

1 Teresa S. Renaker – CA State Bar No. 187800  
Margo Hasselman Greenough – CA State Bar No. 228529  
2 Kirsten G. Scott – CA State Bar No. 253464  
RENAKER HASSELMAN SCOTT LLP  
3 235 Montgomery Street, Suite 944  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
4 Telephone: (415) 653-1733  
Facsimile: (415) 727-5079  
5 teresa@renakerhasselman.com  
margo@renakerhasselman.com  
6 kirsten@renakerhasselman.com

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10 SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND DIVISION

11 NAOMI BERMAN, )  
12 Plaintiff, ) Case No. 3:19-cv-06489  
13 vs. ) **COMPLAINT (ERISA)**  
14 ESTEE LAUDER INC., THE ESTEE LAUDER )  
INC. EMPLOYEE BENEFITS COMMITTEE, )  
15 ALIGHT SOLUTIONS LLC, and )  
STATE STREET BANK & TRUST CO., )  
16 Defendants. )  
17

18 **JURISDICTION**

19 1. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 28  
20 U.S.C. § 1331 and the specific jurisdictional statute for claims brought pursuant to the  
21 Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”), ERISA § 502(e) and (f), 29  
22 U.S.C. § 1132(e) and (f).

23 **VENUE**

24 2. Venue lies in the Northern District of California pursuant to ERISA § 502(e)(2),  
25 29 U.S.C. § 1132(e)(2), because the Estee Lauder Companies 401(k) Savings Plan is  
26 administered in part in this District and the breaches alleged occurred in part in this District.

27 **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

28 3. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-2(c), this case should be assigned to the San

1 Francisco Division or Oakland Division because a substantial part of the events or omissions  
2 which give rise to the claims occurred in San Francisco.

3 **NATURE OF THE CASE**

4 4. In September and October 2016, an unknown person or persons stole Plaintiff  
5 Naomi Berman’s retirement savings by withdrawing a total of \$99,000 in three separate  
6 unauthorized distributions from her account in the Estee Lauder Companies 401(k) Savings Plan  
7 (“the Lauder Plan”). Ms. Berman brings this action to remedy the harm caused by the Defendant  
8 Lauder Plan fiduciaries’ failures to safeguard the Lauder Plan’s assets.

9 **THE PARTIES AND THE PLAN**

10 5. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Naomi Berman has been a participant, as defined  
11 by ERISA § 3(7), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(7), in the Lauder Plan. Ms. Berman resides in San  
12 Francisco.

13 6. Defendant Estee Lauder Inc. (“Lauder Inc.”) is a Delaware corporation with its  
14 principal place of business in Melville, New York. Lauder Inc. is the plan sponsor of the Lauder  
15 Plan and is a fiduciary of the Lauder Plan within the meaning of ERISA § 3(21), 29 U.S.C. §  
16 1002(21), in that it exercises authority or control respecting management or disposition of the  
17 Lauder Plan’s assets, it exercises discretionary authority or discretionary control respecting  
18 management of the Lauder Plan, and/or it has discretionary authority or discretionary  
19 responsibility in the administration of the Lauder Plan. Among other authority, Lauder Inc. has  
20 the authority to appoint the Lauder Plan’s Plan Administrator and exercises discretion in  
21 selecting and monitoring the Plan Administrator and/or other fiduciaries.

22 7. Defendant Estee Lauder Inc. Employee Benefits Committee (“the Benefits  
23 Committee”) is the Plan Administrator of the Lauder Plan within the meaning of ERISA §  
24 3(16)(a)(i), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(16)(a)(i). At all relevant times, the Benefits Committee was a  
25 named fiduciary of the Lauder Plan by reason of being the Plan Administrator. The Benefits  
26 Committee is located in New York, New York.

