

**STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF CLAIMS**

KLIMENT MILANOV, TRENTEN
INGELL, and all others who are
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN and
THE REGENTS OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 20-_____-MK

HON. _____

FINK BRESSACK

David H. Fink (P28235)
Darryl Bressack (P67820)
Nathan J. Fink (P75185)
*Counsel for Plaintiffs and the
Proposed Classes*
38500 Woodward Ave., Suite 350
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304
Telephone: (248) 971-2500
dfink@finkbressack.com
dbressack@finkbressack.com
nfink@finkbressack.com

ALLEN BROTHERS PLLC

James P. Allen, Sr. (P52885)
*Counsel for Plaintiffs and the
Proposed Classes*
400 Monroe St., Suite 620
Detroit, Michigan 48226
Telephone: (313) 962-0581
jamesallen@allenbrotherspllc.com

EVANGELISTA WORLEY LLC

James Evangelista (*PHV Forthcoming*)
David Worley (*PHV Forthcoming*)
*Counsel for Plaintiffs and the
Proposed Classes*
500 Sugar Mill Road
Building A, Suite 245
Atlanta, Georgia 30350
Telephone: (404) 205-8400
jim@ewlawllc.com
david@ewlawllc.com

THERE IS NO PENDING OR RESOLVED CIVIL ACTION ARISING OUT OF THE TRANSACTION OR OCCURRENCE ALLEGED IN THIS COMPLAINT.

VERIFIED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs KLIMENT MILANOV and TRENTEN INGELL (“Plaintiffs”), by and through their counsel, bring this action against the Defendants THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN and THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN (collectively “Defendants” or the “University”) on behalf of themselves and those similarly situated, and make the following allegations based on information, attorney investigation, and belief, except as to the allegations pertaining to the Plaintiffs personally, which are founded on their respective knowledge.

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiffs bring this case against Defendants to demand remediation of the Defendants’ refusal to provide restitution for tuition, room and board, fees, and other applicable costs after the Plaintiffs and similarly situated students were sent home from the University of Michigan (the “University”) due to the Novel Coronavirus Disease of 2019 (“COVID-19”) pandemic. As a result of this refusal, the Plaintiffs and similarly situated students lost the benefits of in-person instruction, housing, meals, and student activities for which they had already paid for an entire semester. Plaintiffs and similarly situated students seek refunds of the amounts they paid on a pro-rata basis as well as other damages to be elaborated on herein.

BACKGROUND

2. In or around March 2020, the University announced that because of the COVID-19 pandemic, all classes would be moved online for the remainder of the Winter 2020 semester.

Defendants instructed students who lived in University residence halls and other on-campus housing to move out if they could, although residence halls would remain open for students who had no choice but to remain on campus. On information and belief, most students in on-campus housing have complied with the directive to leave campus. In addition, the services that Plaintiffs' and the proposed Classes' (See Class Definitions, para. 54) tuition and fees were intended to cover were no longer available to them.

3. Despite the cancellation of live in-person instruction, the constructive eviction of students at the University for the remainder of the semester, and the cessation of all campus activities for at least the same time period, the University has not offered adequate refunds of tuition and fees paid to cover the cost of certain on-campus services which will no longer be available to students. With respect to room and board, the University has merely offered a \$1,200 credit for students who follow its directive to move out of residence halls. This \$1,200 credit is not commensurate with the financial losses to the University's students and their families.

4. Half of the semester (which spans from January 8, 2020 through April 30, 2020) remained when the University canceled in-person classes at its campuses in March of 2020 and encouraged students not to return after spring break.

5. The University's decision to transition to online classes and to request or encourage students to leave campus were responsible decisions to make, but it is unfair and unlawful for the University to retain full tuition and fees and a disproportionate share of prepaid amounts for on-campus housing and meal costs and fees, effectively passing the losses on to the students and their families. Other higher education institutions across the United States that also have switched to online learning and requested their students leave campus have recognized the upheaval and

financial harm to students and their families from these decisions and have provided appropriate refunds. The University, unfortunately, has not followed the pattern of many of its peers.

