

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN
MADISON DIVISION**

LISA CLAY, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED,)	Case No. 3:17-cv-307
)	
)	<u>CLASS ACTION</u>
)	
Plaintiff,)	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
)	DAMAGES
vs.)	
)	<u>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</u>
COLONY BRANDS, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff, Lisa Clay (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, allege the following upon information and belief based upon personal knowledge:

NATURE OF THE CASE

1. The Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227, is a remedial statute enacted by Congress to protect consumers from unwanted autodialed/pre-recorded voice calls and faxes. As is applicable here, Congress specifically recognized that the use of automated technology in calls to consumers was more intrusive and raised greater privacy concerns than calls using live representatives:

It is clear that automated telephone calls that deliver an artificial or prerecorded voice message are more of a nuisance and a greater invasion of privacy than calls placed by “live” persons. These automated calls cannot interact with the customer except in preprogrammed ways, do not allow the caller to feel the frustration of the called party, fill an answering machine tape or a voice recording service, and do not disconnect the line even after the customer hangs up the telephone. For all these reasons, it is legitimate and consistent with the Constitution to impose greater restriction on automated calls than on calls placed by “live” persons.

S. Rep. No. 102-178 (Oct. 8, 1991); *see also* Pub. L. No. 102-243, § 2(12) (1991), *codified at* 47 U.S.C. § 227 (“Banning such automated or prerecorded telephone calls to the home, except when the receiving party consents to receiving the call or when such calls are necessary in an emergency situation affecting the health and safety of the consumer, is the only effective means of protecting telephone consumers from this nuisance and privacy invasion.”). Such calls to cell phones were seen as particularly problematic. *See* S. Rep. No. 102-178 (Oct. 8, 1991) (noting that “unsolicited calls placed to ... cellular ... telephone numbers often impose a cost on the called party”).

2. Accordingly, the TCPA explicitly prohibits “mak[ing] any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice ... to any telephone number assigned to a ... cellular telephone service[.]” 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii). The statute provides for injunctive relief and the greater of actual damages or \$500 per violation, which can be trebled where the statute was “willfully or knowingly” violated. 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).

3. The TCPA also ensures that parties involved in causing illegal calls to be made are appropriately held accountable, whether they physically made the calls or not. *See generally In re Joint Petition Filed by DISH Network, LLC et al. for Declaratory Ruling Concerning the TCPA Rules*, 28 FCC Rcd 6574 (2013) (finding that vicarious liability under federal common law agency principles is available for violations of the TCPA, including not only based on classical agency, but on other theories, as well, such as apparent authority or ratification); *see also In re Rules & Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 23 FCC Rcd 559, 565, para. 10 (2008) (“Calls placed by a third party collector on behalf of that creditor are treated as if the creditor itself placed the call.”).

4. In this case, Defendant Colony Brands, Inc. (hereinafter, “Defendant”)—a mail-order cheese company with affiliated retail and non-retail companies—has engaged in illegally calling consumers’ cellular telephone numbers using an automatic telephone dialing system (“autodialer” or “ATDS”) and/or artificial or prerecorded voice. More simply put, without first obtaining prior express consent of the called party, Defendant has illegally called the cellular telephones of hundreds if not more individuals utilizing an ATDS and/or artificial or prerecorded voice.

5. Consequently, Plaintiff brings this action for herself and others similarly situated, seeking damages and any other available legal or equitable remedies resulting from the illegal actions of Defendant in negligently, knowingly, and/or willfully contacting them on their telephones in violation of the TCPA.

JURISDICTION & VENUE

6. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 as Plaintiff and the putative class seek relief under a Federal statute, the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740, 747 (2012).

7. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and 18 U.S.C. § 1441(a) because Defendant does business within the state of Wisconsin and maintains its corporate headquarters in the City of Monroe, County of Green, Wisconsin which is within this judicial district.

PARTIES

8. Plaintiff, Lisa Clay (“Plaintiff”), is a natural person residing in West Point, Mississippi, and is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(10).