27 8. Defendant Alight Solutions LLC is an Illinois limited liability company with its  
28 principal place of business in Illinois. At all relevant times, Alight’s predecessor, Hewitt

1 Associates LLC (“Hewitt”), provided contract administration, record-keeping, and information  
2 management services to the Lauder Plan. At all relevant times, Hewitt was a fiduciary of the  
3 Lauder Plan within the meaning of ERISA § 3(21), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(21), in that it exercised  
4 authority or control respecting management or disposition of the Lauder Plan’s assets, it  
5 exercised discretionary authority or discretionary control respecting management of the Lauder  
6 Plan, and/or it had discretionary authority or discretionary responsibility in the administration of  
7 the Lauder Plan. Specifically, upon information and belief, Hewitt operated a telephone  
8 customer service center and a website at <http://www.ybr.com/esteelauder>, both of which  
9 provided Lauder Plan participants with the ability to manage their Lauder Plan accounts,  
10 including requesting distributions of benefits. Upon information and belief, Hewitt exercised  
11 control over Lauder Plan assets by directing distributions from participants’ accounts, including  
12 the unauthorized distributions in this case. Hewitt was compensated for its services by direct  
13 payment from the Lauder Plan. Alight maintains an office in San Francisco.

14 9. Defendant State Street Bank & Trust Co. (“State Street”) is a Massachusetts  
15 corporation with its principal place of business in Boston, Massachusetts. At all relevant times,  
16 State Street served as custodian of the Lauder Plan’s assets and provided investment  
17 management services to the Lauder Plan. State Street was compensated for its services by  
18 investment management fees paid directly from the Lauder Plan, and by “soft dollar”  
19 commissions.” As such, State Street was a fiduciary of the Lauder Plan within the meaning of  
20 ERISA § 3(21), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(21), in that it exercised authority or control respecting  
21 management or disposition of the Lauder Plan’s assets, it exercised discretionary authority or  
22 discretionary control respecting management of the Lauder Plan, it had discretionary authority  
23 or discretionary responsibility in the administration of the Lauder Plan, and/or it provided  
24 investment advice for a fee or other compensation from the Lauder Plan. State Street maintains  
25 an office in San Francisco.

26 10. The Lauder Plan is an employee pension benefit plan as defined by ERISA §  
27 3(2), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(2), sponsored by Lauder Inc. The Lauder Plan is a defined contribution  
28 or “individual account” pension plan as defined in ERISA § 3(34), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(34).

1 According to the Lauder Plan’s 2016 IRS Form 5500, as of December 31, 2016, the Lauder Plan  
2 had 16,257 participants with account balances, and \$1,413,095,851 in assets.

3 **FACTS**

4 11. Ms. Berman began working for MAC Cosmetics, a division of the Estee Lauder  
5 Companies, in San Francisco in November 1998. She worked full-time while putting herself  
6 through college and then earning a teaching credential.

7 12. While working for MAC Cosmetics, Ms. Berman contributed the maximum  
8 permitted amount to the Lauder Plan and received matching contributions.

9 13. In March 2006, Ms. Berman left MAC Cosmetics to become a teacher in the San  
10 Francisco Unified School District.

11 14. As a vested participant in the Lauder Plan, Ms. Berman continued to receive  
12 periodic Lauder Plan account statements by mail.

13 15. By June 30, 2016, Ms. Berman’s account balance in the Lauder Plan had grown  
14 to more than \$90,000. A true and correct copy of Ms. Berman’s account statement for the  
15 second quarter of 2016 is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

16 16. On or about October 24, 2016, Ms. Berman received by mail a document on  
17 Estee Lauder Companies letterhead entitled “Confirmation of Payment – 401(k) Savings Plan”  
18 and dated October 10, 2016 (“the October 10 Confirmation of Payment”). This document stated  
19 that on October 7, 2016, the Lauder Plan had distributed \$37,000 from Ms. Berman’s account to  
20 a checking account at Suntrust Bank. A true and correct copy of the October 10 Confirmation of  
21 Payment is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

22 17. Subsequently, Ms. Berman received by mail another Confirmation of Payment,  
23 this one dated October 18, 2016 (“the October 18 Confirmation of Payment”). The second  
24 Confirmation of Payment stated that the Lauder Plan had distributed \$50,000 from Ms.  
25 Berman’s account to a checking account at TD Bank. A true and correct copy of the October 18  
26 Confirmation of Payment is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

27 18. Also subsequent to receiving the October 10 Confirmation of Payment, Ms.  
28 Berman received by mail her Lauder Plan account statement for the third quarter of 2016, which

1 showed a withdrawal of \$12,000. Ms. Berman learned from Estee Lauder that the \$12,000 had  
2 been distributed on September 29, 2016, to an account at Woodforest National Bank. Ms.  
3 Berman never received a Confirmation of Payment for the September 29 distribution. A true and  
4 correct copy of Ms. Berman's Lauder Plan account statement for the third quarter of 2016 is  
5 attached hereto as Exhibit D.