6. Accordingly, the University has improperly retained monies paid by Plaintiffs and the other members of the Classes for tuition, room and board, and fees, while prohibiting or otherwise preventing Plaintiffs and other members of the Classes from obtaining the benefits for which they paid. Even if the University did not have a choice of whether to send its students home, it nevertheless improperly retained funds for services it is not providing. No matter the reason for its decisions, the University's actions are unlawful and unfair, and equity demands disgorgement of the fees and monies paid.

7. Plaintiffs bring this class action for injunctive, declaratory, and equitable relief, and any other available remedies, resulting from the University's illegal and unfair conduct, namely retaining full tuition, retaining an unfair share of the costs of room and board paid by Plaintiffs and the other members of the Classes, and retaining the full amount paid for fees, while forcing or encouraging Plaintiffs and other members of the Classes (or the students on behalf of whom Plaintiffs and Class members paid these expenses) to move off campus.

8. This lawsuit also seeks disgorgement of partial tuition for the Winter 2020 semester, the prorated unused portion of room and board, and unused fees that Plaintiffs and other members of the Classes paid, but for which they (or the students on behalf of whom they paid) will not be provided the benefit.

PARTIES

A. Plaintiffs

9. Plaintiff Kliment Milanov is a resident of the state of Washington. He is a freshman student at the University of Michigan. Plaintiff Milanov, a full-time student, is studying viola performance, philosophy and Japanese during his time as an undergraduate at the University.

Plaintiff Milanov is financing his education through student loans, including for the cost of tuition, housing, meals and fees for the University of Michigan's Winter 2020 semester – thus, for every loaned dollar he pays, he will have to pay additional interest.

10. Plaintiff Milanov enrolled in the University for the Winter 2020 semester and lived in on-campus housing at the beginning of the semester, in January 2020. Plaintiff Milanov paid the cost of tuition, room and board, and fees for the entire Winter 2020 semester.

11. Plaintiff Milanov's education has transitioned from in-person to online learning as part of the University's removal of students and non-essential personnel from the University's campuses. Plaintiff Milanov's online classes are not commensurate with the same courses being taught in person; indeed, two of Plaintiff Milanov's classes were essentially canceled because the University's online infrastructure failed to provide an adequate learning environment. Plaintiff Milanov is still forced to pay for those courses, however. Plaintiff Milanov has not been provided an adequate refund of partial tuition.

12. Plaintiff Milanov moved out of on-campus housing in March of 2020 at the behest of the school during the COVID-19 outbreak. Indeed, the sudden change of living arrangements for Plaintiff Milanov was in keeping with the University's recommendation, stating that any student who can move home or to a different location should do so. Plaintiff Milanov has not resided in on-campus housing since he left campus in March of 2020. Plaintiff Milanov has not received an adequate prorated refund of his payments for housing.

13. Plaintiff Milanov paid certain costs for a meal plan during the Winter 2020 semester, the benefits of which will no longer be received. Plaintiff Milanov has not been provided an adequate refund.

14. Plaintiff Milanov also paid certain fees for the entire Winter 2020 semester, the benefits of which will no longer be received. Plaintiff Milanov has not been offered an adequate prorated refund of his payments for fees.

15. Plaintiff Trenten Ingell is a resident of the state of Michigan. He is a sophomore at the University of Michigan. Plaintiff Ingell, a full-time student, is studying philosophy, politics, and economics during his time as an undergraduate at the University. Plaintiff Ingell has partially financed his education through student loans, including financing the cost of tuition, room and board, and fees for the University of Michigan's Winter 2020 semester – thus, for every dollar he pays, he will have to pay additional interest.

16. Plaintiff Ingell enrolled in the University for the Winter 2020 semester and lived in on-campus housing at the beginning of the semester, in January 2020. Plaintiff Ingell paid the cost of tuition, room and board, and fees for the entire Winter 2020 semester.

