CAUSE NO. D-1-GN-14-005114

JAMES STEELE, et al.,	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
Plaintiffs	§	
	§	
V.	§	
	§	TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS
GTECH CORPORATION,	§	
Defendant.	§	
	§	
	§	201 st JUDICIAL DISTRICT
	§	
	§	
	Ş	

PLAINTIFFS' THIRD AMENDED PETITION

Plaintiffs, James Steele et al., file this Third Amended Petition against Defendant, GTECH Corporation, and allege as follows:

A. DISCOVERY CONTROL PLAN

1. Plaintiffs intend to conduct discovery under Level 3 of Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 190.4, and affirmatively plead that this suit is not governed by the expedited actions process in Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 169.

B. RELIEF

2. Plaintiffs seek monetary relief of over \$1,000,000.

C. PARTIES

3. The names of Plaintiffs are listed on Exhibit "A" which is attached hereto and incorporated herein for all purposes.

4. Defendant, GTECH Corporation, has been served with service of process and has filed its Answer. A copy of this Third Amended Petition is being served on GTECH Corporation's attorney, Kenneth Broughton.

D. JURISDICTION

5. The court has jurisdiction over the lawsuit because the amount in controversy exceeds the court's minimum jurisdictional requirements.

E. VENUE

6. Venue is proper in Travis County under Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code section 15.002 because Defendant, a corporation, maintains its principal office in Travis County.

F. FACTS – THE CONTRACTS

7. GTECH, which is also known by its assumed trade name of "IGT"¹, is the U.S. subsidiary of an Italian gaming company which operates lotteries, sports betting, and commercial bookmaking throughout the world.²

8. In November of 1991, an amendment to the Texas Constitution was adopted to allow the operation of the Texas Lottery. GTECH was awarded the initial lottery operator contract and has held the exclusive contract ever since.

9. On December 10, 2014, GTECH and the TLC executed a new "Contract for Lottery Operations and Services" ("Operations Contract"). The Operations Contract gives GTECH the exclusive right to operate the Texas Lottery through the year 2020. GTECH's fee is 2.21% of sales. Accordingly, GTECH derives a substantial financial benefit from increased lottery ticket

¹ GTECH recently acquired International Gaming Technology, the largest maker of slot machines. GTECH now operates under the assumed name "IGT".

² www.IGT.com;

sales. The Texas Lottery generates sales in excess of \$4.3 billion annually. GTECH receives approximately \$100 million per year from the TLC under its Operations Contract. The Operations Contract is a matter of public record and can be accessed on the TLC's website.³

10. Part 2 of GTECH's Operations Contract stipulates that GTECH will act "as an independent contractor and not as an employee or agent of the TLC."

11. Paragraph 3.8 of GTECH's contract describes the relationship of the parties as follows:

GTECH and the Texas Lottery agree and understand that GTECH shall render the goods, services and requirements under this Contract as an independent contractor, and nothing contained in the Contract will be construed to create or imply a joint venture, partnership, employer/employee relationship, principal-agent relationship or any other relationship between the parties.⁴

12. Under its Operations Contract, GTECH provides the terminals, sales staff, mainframe computer that tracks and administers the lottery games, communication (dedicated circuits, satellite, radio) that transmit the transactions between terminals and the main frame computer, research and sales support, customer service and repair support, along with instant ticket storage, ordering, printing, and distribution.

13. The contract between GTECH and the TLC sets a very high standard of care and conduct for GTECH. Section 3.17 of the Operations Contract provides that the TLC has grounds to terminate the Operations Contract, "for cause" if "GTECH engages in any conduct that results in a negative public impression including, but not limited to, creating even an appearance of

3

http://txlottery.org/export/sites/lottery/Documents/procurement/RFP2011/Lottery%20Operations%20and%2 OServices%20Contract.pdf

impropriety with respect to the Texas Lottery, Texas Lottery games, GTECH, or the State of

Texas."

14. Under its Operations Contract, GTECH has agreed to defend the TLC from and to

assume the TLC's liability for claims of the type raised by Plaintiffs in this lawsuit. Specifically,

Section 3.33.1 of the Operations Contract provides as follows:

3.33.1 GTECH shall indemnify, defend and hold the Texas Lottery, its commission members, the State of Texas, and its agents, attorneys, employees, representatives and assigns (the "Indemnified Parties") harmless from and against any and all claims, demands, causes of action, liabilities, lawsuits, losses, damages, costs, expenses or attorneys' fees (collectively, "Claim"), and including any liability of any nature or kind arising out of a Claim for or on account of the Works, or other goods, services or deliverables provided as the result of this Contract, which may be incurred suffered, or required in whole or in part by an actual or alleged act or omission of GTECH, or a subcontractor of GTECH, or any person directly or indirectly employed by GTECH or a subcontractor of GTECH, whether the Claim is based on negligence, strict liability, intellectual property infringement or any other culpable conduct, whether frivolous or not....

15. The term "Works" is defined in the "Request for Proposals for Lottery Operations

and Services" ("Request for Proposals") which was issued by the Texas Lottery Commission on

January 4, 2010, and which is a matter of public record and can be accessed at the Texas

Lottery Commission's website.⁵ The Request for Proposals was incorporated into and made a

part of the Operations Contract as Exhibit A to that agreement. At page VI of the Request for

Proposals, the term "Works" was defined as follows:

Any tangible or intangible items or things that have been or will be prepared, created, maintained, serviced or developed by a

5

http://www.txlottery.org/export/sites/lottery/Documents/procurement/RFP2011/Lottery_Operations_RFP.pd f

Successful Proposer...which includes but is not limited to lottery games, game names, game designs, ticket format and layout, manuals, instructions, [and] printed material....

16. The TLC also entered into contracts with three private companies to develop instant ticket games and to manufacture instant tickets.⁶ One of those companies was GTECH Printing Corporation which entered into a "Contract for Instant Ticket Manufacturing and Services" ("Instant Ticket Contract") with the TLC in August of 2012. The Instant Ticket Contract is a matter of public record and can be accessed at the Texas Lottery Commission's website.⁷ Subsequent to entering into the Instant Ticket Contract, GTECH Printing Corporation was merged into GTECH Corporation which is now the successor in interest to the rights and obligations of GTECH Printing Corporation under the Instant Ticket Contract.

17. The "Instant Ticket Contract" incorporates, by reference, the provisions of the "Request for Proposals for Instant Ticket Manufacturing and Services" ("Instant Ticket RFP") issued by the Texas Lottery Commission on November 7, 2011, and which can be accessed on the Texas Lottery Commission's website.⁸

18. Under the Instant Ticket Contract, GTECH agrees to defend the TLC and to assume its liability for claims such as those brought in this lawsuit. The Instant Ticket RFP provides, in relevant part, as follows:

3.32.1 The Successful Proposer shall indemnify, defend and hold the Texas Lottery, its commission members, the State of Texas, and its agents, attorneys, employees, representatives and assigns (the —Indemnified Parties) harmless from and against any and all claims, demands, causes of action, liabilities, lawsuits, losses, damages, costs, expenses or attorneys' fees (collectively,

⁶ GTECH Printing Corporation, Scientific Games International, Inc., and Pollard Banknote Ltd.

⁷http://www.txlottery.org/export/sites/lottery/Documents/procurement/instant_contract/GPC_Executed_Contract.pdf.

-Claim), and including any liability of any nature or kind arising out of a Claim for or on account of the Works, or other goods, services or deliverables provided as the result of any Contract resulting from this RFP, which may be incurred, suffered, or required in whole or in part by an actual or alleged act or omission of the Successful Proposer, or a Subcontractor of the Successful Proposer, or any person directly or indirectly employed by the Successful Proposer or a Subcontractor of the Successful Proposer, whether the Claim is based on negligence, strict liability, intellectual property infringement or any other culpable conduct, whether frivolous or not....

19. The term "Works" is defined at Page V of the Instant Ticket RFP as follows:

Any tangible or intangible items or things that have been or will be prepared, created, maintained, serviced or developed by a Successful Proposer (or such third parties as the Successful Proposer may be permitted to engage) at any time following the effective date of the Contract, for or on behalf of TLC under the Contract, including but not limited to...lottery games, game names, game designs, ticket format and layout, manuals, instructions, [and] printed material....

20. At page 2 of the Instant Ticket Contract, GTECH and the TLC agreed that

GTECH would provide its services under the contract "as an independent contractor and not as an employee or agent of the TLC...."

21. GTECH warranted that all goods and services it provides under the Instant Ticket

Contract "shall be performed in a high quality professional and competent manner".