9. Defendant Colony Brands, Inc. (“Defendant”) is a business headquartered at 1112

7th Avenue, Monroe, Wisconsin 53566-1364, constituting a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(10).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

10. Defendant maintains various online retail entities and offers consumers credit/financing accounts for said entities, such as Seventh Avenue, Midnight Velvet, Ginny’s, The Tender Filet, Swiss Colony and various others.

11. Within the four years prior to the filing of this action, Defendant initiated autodialed telephone calls to cellular telephones. On information and belief, Defendant caused dialing equipment to be used to dial the cellular telephone numbers of alleged debtors and others, including Plaintiff.

12. Such dialing equipment had the capacity to dial numbers without human intervention, and constituted an “automatic telephone dialing system” within the meaning of the TCPA. *See In re Rules & Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 18 FCC Rcd 14014, 14092, para. 132 (2003) (“2003 FCC Ruling”) (acknowledging that an ATDS constitutes equipment with “the *capacity* to dial numbers without human intervention”) (emphasis in original); *accord Meyer v. Portfolio Recovery Assocs., LLC*, 707 F.3d 1036, 1043 (9th Cir. 2012), *cert. denied*, 133 S. Ct. 2361 (2013).

13. Unfortunately, many of the people whose cellular telephones were called as a result of Defendant’s autodialing practices never actually consented to receive such calls, whether because Defendant acquired the individual’s number through skip tracing or another indirect method, is listed as a reference on an application or intake form or the individual obtained a “recycled” cellular telephone number which once belonged to a current or previous customer, the

number in Defendant's database attributable to the alleged debtor was incorrect, or any other number of reasons.

14. On information and belief, including considering the experience of Plaintiff described below, many of these individuals were called more than once, and Defendant lacked a sufficiently adequate system for preventing autodialed calls to telephones for which they did not have prior express permission to call.

FACTS RELATING TO LISA CLAY

15. Defendant is a mail-order cheese company with affiliated retail and non-retail companies, including a subsidiary company called Seventh Avenue, Inc., which is a department store catalog company.

16. Beginning in or around January of 2016, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on her cellular telephone number ending in 9705, seeking to speak with an a different female individual and not Plaintiff in regards to an allegedly delinquent credit account associated with Defendant's Seventh Avenue online retail brand.

17. On January 14, 2016, Plaintiff told Defendant that she was not the individual they were look for and requested Defendant to stop calling.

18. Defendant has placed several collection calls a week to Plaintiff's cellular telephone seeking to speak with a person other than Plaintiff. In sum, Defendant placed approximately twenty (23) such autodialed collection calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone.

19. On information and belief, Defendant used an ATDS to place these calls to Plaintiff, seeking to collect a debt allegedly owed by a third party, not Plaintiff.

20. Defendant's use of an ATDS is evidenced by Defendant often placing calls at nearly the exact same time and on a somewhat routine amount of days of a week, thus evidencing that

the calls at issue were pre-planned or programmed to be placed at particular dates and times and/or at a particular frequency. This ATDS has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers, which, if utilized in such a fashion, can be used to dial numbers in a random or sequential fashion and be used in connection with a number generator.

21. Defendant's calls constituted calls that were not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

22. Defendant's calls were placed to a telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

23. On numerous occasions Defendant contacted Plaintiff from telephone number (888) 224-5557.

24. On several occasions, Plaintiff answered Defendant's telephone calls. When a live person was reached, often after a pause or "dead air" (thus further evidencing Defendant's use of an ATDS), Plaintiff informed Defendant that it was contacting the incorrect person and instructed Defendant to stop contacting her. Nonetheless, Defendant continued to place calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone via Defendant's "automatic telephone dialing system" in an attempt to collect an outstanding debt allegedly owed by a third party.

25. This "dead air" is commonplace with autodialing and/or predictive dialing equipment. It indicates and evidences that the algorithm(s) being used by Defendant's and/or its agent's autodialing equipment to predict when the live human agents are available for the next call has not been perfected and/or has not been recently refreshed or updated. Thus resulting in the autodialer placing a call several seconds prior to the human agent's ability to end the current call he or she is on and be ready to accept the new connected call that the autodialer placed, without

human intervention, to Plaintiff.