17. Plaintiff Ingell's education has transitioned from in-person to online learning as part of the University's removal of students and non-essential personnel from the University's campuses. Plaintiff Ingell's online classes are not commensurate with the same courses being taught in person; indeed, asynchronous classes that allow no direct interaction with professors have inhibited his ability to interact with course material in a substantive way. Given that professors rely upon student involvement, in particular questions regarding concepts and coursework, for their grading and examinations, there is a natural disconnect that faculty have with their students. Many of the classes' discussion sections have become entirely limited to ungraded assignments, if not canceled entirely. These classes have become virtually defunct. Plaintiff Ingell is still forced to pay for those courses, however. Plaintiff Ingell has neither been offered nor provided with an adequate refund of partial tuition.

18. Plaintiff Ingell moved out of on-campus housing in March of 2020 at the behest of the school during the COVID-19 outbreak. Plaintiff Ingell has not resided in on-campus housing since he left campus in March of 2020. Plaintiff Ingell has not been provided an adequate prorated refund of his payments for housing.

19. Plaintiff Ingell paid certain costs for a meal plan during the Winter 2020 semester, the benefits of which will no longer be received. Plaintiff Ingell has not received an adequate refund.

20. Plaintiff Ingell also paid certain fees for the entire Winter 2020 semester, the benefits of which will no longer be received. Plaintiff Ingell has not been provided with an adequate prorated refund of his payments for fees.

B. Defendants

21. Defendant, the University of Michigan, is a public university located in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

22. Defendant, the Regents of the University of Michigan, is a body corporate authorized to sue and be sued on behalf of the University of Michigan with respect to its responsibilities governing the University.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

23. This Court has jurisdiction over this action as at least some of the events giving rise to these causes of action occurred in Washtenaw County, Michigan.

24. At least some of the injuries suffered by Plaintiffs and the proposed members of the Classes occurred and will continue to occur in Washtenaw County, Michigan.

25. Pursuant to MCL 600.6419(1)(a), this Court has jurisdiction over this action because the University is a department of the State.

26. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to MCR 2.605 because Plaintiffs and the proposed members of the Classes seek a declaratory judgment, there is an actual controversy between the parties, and the Court would have jurisdiction if relief other than a declaratory judgment were sought.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. Plaintiffs and Other Members of the Classes Paid The Cost of Tuition, Room and Board and/or Fees for the Semester of Winter 2020

27. Plaintiffs and members of the Classes are individuals who paid the cost of tuition, room and board, and/or fees for the University's semester in Winter of 2020.

28. Winter semester classes at the University began on January 8, 2020. Final exams for the semester are scheduled to end on or around April 30, 2020. Prior to the COVID-19 outbreak, students were scheduled to move out of their residences on or around the first week or so of May 2020; because of the COVID-19 outbreak, the students were required to move out in the middle of March.

29. Tuition at the University (with some fees included in the tuition costs) for the 2019-2020 academic year starts at \$15,558 for an in-state resident and starts at \$51,200 for an out-of-state resident. Approximate room and board costs at the University for the year are \$11,996 (although many students pay significantly more for room and board, including Plaintiff Ingell, who paid \$14,180.00 for the year).

30. Tuition and fees listed and described in the above paragraphs are provided by way of example; total damage amounts – which may include other fees not listed herein – will be proven at trial. There are also fees which are not included in the cost of tuition, which are separately discussed above and throughout this Complaint.

B. In Response to COVID-19, the University Gets It Half Right: Students Are Required or Encouraged to Leave Campus, But the University Does Not Provide Them With An Adequate Refund of Partial Tuition, Room and Board and Fees

31. Beginning in January of 2020, COVID-19 began presenting American cities and universities with an unprecedented, modern-day challenge: maintaining the fabric of our economy and communities while protecting American lives.

32. In March 2020, several U.S. cities, states, and municipalities began calling for social distancing to slow the spread of COVID-19. Eventually, some cities, states, and municipalities ordered citizens and residents to “shelter-at-home,” effectively requiring them to stay home, other than to receive essential services.

33. As such, in March 2020, all students who could leave campus residence halls were directed to do so and students were advised that all Winter 2020 classes would be moved to online learning platforms. Students were advised that most University buildings would be locked during the day and all student activities (including campus athletics) would be canceled. Campus food options would be continued on a limited basis.