22. GTECH is obligated, under Section 7.3 of the Instant Ticket RFP, to provide draft working papers for each GTECH instant game. The TLC then provides "requested changes". Following receipt of the requested changes from the TLC, GTECH is obligated, under Section 7.8, to provide final working papers to be executed by the Executive director of the TLC before the tickets are printed. Under Section 7.8, the final working papers provided to the TLC by GTECH "must be complete and free of any errors."

23. GTECH is also required, under Sections 3.36 & 3.37 of the Instant Ticket RFP, to carry general liability insurance and errors & omissions insurance with limits of no less than \$2 million per occurrence.

24. Section 7.2 of the Instant Ticket RFP requires GTECH to provide, at a minimum, "Game Development Services to include but not be limited to graphic design, game design, artwork, prize structures and play style.

25. Section 4.2 of the Instant Ticket RFP requires GTECH to provide experienced personnel for instant game design, including a "Quality Control individual or team whose responsibilities include accuracy of all content in the working papers...."

G. FACTS - FUN 5'S INSTANT SCRATCH-OFF TICKETS

26. In March of 2013, GTECH made a presentation to the TLC and provided examples of scratch-off games developed by GTECH and available for sale to the TLC. One of those games was known as the "Fun 5's" game. GTECH had previously operated its Fun 5's game in Nebraska, Indiana, Kansas, and Western Australia with much financial success and without consumer complaints.

27. The TLC selected GTECH's Fun 5's game as one of the scratch-off games it intended to purchase from GTECH for use in Texas during fiscal year 2014.

28. It was GTECH's responsibility to prepare the first draft of the working papers for the Fun 5's game. GTECH's customer service representative, Penny Whyte, prepared the initial draft of the working papers for the Fun 5's game which included the proposed wording for the instructions to be printed on each Fun 5's ticket. The TLC had no involvement in putting together the initial working papers or the wording of the instructions proposed in those working papers. The initial draft working papers were sent to the TLC only after GTECH had exercised its independent discretion to prepare the first draft and after GTECH had performed an internal review of the proposed artwork, instructions, and parameters for the game.

29. On April 16, 2014, GTECH sent draft "working papers" for approval by the TLC. The draft working papers closely mirrored the game parameters, artwork, and instructions used by GTECH for the Fun 5's game in Nebraska. GTECH's draft working papers proposed a Fun 5's game ticket consisting of five games. For Game 5, GTECH proposed a tic-tac-toe style of game with the following printed instructions:



30. On April 30, 2014, the TLC requested that GTECH change the "Dollar Bill" symbol

to a "5" symbol and change the "5" symbol to a Money Bag " symbol.

31. On May 12, 2014, the TLC requested that GTECH change the parameters of Game 5 to provide that the winning Money Bag "" symbol in the 5X Box would be printed on both winning tickets and non-winning tickets. The stated reason for the requested change was a fear that the 5X Box would be an easy target for "micro-scratching" since only the 5X box would need to be scratched to tell if a ticket was a "winning" ticket.

32. Under the parameters for the game originally proposed by GTECH to the TLC, one hundred percent of the tickets that revealed a Money Bag "^(*)" symbol would be programmed into GTECH's computers as "winning" tickets. This was the same parameter used by GTECH for the Fun 5's game in Nebraska, Indiana, Kansas, and Western Australia. One hundred percent of the consumers in those four jurisdictions who revealed a winning symbol in the 5X Box won five times the amount in the PRIZE Box.

33. At the request of the TLC, GTECH changed the game's parameters and programmed its computers so that a significant percentage of the tickets designated as non-winning tickets would nonetheless reveal a Money Bag "" symbol in the 5X Box.

34. Because the Money Bag " $\textcircled{\ }$ " symbol would be appearing on both winning and non-winning tickets, it was incumbent upon GTECH's client service representative and GTECH's software department to change the wording of the instructions to make it clear to consumers that they would win 5 times the amount in the PRIZE Box only if the ticket revealed **both** a Money Bag " $\textcircled{\ }$ " symbol in the 5X Box **and also** revealed three five symbols in any one row, column, or diagonal in the tic-tac-toe game.

35. The TLC expected GTECH to exercise reasonable care to make sure that the instructions on the Fun 5's game were clear and unambiguous. The TLC did not expect GTECH to deliver games that were misleading.

36. According to the testimony of Gary Grief, Executive Director of the TLC, the TLC relies on GTECH for the language that goes on the tickets because GTECH has the experience in the industry and they run games in states other than Texas. Mr. Grief expected GTECH to exercise reasonable care to propose language for the Fun 5's tickets that was not misleading.

37. According to the testimony of GTECH's client services representative, Laura Thurston, if the TLC requests that a change be made to the working papers, GTECH's client service representative will look at the requested change and decide from there whether to make the requested change. This is an act of independent discretion on the part of GTECH's client service representatives.

38. It was the responsibility of employees of GTECH's printing division to exercise their independent discretion by checking the parameters of the game in the working papers and by comparing the language on the tickets to ensure that the language was not misleading or deceptive.

39. It was also GTECH's contractual responsibility to make sure the final executed working papers were "free of errors". It was GTECH's expectation that when it sent proposed working papers to the lottery, the instructions for the scratch-off game would be clear and not misleading.

40. According to the testimony of the TLC's Products and Drawings Manager, Robert Tirloni, it should be the goal of the folks at GTECH to review the working papers and to make sure the instructions are clear.

41. According to the testimony of the TLC's Instant Product Coordinator, Dale Bowersock, the initial wording for the game's instructions comes from GTECH. It is important for instructions on scratch-off games to be clear and not misleading. It is part of GTECH's job to point out concerns about the game to the TLC. The TLC expects GTECH to have the responsibility to make sure the instructions in their games are not misleading. The TLC expects GTECH to propose wording that is clear and does not misrepresent the chances to win a game.

42. In the exercise of reasonable care and independent discretion, GTECH's personnel should have notified the TLC if a requested change in the parameters of the game would cause problems with the game. It was the responsibility of GTECH's client services representative and its software department to conduct a comprehensive review of the game's instructions to make sure that the change in parameters requested by the TLC did not require a change in the language of the game's instructions. GTECH's customer service representative and its software department had the knowledge and expertise necessary to ensure that the language was clear, unambiguous, and not misleading.

43. GTECH's client services representatives Laura Thurston and Penelope Whyte both reviewed the language of the instructions after the change in parameters was requested by the TLC. Both Ms. Thurston and Ms. Whyte made the decision that GTECH would not change the wording of the instructions. Instead, GTECH's client services representatives decided that the wording would remain as originally proposed by GTECH. GTECH's decision to refrain from changing the proposed wording was not dictated by the TLC. Rather, it was an independent decision made by GTECH's client service representatives and its software department.

44. In other words, even though GTECH was aware, after the requested change in the game's parameters, that not all of the tickets with a Money Bag symbol would be winning tickets, GTECH decided to continue using language on its Fun 5's tickets that misrepresented that all tickets with a Money Bag symbol would "win". The language chosen by GTECH for the final working papers represented as follows:

> "Reveal three "5" symbols in any one row, column or diagonal, win PRIZE in PRIZE box. Reveal a Money Bag "" symbol in the 5X BOX, win 5 times that PRIZE.

45. GTECH's decision to retain the original wording was not dictated by the TLC. It was not unusual for the TLC to ask GTECH to make a change in a game's parameters. However, if a change in the parameters was requested, it was GTECH's duty to exercise its independent discretion to review the instructions to ensure there was no need for a change in the instructions in order to make them clear and unambiguous. Plaintiffs do not complain of the change in parameters requested by the TLC. Rather, Plaintiffs complain of the misleading and deceptive wording chosen for the Fun 5's tickets by GTECH in its exercise of independent discretion.

46. Although the TLC was required to execute GTECH's final working papers before the tickets were printed, the TLC was relying on GTECH to suggest the wording of the instructions due to its expertise in having worked on scratch-off games for many years. Moreover, GTECH's client services representative, Laura Thurston, admits that it would have been reasonable for the TLC to rely upon GTECH to notify the TLC if a change in the wording of the instructions was needed.

47. GTECH had a contractual duty to exercise its independent discretion to ensure that the final executed working papers it submitted to the TLC were "complete" and "free of any errors".

48. The wording selected by GTECH was misleading and deceptive given the change in the games parameters.

49. On May 16, 2014, Mr. Gary Grief, Executive Director of the TLC, executed the final working papers and approved printing of the Fun 5's tickets by GTECH.

