



WEBSITE LEGAL RISK AUDIT – REPORT

# SUTTER PARK FAMILY DENTAL

*sutterparkdental.com*

An automated scan of the same scope a plaintiff firm runs — fourteen lawsuit-track findings, four regulatory findings, ranked by exposure.

# D

RISK GRADE – SIGNIFICANT LAWSUIT EXPOSURE

*Counsel review recommended. Two critical findings sit at the demand-letter trigger threshold.*

01 — EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

# WHAT WE FOUND, *in one minute.*

**T**his site has fourteen distinct lawsuit-track issues across three statutes. Two are critical: a Meta Pixel firing before any consent banner appears, and a live chat widget piping visitor conversations to a third-party vendor without disclosure. Either one, on its own, is a colorable CIPA claim worth \$5,000 per visitor in statutory damages — and Sutter Park Family Dental's California address makes it a textbook target.

<b>D</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>\$5K– \$25K</b>
RISK GRADE	CRITICAL FINDINGS	MEDIUM FINDINGS	LOW FINDINGS	PAGES SCANNED	LIKELY FIRST-OFFENSE SETTLEMENT

**LAWSUIT TRACK · ACT NOW**

## 14 FINDINGS UNDER ADA, UNRUH, CIPA, VPPA

These can become a demand letter on any business day. No cure period, no pre-suit notice, no warning. Per-violation statutory damages stack.

**REGULATORY TRACK · CURE WINDOW**

## 4 FINDINGS UNDER CALOPPA, CCPA, VCDPA

Become enforcement actions only if a state attorney general acts — and most statutes provide a 30 to 60-day cure period before any penalty attaches.

**WHAT FOLLOWS**

**TWO CRITICAL FINDINGS GET FULL EVIDENCE TREATMENT. NINE MEDIUM AND THREE LOW FINDINGS LAND IN SUMMARY TABLES. THEN THREE PATHS TO REMEDIATION.**

PAGE 03 — FINDING 01 · PAGE 04 — FINDING 02 · PAGE 05 — TABLES · PAGE 06 — NEXT STEPS

*This is an automated audit, not legal advice and not a WCAG, CCPA, GDPR, or ADA conformance certification. Automated tools detect roughly 30–40% of accessibility issues by criteria coverage; manual review is required for full compliance assurance.*

## 02 — THE TWO CRITICAL FINDINGS

# EITHER OF THESE ALONE IS A *colorable CIPA claim.*

Both findings below are demand-letter triggers under California Penal Code §§631 and 637.2. Each visitor experience is one cause of action. Statutory damages do not require proof of harm.

01

CRITICAL

CIPA · CAL. PENAL CODE §637.2

\$5,000 / VIOLATION

## META PIXEL FIRES BEFORE CONSENT.

## OBSERVED

On every page load, the site issues a network request to connect.facebook.net/en\_US/fbevents.js 1.2 seconds after page open — well before any cookie or consent banner appears. The pixel transmits visitor IP, page URL, and (where available) the visitor's Facebook ID to Meta. No consent gate sits in front of it.

## WHY IT MATTERS

CIPA §637.2 provides \$5,000 in statutory damages per violation, with no requirement to prove actual harm. A California visitor who experiences this pre-consent transmission has a complete cause of action. Class-action plaintiff firms (Pacific Trial Attorneys, Bursor & Fisher) run automated scanners that detect exactly this signature. The signature is one network request.

## EVIDENCE

URL	sutterparkdental.com/ + 4 of 5 scanned
REQUEST	POST connect.facebook.net/en_US/fbevents.js
TIMING	+1.2s – pre-consent
BANNER	not detected before request
PIXEL ID	987654321098765

## RECOMMENDED FIX

Either (a) remove the Meta Pixel entirely if it isn't driving meaningful conversion attribution, or (b) gate it behind an opt-in consent banner that defaults to 'off' and only loads the pixel after explicit click. Cookiebot, OneTrust, and Termly all support this pattern.

ESTIMATED EFFORT – 2-4 HOURS OF DEVELOPER TIME

02

CRITICAL

CIPA · CAL. PENAL CODE §631 + §637.2

\$5,000 / VIOLATION

## LIVE CHAT CONVERSATIONS ROUTE TO A THIRD-PARTY VENDOR UNDISCLOSED.

### OBSERVED

The Drift chat widget (js.drifft.com/include/...) is loaded on the homepage, About page, and Contact page. Conversations typed into the chat are transmitted to Drift's servers in real time. The privacy policy does not disclose Drift by name, does not explain that conversations are intercepted by a third party, and the chat widget itself displays no consent notice before opening.

### WHY IT MATTERS

California CIPA §631 prohibits the recording or interception of communications without consent of all parties. Multiple recent suits (Pacific Trial Attorneys filings throughout 2025) have alleged that loading a third-party chat tool without disclosure constitutes interception. Per-conversation damages: \$5,000.

### EVIDENCE

PAGES	/, /about, /contact
VENDOR	Drift (js.drifft.com)
POLICY	no disclosure
NOTICE	not shown in widget
SESSIONS	high – chat is prominent CTA

### RECOMMENDED FIX

Either (a) replace Drift with a self-hosted chat that doesn't route off-domain, (b) add a one-time consent screen before the chat opens, or (c) name Drift explicitly in the privacy policy and add a chat-side notice. Note: option (c) is the weakest — most CIPA filings target this exact configuration.