34. The University has retained the value of payments made by Plaintiffs and the other members of the Classes for tuition for live in-person instruction, room and board and fees, while failing to provide the services for which those fees were paid.

35. Various members of the Classes have demanded the return of the unused amounts of funds paid for tuition, for room and board and for fees, through a number of channels. The University has made clear its policy that it will not return any tuition or fees, and will only provide a minimal credit (not a full return of the prorated, unused amounts) for room and board.

36. Through this lawsuit, Plaintiffs seek – for themselves and the other members of the Classes – a partial refund of tuition representing the difference in value of a half semester of live in-person instruction versus a half semester of online distance learning, as well as the return of the

unused portion of room and board proportionate to the amount of time that remained in the Winter 2020 semester when students were directed to move out of their on-campus housing.

1. The University Failed to Refund Partial Tuition: The Difference in Value of Online Education vs. Live In-Person Instruction in Brick and Mortar Classrooms

37. University students were not offered a partial refund of tuition representing the value of the quarter of the academic year that they were forced to use online distance learning platforms in lieu of live in-person instruction in brick and mortar classrooms.

38. As noted in a July 9, 2017 study by Eric Betting and Susanna Loeb of the Brookings Institute (the “Brookings Study”)¹, the promises of online courses are “far from fully realized”:

- While online courses can improve access, they are challenging, especially for the “least well-prepared students” who “consistently perform worse in an online setting than they do in face-to-face classrooms.”
- Taking courses online “increases their likelihood of dropping out and otherwise impedes progress through college.”

39. Of note, the Brookings Study uses data from DeVry University, comparing both DeVry’s online and in-person courses. The results are telling and provide evidence that students learn less in the online setting:

¹ <https://www.brookings.edu/research/promises-and-pitfalls-of-online-education/>.

- **Taking courses online reduces student grades** by 0.44 points on the traditional four-point grading scale, a 0.33 standard deviation decline relative to taking courses in-person.
- Specifically, **students taking the course in-person earned roughly a B-(2.8) grade on average while if they had taken it online, they would have earned a C (2.4).**
- **Taking a course online reduces a student's GPA** the following term by 0.15 points, with larger drops of 0.42 points and 0.32 points respectively in the next term's grades for courses taken in the same subject area or for courses in which the online course is a prerequisite.
- The study also found that **taking a course online, instead of in-person, increases the probability that the student will drop out of school**, citing that students are approximately 9% less likely to remain enrolled in the semester after taking an online course.

40. The Brookings Study concludes that the “analyses provide evidence that students in online courses perform substantially worse than students in traditional in-person courses and that experiences in these online courses impact performance in future classes and their likelihood of dropping out of college as well. The negative effects of online course-taking are far stronger for students with lower prior GPA.”

41. In addition to the value of live in-person instruction, students are more successful academically and otherwise when living in university residence halls.² “The truth of the matter is that campus housing provides a great deal of return to the students who chose to live in the residence halls. This has been demonstrated through multiple studies over multiple years.”³

42. Several studies demonstrated that living in a residence hall had a positive impact on degree attainment and that on-campus students were more likely to stay in school and graduate than commuter students.⁴ “The data are very clear – the impact of higher education increases

² <https://theconversation.com/why-there-is-value-in-on-campus-living-45691>

³ Id.

⁴ Id.

dramatically when students are enrolled in a college that engages them in a robust campus life program, especially in a college where they live on campus and are constantly interacting with a range of people and ideas.”⁵

43. While Plaintiffs acknowledge the necessity of the University’s efforts to continue delivering their education in some format, the value (and cost) of online classes is less than in-classroom instruction.

44. Plaintiffs and members of the Classes who paid tuition for live in-person instruction in brick and mortar classrooms that were forced to use online distance learning platforms for the remainder of the Winter 2020 semester did not get the full benefit of what they bargained for when they paid tuition for the Winter 2020 semester.

2. The University Failed to Refund Prorated Room and Board

45. While social distancing is recommended by healthcare professionals and the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (“CDC”), the resulting impact to the economy – and individual families’ wallets – cannot be overstated.

