

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---

MICHAEL BAKON on behalf of himself and  
all other similarly situated consumers

Plaintiff,

-against-

RUSHMORE SERVICE CENTER, LLC

Defendant.

---

## **CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

### **Introduction**

1. Plaintiff, Michael Bakon, brings this action against Rushmore Service Center, LLC for violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.* (“FDCPA”). The FDCPA prohibits debt collectors from engaging in abusive, deceptive and unfair collection practices while attempting to collect on debts.

### **Parties**

2. Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of New York who resides within this District.
3. Plaintiff is a consumer as that term is defined by Section 1692(a)(3) of the FDCPA, in that the alleged debt that Defendant sought to collect from Plaintiff a consumer debt.
4. Upon information and belief, Defendant's principal place of business is located in Sioux Falls, South Dakota.
5. Defendant is regularly engaged, for profit, in the collection of debts allegedly owed by consumers.

6. Defendant is a “debt collector” as that term is defined by the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692(a)(6).

#### **Jurisdiction and Venue**

7. This Court has federal question jurisdiction under 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
8. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), as the acts and transactions that give rise to this action occurred, in substantial part, in this district.

#### **Allegations Particular to Michael Bakon**

9. Upon information and belief, on a date better known by Defendant, Defendant began to attempt to collect an alleged consumer debt from the Plaintiff.
10. On or about May 18, 2016, Defendant sent the Plaintiff a collection letter.
11. The said letter was an effort to collect on a defaulted consumer debt.
12. Such a collection letter, like the said May 18, 2016 collection letter, is open to one of multiple interpretations and would likely be misunderstood by an unsophisticated consumer.
13. § 1692e requires debt collectors, when informing debtors of their account balance, to disclose whether the balance may increase due to interest and fees. Avila v. Riexinger Associates, LLC, 817 F.3d 72, 76 (2d Cir. 2016).
14. Defendant’s collection letter fails to include the safe harbor language set out in Avila v. Riexinger Associates, LLC, 817 F.3d 72, 76 (2d Cir. 2016).
15. An unsophisticated consumer would be left uncertain by the said letter as to whether the said account was accruing interest or not.
16. Pursuant to section 5001 of New York Civil Practice Law and Rules, a creditor shall

- recover prejudgment interest "upon a sum awarded because of a breach of performance of a contract." N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5001(a); see also Rhodes v. Davis, 628 Fed. Appx. 787, 794 (2d Cir. 2015) (Under New York Law, "[i]nterest is generally mandatory "upon a sum awarded because of a breach of performance of a contract . . . ." (citing Id. § 5001(a))).
17. Section 5004 sets the rate of prejudgment interest at nine percent. N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5004. When calculating the interest due, it "shall be computed from the earliest ascertainable date the cause of action existed." Id. § 5001(b).
  18. "In New York, a breach of contract cause of action accrues at the time of the breach." Ely-Cruikshank Co. v. Bank of Montreal, 81 N.Y.2d 399, 402, 615 N.E.2d 985, 599 N.Y.S.2d 501 (1993) (citations omitted).
  19. Prejudgment interest on defaulted debt obligations "shall be computed from the earliest ascertainable date the cause of action existed," which is when the debtor fails to make the monthly payment. N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5001(b).
  20. "New York law provides that "[i]nterest shall be recovered upon a sum awarded because of a breach of performance of a contract," N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5001(a), and that interest is to be computed "from the earliest date the cause of action existed," N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5001(b), at the rate of nine percent per annum, N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5004. Accordingly, Plaintiffs are entitled to prejudgment interest on the installments that were not timely paid." Kasperek v. City Wire Works, Inc., No. 03 CV 3986 (RML), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19803, at \*8 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 12, 2009).
  21. The said May 18, 2016 letter failed to correctly state the in full the amount of the debt allegedly owed.
  22. Though the May 18, 2016 letter listed a "Amount" and demanded payment in full, the

letter did not state on which date the “Amount” was calculated, and did not explain that contractual or statutory prejudgment interest and/or legal fees would continue to accrue on the unpaid principal; thus, the Plaintiff’s total balance might be greater on the date he makes a payment.