6 19. The Lauder Plan account statements and Confirmations of Payment state that  
7 they are "delivered by Aon," referring to Aon Consulting, Inc., the sole member (owner) of  
8 Hewitt Associates LLC.

9 20. Ms. Berman never requested or authorized any distribution from the Lauder Plan,  
10 and never had any account at Woodforest National Bank, Suntrust Bank, or TD Bank.

11 21. By the time that Ms. Berman received the first mailed distribution notice, all  
12 three distributions had been completed.

13 22. Upon receiving the first Confirmation of Payment, Ms. Berman telephoned the  
14 Hewitt Customer Service Center at the number on the Confirmation of Payment. The Customer  
15 Service Center informed her that her remaining account balance was \$3,791.

16 23. The Customer Service Center stated that it would investigate the unauthorized  
17 distributions, but never provided Ms. Berman with any information regarding its investigation.

18 24. Between October 24, 2016, and January 2, 2017, Ms. Berman made at least 23  
19 calls to the Customer Service Center regarding the unauthorized distributions. Ultimately, the  
20 Customer Service Center informed Ms. Berman that it had completed its investigation, no  
21 money had been recovered, and Ms. Berman's Lauder Plan account would not be made whole  
22 for the losses. Neither Lauder Inc., nor the Benefits Committee, nor Hewitt contacted Ms.  
23 Berman further regarding the unauthorized distributions.

24 25. On or about October 25, 2016, Ms. Berman reported the unauthorized  
25 distributions to the San Francisco Police Department and the FBI, and placed a fraud alert on  
26 her credit file with Equifax.

27 26. On November 7, 2016, State Street emailed Ms. Berman and requested that she  
28 complete an "Affidavit of Forgery" for each unauthorized distribution. Ms. Berman returned the

1 requested affidavits the same day. State Street did not contact Ms. Berman further regarding the  
2 unauthorized distributions.

3 27. Other than the unauthorized distributions from her Lauder Plan account, Ms.  
4 Berman did not experience unauthorized activity in any of her financial accounts.

5 28. Prior to her receipt of the October 10 Confirmation of Payment, Ms. Berman had  
6 no knowledge of the unauthorized distributions. None of the Defendants contacted her prior to  
7 the distributions to obtain her authorization to make the distributions, and none of the  
8 Defendants notified her of the distributions by any means other than the mailed Confirmations  
9 of Payment and third-quarter account statement, until she telephoned the customer service  
10 center.

11 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

12 **Claim to Restore Plan Losses**  
13 **Pursuant to ERISA §§ 409 and 502(a)(2), 29 U.S.C. §§ 1109 and 1132(a)(2)**  
14 **Against All Defendants**

15 29. Ms. Berman incorporates Paragraphs 1 through 28 as though fully set forth  
16 herein.

17 30. ERISA § 404(a), 29 U.S.C. § 1104(a), requires that a fiduciary discharge its  
18 duties with respect to a plan solely in the interest of the participants and beneficiaries; for the  
19 exclusive purpose of providing benefits to participants and their beneficiaries and defraying  
20 reasonable expenses of administering the plan; and with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence  
21 under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent man acting in a like capacity and familiar  
22 with such matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like character and with like  
23 aims.

24 31. ERISA § 409, 29 U.S.C. § 1109, provides that any person who is a fiduciary with  
25 respect to a plan who breaches any of the responsibilities, obligations, or duties imposed upon  
26 fiduciaries by ERISA Title I shall be personally liable to make good to such plan any losses to  
27 the plan resulting from each such breach, and shall be subject to such other equitable or  
28 remedial relief as the court may deem appropriate.