46. University students were informed that they would receive a \$1,200 credit to their student account so long as they moved out of residence halls by a set date.

47. In a March 2020 letter to students, the University stated the following:

“We write now to share the details of a \$1,200 refund being offered on your University Housing contract for the 2019-2020 academic year.

For all of you who have already moved out of University Housing or who are able to move out no later than March 25, the university is offering a \$1,200 refund. This applies to all undergraduate and graduate students who are able to vacate their university residence hall or university apartment by 5 PM on March 25.

⁵ https://www.huffpost.com/entry/the-value-of-campus-life_b_57f3e995e4b03d61445c7443

If you are eligible to receive the \$1,200 refund it will be applied to your student account. If there are any unpaid charges on your student account, the refund will be applied first to those charges and any remaining refund will be issued directly to you via direct deposit in the month of April.

48. The delayed refund is insufficient because it does not refund the full prorated, unused portion of room and board payments for the half semester students were no longer on campus.

49. Furthermore, even though the University claims that remaining in on-campus housing is an option: residence halls and other campus housing are not designed to safely house students in the event of a pandemic and, in order to stay safe, unless there are absolutely no other options, students must move out in order to practice safe, social distancing in accordance with recommendations by the CDC.

50. In addition to the price of tuition, costs and fees, Plaintiffs and members of the Classes paid for on-campus meals. After the school was effectively closed and students were asked to leave, students – including the Plaintiffs and members of the Classes – lost access to the food being served on campus. The University has failed to adequately reimburse students with a refund of the amounts paid (on a prorated basis) for meals.

3. Student Fees

51. Aside from the woefully insufficient “relief” provided to Plaintiffs and members of the Classes for their on-campus housing costs, the University failed to offer students a refund of any of the fees they paid for the semester that were unused or for which they had not received a benefit.

52. This is so even though most University buildings were closed and all student activities were canceled for the remainder of the Winter 2020 semester.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

53. Plaintiffs bring this action as a class action, pursuant to Michigan Court Rule 3.501, individually on behalf of the proposed classes (“Classes”) enumerated in paragraph 54, under Class Definitions.

54. **Class Definitions.** Plaintiffs bring this case for damages, equitable relief and disgorgement, on behalf of three Classes, defined as:

Tuition Class: All people who paid tuition for students enrolled in classes at the University for the Winter 2020 semester who were denied live in-person instruction and forced to use online distance learning platforms for the last quarter of the 2019-2020 academic year (the “Tuition Class”).

Room and Board Class: All people who paid the costs of room and board (housing and meals) for students enrolled in classes at the University for the Winter 2020 semester who moved out of their on-campus housing prior to the completion of that semester because of the University’s policies and announcements related to COVID-19 (the “Room and Board Class”).

Fee Class: All people who paid fees for or on behalf of students enrolled in classes at the University for the Winter 2020 semester (the “Fee Class”).

55. Excluded from the Classes are the University of Michigan, and any of their respective members, affiliates, parents, subsidiaries, officers, directors, employees, successors, or assigns, the judicial officers, and their immediate family members, and Court staff assigned to this case. Plaintiffs reserve the right to modify or amend the Class definitions, as appropriate, during the course of this litigation.

56. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained on behalf of the Classes proposed herein under the criteria of Michigan Court Rule 3.501.

57. **Numerosity – Michigan Court Rule 3.501(A)(1)(a).** The members of each of the Classes are so numerous and geographically dispersed that individual joinder of all members of the Classes is impracticable. The precise number of members of the Classes is unknown to Plaintiffs, but may be ascertained by the University’s records. Members of the Classes may be

notified of the pendency of this action by recognized, Court-approved notice dissemination methods, which may include U.S. Mail, electronic mail, Internet postings, and/or published notice.

