported and without merit. CFSP relies on a quote from *Cel-Tech Communications v. Los Angeles Cellular Telephone Co.* (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 163, 185. (CFSP Br. p. 17.) But *Cel-Tech* was not an unconscionability case, and the mandates of Financial Code section 22302 and Civil Code section 1670.5 were not before the *Cel-Tech* Court. *Cel-Tech* was addressing the “unfairness” prong of the UCL, but no such claim is being made in this case. The claim in this case is instead brought under the “unlawful” prong of the UCL, which this Court has consistently construed as authorizing “borrowing” a violation of any law as a predicate for an “unlawful” business practice. (See pp. 21-22, *infra*.)

The amicus brief from the California Attorney General directly refutes amici’s assertion that the unconscionability claim under California law is vague or rudderless:

As the legislative history for Civil Code section 1670.5 shows, the Legislature considered unconscionability to have a “well-understood meaning” based on “[a] multitude of cases.” (See *ante* p. 15.)

Respondent’s view of unconscionability as “a vague and malleable” concept (see Def.’s Answer Br. at 10) is not shared by the Legislature,

which rejected the same arguments when enacting Civil Code section 1670.5.

(Cal. Attorney General Br. p. 25; *see also* pp. 8-12 (“price unconscionability” doctrine); 13-15 (legislative history of §1670.5).)

This Court has consistently and faithfully applied that “well-understood meaning” to section 1670.5 in its jurisprudence since 1979, when the statute was enacted and codified the common law doctrine. (*See, e.g., Baltazar v. Forever 21, Inc.* (2016) 62 Cal.4th 1237, 1243-1245 (reviewing general principles of unconscionability); *Sonic-Calabasas A, Inc. v. Moreno* (2013) 57 Cal. 4th 1109, 1153 (*Sonic II*).)

The Consumer Amici Brief demonstrates exhaustively that over the course of centuries, the unconscionability rules have been applied to pricing cases and have developed the same “well-understood” meaning as section 1670.5 has in California. (Ctr. For Responsible Lending *at al.* Br. pp. 24-29; *see also* pp. 13-18, 31-41.) The cited sources, individually and in combination, squarely refute the bald suggestion by CashCall’s amici that section 1670.5 is untethered and incapable of understanding by business entities and courts alike.

CJAC claims that interest rate unconscionability requires a “cost benefit analysis” because that is “the favored means of evaluating financial regulations governing interest rates ....” (CJAC Brief p. 24.) CJAC cites no case law to support this claim. None of this Court’s cases cites “cost benefit analysis” as a factor to be considered in adjudicating whether one or more price terms is

substantively unconscionable. (*E.g., Perdue, supra*, 38 Cal.3d at 926-927; *see also* Ctr. For Responsible Lending *at al.* Br. pp. 21-24 (identifying and discussing the factors identified in *Perdue*.)

CJAC goes on to state that cost-benefit analysis “[w]ould logically apply when courts try to regulate interest rates based on unconscionability,” citing and quoting from Posner and Weyl, *Cost-Benefit Analysis of Financial Regulations: A Response to Criticisms* (2015) 124 Yale L. J. Forum 246. (CJAC Brief p. 24.) But there is nary a word about unconscionability in that article. And there is no mention there of courts or anything having to do with unconscionability adjudication. The article is exclusively about the cost-benefit analysis of financial regulation using bank capital requirements as its prime example. (*Cost-Benefit Analysis of Financial Regulations, supra*, 124 Yale L.J. at p. 248.) It was written to refute the criticisms of the leading critic of the authors’ theory that financial regulators should use cost benefit analysis to evaluate financial regulations. (*Id.* at p. 246.)

In sum, the doctrine of unconscionability, which section 1670.5 codified and delegated exclusively to “the courts” for application, is a long-established and well-developed *judicial* doctrine, and does not reflect “economic policymaking,” as both CashCall and its amici contend. The amici supporting Petitioners persuasively refute the suggestion that courts should abstain from adjudicating legitimate claims of price unconscionability. (Cal. Attorney General Br. pp. 25-26; Ctr. For Responsible Lending *at al.* Br. pp. 31-41.)