32. ERISA § 502(a)(2), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(2), authorizes a plan participant to bring

1 an action for appropriate relief under ERISA § 409.

2 33. Defendants, and each of them, breached their fiduciary duties of loyalty and  
3 prudence by causing or allowing the Lauder Plan to make unauthorized distributions of plan  
4 assets; failing to confirm authorization for distributions with the plan participant before making  
5 distributions; failing to provide timely notice of distributions to the plan participant by telephone  
6 or email; failing to identify and halt suspicious distribution requests, such as requests for  
7 multiple distributions to accounts in different banks; failing to establish distribution processes to  
8 safeguard Lauder Plan assets against unauthorized withdrawals; failing to monitor other  
9 fiduciaries' distribution processes, protocols, and activities; and related acts and omissions.

10 34. As a result of Defendants' breaches, the Lauder Plan has suffered losses,  
11 including \$99,000 and investment earnings thereon from Ms. Berman's account.

## 12 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

### 13 **Claim for Penalties for Document Disclosure Violations** 14 **Pursuant to ERISA § 502(c), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(c)** **Against Defendant Benefits Committee**

15 35. Ms. Berman incorporates Paragraphs 1 through 28 as though fully set forth  
16 herein.

17 36. ERISA § 104(b)(4), 29 U.S.C. § 1024(b)(4), provides that a plan administrator  
18 shall, upon written request of any participant or beneficiary, furnish a copy of the latest updated  
19 summary plan description, and the latest annual report, any terminal report, the bargaining  
20 agreement, trust agreement, contract, or other instruments under which the plan is established or  
21 operated.

22 37. ERISA § 502(c), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(c), provides that any administrator who fails  
23 or refuses to comply with a request for any information which such administrator is required by  
24 ERISA to furnish to a participant or beneficiary by mailing the material requested to the last  
25 known address of the requesting participant or beneficiary within 30 days after such request may  
26 in the court's discretion be personally liable to such participant or beneficiary in the amount of  
27 up to \$100 a day from the date of such failure or refusal, and the court may in its discretion  
28 order such other relief as it deems proper.

1 38. 29 C.F.R. § 2575.502c-1 increases the penalty under ERISA § 502(c) to \$110  
2 per day.

3 39. On March 25, 2019, counsel for Ms. Berman made a written request for Lauder  
4 Plan documents to the Benefits Committee pursuant to ERISA § 104(b)(4). Upon information  
5 and belief, the Benefits Committee received the request on March 28, 2019. The Benefits  
6 Committee has not responded to the request.

7 40. Accordingly, the Benefits Committee has failed or refused to provide requested  
8 material since April 27, 2019.

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 **WHEREFORE**, Ms. Berman prays that the Court grant the following relief:

11 As to the First Claim for Relief:

- 12 A. Declare that Defendants, and each of them, have breached their fiduciary duties
- 13 of loyalty and prudence;
- 14 B. Order that Defendants, and each of them, restore to Ms. Berman’s Lauder Plan
- 15 account \$99,000, plus investment earnings thereon from the distribution dates to
- 16 the date of judgment herein;
- 17 C. Award Ms. Berman reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs of suit incurred herein
- 18 pursuant to ERISA § 502(g), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g); and
- 19 D. Provide such other equitable and remedial relief as the Court deems appropriate.

20 As to the Second Claim for Relief:

- 21 A. Order that Defendant Benefits Committee pay to Ms. Berman a penalty of \$110
- 22 per day for each day from April 27, 2019, to the day that the Benefits Committee
- 23 provides to her all documents required to be provided under ERISA § 104(b)(4);
- 24 B. Award Ms. Berman reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs of suit incurred herein
- 25 pursuant to ERISA § 502(g), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g); and

26 //

27 //

28 //



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

C. Provide such other relief as the Court deems equitable and just.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 9, 2019

RENAKER HASSELMAN SCOTT LLP

By: /s/ Teresa S. Renaker

Teresa S. Renaker  
Attorneys for Plaintiff