50. GTECH printed approximately 16.5 million Fun 5's tickets and delivered them to a warehouse in Austin.

51. GTECH charged the Texas Lottery Commission approximately \$390,000 for the use of GTECH's Fun 5's scratch-off game and for the Fun 5's tickets it printed.

52. An example of the Fun 5's tickets that GTECH printed and distributed to retailers is shown below:



53. Sales of the Fun 5's tickets began on September 2, 2014.

54. In the first days that ticket sales began, GTECH began to receive complaint calls from retailers on GTECH's toll free hotline. One retailer said that he thought his customer who revealed a Money Bag symbol was a winner based on the retailer's reading of the instructions. Another retailer said he thought his customer had won five times the amount in the PRIZE Box because he had a Money Bag symbol in the 5X Box. The retailer said "Oh, congratulations!" to his customer but when he ran the ticket through the computer terminal, it said "not a winner". The retailer told GTECH "I'm a little confused. Are we having an issue with the ticket here?" Yet another retailer complained to GTECH "I mean the way it's worded, you know, you got the Money Bag in that box, you instantly win five times that amount."

55. The TLC also began to receive complaints on the first day of Fun 5's ticket sales. On September 2, 2014, TLC employee Angelica Tagle reported to TLC employees and officials "[w]e have been getting a few calls for Game 1592, Fun 5's. It seems that players think that they automatically win 5X the prize amount on Game 5 when they reveal the 'money bag'." TLC employee Angela Briones responded "[a]re they going to change this (the poor wording)?"

56. On September 3, 2014, TLC employee Wesley Barnes, reported to Dale Bowersock, the TLC's Instant Ticket Coordinator as follows:

We've had an issue with the new game Fun 5's...The way the instructions read in the second sentence gives the impression that matching the "5" symbols is not necessary to win the bonus portion, that you only have to get the Money Bag Symbol...I think we are going to see more problems like this from this game.

57. On September 3, 2014, Gary Grief, the Executive Director of the TLC, received a phone call from a lottery player named Josey Jones who was concerned "that the instructions are misleading the way they are currently written."

58. On September 4, 2014, TLC employee Angelica Tagle reported that as of the prior day, the TLC had received about 83 calls from players in reference to Game 5 on the Fun 5's who felt "that the wording is misleading."

59. On the same day, the official calendar for the TLC's Executive Director, Gary Grief, shows that he met with Joe Lapinski, GTECH's head of Texas operations, and Jay Gendron, Senior Vice President for GTECH in Providence, Rhode Island. Although no details of that meeting have been made public, it is inconceivable that Mr. Grief and the officials from GTECH did not discuss the fact that both consumers and retailers were complaining that the Fun 5's tickets sold to the TLC by GTECH and printed by GTECH contained "misleading" instructions.

60. On September 5, 2014, Angelica Tagle reported that the TLC had received 134 calls regarding the Fun 5's game. On the same day she reported that the TLC phone operators "were getting push back from the players." The comments received from the players included "[t]his is misleading, disappointed, not clear enough, [t]he other games have two ways to win and why would game 5 be any different." Ms. Tagle concluded with the comment that "FYI – the calls are still coming in today." Ms. Tagle's e-mail was forwarded to the TLC's Executive Director Gary Grief, its Communications Director, Kelly Cripe, and its attorney, Bob Baird.

61. In addition to a large number of angry calls, the TLC received numerous letters and e-mails from angry consumers who expressed concern that they had been cheated and misled by the TLC. 62. On September 5th, TLC employee Carol Vela reported that the TLC had received 83 calls from players regarding Fun 5's on September 3rd and 144 calls on September 4th.

63. Also on September 5th, the TLC's Instant Product Coordinator, Dale Bowersock, instructed his assistant, Jessica Burrola, to prepare the necessary paperwork to "Call" the Fun 5's game effective September 5th in anticipation that the Executive Director, Gary Grief might decide to "Call" the game for "business reasons". If Mr. Grief had decided to "Call" the game, a message would have been transmitted to each of GTECH's retail computer terminals in the state of Texas instructing the retailers to immediately stop selling the Fun 5's tickets, to remove the tickets from the retailers' displays, and to hold the tickets for collection by GTECH's Lottery Service Representatives.

64. GTECH was fully aware that the wording chosen by GTECH and printed by GTECH on the Fun 5's tickets was misleading and deceptive. Upon information and belief, GTECH learned that its wording was misleading and deceptive from one or more of the following sources: (1) two of GTECH's client services representatives and its software department reviewed the wording of the instructions before the tickets were printed and were fully aware that contrary to what the wording chosen by GTECH represented, not every ticket that revealed a Money Bag symbol would "win"; (2) GTECH received calls to its hotline from retailers; (3) GTECH's Lottery Service Representatives learned of complaints from retailers; (4) GTECH's head of Texas operations, Joe Lapinski, spoke by phone with Gary Grief on an almost daily basis and met with him in person on a weekly basis; (5) GTECH's Executive Vice President, Jay Gendron, met with Joe Lapinski and Gary Grief in Grief's office on September 4th; (6) GTECH's Chief Executive Officer, Jaymin Patel, held a phone conference with Gary Grief on October 7th; (7) Gary Grief attended a breakfast with GTECH officials on October 1, 2014, and had dinner with GTECH officials that same evening; and, (8) officials of GTECH met weekly in Austin with the Instant Product Manager of the TLC to discuss issues related to scratch-off tickets.

65. The TLC asked GTECH whether lottery retailers were complaining about the Fun 5's game. GTECH failed to disclose to the TLC that lottery retailers were, in fact, complaining to GTECH that the wording on the Fun 5's tickets was misleading lottery players. GTECH also failed to disclose that its own officials believed the wording on the Fun 5's tickets was not clear.

66. GTECH had full knowledge that the wording it printed on the Fun 5's tickets was misleading players into believing that they had won five times the amount in the PRIZE Box when they had not. GTECH nonetheless continued to take orders from retailers for replacement packs of Fun 5's tickets, continued to deliver Fun 5's tickets to retailers, continued to activate packs of Fun 5's tickets so they could be sold to consumers, and continued to validate tickets with a Money Bag symbol as "non-winning" tickets even though the wording on the tickets misled consumers and retailers into believing that the tickets should be "winning" tickets.

67. During the forty-six days between September 5th when Gary Grief decided he would not "call" the game and October 21st when he finally agreed to do so, sales of the misleading and deceptive Fun 5's tickets generated approximately \$21 million in revenues, a percentage of which was paid to GTECH as its fee for operating the game.

68. On September 8, 2015, the South Regional Summary for the TLC's Claim Centers in Beaumont, Corpus Christi, Houston, McAllen, San Antonio, and Victoria reported that all of those Claims Centers were receiving calls and personal visits from players who "are interpreting the 'Money Bag' in the Bonus Box in Game 5 to mean they won 5 times the amount shown in the Prize Box".

69. On September 26th, the North Region Customer Service Summary reported that all TLC Claims Centers in the northern part of Texas "continue to report that the problems with game #1592 Fun 5's continue".

70. On October 7, 2014, Gary Grief requested that his staff provide him with "weekly sales data since the game began along with the most recent call volume of player complaints...." In response, TLC Manager Michael Anger reported to Grief that "the call volume has remained between 75 and 100 calls a day through the week last week. This is consistent with the volume for the last several weeks." Kathy Pyka reported to Grief that the Fun 5's tickets had generated weekly sales between approximately \$2,000,000 and \$4,500,000 per week for a total of \$15,919,185 as of the week ending October 4, 2014. After being informed that slightly over 16.5 million Fun 5's tickets had been printed, Grief responded "[w]hat percentage sold through are we?" In response, Dale Bowersock reported to Grief that the Fun 5's game was "19.27% sold."

71. On October 7, 2014, the same day he requested and received this information, Grief had a conference call with Jaymin Patel, Chief Executive Officer of GTECH in Providence, Rhode Island.

72. The TLC continued to sell Fun 5's tickets for approximately two more weeks until October 21, 2014 when Grief finally authorized his staff to "call" the game and to discontinue sales of the misleading and deceptive tickets. On October 21, 2014, the Texas Lottery issued a press release to announce that it was closing the Fun 5's game early and would discontinue selling the tickets, citing "confusion" expressed by players and the Texas Lottery's responsibility to create games that are "clear to understand for our players".

73. As operator of the lottery, GTECH is responsible for providing the Texas Lottery with computer terminals that are programmed to validate tickets bearing certain serial numbers as "winning" tickets. This is an important function inasmuch as Paragraph 1.2(L) of the official game procedures for Instant Game No. 1592, defines a "Non-Winning Ticket" in relevant part as "[a] ticket which is not programmed to be a winning Ticket...."