### **III. APPLYING THE UNCONSCIONABILITY DOCTRINE TO CASHCALL'S LOANS WOULD NOT IMPAIR ACCESS TO NEEDED CREDIT.**

CashCall asserts that borrowers will be deprived of needed credit if these loans could be held unconscionable. CFSP makes the same assertion but offers neither data nor argument to support its theory. (CFSP Brief pp. 17-25.) Rather, CFSP's argument is based entirely on *payday lending* data, and it echoes the claims of payday lenders, who make high-cost, very short-term loans without regard to borrowers' ability to repay them. Not only does this case not involve payday loans—which consist of very small dollar amounts and very short term loans unlike CashCall's at issue here with loan terms of 42 and 36 months—but there has also been no data showing impaired access to needed credit in states that have affirmed the remedy that Petitioners seek here.

First, CFSP does not cite any study concluding that applying unconscionability law would impair access to the installment loans at issue here—\$2,500 or more loans payable not in 31 days, but over three to four years at sustained interest rates of well over 100%. Conspicuously, CFSP provides the Court no evidence of any impact on installment lending in other states where the unconscionability laws have been applied to loans like CashCall's. (*See* Ctr. For Responsible Lending *et al.* Br. p. 28, n. 29 (reporting that the unconscionability doctrine has been applied to consumer lending in at least 14 states, including

Alabama, Colorado, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming).) “Despite the application of the unconscionability doctrine to interest rates in these states, the consumer lending industry apparently remains sufficiently profitable to continue operating in each of them.” (*Id.*)

Nor does CFSP cite any evidence of credit foreclosure in New Mexico, where the Supreme Court in *State ex rel. King v. B&B Inv. Grp., Inc.* (N.M. 2014) 329 P.3d 658, 672, held that the elimination of interest rate caps did not displace the application of state unconscionability law to high-cost signature loans.

Nevertheless, even as to payday loans, CFSP’s arguments are unavailing. In California, payday loans are regulated by the Deferred Deposit Transaction Law (Financial Code §§ 23000 *et seq.*), not by the CFL (Financial Code §§ 22000 *et seq.*). In California, a payday loan (a “deferred deposit transaction”) is the deferral of the deposit of a customer’s personal check, not to exceed \$300, for up to 31 days. (Fin. Code, § 23035.) The fee for a payday loan cannot exceed 15% of the face amount of the check. (*Id.*, § 23036, subd. (a).)

CFSP’s assertions with respect to payday loans are negated by the fact that fifteen states and the District of Columbia have effectively prohibited high-cost payday lending by instituting interest rate caps of 36% or less, and studies show

that borrowers have not been deprived of needed credit or suffered other adverse consequences that CFSP claims would result.<sup>6</sup>

Similarly, in 2008, the Arkansas Supreme Court shut down payday lending in the state, holding that a state law authorizing payday lending violated the state constitution's usury cap of 17%. (*Mcghee v. Arkansas State Board of Collection* (Ark. 2008) 289 S.W.3d 18.) Lenders argued to the Supreme Court that banning the loans would diminish access to needed credit. (*Id.* at p. 28.)

In a survey seven years later, former payday borrowers reported results similar to those in North Carolina: that in the years following the Supreme Court's decision they employed other strategies to meet cash shortfalls, and that they were better off without the high-cost loans. (Meredith Covington & Jennifer Johnson, *Into the Light: A Survey of Arkansas Borrowers Seven Years after State Supreme Court Bans Usury Payday Lending Rates*, Southern Bancorp Community Partners (April 2016) pp. 5-6).<sup>7</sup>)

---

<sup>6</sup> For example, a study commissioned by the North Carolina Commissioner of Banks after that state eliminated payday lending concluded that the absence of payday loans had no significant impact on the availability of credit in North Carolina and identified an array of financial options that low- and moderate-income individuals used during a financial shortfall. (Ctr. for Community Capital, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, *North Carolina Consumers After Payday Lending: Attitudes and Experiences with Credit Options* (Nov. 2007) p. 1.) These options included formal alternatives, such as the use of a credit card or cash advance, and informal assistance such as help from friends and family. The study found that nearly nine out of ten households surveyed thought that payday lending was a bad thing, and this overwhelmingly negative view of the product did not vary significantly for households that had experienced a financial shortfall.