58. **Commonality – Michigan Court Rule 3.501(A)(1)(b).** This action involves questions of law and fact common to the Classes, which predominate over any individual questions, including:

- a. Whether Defendants engaged in the conduct alleged herein;
- b. Whether there is a difference in value between online distance learning and live in-person instruction;
- c. Whether the University breached its contracts with Plaintiffs and the other Tuition Class members by retaining the portion of their tuition representing the difference between the value of one half a semester of online distance learning and one half a semester of live in-person instruction in brick and mortar classrooms;
- d. Whether the University was unjustly enriched by retaining tuition payments of Plaintiffs and the Tuition Class representing the difference in value of one half a semester of online distance learning and one half a semester of live in-person instruction in brick and mortar classrooms;
- e. Whether the University breached its contracts with Plaintiffs and the other members of the Room and Board Class who entered into housing agreements by not refunding them a full prorated amount of their housing expenses when a pandemic prevented them (or the students on whose behalf they paid) from continuing to live on campus safely and whether the University breached its contracts with Plaintiffs and the other Class

members by retaining costs for food and on-campus dining without providing those services which the costs were intended to cover;

- f. Whether the University was unjustly enriched by retaining payments of Plaintiffs and the other Room and Board Class members while they (or the students on whose behalf they paid) moved out of their on-campus housing;
- g. Whether the University breached its contracts with Plaintiffs and the other Fee Class members by retaining fees without providing the services which the fees were intended to cover;
- h. Whether the University was unjustly enriched by retaining fees of Plaintiffs and the other Fee Class members without providing the services which the fees were intended to cover;
- i. Whether certification of any or all Room and Board Class, Fee Class and/or Tuition Class is appropriate under Michigan Court Rule 3.501;
- j. Whether Class members are entitled to declaratory, equitable, or injunctive relief, and/or other relief; and
- k. The amount and nature of relief to be awarded to Plaintiffs and the other Class members.

59. **Typicality – Michigan Court Rule 3.501(A)(1)(c).** Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the other members of the Classes because Plaintiffs and the other members each paid for tuition, room and board, fees and certain other costs associated with the Winter 2020 semester at the University but were not provided the services that those fees and costs were meant to cover. Plaintiffs and the other members of the Classes suffered damages – namely, the loss of their payments – as a direct and proximate result of the same wrongful conduct in which the

University engaged. Plaintiffs' claims arise from the same practices and course of conduct that give rise to the claims of the other members of the Classes.

60. **Adequacy of Representation – Michigan Court Rule 3.501(A)(1)(d).** Plaintiffs are adequate Class representatives because their interests do not conflict with the interests of the other members of the Classes who they seek to represent, Plaintiffs have retained counsel competent and experienced in complex class action litigation, and Plaintiffs intend to prosecute this action vigorously. The interests of the members of the Classes will be fairly and adequately protected by Plaintiffs and their counsel.

61. **Superiority of Adjudication as a Class Action – Michigan Court Rule 3.501(A)(1)(e), Michigan Court Rule 3.501(A)(2).** Because of the aforementioned, and in an effort to preserve judicial economy, this case will be best maintained as a Class Action, which is superior to other methods of individual adjudication of claims.

62. **Declaratory and Injunctive Relief – Michigan Court Rule 3.501(A)(2)(b).** The University has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to Plaintiffs and the other members of the Classes, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief and declaratory relief, as described below, with respect to the members as a whole.

CLAIMS ALLEGED

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Breach of Contract **(Plaintiffs and Other Members of the Tuition Class)**

63. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege the allegations in the Paragraphs above, as if fully alleged herein.

64. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of other members of the Tuition Class.

65. Plaintiffs and the Tuition Class entered into contracts with the University which provided that Plaintiffs and other members of the Tuition Class would pay tuition, and in exchange, the University would provide live in-person instruction in a brick and mortar classroom.

66. Plaintiffs and other members of the Tuition Class fulfilled their end of the bargain when they paid tuition for the Winter 2020 semester either out-of-pocket or by using student loan financing.

67. The University breached the contract with Plaintiffs and the Tuition Class by moving the second half of all classes for the Winter 2020 semester to online distance learning platforms.

68. The University retained tuition monies paid by Plaintiffs and other members of the Tuition Class, without providing them with the benefit of their bargain.