74. In other words, under the official game procedures for Instant Game No. 1592, a ticket must be treated as a "Non-Winning Ticket" by the TLC if GTECH's computer program fails to validate the ticket as a "Winning Ticket", even if the ticket otherwise meets all the criteria of being a winning ticket under the language on the ticket and under the official game procedures. Because the validation of winning scratch-off tickets was an act uniquely within the power and control of GTECH, players of the Texas Lottery, including these Plaintiffs, placed a high degree of trust and confidence in GTECH and were dependent on GTECH to act in the best interest of the citizens who purchased scratch-off lottery tickets.

75. The Texas Lottery Commission began selling Fun 5's tickets to the public on or about September 2, 2014. Almost immediately after the first tickets were sold, consumers began complaining to the TLC that their tickets revealed a Money Bag "" symbol in Game 5 but GTECH's computer program was not validating their tickets as "winning" tickets.

76. GTECH's computer validation program did not conform to the language on the Fun 5's ticket. GTECH's non-conforming computer program added a requirement for a ticket to be validated as a "Winning Ticket" that was not present in the language printed on the Fun 5's tickets. Specifically, GTECH programmed its computer validation program to treat the instructions for Game 5 as if the following language had been added:

Reveal three "5" symbols in any one row, column or diagonal, win PRIZE in PRIZE box. [**And, if you also**] Reveal a Money Bag "^(*)" symbol in the 5X BOX, win 5 times that [**the**] PRIZE [**won**].

77. GTECH learned, in the early days of September 2014, of complaints from lottery players who had purchased tickets with a Money Bag " \bigcirc " symbol but whose tickets were not being validated by GTECH's computers as "winners". Despite notice of these complaints, GTECH knowingly and intentionally decided to continue using its non-conforming computer validation program to eliminate a significant percentage of the tickets with a Money Bag " ${}^{\textcircled{}}$ " symbol from the list of "winning" tickets. GTECH also knowingly and intentionally continued to distribute Fun 5's tickets on which GTECH had printed the misleading and inaccurate language. Had GTECH corrected its error and changed its computer validation program to conform to the language printed on the Fun 5's tickets, it would have exposed the Texas Lottery to a total payout for the Fun 5's game far in excess of the payout GTECH originally calculated for the Texas Lottery. Had GTECH discontinued distribution of the misleading Fun 5's tickets, it would have suffered a loss of revenues from its percentage of gross ticket sales. Rather than admit that it had made a costly mistake in judgment or suffer a decrease in revenues, GTECH decided to cover up its mistake by continuing to distribute the misleading tickets and by continuing to use its non-conforming validation program which failed to validate a significant percentage of the tickets with a Money Bag " \bigcirc " symbol as "winning" tickets.

78. The language developed by GTECH, and which GTECH printed on the tickets, misled Plaintiffs into believing that 100% of Fun 5's tickets with a Money Bag "^(*)" symbol in Game 5 would be "winning" tickets.

79. Plaintiffs purchased Fun 5's tickets that revealed a Money Bag " $\textcircled{\ }$ " symbol in Game 5. Plaintiffs reasonably relied upon the representation GTECH printed on the Fun 5's tickets that Plaintiffs would receive five times the amount printed in the PRIZE box on their tickets if their tickets revealed a Money Bag " $\textcircled{\ }$ " symbol. However, when Plaintiffs attempted to cash their apparently winning tickets, they learned that GTECH's computer validation program did not validate their tickets as winning tickets. That meant their tickets were automatically defined as "Non-Winning Tickets" in accordance with Paragraph 1.2(L) of the official game procedures for Instant Game No. 1592 and were not eligible for prize payouts.

80. Plaintiffs do not contend that their tickets are "winning tickets". It is undisputed that their tickets are "non-winning" tickets. Instead, they contend that they were misled by GTECH into believing that if their tickets revealed a Money Bag symbol in Game 5, they would win five times the amount in the PRIZE Box.

H. COUNT 1- COMMON LAW FRAUD

81. GTECH chose the wording of the representation it printed on the Fun 5's tickets. The wording was not dictated or required by the TLC. Instead, the wording was chosen by GTECH's customer service representatives in the exercise of their independent discretion.

82. GTECH printed and distributed the misleading and deceptive Fun 5's tickets for sale to Plaintiffs. GTECH received a fee based on a percentage of the gross sales of the Fun 5's tickets and therefore had an incentive to maximize the sale of Fun 5's tickets.

83. Each of the Fun 5's tickets contained a written representation that if the ticket revealed a Money Bag " $\tilde{}$ " symbol in Game 5, the player would "win".

84. This representation was material.

85. The representation made on the Fun 5's tickets was false. In fact, a significant percentage of tickets with a Money Bag " $\tilde{}$ " symbol were not "winning" tickets.

86. GTECH knew that the representation was false. It used nearly identical language on Fun 5's tickets in other states and programmed its computers in those states to recognize 100% of tickets that revealed a winning symbol as "winning" tickets. However, in Texas, GTECH programmed its computers to leave off from the list of "winning" tickets a significant percentage of tickets that revealed a Money Bag "^(©)" symbol.

87. GTECH knew that if it left off from the list of "winning" tickets a significant percentage of tickets that revealed a Money Bag " $\overset{\sim}{\bigcirc}$ " symbol, those tickets would not be eligible for prize payouts.

88. Alternatively, GTECH made the representation recklessly. It represented as a positive assertion that a player would "win" if he or she revealed a Money Bag "" symbol on a Fun 5's ticket. However, GTECH made the representation on every one of the tickets without knowing which of the tickets with a Money Bag "" symbol would be "winning" tickets and which ones would be "non-winning" tickets.

89. GTECH had reason to know that the representation it crafted and that it printed on the Fun 5's tickets would reach a class of which Plaintiffs were members. 90. GTECH benefited from the sale of the misleading and deceptive tickets in that it received a percentage of the revenues from the ticket sales.

91. The representation GTECH printed on the Fun 5's tickets was a false statement of fact.

92. GTECH made the representation knowing that it was a false representation.

93. GTECH intended for a class of lottery players, of which Plaintiffs were members, to rely on the false representation.

94. GTECH expected lottery players to rely on the instructions it printed on the Fun 5's tickets.

95. Plaintiffs justifiably relied on GTECH's false representation.

96. The false representation caused Plaintiffs injury.

97. Plaintiffs seek benefit-of-the-bargain damages from GTECH. In particular, Plaintiffs are entitled to the difference between the value of the Fun 5's tickets as represented by GTECH and the value actually received by Plaintiffs.

98. <u>Exemplary Damages</u>. Plaintiffs' injuries resulted from Defendant's actual fraud or malice, which entitles Plaintiffs to exemplary damages under Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code section 41.003(a).

COUNT 2 – FRAUD BY NONDISCLOSURE

99. GTECH failed to disclose to Plaintiffs material facts related to Game 5 of the Fun 5's game.

100. GTECH had a duty to disclose to Plaintiffs that a significant percentage of the tickets with a Money Bag symbol would not be on the list of "winning" tickets. GTECH disclosed

limited information to Plaintiffs in the language it chose to print on the tickets, which created a substantially false impression.

101. The information was material because the language printed on the tickets left the false impression that every ticket with a Money Bag symbol would be a "winning" ticket.

102. GTECH knew that Plaintiffs and other similarly situated lottery players were ignorant of the information and did not have an equal opportunity to discover the truth.

103. GTECH had a duty to inform purchasers of Fun 5's tickets that they would not automatically "win" if they revealed a Money Bag "", symbol. Instead, GTECH deliberately remained silent and did not disclose the truth to Plaintiffs.

104. By deliberately remaining silent, GTECH intended for Plaintiffs to act without the information.

105. Plaintiffs justifiably relied on GTECH's deliberate silence.

106. By deliberately remaining silent, GTECH proximately caused injury to Plaintiffs which resulted in damages.

107. Plaintiffs seek benefit-of-the-bargain damages from GTECH. In particular, Plaintiffs are entitled to the difference between the value of the Fun 5's tickets as represented by GTECH and the value actually received by Plaintiffs.

108. <u>Exemplary Damages</u>. Plaintiffs' injuries resulted from Defendant's actual fraud or malice, which entitles Plaintiffs to exemplary damages under Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code section 41.003(a).

I. COUNT 3 – AIDING AND ABETTING FRAUD

109. GTECH substantially assisted the TLC in committing a fraud on Plaintiffs and other similarly situated lottery players.