<sup>7</sup> Available at [http://southernpartners.org/pp/PP\\_V43\\_2016.pdf](http://southernpartners.org/pp/PP_V43_2016.pdf)



The Department of Defense (“DoD”) similarly rejected the claim by high-cost lenders that limiting interest rates on loans to service members to 36% would deny access to needed credit. The regulations implementing the 36% rate cap in the Military Lending Act (10 U.S.C. § 987) initially covered short-term payday loans exclusively, but subsequent studies of the harms associated with other credit products persuaded DoD, in 2015, to extend the cap to include larger, longer-term high-cost loans like those at issue here. (Department of Defense, *Limitations on Terms of Consumer Credit Extended to Service Members and Dependents: Final Rule* (July 22, 2015) 32 CFR, Part 232.<sup>8</sup>) In making this determination, the DoD relied on substantial evidence showing that the harms associated with loans above the 36% interest rate threshold caused more harm than benefit. For example, financial counselors and legal assistance attorneys surveyed by DoD “said high cost of credit was often a major factor contributing to problems experienced by their clients.”

When asked about applying a 36% APR cap beyond payday loans to cover consumer loans more generally, “the overwhelming majority said that the loss of access to credit above that threshold would not be detrimental.” (Department of Defense, *Report: Enhancement of Protections on Consumer Credit for Members*

---

<sup>8</sup> Available at <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-07-22/pdf/2015-17480.pdf>.

*of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents* (April 2014) p. 2.<sup>9</sup>) Likewise, the vast majority (88%) of military service members surveyed said they would not be inconvenienced by the loss of access to high-interest loans. (*Id.* at p. 11.)

Public polling consistently demonstrates a strong bipartisan consensus against excessively high interest-rate loans.<sup>10</sup> Every time voters have been given the opportunity, they have voted to cap interest rates at 36% per year or less.

---

<sup>9</sup> Available at [https://consumerfed.org/pdfs/140429\\_DoD\\_report.pdf](https://consumerfed.org/pdfs/140429_DoD_report.pdf).

<sup>10</sup> For example, a 2016 poll found nearly nine out of ten (89%) Coloradans opposed a proposal to raise the maximum rate allowed on a \$3,000 loan from 28% to 36%. The poll revealed little partisan difference on this issue. *See* [http://www.responsiblelending.org/sites/default/files/nodes/files/research-publication/crl\\_colorado\\_inst\\_polling\\_memo\\_may2016\\_0.pdf](http://www.responsiblelending.org/sites/default/files/nodes/files/research-publication/crl_colorado_inst_polling_memo_may2016_0.pdf) Similarly, a 2015 poll of likely North Carolina voters found “nearly monolithic” opposition to a proposal to allow consumer finance lenders to charge over 60% interest. Fully 93% opposed, including 88% of Republicans, 89% of Independents and 98% of Democrats. *See* [http://responsiblelending.org/media-center/press-releases/pdf/nc\\_lending\\_memo\\_07april2015.pdf](http://responsiblelending.org/media-center/press-releases/pdf/nc_lending_memo_07april2015.pdf). Likewise, a 2015 poll of Iowa Republicans found that roughly three-quarters (74%) supported limiting interest rates on payday loans to 36%. By an even higher margin (78%), respondents supported requiring payday loan lenders to first determine the borrower’s ability to pay back the loan without defaulting on or delaying other expenses. *See* <http://pos.org/about-us/leadership/glen-bolger-va/>. A poll of voters in Rhode Island, the only New England state to permit payday lending, found that 76% supported capping interest rates at 36%. *See* Press Release: R.I. Office of the Gen. Treasurer, *Coalition, Raimondo, Taveras Raise Awareness on Payday Lending Pitfalls* (Apr. 17, 2012) (reporting poll results), <http://www.ri.gov/press/view/16334>. A poll of residents of San Jose, California found that 63% would favor a moratorium on issuing new licenses to payday lenders in San Jose, <http://www.responsiblelending.org/research-publication/san-jose-payday-lending-poll>. *See also* Timothy E. Goldsmith & Natalie Martin, *Interest Rate Caps, State Legislation and Public Opinion: Does the Law Reflect the Public’s Desires?* (Jan. 2014) 89 *Chicago-Kent L. Rev.* 115, 129 (“Even in New Mexico, where there generally are no interest rate caps, the general public overwhelmingly favors caps.”).

(NCLC, *Why 36%*, *supra*, at p. 4.) This strong public sentiment cuts across party lines.