ESTIMATED EFFORT – 1-3 DAYS DEPENDING ON PATH

*“THE SIGNATURE PLAINTIFF SCANNERS LOOK FOR IS ONE NETWORK REQUEST TO A TRACKING ENDPOINT BEFORE ANY CONSENT UI IS ACKNOWLEDGED. WE SEE THAT SIGNATURE ON THIS SITE, TWICE.*

– VITKI DATA SCANNER – MAY 3, 2026

### SETTLEMENT CONTEXT

#### WHY THESE TWO FINDINGS MATTER MOST

Sutter Park Family Dental's address in Sacramento makes it a California-resident defendant. Under §637.2, any California visitor who experiences either of these transmissions has standing. Recent CIPA settlements for small businesses with this profile cluster between **\$5,000 and \$25,000** for first-offense matters resolved pre-litigation, with attorneys' fees added for the plaintiff side.

*This is an automated audit, not legal advice. Statutes referenced are accurate to the date of this report and may change. For questions about specific legal exposure, consult counsel.*

## 03 — MEDIUM · LOW · INFORMATIONAL

# THE REMAINING SIXTEEN FINDINGS.

Lower per-finding damages, higher cumulative WCAG exposure. Most fix in under an hour each; together they account for the bulk of accessibility risk.

**MEDIUM** 9 FINDINGS

#	TITLE	LENS	STATUTE	DAMAGES ANCHOR
03	47 WCAG 2.1 AA violations across 5 pages — button labels, color contrast, missing alt text	WCAG	ADA III + Unruh	\$4,000 / CA visit
04	No accessibility statement on the site	WCAG	ADA III	Injunctive + fees
05	Privacy policy missing 4 of 6 CalOPPA-required elements	Privacy	Cal. B&P §22575	AG notice
06	Cookie banner is decorative — does not block trackers when "Reject" is clicked	Cookies	GDPR Art. 7 / CCPA	\$7.5K-\$20K / state-AG
07	Appointment-booking form fails keyboard navigation — focus traps in date picker	WCAG	ADA III + Unruh	\$4,000 / CA visit
08	Patient testimonial videos play without captions	WCAG	ADA III + Unruh	\$4,000 / CA visit
09	TikTok Pixel detected — no opt-out	Trackers	CIPA §637.2 (post-Camplisson)	\$5,000 / visit
10	Microsoft Clarity session-replay records visitor input fields	Trackers	CIPA §631	\$5,000 / visit
11	Color contrast ratio fails on primary CTA buttons — 3.1:1, requires 4.5:1	WCAG	ADA III	\$4,000 / CA visit

**LOW & INFO** 5 FINDINGS

#	TITLE	NOTE
12	Alt text present but generic ("image", "photo") on 12 images	Useful for SEO too — fix recommended
13	Form labels associated via placeholder rather than <label> (4 forms)	Screen-reader degraded experience
14	Two videos use auto-play (accessibility concern, not strict violation)	Disable auto-play
INFO	Google Analytics 4 detected	Not currently a CIPA target — disclose in privacy policy
INFO	Stripe Elements payment form is properly isolated	Good practice — no action needed

*Damages anchors reflect statutory minimums and do not include attorneys' fees, which the plaintiff bar typically recovers separately under fee-shifting provisions.*

## 04 — WHAT TO DO NEXT

# THREE PATHS, *by* *speed and cost.*

The two critical findings — Meta Pixel and the Drift chat widget — are the demand-letter triggers; fix those first regardless of which path you choose. The medium-severity WCAG findings can be batched. Re-scans are included to verify.

## PATH A

## DIY REMEDIATION

FREE · ~2 WEEKS

Hand this report to your web developer. Critical findings (01 and 02) first — they're the demand-letter triggers. Medium-severity WCAG batched over 2–3 weeks. One re-scan included.

## PATH B

VITKI FORGE  
REMEDICATION

PAID · 1-3 WEEKS

Our sister team takes this report and fixes everything to verified compliance.

- Critical Fixes — **~\$1,500**
- Full Compliance Sprint — **~\$3,500**
- Compliance + Care — **\$99–249/mo**

*Audit fee credits toward Forge work if started within 60 days.*

## PATH C

## REFER TO COUNSEL

VARIABLE

For sites with revenue exposure or pending litigation concerns, this report is structured to be reviewed by an attorney. Several findings cite specific statutes counsel may want to interpret before remediation.

## RE-SCANS INCLUDED

**ONE RE-SCAN IS BUNDLED WITH THIS PRO TIER AUDIT.  
AFTER REMEDIATION, REQUEST THE RE-SCAN TO VERIFY.**

EMAIL: [HELLO@VITKIDATA.COM](mailto:HELLO@VITKIDATA.COM) · REFERENCE AUDIT ID #VD-2026-0142

*This is an automated audit, not legal advice and not a WCAG, CCPA, GDPR, or ADA conformance certification. Automated tools detect roughly 30–40% of accessibility issues by criteria coverage; manual review by a qualified human tester is required for full compliance assurance. Results reflect a single point in time. Statutes referenced are accurate to the date of this report and may change. For questions about your specific legal exposure, consult counsel.*