110. GTECH knew that the TLC was selling lottery tickets that were misleading or deceptive and that the TLC ought not to be doing so.

111. GTECH intended to assist the TLC in selling the deceptive and misleading tickets to lottery players.

112. GTECH assisted the TLC by printing the misleading and deceptive language on the Fun 5's tickets, by distributing the deceptive and misleading tickets to retailers, by activating packs of the Fun 5's tickets to make them eligible for sale, and by continuing to operate the computer system which validated Plaintiffs' tickets as "non-winners" even though the instructions represented that the players would "win" if they revealed a Money Bag " $\overset{\circ}{=}$ " symbol.

113. GTECH's assistance and participation, separate from the TLC's acts, breached GTECH's duty to Plaintiffs.

114. Defendant's assistance and participation was a substantial factor in causing the fraud.

115. Plaintiffs seek benefit-of-the-bargain damages from GTECH. In particular, Plaintiffs are entitled to the difference between the value of the Fun 5's tickets as represented by the TLC and GTECH and the value actually received by Plaintiffs.

J. COUNT 4 – TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE WITH EXISTING CONTRACT

116. Plaintiffs had valid contracts with the Texas Lottery. They exchanged \$5 of their hard-earned cash for each of their Fun 5's tickets in return for the promise that they would be

entitled to receive five times the amount in the Prize Box if their ticket revealed a Money Bag

117. GTECH knew or had reason to know that a class of lottery players, of which Plaintiffs were members, had entered into such contracts with the Texas Lottery. Moreover, Defendant knew or had reason to know of the interest that a class of lottery players, of which Plaintiffs were members, had in said contracts.

118. Defendant willfully and intentionally interfered with Plaintiffs' contracts with the Texas Lottery by using and continuing to use a non-conforming computer program that left the serial number of Plaintiffs' tickets off from the list of "Winning Tickets".

119. Defendant's interference proximately caused injury to Plaintiffs, which resulted in damages in excess of \$500,000,000.00 which represents five times the collective amount printed in the Prize Box in Game 5 of Plaintiffs' Fun 5's tickets.

120. <u>Exemplary Damages.</u> Plaintiffs' injuries resulted from Defendant's malice or actual fraud, which entitles Plaintiffs to exemplary damages under Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code section 41.003(a).

COUNT 4 – CONSPIRACY

121. Defendant GTECH, in combination with the TLC, agreed to print misleading and deceptive instructions on Fun 5's tickets, to distribute the misleading and deceptive tickets for sale to lottery players in Texas, and to use GTECH's computer system to validate tickets as non-winners when the clear language of the tickets represented that they should have been validated as winning tickets.

122. Officials of both GTECH and the TLC admitted in their deposition testimony that they were aware that lottery players would rely upon the instructions printed by GTECH on the tickets. They also admitted that the TLC ought not to defraud lottery players by selling misleading and deceptive tickets to players and that GTECH ought not to assist the TLC in doing so.

123. GTECH and the TLC had a meeting of the minds that they would sell the misleading and deceptive tickets to lottery players and that they would continue selling the tickets despite complaints from both consumers and retailers.

124. To accomplish their object or course of action, GTECH printed the misleading and deceptive language on the tickets, GTECH distributed the tickets to retailers in Texas, GTECH activated the packs of tickets so they would be eligible for sale, the TLC sold the tickets to Texas lottery players, and GTECH validated the tickets as non-winning tickets even though some of Plaintiffs' tickets contained a Money Bag symbol which should have entitled them to receive five times the Prize in the Prize Box based on the representations printed on the tickets.

125. Plaintiffs were injured as a proximate result of the actions of GTECH and the TLC.

126. Plaintiffs seek benefit-of-the-bargain damages from GTECH. In particular, Plaintiffs are entitled to the difference between the value of the Fun 5's tickets they purchased, as represented by the TLC and GTECH, and the value actually received by Plaintiffs. In other words, Plaintiffs should have received a prize payout of five times the amount appearing in the Prize Box on each of their Fun 5's tickets that revealed a Money Bag symbol. Instead, their Fun 5's tickets were validated by GTECH as "not a winner" and were worthless. 127. GTECH is jointly and severally liable for the injuries caused to Plaintiffs as a result of the conspiracy.

K. JURY DEMAND

128. Plaintiffs have demanded a jury trial and have tendered the appropriate fee.

L. PRAYER

129. For these reasons, Plaintiffs ask that they be awarded a judgment against Defendant for the following:

- a. Actual damages;
- b. Exemplary damages;
- c. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;
- d. All attorneys' fees and reimbursement of the costs incurred in connection with this suit; and
- e. All other relief to which Plaintiffs are entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

LAGARDE LAW FIRM, P.C.

Richard L. LaGarde SBN: 11819550 Mary Ellis LaGarde SBN: 24037645 3000 Weslayan Street, Suite 380 Houston, Texas 77027 Telephone: (713) 993-0660 Facsimile: (713) 993-9007 Email: richard@lagardelaw.com mary@lagardelaw.com

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS

MANFRED STERNBERG & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

Manpul the ?.

Manfred Sternberg SBN: 19175775 4550 Post Oak Place Dr. #119 Houston, TX 77027 Telephone: (713) 622-4300 Facsimile: (713)622-9899 Email: manfred@msternberg.com

CO-COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument was served upon the attorneys of record of all parties to the above cause in accordance with Texas Rules of Civil Procedure on the 19th day of January, 2016.

Kenneth E. Broughton Francisco Rivero Arturo Munoz REED SMITH, LLP 811 Main Street, Suite 1700 Houston, TX 77002 Telephone: (713) 469-3819 Facsimile: (713) 469-3899 Email: <u>kbroughton@reedsmith.com</u> <u>frivero@reedsmith.com</u> <u>amunoz@reedsmith.com</u>

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT GTECH CORPORATION

Leroy B. Scott Scott Esq. 3131 McKinney Ave., Ste. 600 Dallas, TX 75204 Telephone: (214) 224-0802 Facsimile: (214) 224-0802 Email: lscott@scottesq.com

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENOR, KENYATTA JACOBS

James D. Hurst JAMES D. HURST, P.C. 1202 Sam Houston Ave. Huntsville, TX 77340 Telephone: (936) 295-5091 Facsimile: (936) 295-5792 Email: jdhurst@sbcglobal.net

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENORS, JAFREH AND BECHTOLD

Clinton E. Wells JR. McDowell Wells, L.L.P. 603 Avondale Houston, TX 77006 Telephone: (713) 655-9595 Facsimile: (713) 655-7868 Email: cew@houstontrialattorneys.com

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENORS, BOGHOSIAN, WILSON, AND BAMBICO

Andrew G. Khoury KHOURY LAW FIRM 2002 Judson Road, Ste. 204 Longview, TX 75606-1151 Telephone: 903-757-3992 Facsimile: 903-704-4759 Email: andy@khourylawfirm.com

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENORS, THOMAS GREGORY, ET AL.

Daniel H. Byrne Lessie G. Fitzpatrick FRITZ, BYRNE, HEAD & HARRISON, PLLC 98 San Jacinto Blvd., Ste. 2000 Austin, TX 78701 Telephone: (512) 476-2020 Facsimile: (512) 477-5267 Email: dbyrne@fbhh.com Ifitzpatrick@fbhh.com

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENORS, HIATT, ET AL.

Leonard E. Cox P.O. Box 1127 Seabrook, TX 77586 Telephone: (281) 532-0801 Facsimile: (281) 532-0806 Email: Lawyercox@lawyercox.com

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENORS, YARBROUGH AND CLARK

John H. Read, II The Law Offices of John H. Read, II 1230 N. Riverfront Blvd. Dallas, TX 75207-4013 Tel: 214-760-9999 Fax: 213-631-0721 Email: john@readlawoffices.com

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENORS, ESTRADA, ET AL.

Jerry B. Register JERRY B REGISTER P.C. 1202 Sam Houston Ave. P.O. Box 1402 Huntsville, TX 77342 Tel: (936) 295-9109 Fax: (936) 295-4424 Email: jbreg@sbcglobal.net

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENOR, MICHAEL CRIST

Christopher S. Hamilton Andrea L. Fitzgerald STANDLY AND HAMILTON, L.L.P. 325 N. St. Paul Street, Suite 3300 Dallas, Texas 75201 Tel: 214-234-7900 Fax: 214-234-7300 Email: <u>chamilton@standlyhamilton.com</u> <u>afitzgerald@standlyhamilton.com</u> Wes Dauphinot DAUPHINOT LAW FIRM 900 Wes Abram Arlington, TX 76013 Tel: 817-462-0676 Fax: 817-704-4788 Email: wes@dauphinotlawfirm.com

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENORS, DIANE AND DANIEL LACROIX

William Pratt LAW OFFICE OF WILLIAM PRATT 3265 Lackland Road Fort Worth, TX 76010 Tel: 817-738-4940 Fax: 817-738-4161 Email: lawofficeoffice@yahoo.com

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENORS, DIANE LACROIX AND DANIEL LACROIX, JR.

