

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

DANIEL ABRAHAMOV, on behalf of
himself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

MRS BPO, LLC

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
AND
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff DANIEL ABRAHAMOV (hereinafter, “Plaintiff”), a New York resident, brings this class action complaint by and through his attorneys, Daniel Cohen, PLLC, against Defendants MRS BPO, LLC (hereinafter “Defendant”), individually and on behalf of a class of all others similarly situated, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, based upon information and belief of Plaintiff’s counsel, except for allegations specifically pertaining to Plaintiff, which are based upon Plaintiff’s personal knowledge.

INTRODUCTION/PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. Congress enacted the FDCPA in 1977 in response to the “abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors.” 15 U.S.C. § 1692(a). At that time, Congress was concerned that “abusive debt collection practices contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy.” *Id.* Congress concluded that “existing laws . . . [we]re inadequate to protect consumers,” and that “the effective collection of debts” does not require “misrepresentation or other abusive debt collection practices.” 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692(b) & (c).
2. Congress explained that the purpose of the Act was not only to eliminate abusive debt collection practices, but also to “insure that those debt collectors who refrain from using

abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged.” *Id.* § 1692(e). After determining that the existing consumer protection laws were inadequate, *id.* § 1692(b), Congress gave consumers a private cause of action against debt collectors who fail to comply with the Act. *Id.* § 1692k.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The Court has jurisdiction over this class action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq.* and 28 U.S.C. § 2201. If applicable, the Court also has pendent jurisdiction over the state law claims in this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).
4. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

NATURE OF THE ACTION

5. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of a class of New York consumers seeking redress for Defendant’s actions of using a misleading, deceptive, unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.
6. Defendant's actions violated § 1692 *et seq.* of Title 15 of the United States Code, commonly referred to as the Fair Debt Collections Practices Act (“FDCPA”) which prohibits debt collectors from engaging in abusive, deceptive and unfair practices.
7. Plaintiff is seeking damages, and declaratory and injunctive relief.

PARTIES

8. Plaintiff is a natural person and a resident of the State of New York, and is a “Consumer” as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692(a)(3).
9. Defendant is a collection agency with an office maintained in Cherry Hill, New Jersey.
10. Defendant is a company that uses the mail, telephone, and facsimile, and regularly engages in business, the principal purpose of which is to attempt to collect debts alleged to be due another.
11. Defendant is a “debt collector,” as defined under the FDCPA under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

12. Plaintiff brings claims, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (hereinafter “FRCP”)

Rule 23, individually and on behalf of the following consumer class (the “Class”):

- Plaintiff brings this action individually and as a class action on behalf of all persons similarly situated in the State of New York from whom Defendant attempted to collect a consumer debt using the same unlawful form letter herein, from one year before the date of this Complaint to the present.
- The Class satisfies all the requirements of Rule 23 of the FRCP for maintaining a class action:

13. The Class satisfies all the requirements of Rule 23 of the FRCP for maintaining a class action:

- Upon information and belief, the Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable because there are hundreds and/or thousands of persons who have received debt collection letters and/or notices from Defendant that violate specific provisions of the FDCPA. Plaintiff is complaining of a standard form letter and/or notice that is sent to hundreds of persons (*See Exhibit A*, except that the undersigned attorney has, in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2 partially redacted the financial account numbers in an effort to protect Plaintiff’s privacy);
- There are questions of law and fact which are common to the Class and which predominate over questions affecting any individual Class member. These common questions of law and fact include, without limitation:
 - a. Whether Defendant violated various provisions of the FDCPA;
 - b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class have been injured by Defendant’s conduct;
 - c. Whether Plaintiff and the Class have sustained damages and are

entitled to restitution as a result of Defendant's wrongdoing and if so, what is the proper measure and appropriate statutory formula to be applied in determining such damages and restitution; and

d. Whether Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to declaratory and/or injunctive relief.

- Plaintiff's claims are typical of the Class, which all arise from the same operative facts and are based on the same legal theories.
- Plaintiff has no interest adverse or antagonistic to the interest of the other members of the Class.
- Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interest of the Class and has retained experienced and competent attorneys to represent the Class.
- A Class Action is superior to other methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims herein asserted. Plaintiff anticipates that no unusual difficulties are likely to be encountered in the management of this class action.
- A Class Action will permit large numbers of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously and without the duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would engender. Class treatment will also permit the adjudication of relatively small claims by many Class members who could not otherwise afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein. Absent a Class Action, class members will continue to suffer losses of statutory protected rights as well as monetary damages. If Defendant's conduct is allowed to proceed without remedy, it will continue to reap and retain the proceeds of its ill-gotten gains.

- Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to the entire Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

ALLEGATIONS PARTICULAR TO DANIEL ABRAHAMOV

14. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs numbered “1” through “13” herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.
15. Defendant collects and attempts to collect debts incurred or alleged to have been incurred for personal, family or household purposes on behalf of creditors using the United States Postal Services, telephone, facsimile, and Internet.
16. Upon information and belief, within the last year Defendant commenced efforts to collect an alleged consumer “debt” as defined by 15 U.S.C. 1692a(5), when it mailed a Collection Letter to Plaintiff seeking to collect on an unpaid account allegedly owed to Chase Bank USA, N.A.
17. On or around December 30, 2016, Defendant sent Plaintiff a collection letter (hereinafter, the “Letter”). See Exhibit A.
18. The Letter was sent or caused to be sent by persons employed by Defendant as a “debt collector” as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(6).
19. The Letter is a “communication” as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(2).
20. The Letter states in pertinent part: *“If we settle this debt with you for less than the full outstanding balance, Chase may offer you less favorable terms in the future for some Chase products or services, or may deny your application.”*
21. As a result of the following Counts, Defendant violated the FDCPA.

First Count

**15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(10), 1692e(2)(A) & 1692f
Defendant’s Letter Dated December 30, 2016 Falsely Implies That Paying The Debt**

Claimed In Full Rather Than Accepting A Settlement Will Enhance The Consumer's Likelihood Of Receiving Future Credit Products, And Will Lead To Improved Creditworthiness

22. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs numbered “1” through “21” herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.
23. Sections 1692e, 1692e(10), and 1692e(2)(A), of Title 15 of the U.S. Code, prohibit false, misleading or deceitful statements in collection communications.
24. Section 1692f prohibits debt collectors from using unconscionable or unfair means in connection with the collection of a debt.
25. A collection notice that may confuse or mislead the least sophisticated consumer is deceptive under the FDCPA, such as where “it can be reasonably read to have two or more different meanings, one of which is inaccurate.” *Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.*, 74 F.3d 30, 35 (2d Cir. 1996); accord *Brown v. Card Serv. Ctr.*, 464 F.3d 450, 455 (3rd Cir. 2006); *Kistener v. Law Offices of Michael P. Margelefsky, LLC*, 518 F.3d 433, 441 (6th Cir. 2008); *Gonzales v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 660 F.3d 1055 (9th Cir. 2011) (conditional language on liability such as “may” or “if” may render a true statement misleading).
26. According to guidance published by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (hereinafter “CFPB”), a debt collector’s representation to a consumer that paying debts may improve the consumer’s creditworthiness or “enhance the likelihood that a consumer will subsequently receive credit from a lender” may be deceptive. CFPB Bulletin 2013-08 – Representations Regarding Effect of Debt Payments on Credit Reports and Scores (July 10, 2013). *available at: http://files.consumerfinance.gov/f/201307_cfpb_bulletin_collections-consumer-credit.pdf*.
27. “The CFPB has authority to issue substantive rules for debt collection under the FDCPA.”

Zweigenhaft v. Receivables Performance Mgmt., LLC, No. 14 CV 01074 (RJD)(JMA), 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 160441, at *9 n.2 (E.D.N.Y. Nov. 13, 2014).