Most recently, in 2016 in South Dakota, voters overwhelmingly elected to impose a 36% interest rate cap. The measure won with three-quarters of voters' approval as voters rejected high-cost lenders' claims to be providing needed credit, as CashCall claims here. (Dana Ferguson, *Payday Lenders Flee South Dakota After Rate Cap*, *Courier Journal* (Jan. 6, 2017).<sup>11</sup>) Similar measures have also succeeded in Arizona and Montana (*see* Center for Responsible Lending, *Shark Free Waters: States are Better off Without Payday Lending* (Aug. 2016, updated Sept. 2017) p. 2),<sup>12</sup> and in Ohio voters implemented an annual rate cap of 28%. (*Id.*; *see also* NCLC, *Why 36%*, *supra*, at p. 4.)

It is clear that subprime installment lending at triple-digit interest continues to trouble the conscience of the nation. Amici present the Court with no study supporting the claim that applying unconscionability law to CashCall's installment loans would have any adverse impact on consumer credit. Even viewing the cited literature in the light most favorable to the industry's position, the study results are

---

<sup>11</sup> Available at <https://www.courierjournal.com/story/news/politics/2017/01/06/payday-lenders-flee-sd-after-rate-cap/96103624/>.

<sup>12</sup> Available at <http://www.responsiblelending.org/sites/default/files/nodes/files/research-publication/crl-shark-free-waters-aug2016.pdf>.

at best mixed with respect to payday loans—an entirely different loan product than those at issue here.

And, even if the result of adopting Petitioners’ position was fewer unconscionable loans—which no evidence suggests would be the case—this is a *policy* argument, not a *statutory construction* argument. The Legislature resolved California public policy in favor of applying section 1670.5 to CFL loans by enacting section 22302. (*See* pp. 2-11, *supra*.) This Court cannot change that legislative determination.

This Court should reject amici’s invitation to arrive at a “right policy” for CFL loans of \$2,500 or more. The Legislature already declared that policy by enacting section 22302, and changing that policy is beyond the purview of the courts.

#### **IV. CALIFORNIA’S UCL AUTHORIZES AFFIRMATIVE RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS OF PREDICATE STATUTES.**

CJAC argues that consumers may not assert a claim for affirmative injunctive and restitutionary relief under the UCL predicated on section 1670.5 because that statute only applies defensively. (CJAC Br. pp. 15-17.)

CJAC is mistaken. “By proscribing ‘any unlawful’ business practice, ‘[the UCL] ‘borrows’ violations of other laws and treats them as unlawful practices’ that the [UCL] makes independently actionable.” (*Rose v. Bank of America, N.A.* (2013) 57 Cal.4th 390, 396 (internal quotation marks omitted).)

This Court has repeatedly—and very recently—reaffirmed the holding that the remedies authorized by the UCL are cumulative to any and all others provided by law. (*Solus Industrial Innovations, LLC v. Superior Court* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 316, 341; *see also Stop Youth Addiction v. Lucky Stores* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 553, 566.) “[B]y borrowing requirements from other statutes, the UCL does not serve as a mere enforcement mechanism. It provides its own distinct and limited equitable remedies for unlawful business practices, using other laws only to define what is ‘unlawful.’” (*Solus*, 4 Cal.5th at 341)

This Court has also repeatedly reaffirmed the breadth of the UCL:

[T]he Legislature framed the UCL’s substantive provisions in “‘broad, sweeping language’” (*Cel-Tech Communications, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Telephone Co.* (1999) 20 Cal.4th 163, 181 [83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 973 P.2d 527]; *see also Bank of the West v. Superior Court* (1992) 2 Cal.4th 1254, 1266 [10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 538, 833 P.2d 545] [“The Legislature intended this ‘sweeping language’ to include “‘anything that can properly be called a business practice and that at the same time is forbidden by law.’” ”]) and provided “courts with broad equitable powers to remedy violations .” (citation omitted).

(*Kwikset Corp. v. Superior Court* (2011) 51 Cal. 4th 310, 320.)

In summary, then, a party can seek any remedy authorized by the UCL for violations of any predicate law. That is precisely what the Petitioners have done in this case. They seek injunctive and restitutionary relief under the UCL for CashCall’s installment loans, the terms of which they claim violate section 22302 and Civil Code section 1670.5. Contrary to CJAC’s argument, the claims of unconscionability in this case are solidly grounded in this Court’s jurisprudence interpreting the UCL.