William S. Webb KRAFT & Associates, P.C. 2777 Stemmons Freeway, Suite 1300 Dallas, Texas 75207 Tel: 214-999-9999 Fax: 214-637-2118 Email: swebb@kraftlaw.com

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENORS, WILEY-BEAMON, ET AL.

Paul T. Morin PAUL T. MORIN, P.C. 503 W. 14th Street Austin, Texas 78701 Tel: 512-499-8200 Fax: 512-499-8203 Email: PMorin@austin.rr.com

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENOR,

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENOR THOMAS G. JONES

Eugene W. Brees WHITEHURST, HARKNESS, BREES, CHENG, ALSAFFAR & HIGGINBOTHAM, PLLC 7500 Rialto Blvd., Suite 250 Austin, TX 78735 Tel: 512-476-4346 Fax: 512-476-4400 Email: cbrees@nationaltriallaw.com

Richard Warren Mithoff Warner V. Hocker MITHOFF LAW Penthouse, One Allen Center 500 Dallas, Suite 3450 Houston, TX 77002 Tel: 713-654-1122 Fax: 713-739-8085 Email: <u>rmithoff@mithofflaw.com</u> Email: <u>whocker@mithofflaw.com</u>

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENOR SANDRA FLORES

AILEHS GAINES

Blake C. Erskine ERSKINE & MCMAHON, LLP P.O. Box 3485 Longview, Texas 75606 Tel: 903-757-8435 Fax: 903-757-9429 Email: blakee@erskine-mcmahon.com

COUNSEL FOR INTERVENORS, NATHAN ADAMS AND JENNIFER ADAMS

Rhand

RICHARD L. LAGARDE

Exhibit "A" to Plaintiffs' Third Amended Petition

Darlene & Don Abney Timothy & Michelle Adams Rachael Adkison Adan Alanis Luciano T. Alaniz Pablo Almaguer Luis & Sandra Alvarado Jorge & Alvarado Jessica & Alvarado Julia Alvarado Carlethia Ambrose Michelle & David Andelman Jose Andrade **Cleo & Juston Edwards Andrews** Ashlie Pracht & Christopher Ansley Allan & Jo Antich Jack & Jamie Applewhite Jose & Marissa Aranda Karina Chavez & Everado Armendariz Cherie Arnold Alifonso Arredondo Adrian & Jennifer Arredondo Cynthia & Gabriel Ramirez Arreola Crystal & Jon Atteberry Patricia A. Austin **David Avalos** Anton Bailey Bridgette Lynette & Cicely D. Joulevette Bailey

Cause No. D-1-GN-14-005114; James Steele, et al. v. GTECH Corporation; in the 201st Judicial District Court of Travis County, Texas

Raymond L. Baines Jeremy & Dustin Gray Baker Brian & Lorry Baldwin **Richard & Balladares** Russell D. & Brenda G. Ballard Quincy J. & Martha J. Baltrip Jonathan & Lindsay Banks Sandra L. Barber Harold W. Barber Cathy & Clarence Barr-Baker Iris Barrientos Jeanie & Jeremy Wilson Basham Robert Baugh Deborah K. Bean **Kevin Beckner** Sandra & Steve Belden Mary Bell Bon & Diana Beltran Victoria Beltran Janie Benjamin James E. III & Petra S Bennett Felicia & Shyam Bhelle Lawrence Biehler Alvin & Marilyn Biela James Brodie & Rachel Biggs Bonnie J. Binns Brian L. & Susan M. Black Eva & Robert Blackwell Janice Blake

Cause No. D-1-GN-14-005114; James Steele, et al. v. GTECH Corporation; in the 201st Judicial District Court of Travis County, Texas

Shane & Tauna Danielle Blevins Sophia Yvonne & David Allen Blevins James Bluiett Antoine & Tamara Bolden Amanda Bolding **Chris Bolton** Anthony Bonkowski Loyce Boose Jessica Bornholdt Susan I. Bosquez Latisha & Boyd Russ & Lynn Brandau Deanna L. & James L Brandenburg Annie & Jerry Walker Breitling Samuel G. & JoAnn Breitling Odis B. Briggs, Sr. Sascha Brigham Virginia Briner David Brockwell Jeremy Brooks Alan & Jeanette Brown Eddie & Sandra Brown Stacey L. Brown Tara Brown Tyrone & Mary Brown LaKesha Brownfield Dianna & Tommy Bruton William S. Bryer Mi Chelle & Jason Bunte

Cause No. D-1-GN-14-005114; James Steele, et al. v. GTECH Corporation; in the 201st Judicial District Court of Travis County, Texas

Dietriche & Allison Butler Gordon & Shannon Butler David W. Byars Stacie Byington Calvin Byrd Amber Cain Earnestine Calhoun Rashelle Caliebe **Kimberly Campbell** Jesus Campos Ricardo Canales, Jr. Roel & Herlinda Cantu Pauline Cantu Alma Nellie Cantu Juan Cantu Leticia & Pedro Cardenas, Jr. Rigo & Gabriella Cardosa Alfred B. Carlin Amanda Carpenter Melvin Carraway Raymond & Ranisha Carter Robert & Beverly Case Joe & Esther Castaneda Cody & Jacklyn Fowler Castillo Alfred & Rosario Castillo Tomas Castro, Jr. & Carmen Elizondo Brent Catalena Randy & Tina Caudle Sylvester Celestine

Anthony Cerniglia & April Davis Mary Helen & Trini Rivera Cervantez Clement & Mildred P. Cervenka **Crystal & Joseph Chambers** Josie Chapa Angelia Chapman James R. Chapman Juan Chapoy T C Chat Jessie & Sonia Chavarria Bertha & Cruz Chavez Maria H. & Arturo Chavez Roy & Crystal Chavez Eric Chavez Rayford A. & Ruby Chimney Ismail & Fatima Ismail Chintamen Daryl Clark Mark & Dena Claver Carl Clay **Billy & Cathy Cleaver Kwamen Cleveland** Karon & Christopher Cloyd Corey Cobb & Cynthia Guice Dan & Cynthia Cobian Felicia Coleman Willie J. & Ruth Helen Collins Mary Conners Sharon Conti

Irma Contreras

Cause No. D-1-GN-14-005114; James Steele, et al. v. GTECH Corporation; in the 201st Judicial District Court of Travis County, Texas

Cheryl Renee Cook Kathy Cook Ben Luke Cooke Betty & Sylvester Cooper Luis Correa Lisa & Jeff Corzine Gloria & Mack Cotton Gena & Casey Craig Pam Crain Larry & Dorothy Crane Truman Crane, Jr. Janice Craven Don Crawford Andrea Creamer & Bobby Stell Jeanie Crenshaw Michael A. Crist, DDS, PA Jerry & Bobbie Cruikshank Gerald Crump Alfredo V. & Melva Cruz Daniela Cruz Felix Cruz & Gloria Valdez Janet Cruz & Michael Iglesias Teresa Cruz David & Stephanie Culver Sandra Curry Mitzi Curtis Verneice S. Daniels **Reginia Daniels-Young** Jacqueline & Jesse Dans

Sherry Davidson **Michelle Davies** R L & Lisa Davis Bennie & Latoya C. Davis Bobby & Anna Davis Lakesha Davis & Dequincy Hollins Michell Davis Thomas Joe & Chasity Adams Davis Juan Albert De La Cruz Carlos De la Fuente Eduardo Tarango De La O Jr. Edna De La Torre Mary Diaz De Leon Elva Martinez & Roberto de Longoria Lucinda & Miguel A. de los Santos Joe & Janie De Los Santos Maura DeAngelo & Brandon Tripicchio Gaile Dearing Joan Deckard Douglas P & Kristen Deeken Tom Deere Diana Degollado Josie Degollado Omar M. Del Bosque Joe DeLeon Virginia Diaz DeLeon Evangelina Ruiz Delgado & Andres Perez Kelly B. & Angelica M. Delgado-Goudschaal Juanita F. Dembo