23. A reasonable consumer could read the notice and be misled into believing that he or she could pay her debt in full by paying the amount listed on the notice.
24. However, since contractual or statutory prejudgment interest is automatically accruing daily, and if there are undisclosed legal fees that will accrue, a consumer who pays the “Amount” stated on the notice will not know whether the debt has been paid in full.
25. The debt collector could still seek the automatically accrued contractual or statutory prejudgment interest that accumulated after the notice was sent but before the balance was paid, or sell the consumer’s debt to a third party, which itself could seek the interest and fees from the consumer.
26. The statement of an “Amount,” without notice that the amount is already increasing due to accruing automatically accruing contractual or statutory prejudgment interest or other charges, would mislead the least sophisticated consumer into believing that payment of the amount stated will clear his or her account.
27. The FDCPA requires debt collectors, when notifying consumers of their account balance, to disclose that the balance may increase due to interest and fees; failure to include such disclosures would harm consumers such as the Plaintiff who may hold the reasonable but mistaken belief, that timely payment will satisfy their debts and it would abrogate the Congressional purpose of full and fair disclosure to consumers that is embodied in Section 1692e.

28. Pursuant to New York state law, prejudgment interest starts to accrue on the debt from the date of the breach of contract at the rate of 9% per annum.
29. The amount of the contractual or prejudgment interest automatically increases each day that the defaulted debt remains unpaid due to the automatically contractual or statutory accrued interest.
30. Collection notices that state only the “Amount,” but fail to disclose that the balance might increase due to interest and fees, are “misleading” within the meaning of Section 1692e.
31. To the extent that the Creditor or the Defendant intended to waive the automatically accrued and accruing interest, it was required to disclose that in the most conspicuous of terms.
32. Rushmore Service Center, LLC was required to include a disclosure that the automatically accrued interest was accruing, or in the alternative, Rushmore Service Center, LLC was required to disclose that the creditor has made an intentional decision to waive the automatically accruing interest; nonetheless it did not make any of those disclosures in violation of 1692e.
33. Failure to disclose such a waiver of the automatically accruing interest is in of itself deceptive and “misleading” within the meaning of Section 1692e.
34. Rushmore Service Center, LLC knew that the balance would increase due to interest, fees and/or disbursements.
35. “Applying these principles, we hold that Plaintiffs have stated a claim that the collection notices at issue here are misleading within the meaning of Section 1692e... a consumer who pays the "current balance" stated on the notice will not know whether the debt has been paid in full.” Avila v. Riexinger & Assocs., LLC, Nos. 15-1584(L), 15-1597(Con),

2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 5327, at \*10-11 (2d Cir. Mar. 22, 2016)

36. Although the May 18, 2016 letter stated a “Amount” and demanded payment in full, the letter also failed to disclose to the Plaintiff that the Defendant would attempt to collect the additional accruing interest at a later date.
37. Absent a disclosure by the holder of the debt that the automatic interest is waived, even if the debtor pays the “Amount” the Defendant and or the creditor **could** still seek the automatic interest that accumulated after the breach of contract, or sell the consumer’s debt to a third party, which itself could seek the automatic interest and from the consumer. *Avila*, at \*10-11.
38. Upon receiving the May 18, 2016 letter, the Plaintiff was uncertain whether the “Amount” was accruing interest as there was no disclosure or admonition indicating otherwise.
39. A debtor who pays the “Amount” stated in the collection letter will be left unsure as to whether or not the debt has been paid in full, as the Defendant could still attempt to collect on any interest and fees that accumulated after the letter was sent but before the balance was paid.
40. The May 18, 2016 letter would cause the unsophisticated consumer uncertainty and force him to guess how much money he allegedly owed to the Defendant, how much money would accrue daily on his alleged debt, how much additional money he would owe if he paid the amount demanded in the May 18, 2016 letter, and if or when the Defendant’s collection efforts would actually discontinue if he remitted “Amount” that the Defendant demanded.
41. Section 1692e of the FDCPA prohibits a debt collector from using any false, or any

deceptive or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of a debt, including the false representation of the character, amount or legal status of any debt, see, 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(A) and § 1692e(10).

42. Upon information and belief, such actions are part of a scheme or business of the Defendant when attempting to collect alleged debts from consumers in the State of New York.
43. Upon information and belief, the Defendant's collection letters, such as the said May 18, 2016 collection letter, number in at least the hundreds.
44. The Defendant, by failing to state that it would add interest to the amount of the debt, made materially false statements, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e of the FDCPA.
45. Defendant's May 18, 2016 letter is in violation of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(2)(A) and 1692e(10) of the FDCPA for the use of any false representation or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect any debt and for misrepresenting the amount of the debt owed by the Plaintiff.
46. Plaintiff suffered injury in fact by being subjected to unfair and abusive practices of the Defendant.
47. Plaintiff suffered actual harm by being the target of the Defendant's misleading debt collection communications.
48. Defendant violated the Plaintiff's right not to be the target of misleading debt collection communications.
49. Defendant violated the Plaintiff's right to a truthful and fair debt collection process.
50. Defendant used materially false, deceptive, misleading representations and means in its attempted collection of Plaintiff's alleged debt.

