

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS: Lina M. Khan, Chair
Noah Joshua Phillips
Rebecca Kelly Slaughter
Christine S. Wilson

<p>In the Matter of</p> <p>RESIDUAL PUMPKIN ENTITY, LLC, a limited liability company, formerly d/b/a CAFEPRESS, and</p> <p>PLANETART, LLC, a limited liability company, d/b/a CAFEPRESS.</p>	<p>DOCKET NO.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------

COMPLAINT

The Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Residual Pumpkin Entity, LLC, a limited liability company, and PlanetArt, LLC, a limited liability company (collectively, "Respondents"), are engaged in unfair and deceptive acts and practices in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. § 5701, appearing to the Commission that this proceeding is in the public interest, alleges:

- Respondent Residual Pumpkin Entity, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company with its principal office or place of business at 11909 Shelbyville Road, Louisville, Kentucky 40243.
- Respondent PlanetArt, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company with its principal office or place of business at 23801 Calabasas Road, Suite 2005, Calabasas, California 91302.
- Respondent Residual Pumpkin Entity developed and operated a platform that allows consumers to purchase customized merchandise such as shirts and coffee mugs from other consumers or

and began operating the website www.cafepress.com. As part of the September 1, 2020 transaction, CafePress changed its name to Residual Pumpkin Entity. This complaint uses the name Residual Pumpkin to refer to activity conducted by that entity before its September 1, 2020 name change.

i. Residual Pumpkifailed to reasonably respond to security incidents. For example, Residual Pumpkifailed to:

i. timely disclose security incidents to relevant parties, preventing them from taking readily available lowcost measures to avoid or mitigate reasonably foreseeable harm;3 (n)JTJ ET Q q 0 0 612 192hë•i À &äp ïï g'34í>!®ïïZiZÒpíç «N

18. On April 10, 2019, Residual Pumpkin received an email from a foreign government with an attached letter stating that a hacker had illegally obtained access to CafePress user account information from January 2014 to January 2019. The email included an attachment with CafePress account logins and passwords and said the hacker had sold the information to a large group of individuals. The email also stated that the hacker had sold the information to a large group of individuals. The email also stated that the hacker had sold the information to a large group of individuals.

19. On April 15, 2019, Residual Pumpkin required all users who logged into the service to reset their passwords, telling consumers only that the company had updated its password policy.

20. Publicly available internet posts began appearing on July 13, 2019, stating that consumer GDWD LQ 5HVLGXDO 3XPSNLQ TV FXVWR SRK D G DISB Q DRH W G D R Twitter.com, Reddit.com and other discussion boards. By July 19, 2019, posters began to request assistance with decrypting the passwords. By August 3, 2019, posts appeared purporting to show recovered passwords from the breach.

21. On July 26, 2019, Residual Pumpkin became aware of a post on Facebook stating that the poster had received notice from a monitoring service that her information had been breached. The post stated that the poster had received notice from a monitoring service that her information had been breached.

22. From July 26, 2019, through August 5, 2019, Residual Pumpkin received additional reports from consumers stating that they received third-party notifications that their data had been hacked. On August 5, 2019, a post on the haveibeenpwned.com website indicated that the website had been breached. The next day, Residual Pumpkin internally confirmed that its customer records were available for sale on the dark web.

23. After third parties publicized the breach, Residual Pumpkin reviewed the data it had received in the April 10, 2019 email and confirmed that it appeared to contain CafePress account names and passwords.

24. In September 2019, Residual Pumpkin

Injury to Consumers

34. &RQVXPHUV KDYH OLNHO\ VXIIHUG DFWXDO LQMXU\ DV IDLOXUHV %UHDFKHG 3HUVRQDOV,QIRUPDWLRQ DVSRQGHQWV used to commit identity theft and fraud. For example, as noted above, Personal Information H[ILOWUDWHG ISystem,includinglogincredentials and Social Security numbers, was known to be in the hands of criminals on the dark web including credit card fraudsters scammers who, among other things, used recovered passwords in extortion attempts of 5HVSRRGHQWV¶ FRQVXPHUV

35. 5HVLGXDO 3XPSXU¶WR UHVSRRG DGHTXDWHO\ WR PXO led to an unreasonable delay in notifying consumers that their information was exposed and increased the likelihood that those consumers would become victims of identity theft and fraud. 5HVLGXDO 3XPSXU¶VSDVVZRUG UHVHW SURFHGXUH IXUWK FRQVXPHUV¶ 3HUVRQDO ,QIRUPDWLRQ DV



To limit the use and disclosure of your personal information, please submit a written request to GDPR@cafepress.com.

38. The 'HSDUWPHQW RI &RPPHUFH³ &RPPHUFH' DQG WKH (X) the Privacy Shield to provide a mechanism for companies to transfer personal data from the European Union to the United States in a manner consistent with the requirements of the European Union law on data protection. The Swiss Privacy Shield framework is identical to the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework.

39. 3ULYDF\ 6KLHOG H\SKUDHW V\OKLSOHR YLGHFWLRQV E\ RUJDQL] Privacy Shield are entirely voluntary, effective compliance is compulsory: organizations that self-certify to the Department and publicly declare their commitment to adhere to the Principles of the Privacy Shield Framework. PXVW FRPSO\ IXOO\ ZLWK WKH 3ULQFLSOHV

40. To join the EU-U.S. and/or Swiss-U.S. Privacy Shield framework, a company must certify to Commerce that it complies with the Privacy Shield Principles. Participating companies must annually recertify their compliance.

41. Companies under the jurisdiction of the FTC are eligible to join the EU-U.S. and/or Swiss-U.S. Privacy Shield framework. Both frameworks warn companies that claim to have self

Principles, except where the burden or expense of providing access would be
GLVSURSRUWLRQDWH WR WKH ULVNV WR WKH LQGL
where the rights of persons other than the individual would be violated.

44. Although the European Court of Justice determined on July 16, 2020 that the EU
Privacy Shield framework was not adequate for allowing the lawful transfer of personal data
from the European Union and the Swiss Data Protection and Information Commissioner
determined on September 8, 2020 that the Swiss U.S. Privacy Shield framework was similarly

49. The acts and practices of Respondents alleged in this complaint involve material conduct occurring within the United States.

Count I
Data Security Misrepresentations

50. As described in Paragraphs 10, Respondents have represented, directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, that they

Count V
Misrepresentation Relating to Privacy Shield Frameworks

~~557~~.. As described in Paragraph