Velma Denby Derek & Jo Helen Deplanter Elissa Dews Lela M. Diggs Jeanette Dilosa Christopher Dohm & Megan Maynord Charles William & Julia Patricia Dohm, II Manuel & Sanjuana Dominguez Carol & Lionel, Sr. Donald Robert & Christine Donaldson Derek & Rena Doughty **Clifton & Mickey Douglas** Eric Douglas Tyler Doyle Denis & Janet Duckworth Jennifer & Michael Dulin TrayLicia Dunlap Sandy & Lester Durham Kathlyn & Michael Dvorak Mary Eaglan Zeltee Edwards Suehadie Elizondo Michelle Ellinwood Cardell D. Ellis Michael & Angela Ellis Kimberly Ellis Joseph & Claretta Eni Deron J. Entler Adrian & Cindy Esparza

Melissa Estepa **Daisy Evans** Freddie & Stephanie Evans Nicole Everett **Doug Farmer** Jason Feagin Johnnie Felan **Ovum Ferguson** Alvin Ferrell Daniel Joel Fink Melodie Colleen Fitts **Copeland Fitzgerald** Donnie & Brandi Flanagan Dorothy Flanagan Thil Flinoil Ray & Susan Flood Alejandra Flores Alma Flores & Gloria Sedillo Aurelia Flores Edgar Flores & Sandra Guerrero Sandy Flores **Charlotte Floyd** Beau & Rachel M. Follis Wilbert T. & Trina R. Forcey **Derrick Fort Everett Fortiscue** Auduery Franklin **Clarence Franklin** Josephine Franklin-Keys

Delphine French Gudrun (Peggy) Fryer Michelle Fuentes & Jaime E. Yeack Josue Fuentes Martha & Daniel Galindo Kristopher Galland Sylvia & John Gallardo Soledad Gallardo & Cruz Gallardo, Jr. Josie & Charles R. Gallegos **Roxanne Gallegos** Kevin & Delia Galligan Kay Gallivan Andrew J. Garcia Bertha & Dario Garcia Erica Garcia Godofredo Garcia Lucy T. & Rafael Garcia Olga Garcia Raphael Garcia Robert & Olivia Garcia Rolando Garcia Martin Garcia, Jr. Gina Lizette Garza & Antonio Esparza Rebecca Garza Alvaro Garza, Jr. Daisy Gaston-Akinwanile Pamela Gilbert Terri Gilmore Kortina Givens & Roland Chandler

Tina Gladney Milagros Gomez Cesar M. & Sylvia Gonzales Roy A. Gonzales Amelia Gonzalez Diana A. Gonzalez Rebecca Anne Gonzalez Patricia A. Goodley Herb Goodman & Barbara Carr Cecilia Graham Tommie & Connie Graham Michael & Linette Graham Deloria Grant Raymond & Sarah Grant Charles Grays Cyndi Grayson Monique Green Patsy & Lee Green Randy Gregory Pernell Grisby Shane & Audri Grivich Cynthia & Javier Guajardo Sammy & Mireya Guerra Nerio Abel Guerrero, Jr. Abel, Sr. & Rosemary Guerrero Mary Lewis Guidry Lillian Gunn Anthony Gutierrez Harriet Renay & Glenn Guy

Albert & Rebecca S. Hackney **Charles Aaron & Christa Hailey Christina Hall Timothy Hall** James E. Hamilton Forest Hardy Deanna Harley **Richard Harper** Cynthia & Howard Harris Kanitia Harris Jala Harris Narsha Harris-Gordwin James Hart **Russell Hasker** Rhonda Hatfield Robert D. & Mary S. Haveron Carlester W. & Evelyn Haynes Kandy & Brian Heard Tawanda Heim-Jones & Gerald Jones, Jr. Jaime Henry Angela Henson Laquena Henson Beatriz V. Hernandez Maria D. Hernandez Jose & Florinda Hernandez Linda Herrington Heath & Elizabeth Hertenberger James C. Hester Lawrence Hicks

Peter Hickson Justin Hill Yolanda Hill Otis Hill, Jr. **Carolyn & Carnell Hines** Rudy Hinojosa Darlene & Dale Hodge Brenda Hoelscher Jon & Lindsey Hoggard **Brian Holloway** Steffanie & Brandon Holloway Mark & Karen Holloway **Christine Holmen Deaudralyn Holmes Georgie Holmes** Jacob Daniel Honea Sean Honea Gina M. Horton **Jimmy Hoskins** Renah & Minnie Rene House Shalen House Angela Howard Daneka Howard Ralph Gene Howard Carol & Charles Hoyt Brandin Huber Michael Hudson Rosa A. & Rene Huerta Tammy & David Huff

Anna Hughes James Ray & Rhonda Sue Hunt Jennifer Hunt John & Gloria Hunt Sharon Hunter David E. & Luewilda M. Hurles Alfie & Tavecia Hutchinson Carol Jackson Jackie S., Sr.& Rose Jackson Johnathan Jaramillo Donnie Jarrett Gwendolyn R Jefferson Jamal Jefferson Joia Jefferson Patricia & Ronald Jenkins Mario Jenkins Richard A. Joe Alton Johnson Charles E. & Clarice P. Johnson Goldie Johnson James A. & Jessie M. Johnson Neal & Sandra Johnson Wilhelmina Johnson Roland & Lakundria Johnson Terrance & Meesha Johnson Wanda A. Johnson Shannon Johnson Buddy & Amanda Johnson Africa K. Jones & Robert Jones, II

Mary & David Jones **Mitchell Jones** Jericha Karinn & Antonio Jones-Kelly Metilda Joseph **Ronald & Alexis Joubert** Markeith Joulevette Sandra Joya Escobeda & Carlos Escobedo David Juarez Deborah Juarez Diana Juarez Arturo & Cleofas Juarez David Juarez, Jr. Hasibullah Karim Ernest W. & Katherine T. Karisch Bobby G. & Janet T. Keeling Mambi & Aminata Keita Lena Kelley Eva Muriel & Frederick A. Kendrick James A. & Kim Key Susanne Khan-Evans Darryl & Annjenet Killen Brenda Kimble Rhonda Kinchion Andrew & Evelyn King Arthur King **Dorothy King** Felicia & Derry King Walter & Jolley Kingsberry **Brittany Kiser**

Richard L. & Annabell Knebel William E & Cam Koehler Z.E. Kominczak Russell Korman Samuel W. Kostis Kaci Kovalcik Darvin Krenek Ronald & Helen Krueger Dalores & Justin Kurdupski Carmene L. Kyle George Kyle Barbara Kyle Randy & Nhi Lam Jeremy Lane Kendrick J Lane Donna Lang Barbara Lanham Jeff LaReau Nikki Michele Larkin Matthew & Lindsay Larrabee Danielle Lavertu Pete Laxson Veronica & Richard Layman Leslie Lea Stephanie Leal George Lee James & Rachel Lee **Deborah & Gerald Lewis Byron Lewis**

Linda Sue Lewis & Michael Keith Clement Irene S. Linehan Frederick W. Lister Grace Little Margaret L. & Paul A. Lombrano Jan London San Juanita Lopez Yolanda Gomez Lopez & David Lopez Jose Guadalupe & Hortencia Loredo Willie Love & Tasma Greer Ara Love Tarik Lovelace Rufus L. & Rita Lovett Redia & Jerry Lowe Janice K. Lowery Robert W. Lowring Jacqueline S. Lowther & David C. Anderson Daniel Luna Deanne Marie Luna Samantha Luna Vickie Lyons Delfino & Josefina Macatangay Violet Mack Carmela Madarieta Safin Maknojia Sheri Mansfield Sharon Manuel **Dennis March** Glenda & Armando Martin

Amanda M. Martin & Cori Hansen

Daniel Martinez

Hilda Martinez

Linda T. Martinez

Melissa Martinez

Nora Martinez

Ramiro & Sylvia Martinez

Jose & Teresa Martinez

Veronica Matas

Andrea Mayes

Lee G. Mayes

Marcus & Sondra McCarty

Pam McClendon

Cedric & Evelyn McClinton

Kenny McClure

Connie McComb

Denise McCoy

Walter Dale McCulley

Russell W. McDaniel

Sean & Melissa McDermott

Kenneth & Clorine McGowan

James Robert McIntire

Jason McIntire

Rosemary & J J McKeller

Allen McNeal

Denise McNeal

Laquisha McQueen

Cornelius McShan

Shahinur MD Rahman

Chanda M. Meadows Lupe Campos Medina Rebecca & Jenaro Medrano Maida & William Melendez Guadalupe Melgoza Arthur B. & Calletana Mendez Jacob Mendez Juan F., Jr. & Virginia S. Mendoza Cynthia Merritt Jammie Meshburn Lacey Metker & Brian Brown Rebecca Meusel Kenneth Middleton Ken & Charma Migas Brian & Lauren Miller Melody F. Miller & Bill L. Miller, Sr. William Mings Matthew Minshew Oscar & Adys Mirabal Thelma Faye Mitchell & Willie Z. Mitchell, Sr. Shirley M. & Paul Mitchell John Mitschke & Kathy McMorrow Yasmin Mohammad **Nestor Daniel Molina** Joseph Monroe Michael Moore Penelope & Glenn Moore Jeanne Moore Kim & Phil Moore