51. Defendant's communications were designed to cause the debtor to suffer a harmful disadvantage in charting a course of action in response to the Defendant's collection efforts.
52. The FDCPA ensures that consumers are fully and truthfully apprised of the facts and of their rights, the act enables them to understand, make informed decisions about, and participate fully and meaningfully in the debt collection process. The purpose of the FDCPA is to provide information that helps consumers to choose intelligently. The Defendant's false representations misled the Plaintiff in a manner that deprived him of his right to enjoy these benefits, these materially misleading statements trigger liability under section 1692e of the Act.
53. These deceptive communications additionally violated the FDCPA since they frustrate the consumer's ability to intelligently choose his or her response.
54. Plaintiff seeks to end these violations of the FDCPA. Plaintiff has suffered damages including but not limited to, fear, stress, mental anguish, emotional stress and acute embarrassment. Plaintiff and putative class members are entitled to preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, including, declaratory relief, and damages.

#### **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

55. This action is brought as a class action. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
56. The identities of all class members are readily ascertainable from the records of Rushmore Service Center, LLC and those business and governmental entities on whose behalf it attempts to collect debts.



57. Excluded from the Plaintiff's Class is the Defendant and all officers, members, partners, managers, directors, and employees of Rushmore Service Center, LLC, and all of their respective immediate families, and legal counsel for all parties to this action and all members of their immediate families.
58. There are questions of law and fact common to the Plaintiff's Class, which common issues predominate over any issues involving only individual class members. The principal issues are whether the Defendant's communications with the Plaintiff, such as the above stated claims, violate provisions of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.
59. The Plaintiff's claims are typical of the class members, as all are based upon the same facts and legal theories.
60. The Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Plaintiff's Class defined in this complaint. The Plaintiff has retained counsel with experience in handling consumer lawsuits, complex legal issues, and class actions, and neither the Plaintiff nor his attorneys have any interests, which might cause them not to vigorously pursue this action.
61. This action has been brought, and may properly be maintained, as a class action pursuant to the provisions of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure because there is a well-defined community interest in the litigation:
  - (a) **Numerosity:** The Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the Plaintiff's Class defined above is so numerous that joinder of all members would be impractical.
  - (b) **Common Questions Predominate:** Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Plaintiff's Class and those questions predominate

over any questions or issues involving only individual class members. The principal issues are whether the Defendant's communications with the Plaintiff, such as the above stated claims, violate provisions of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.

- (c) **Typicality:** The Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the class members. Plaintiff and all members of the Plaintiff's Class defined in this complaint have claims arising out of the Defendant's common uniform course of conduct complained of herein.
- (d) **Adequacy:** The Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class members insofar as Plaintiff has no interests that are adverse to the absent class members. The Plaintiff is committed to vigorously litigating this matter. Plaintiff has also retained counsel experienced in handling consumer lawsuits, complex legal issues, and class actions. Neither the Plaintiff nor his counsel have any interests, which might cause them not to vigorously pursue the instant class action lawsuit.
- (e) **Superiority:** A class action is superior to the other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because individual joinder of all members would be impracticable. Class action treatment will permit a large number of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum efficiently and without unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that individual actions would engender. Certification of a class under Rule 23(b)(1)(A) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is appropriate because adjudications with respect to individual

members create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications which could establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant who, on information and belief, collects debts throughout the United States of America.

62. Certification of a class under Rule 23(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is also appropriate in that a determination that the above stated claims, violate provisions of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, and is tantamount to declaratory relief and any monetary relief under the FDCPA would be merely incidental to that determination.
63. Certification of a class under Rule 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is also appropriate in that the questions of law and fact common to members of the Plaintiff's Class predominate over any questions affecting an individual member, and a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.
64. Further, Defendant has acted, or failed to act, on grounds generally applicable to the Rule (b)(1)(A) and (b)(2) Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief with respect to the Class as a whole.
65. Depending on the outcome of further investigation and discovery, Plaintiff may, at the time of class certification motion, seek to certify one or more classes only as to particular issues pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(4).

**AS AND FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

**Violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act brought by Plaintiff on behalf of himself and the members of a class, as against the Defendant.**

66. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs numbered one (1) through sixty five (65) herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.
67. This cause of action is brought on behalf of Plaintiff and the members of a class.
68. The class involves all individuals whom Defendant's records reflect resided in the State of New York and who were sent a collection letter in substantially the same form letter as the letter sent to the Plaintiff on or about May 18, 2016; and (a) the collection letter was sent to a consumer seeking payment of a personal debt; and (b) the collection letter was not returned by the postal service as undelivered; and (c) the Plaintiff asserts that the letter contained violations of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(2)(A) and 1692e(10) of the FDCPA for the use of any false representation or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect any debt and for misrepresenting the amount of the debt owed by the Plaintiff.

**Violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act**

69. The Defendant's actions as set forth above in the within complaint violates the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.
70. Because the Defendant violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, the Plaintiff and the members of the class are entitled to damages in accordance with the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, respectfully requests preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, and that this Court enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor and against the Defendant and award damages as follows:

- (a) Statutory damages provided under the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692(k);

- (b) Attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs incurred in bringing this action; and
- (c) Any other relief that this Court deems appropriate and just under the circumstances.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York  
November 3, 2016

/s/ Maxim Maximov  
Maxim Maximov, Esq.  
Attorneys for the Plaintiff  
Maxim Maximov, LLP  
1701 Avenue P  
Brooklyn, New York 11229  
Office: (718) 395-3459  
Facsimile: (718) 408-9570  
E-mail: m@maximovlaw.com

Plaintiff requests trial by jury on all issues so triable.

/s/ Maxim Maximov  
Maxim Maximov, Esq.

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

MICHAEL BAKON

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

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) MAXIM MAXIMOV, LLP OFFICE: (718) 395-3459 1701 AVENUE P FAX: (718) 408-9570 BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11229 E-MAIL: M@MAXIMOV.LAW.COM

DEFENDANTS

RUSHMORE SERVICE CENTER, 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)

Large table with categories: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, 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, 6 Multidistrict Litigation

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 15 U.S.C. SECTION 1692 -- FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT (FDCPA) Brief description of cause: UNLAWFUL AND DECEITFUL DEBT COLLECTION BUSINESS PRACTICES

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 11/03/2016 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /S/ MAXIM MAXIMOV, ESQ.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

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, N/A, counsel for \_\_\_\_\_, 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

**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:

N/A

**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? 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? NO
  - b) Did the events of omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern District? YES

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? \_\_\_\_\_

(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/ MAXIM MAXIMOV, ESQ.



**Rushmore Service Center**

PO BOX 5508  
SIOUX FALLS SD 57117-5508

May 18, 2016

MICHAEL BAKON  
1430 56TH ST  
BROOKLYN, NY 11219-4617

**Original Creditor:** PREMIER BANKCARD, LLC  
**Account:** [REDACTED]  
**Claim #:** [REDACTED]  
**Amount:** \$924.21

Michael Bakon:

Our office has been retained by the above referenced creditor to collect on an overdue account.

Unless you notify this office within 30 days after receiving this notice that you dispute the validity of this debt or any portion thereof, this office will assume this debt is valid. If you notify this office in writing within 30 days from receiving this notice that you dispute the validity of this debt or any portion thereof, this office will obtain verification of the debt or obtain a copy of a judgment and mail you a copy of such judgment or verification. If you contact this office in writing within 30 days after receiving this notice, this office will provide you with the name and address of the original creditor, if different from the current creditor.

This is an opportunity for you to resolve this debt. Please contact our office at 1-866-950-3200 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. CST, Monday through Friday to resolve this matter.

Sincerely,

Joe Roberts  
Collection Manager

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

**\*\*Notice: Please see the reverse side for important information\*\***

Please detach this portion and return with your payment to insure proper credit. Retain upper portion for your records.

Account Number	Balance Due	Amount Enclosed
[REDACTED]	\$924.21	\$

**PLEASE PROVIDE ADDRESS CHANGES ON BACK.**

MICHAEL BAKON  
1430 56TH ST  
BROOKLYN, NY 11219-4617

RUSHMORE SERVICE CENTER  
PO BOX 5507  
SIOUX FALLS, SD 57117-5507





UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---

MICHAEL BAKON on behalf of himself and  
all other similarly situated consumers

Plaintiff,

-against-

RUSHMORE SERVICE CENTER, LLC

Defendant.

---

**SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION**

TO: RUSHMORE SERVICE CENTER, LLC  
3820 NORTH LOUISE AVENUE  
SIOUX FALLS, SOUTH DAKOTA 57107

**YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED** and required to file with the Clerk of this Court  
and serve upon PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY:

MAXIM MAXIMOV, ESQ.  
MAXIM MAXIMOV, LLP  
1701 AVENUE P  
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11229

an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, with **21** days after service of this  
summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will  
be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.

---

CLERK

---

DATE

---

BY DEPUTY CLERK

# ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Debt Collection Agency Rushmore Service Center, LLC Hit with Lawsuit](#)

---