69. Plaintiffs and other members of the Tuition Class have been damaged in that they have been deprived of the value of the services the tuition was intended to cover – live in-person instruction in brick and mortar classrooms.

70. Plaintiffs and other members of the Tuition Class are entitled to a refund.

71. Plaintiffs and other members of the Tuition Class are entitled to an equitable remedy – here: disgorgement of the difference between the value of one half a semester of online learning versus the value of one half a semester of live in-person instruction in brick and mortar classrooms.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Breach of Contract (Plaintiffs and Other Members of the Room and Board Class)

72. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege the allegations in the Paragraphs above, as if fully alleged herein.

73. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the other members of the Room and Board Class.

74. Plaintiffs and other members of the Room and Board Class entered into contracts in the form of agreements with the University that provided that Plaintiffs and other members of the Room and Board Class would pay monies and, in exchange, the University would provide room and board.

75. Plaintiffs and other members of the Room and Board Class fulfilled their end of the bargain when they paid monies due and owing for their room and board for the semester. Plaintiffs and other members of the Room and Board Class were not provided room and board for the entire semester; accordingly, Plaintiffs and other members of the Room and Board Class are entitled to a refund.

76. Plaintiffs and the other members of the Room and Board Class are entitled to an equitable remedy in the event of a breach – here: disgorgement of the unused days of room and board costs already charged.

77. The University has retained monies paid by Plaintiffs and other members of the Room and Board Class for their Winter 2020 residence hall housing, without providing the benefit of the bargain.

78. Plaintiffs and other members of the Room and Board Class have been damaged in that they have been deprived of the value they paid for room and board while the University retained that value.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Breach of Contract **(Plaintiffs and Other Members of the Fee Class)**

79. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege the allegations in the Paragraphs above, as if fully alleged herein.

80. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the other members of the Fee Class.

81. Plaintiffs and the Fee Class entered into contracts with the University, which provided that Plaintiffs and other members of the Fee Class would pay various fees, and in exchange, the University would provide services to students.

82. The University retained monies paid by Plaintiffs and the other members of the Fee Class, without providing them the benefit of their bargain.

83. Plaintiffs and the other members of the Fee Class have been damaged in that they have been deprived of the value of the services the fees they paid were intended to cover, while the University retained those fees.

84. Plaintiffs and other members of the Fee Class are entitled to a refund and to an equitable remedy – here: disgorgement of the prorated, unused amounts of costs already charged and collected.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Unjust Enrichment **(Plaintiffs and Other Members of the Tuition Class)**

85. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege the allegations in the Paragraphs above, as if fully alleged herein.

86. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the other members of the Tuition Class and in the alternative to the breach of contract claim brought on behalf of Plaintiffs and the other members of the Tuition Class.

87. The University has received a benefit at the expense of Plaintiffs and other members of the Tuition Class to which it is not entitled. Plaintiffs and other members of the Tuition Class paid substantial tuition for live in-person instruction in brick and mortar classrooms and did not receive the full benefit of their bargain. Accordingly, the University should return the monies paid for tuition for the Winter 2020 semester by Plaintiffs and other members of the Tuition Class. Equity demands the return of value of the difference between one half of one semester of instruction on online distance learning platforms versus one half of one semester of live in-person instruction in brick and mortar classrooms.

88. The University has been unjustly enriched by retaining the monies paid by Plaintiffs and other members of the Tuition Class for live in-person instruction in brick and mortar classrooms without providing the services for which those monies were paid. Equity requires that the University return a portion of the monies paid in tuition to Plaintiffs and other members of the Tuition Class.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Unjust Enrichment **(Plaintiffs and Other Members of the Room and Board Class)**

89. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege the allegations in the Paragraphs above, as if fully alleged herein.

90. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the other members of the Room and Board Class and in the alternative to the breach of contract claim brought on behalf of Plaintiffs and the other members of the Room and Board Class.

91. The University has received a benefit to which it is not entitled at the expense of Plaintiffs and other members of the Room and Board Class. Plaintiffs and other members of the Room and Board Class paid for room and board and did not receive the full benefit of their bargain. Accordingly, the University should return the unused monies paid for room and board for the Winter 2020 semester by Plaintiffs and other members of the Room and Board Class. Equity demands the return of the prorated, unused amounts paid by Plaintiffs and other members of the Room and Board Class.