## CONCLUSION


CashCall's two amici do not present any principled argument addressed to the statutory construction issue this Court certified for decision. Instead, they make a policy argument that subprime installment lending should be exempt from judicial scrutiny under the unconscionability statute because the market is self-regulating. The Legislature, however, determined otherwise when it enacted section 23302.

Nor do these amici cite to any evidence demonstrating that if the unconscionability of CashCall's loans is judicially determined in this case, low-income borrowers will be worse off. Finally, they make no persuasive argument against the fundamental and longstanding view that the unconscionability doctrine, which the Legislature codified in Section 1670.5, cannot be used as a predicate for relief under the UCL.

For all these reasons, Petitioners urge the Court to answer the Ninth Circuit's question in the affirmative and remand this case back to that Court.

Dated: November 30, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
James C. Sturdevant

JAMES C. STURDEVANT (SBN  
94551)  
[sturdevant@sturdevantlaw.com](mailto:sturdevant@sturdevantlaw.com)

THE STURDEVANT LAW FIRM  
A Professional Corporation  
4040 Civic Center Drive, Suite 200  
San Rafael, CA 94903  
Telephone: (415) 477-2410  
Facsimile: (415) 492-2810

STEVEN M. TINDALL (SBN 187862)  
smt@classlawgroup.com  
ANDRE M. MURA (SBN 298541)  
amm@classlawgroup.com  
GIBBS LAW GROUP LLP  
505 14th Street, Suite 1110  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Telephone: (510)350-9700  
Facsimile: (510) 350-9701

JESSICA RIGGIN (SBN 281712)  
jriggin@rukinhyland.com  
RUKIN HYLAND LLP  
1939 Harrison St., Ste. 290  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Telephone: (415) 421-1800  
Facsimile: (415) 421-1700

ARTHUR D. LEVY (SBN 95659)  
arthur@yesquire.com  
LAW OFFICE OF ARTHUR D. LEVY  
1814 Franklin Street, Suite 1040  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Telephone: (415) 702-4551  
Facsimile: (415) 814-4080

DAMON M. CONNOLLY (SBN  
139779)  
damon@damonconnollylaw.com  
LAW OFFICES OF DAMON M.  
CONNOLLY  
1000 4<sup>TH</sup> Street, #600  
San Rafael, CA 94901  
Telephone: (415) 256-1200

**CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT**

I certify that the document contains 6,255 words, excluding the parts of the document that are exempted by Supreme Court Rule 33.1(d).

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on March 16, 2018.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Steven/M. Tindall



**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I am employed in the county of Alameda, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is: 505 14th Street, Suite 1110, Oakland, California 94612.

On March 16, 2018, I served a copy of the foregoing documents described as follows:


**PETITIONERS' CONSOLIDATED ANSWER TO AMICUS CURIAE BRIEFS IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT**

on the following interested party(ies) in this action:

Jessica Riggin RUKIN HYLAND LLP 1939 Harrison St., Ste. 290 Oakland, CA 94612	Damon M. Connolly Law Offices of Damon M. Connolly 1000 4 <sup>th</sup> Street, #600 San Rafael, CA 94901
Arthur D. Levy Law Office of Arthur D. Levy 1814 Franklin Street, Ste. 1040 Oakland, CA 94612	Beth E. Terrell Terrell Marshall Law Group LLC 936 North 34th Street, Ste. 300 Seattle, WA 98103
Brad W. Seiling Donald S. Brown Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP 11355 West Olympic Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90064	Center for Responsible Lending 1970 Broadway, Ste. 350 Oakland, CA 94612
Ted Mermin 3130 Shattuck Ave. Berkeley, CA 94705	Michael J. Quirk Williams Cuker Berezofsky, LLC 1515 Market Street, Suite 1300 Philadelphia, PA 19102
James C. Sturdevant The Sturdevant Law Firm 4040 Civic Center Dr., Ste. 200 San Rafael, CA 94903	

[X] BY MAIL: by placing the document(s) listed above for collection and mailing following the firm's ordinary business practice in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid for deposit in the United States mail at Oakland, California addressed as set forth above.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on March 16, 2018 in Oakland, California.

  
Renée Byndloss