28. Courts appropriately consider guidance in CFPB Bulletins and other publications to determine whether a given statement or communication violates the FDCPA. *See, e.g., Zweigenhaft*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 160441; *Bautz v. ARS Nat'l Servs.*, 226 F. Supp. 3d 131, 148 n.7 (E.D.N.Y. 2016); *Portalatin v. Blatt*, 125 F. Supp. 3d 810, 816 (N.D. Ill. 2015) (*citing Jerman v. Carlisle, McNellie, Rini, Kramer & Ulrich, L.P.A.*, 559 U.S. 573, 130 S. Ct. 1605 (2010)). *Carter v. First Nat'l Collection Bureau, Inc.*, 135 F. Supp. 3d 565, 573 (S.D. Tex. 2015); *Buchanan v. Northland Grp.*, 776 F.3d 393, 398 (6th Cir. 2015); *Oberg v. Blatt, Hasenmiller, Leibsker & Moore, LLC*, No. 14 C 7369, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 172439, at *9 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 29, 2015).
29. Courts frequently adjure debt collectors to look to consumer protection agencies for compliance with the FDCPA, as the rules, guidance and advisory opinions issued by these agencies are supported by extensive scientific studies and research to determine whether certain collection practices are likely to deceive the least sophisticated consumer. *See, e.g., Bautz*, 226 F. Supp.3d at 148 n.7; *Portalatin*, 125 F. Supp. 3d at 816 (*citing Jerman*, 559 U.S. 573 (2010)) (“the whole point of authorizing the CFPB to produce advisory opinions is to encourage debt collectors to seek CFPB guidance regarding the meaning of the FDCPA.”); *Hasenmiller*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 172439, at *9 (Section 1692k(e) “provides that a debt collector that acts in reliance on a CFPB advisory opinion cannot be held liable even if the CFPB advisory opinion is later rescinded or reversed, either by the agency or by judicial decision”).
30. Defendant’s December 30, 2016 letter is misleading and deceptive viewed from the

perspective of the least sophisticated consumer, in that it implies that the consumer may enhance her likelihood of approval for credit products by paying the claimed debt in full rather than the reduced settlement amount.

31. The language at issue states: *“If we settle this debt with you for less than the full outstanding balance, Chase may offer you less favorable terms in the future for some Chase products or services, or may deny your application.”*

32. This language falsely implied that if the Plaintiff does the converse -- that is, pays the claimed balance in full rather than agreeing to the lesser settlement amount -- Plaintiff could enhance her likelihood of receiving future credit products from Chase Bank or improve her overall creditworthiness.

33. On information and belief, Plaintiff’s payment in full of the amount claimed would not have enhanced her likelihood of obtaining Chase credit products or services in the future, nor would it have improved her overall creditworthiness.

34. Thus, Defendant’s December 30, 2016 Letter violates Section 1692e(10) of the FDCPA when viewed from the perspective of the “least sophisticated consumer,” by falsely implying that payment in-full (rather than settlement) of the claimed debt would have enhanced her likelihood of receiving future credit products or enhanced her overall creditworthiness.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants as follows:

- (a) Declaring that this action is properly maintainable as a Class Action and certifying Plaintiff as Class representative and Daniel Cohen, PLLC, as Class Counsel;
- (b) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class statutory damages;
- (c) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class actual damages;
- (d) Awarding Plaintiff costs of this Action, including reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses;
- (e) Awarding pre-judgment interest and post-judgment interest; and
- (f) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Daniel Cohen
Daniel Cohen, Esq.
Daniel Cohen, PLLC
300 Cadman Plaza W, 12th floor
Brooklyn, New York 11201
Phone: (646) 645-8482
Fax: (347) 665-1545
Email: Dan@dccohen.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

/s/ Daniel Cohen
Daniel Cohen, Esq.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
December 29, 2017

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

DANIEL ABRAHAMOV, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Kings (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

DANIEL COHEN PLLC, 300 Cadman Plz W, 12 Fl., Brooklyn, NY 11201, (646) 645-8482

DEFENDANTS

MRS BPO, LLC

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff, 2 U.S. Government Defendant, 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party), 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

Table with columns for Plaintiff (PTF) and Defendant (DEF) citizenship: Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation.

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

Large table with categories: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, CIVIL RIGHTS, TORTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding, 2 Removed from State Court, 3 Remanded from Appellate Court, 4 Reinstated or Reopened, 5 Transferred from Another District (specify), 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer, 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 15 USC 1692

Brief description of cause: Defendant violated the FDCPA

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE 12/29/2017 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Daniel Cohen

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

CERTIFICATION OF ARBITRATION ELIGIBILITY

Local Arbitration Rule 83.10 provides that with certain exceptions, actions seeking money damages only in an amount not in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs, are eligible for compulsory arbitration. The amount of damages is presumed to be below the threshold amount unless a certification to the contrary is filed.