92. The University has been unjustly enriched by retaining the monies paid by Plaintiffs and other members of the Room and Board Class for room and board for the semester while not providing the room and board for which those monies were paid. Equity requires the University return the full prorated unused amounts paid by Plaintiffs and other members of the Room and Board Class for their room and board expenses.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Unjust Enrichment **(Plaintiffs and Other Members of the Fee Class)**

93. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege the allegations in the Paragraphs above, as if fully set forth herein.

94. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the other members of the Fee Class, respectively, and in alternative to the breach of contract claim brought on behalf of Plaintiffs and the other members of the Fee Class.

95. The University has received a benefit to which it is not entitled at the expense of Plaintiffs and other members of the Fee Class. Plaintiffs and other members of the Fee Class paid University fees and did not receive the full benefit of their bargain when the school shut down most facilities. Accordingly, the University should return the monies paid for fees for the Winter

2020 semester by Plaintiffs and other members of the Fee Class. Equity demands the return of these amounts paid by Plaintiffs and other members of the Fee Class.

96. Plaintiffs and the other members of the Fee Class paid fees for or on behalf of students, which were intended to cover the cost of services for the Winter 2020 semester. In exchange, students were entitled to receive Fee-related services for the entire semester.

97. With respect to fees, the University moved classes online and stopped providing the services these fees were intended to cover.

98. MCL 691.1407 does not bar the unjust enrichment claims against the University because the claim seeks restitution to correct for the benefit the University unfairly received when it retained the benefits described herein.

99. The University has retained fees paid by Plaintiffs and other members of the Fee Class, without providing the services for which they were paid and, as such, has been enriched.

100. The University has been unjustly enriched by retaining the fees paid by Plaintiffs and the other members of the Fee Class for the semester while not providing the services for which those fees were intended. Equity requires that the University to return the fees paid by Plaintiffs and the other members of the Fee Class.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

101. Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of the other members of the Classes, respectfully request that the Court enter judgment in their favor and against Defendants as follows:

A. Certifying the Classes as requested herein, designating Plaintiffs as class representatives, and appointing the undersigned counsel as Class Counsel;

B. Declaring that the University is financially responsible for notifying the members of the Classes of the pendency of this suit;

C. Declaring that the University has wrongfully kept monies paid for tuition, on-campus housing, meals, and fees;

D. Requiring that the University disgorge amounts wrongfully obtained for on-campus tuition, on-campus housing, meals and fees.

E. Awarding injunctive relief as permitted by law or equity, including enjoining the University from retaining the prorated, unused monies paid for tuition, on-campus housing, meals and fees;

F. Awarding Plaintiffs' reasonable attorney's fees, costs and expenses;

G. Awarding pre- and post-judgment interest on any amounts awarded; and

H. Awarding such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

DATED: April 15, 2020

FINK BRESSACK



David H. Fink (P28235)
Darryl Bressack (P67820)
Nathan J. Fink (P75185)
38500 Woodward Avenue, Suite 350
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304
Telephone: (248) 971-2500
dfink@finkbressack.com
nfink@finkbressack.com
dbressack@finkbressack.com

ALLEN BROTHERS PLLC

James P. Allen, Sr. (P52885)
400 Monroe St., Suite 620
Detroit, Michigan 48226
Telephone: (313) 962-0581
jamesallen@allenbrotherspllc.com

EVANGELISTA WORLEY LLC

James Evangelista (*Pro Hac Vice Forthcoming*)
David Worley (*Pro Hac Vice Forthcoming*)
500 Sugar Mill Road
Building A, Suite 245
Atlanta, Georgia 30350

Telephone: (404) 205-8400
jim@ewlawllc.com
david@ewlawllc.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Proposed Classes

VERIFICATION

I declare under the penalties of perjury that this Complaint has been examined by me and that its contents are true to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief.

/s/ Kliment Milanov

/s/ Trenten Ingell