Marina Morales Victor & Sandra Moraza Israel Moraza Nathaniel Morris Megan Moss Andre & Latrice Moten Robert & Lorena Mottu Judy Mouton Jason Mouton Gary & Rosemary Muenchow Michael J. Mulcahey Regina & Paul A. Mullings George L. Muniz, Sr. & Janie L. Muniz Maria DelCarmen Munoz Ricardo Munoz, Jr. **Catherine Murry** Mohammad M. Musleh Adrienne & Michael Myers **Ronald & Christy Myers** Ted A. & Linda A. Myers Jose Luis & Noemi O. Nanez Elvis Navarro **Ronald Neal** Ryan Neff Tracy & Rebecca Neil Edward & Dahlia Nicholos Mattie Nickerson Helen Nickerson Stephen Nordyke

Dana Norton & Daniel Carey Brenda Nunez Nereyda Ochoa Joel Olson **Kyle Patrick Oneil** Albert Orosco, Jr.& Mary Lou Orosco Selena Orozco Richard Orozco, Jr. Holly Orum Michael & Latoya Owens Aaron & Robin Oyler Gabriel Padilla Braulio & Clarissa Padron David Palmer Pamela Parham Lenella Parks Nevin Parson Kunal Priyal Patel Kathryn Patterson Renee & Robert Brent Patterson Lawrence Paye & Famatta Jebbeh Paye Leticia Marie Pecina Mark & Shannon Pena Cristina Perez Laura Bettina Perez Matthew Perez Virginia M. & Dario Perez **Tony Perez** Alma Perez

Taunya Perry & Wash Sellers, Jr. Vincent Pham Mark Phillips Shekita Phillips Bobby, Jr. & Cheryll Jean Phillips Adolio & Bertha Pinales Charles & Yolanda Plata Ashley Poblete Diane & John Poglajen Mark Pollack Aaron Porras Clyde Powell David & Roseanna Powell Sharon Prejean Sigamone Price Julieta Quintana Daisy Veronica Quintanilla Carol Loretta Rainey Jordan Rajama Zenobia Denise Rambo Blanca C Ramirez Patricia Ramirez & Juan C. Rodriguez Lolita Christina Wallace Randall Janice M. & Victor Randall Bryan S. & Monique Rector Ricky J & Teresa K. Redding Alfred & Deadra Reed Julie Reed

Alberta Reinbold

Jimmie Reynolds Cary & Donna Reynolds **Billie Rich** Lorin Richardson Kim & Joanie Richter Cecilia Ellen Ridgeway Aisha Riley **Kristine Rios** Juan, Jr. & Melissa Rios Merlene Roberts Cynthia D. Robinson Annette Robinson Harrison T Robison Blanca S. Rodriguez Jose Rodriguez Michael J. Rodriguez Tamiko D. Rodriguez Jesse T. Rodriguez Dora Rodriquez-Curtiss & Andrew Curtiss Laci Rogers Mary Roten Ryan Rule Michael Rutherford Claudia & Ramiro Ruvalcaba **Terrell Sadrick** Juan Saenz Raul & Blanca Hilda Salazar Terry & Linda Samples

Roderick Samples

Cause No. D-1-GN-14-005114; James Steele, et al. v. GTECH Corporation; in the 201st Judicial District Court of Travis County, Texas

Donna Samuel

Bernardo & Carmen Sanchez

Edward & Alberta Sanchez

Jason Sanchez

Jose Sanchez

Juan D. Sanchez

Katharina Sanchez

Janet Sarpy

Frederick D. Satchell

Vennie Iris Savia

Schonda Schannon

Peggy A. Scharfe-Tufts

James Wayne Schulte

Denise Schulze

Darrell Scott

James N. Seguin & Olivia M. Benavides

Terry L. Seidl

Sarita Sharma

Chrystal & Adrian Sheffield

Mary Shelton

Debra A. & Howard Shelwood

Janet Sheppard

Jason Shriver

Chaz Simmons

Denovis Simmons

Terry & Diane Sivadge

Jacob Cole Skains

Anton J & Donna Skell

William Slater

Donald & Natausha Slaughter Andrew Peter & Sandra J. Slovak April Smith **Eric Dinell Smith** Georgette & Matthew Smith Jason G. Smith & Cassandra Tabion Jerome & Debra Smith Lance Smith Patrick Smith Ratisha Smith **Tammy Smith** Willie Smith Barbara Sosa Christopher John Sotelo Ron & Carolyn Sparks John Spears Lisa Spinks **Timothy Standfield & Charlott Holt** Jason & Liria Staton James & Geraldine Steele **Terry Stevens** Betty & William Stevenson Perryce Steward Sharon Stinnett & Otis Shores Don & Mary Ann Stone Cynthia Stricklin **Diane Sullivan** Tyler Sullivan

Alvin W. & Susan Sullivan

Nebahat Sungur Maryon Talton **Roderick Taylor Cerol Taylor** Cory Taylor **Trevor Taylor Clay Taylor** Rhonda & Robert S. Taylor-Carrignan Charles & Robbie Teague Tracy S. Teague Natalie Terry **Drake Thais** Leroy Thomas & Rose Payton Lisa Thomas **Ronald Thomas** Robert T Thomas Shoneta Thomas Frances Thomas & Otha Thomas Robert Thomas, Jr. Shirley M. & John M. Thompson Tommy & Sandy Tidwell Ashley Tijerina Derrick Torres **Rufina Torres** Juan Torrez Jose Antonio Torrez Jose Trevino & Juanita Gutierrez Muluka Tsegay Pamela & David Turbeville

Lee Anna Turner Jeffrey Scott Tyson Rosemary & Christian John Ulrich Eloy J & Diana R. Uresti Elizabeth & Hector Valadez Pascual & Delia Valdez Sara & Jose Valdez Alma L. Valle Ivy Vallee Gary Van Ausdall Sylvia & Domingo Vargas Anna Lisa Vasquez Angelica M. Vasquez Santos M. Vasquez Marcus & Tiffany Vasquez Lenny Vega Sheri Vela Donald, Jr. & Jill Vermeulen Michael Leon Verner Latricia Vessel Mandy & Casey Vidaurri Jesus Villanueva Kelly (Joe) & Mary Villarreal Wesley & Kim Vonheeder Delores A. Wade Deborah & Sitman Wainwright Sitman & Kara Wainwright Bryan & Crystal Wainwright Sonny & Vanessa Wainwright

Phyllis Waldrop John & Stephanie Shell Walker Ruby & Carl Ambrose Walker Vanessa Jenkins Walker Arthur G. Walker, Sr. Jonita Rene Ward Harry H. & Barbara A. Wardell Dane & Emma Warren Stacey Warren Larry Washington Robert E. & Carolyn R. Washington Wilmer Washington Jacquelyn & Kenneth Watts Tamika Watts Jeff & Deanna Way **Yvette Webber** Cynthia Werner Barbara West Jay & Terry West Jennifer West Yolanda Wherry Dan & Debra White Jackie White Warren & Pam White Gary & Sharon Whiteley Travis Widemon Dave & Jennifer Wigen Bryce Wilhite **Beverly Williams**

Dwayne Williams Mark & Dolores Williams **Keith Williams** Ted Williams Erica Williams Constance & Charlie Wilson Richard Wilson Tiffany & Bobby Wilson Antonio & Shantera Jones Wiltz Anna Ruth Wiltz Trina Armstead Winn & Gerald Winn Tina & Duane Winters Norma Wolf Mary Woodard **Donald Wooten** Ira Wooten Robbie & Brenda Wooten Jessica A. Wren Normie L. Wright, Jr. Linda Wyatt John & Joanne Yaniec Rosendo Ybarra Nilufa Yeasmin Scott Young Jim L & Bettye J. Zachery Joe & April Zuar Daniel & Erica Zuniga

Cause No. D-1-GN-14-005114; James Steele, et al. v. GTECH Corporation; in the 201st Judicial District Court of Travis County, Texas