I, DANIEL COHEN, counsel for PLAINTIFF, do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is ineligible for compulsory arbitration for the following reason(s):

- monetary damages sought are in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs,
- the complaint seeks injunctive relief,
- the matter is otherwise ineligible for the following reason Question of law rather than questions of fact predominates

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT - FEDERAL RULES CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1

Identify any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more of its stocks:

NONE

RELATED CASE STATEMENT (Section VIII on the Front of this Form)

Please list all cases that are arguably related pursuant to Division of Business Rule 50.3.1 in Section VIII on the front of this form. Rule 50.3.1 (a) provides that "A civil case is "related" to another civil case for purposes of this guideline when, because of the similarity of facts and legal issues or because the cases arise from the same transactions or events, a substantial saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to the same judge and magistrate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that " A civil case shall not be deemed "related" to another civil case merely because the civil case: (A) involves identical legal issues, or (B) involves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that "Presumptively, and subject to the power of a judge to determine otherwise pursuant to paragraph (d), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still pending before the court."

NY-E DIVISION OF BUSINESS RULE 50.1(d)(2)

- 1.) Is the civil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk County? Yes No
- 2.) If you answered "no" above:
 - a) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffolk County? Yes No
 - b) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern District? Yes No
 - c) If this is a Fair Debt Collection Practice Act case, specify the County in which the offending communication was received: **KINGS COUNTY** .

If your answer to question 2 (b) is "No," does the defendant (or a majority of the defendants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or Suffolk County, or, in an interpleader action, does the claimant (or a majority of the claimants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or Suffolk County? Yes No
(Note: A corporation shall be considered a resident of the County in which it has the most significant contacts).

BAR ADMISSION

I am currently admitted in the Eastern District of New York and currently a member in good standing of the bar of this court.

Yes No

Are you currently the subject of any disciplinary action (s) in this or any other state or federal court?

Yes (If yes, please explain) No

I certify the accuracy of all information provided above.

Signature: /s/ Daniel Cohen

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received by me on *(date)* _____ .

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____ ; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* _____
_____, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,
on *(date)* _____ , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* _____ , who is
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____ ; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because _____ ; or

Other *(specify)*:

My fees are \$ _____ for travel and \$ _____ for services, for a total of \$ _____ 0.00 .

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:



Send Payment/Correspondence to:
MRS Associates
7330 LINDA AVE
CHERRY HILL, NJ 08003
877-851-1451

RE: CHASE BANK USA N.A.
MRS ACCT#: LU4 2856939
CLIENT ACCT#: xxxxxxxxxxxx6507

ACCOUNT BALANCE : \$3,340.69

Office Hours :

Monday - Thursday 9am - 9pm ET
Friday 9am - 8pm ET

December 30, 2016

Dear DANIEL ABRAHAMOV,

We recognize that a possible hardship or pitfall may have prevented you from satisfying your obligation. We are presenting three options that will enable you to avoid further collection activity being taken against you. We are not obligated to renew this offer.

Option 1: You pay only \$1,436.50 in ONE PAYMENT that must be received in this office on or before 01/23/2017.

Option 2: You make TWO PAYMENTS of \$885.29 each. The first payment must be received in this office on or before 01/23/2017 and the second payment on or before 02/23/2017.

Option 3: A monthly payment plan on the full balance of the account.

Payment may be made by calling 877-851-1451, mailing to the above address or by using our online payment website at <https://mrspay.webview.com> (internet connection required). If you have any questions or wish to discuss other arrangements, you may contact us.

When you call please let our representative know that you have received the CHASE BANK USA N.A. Option Letter.

Sincerely,

MRS Associates
877-851-1451

MRS Associates is a trade name of MRS BPO, L.L.C.

Tax time is a great time to put issues like this behind you. Consider using your tax refund to satisfy your outstanding obligation.

If we settle this debt with you for less than the full outstanding balance, Chase may offer you less favorable terms in the future for some Chase products or services, or may deny your application.

NEW YORK CITY RESIDENTS:

New York City Department of Consumer Affairs, license number 1292105, 1292103.

MRS Associates contact: Denise Eichenberg - Mon - Fri 9 AM - 5 PM ET (800) 716-6429.

This is an attempt to collect a debt and any information obtained will be used for that purpose.
This communication is from a debt collector.

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [MRS BPO Facing New York Consumer's FDCPA Lawsuit](#)