26. The dead air is essentially the autodialer holding the call it placed to Plaintiff until the next available human agent is ready to accept it. Should the call at issue been manually dialed by a live human being, there would be no such dead air as the person dialing Plaintiff's cellular telephone would have been on the other end of the call the entire time and Plaintiff would have been immediately greeted by said person.

27. Plaintiff is not the individual that Defendant is seeking to speak with. Further, Plaintiff has had no business relationship with Defendant nor did Plaintiff ever provide Defendant with her cellular telephone number. Thus, Defendant did not have Plaintiff's "prior express consent" to make calls to her cellular telephone using an automatic telephone dialing system. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A). Even assuming arguendo that Defendant did have Plaintiff's "prior express consent", which it did not, Plaintiff subsequently revoked said consent by instructing Defendant to cease calling her.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

28. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, as members of the proposed class (the "Class") defined as follows:

All persons within the United States who, within the four years prior to the filing of the complaint in this action, through the date of certification, Defendant or its agent/s or employee/s caused to be made any telephone calls to said person's cellular telephone through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system, where such person had not previously consented to receiving such call.

29. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, the Class, having been called by Defendant on her cell phone through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system without her prior express consent.

30. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in the Class, but believe the Class members number in the hundreds, if not more. Thus, this matter should be certified as a Class Action to assist in the expeditious litigation of the matter.

31. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all of its members is impractical. While the exact number and identities of the Class members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through appropriate discovery, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and hereon alleges, that the Class includes hundreds, if not thousands, of members. Plaintiff alleges that the Class members may be ascertained by the records maintained by Defendant.

32. Plaintiff and members of the Class were harmed by the acts of Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant illegally contacted Plaintiff and Class members via their cellular telephones, thereby causing Plaintiff and Class members to incur certain charges or reduced telephone time for which Plaintiff and Class members had previously paid by having to retrieve or administer messages left by Defendant during those illegal calls, occupying Plaintiff's and the Class members' phone thus precluding Plaintiff and the Class from otherwise enjoyment and use of their personal cellular telephones, and further invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and Class members.

33. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of the Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary between Class members, and which may be determined without reference to the individual circumstances of any Class members, include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this action, Defendant made any collection call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) to a Class member using any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice to any telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service;
- b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
- c. Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.

34. As a person who received calls from Defendant using an automatic telephone dialing system, without her prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of the Class.

35. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of class actions.

36. A class action is superior to other available methods of fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, since individual litigation of the claims of all Class members is impracticable. Even if every Class member could afford individual litigation, it would be unduly burdensome to the courts in which individual litigation of numerous issues would proceed. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent, or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex factual issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action presents fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court system, and protects the rights of each Class member.

37. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the this Class members not parties to such adjudications or that would substantially impair or impede the ability of such non-party Class members to protect their interests.

38. Defendant has acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final and injunctive relief with regard to the members of the Class as a whole.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
Violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227
(Against All Defendants)

39. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the foregoing allegations as if set forth fully herein.

40. It is a violation of the TCPA to make “any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice ... to any telephone number assigned to a ... cellular telephone service....” 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

41. “Automatic telephone dialing system” refers to any equipment that has “the *capacity* to dial numbers without human intervention.” *See 2003 FCC Ruling*, 18 FCC Rcd. at 14092, para. 132.

42. Defendant caused equipment having the capacity to dial numbers without human intervention to be used to make non-emergency telephone calls to the cellular telephones of Plaintiff and the other members of the Class defined above.

43. These calls were made without regard to whether or not Defendant had first obtained express permission from the called party to make such calls. In fact, Defendant did not

have prior express consent to call the cell phone of Plaintiff and the other members of the Class when the autodialed and/or artificial or prerecorded voice calls were made.

44. As such, Defendant's calls were willful or, at a minimum, negligent. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 312(f)(1).

45. Defendant has, therefore, violated Section 227(b)(1)(A)(iii) of the TCPA by causing an automatic telephone dialing system to be used to make non-emergency telephone calls to Plaintiff and the other members of the Class without their prior express permission.

46. As a result of Defendant's conduct and pursuant to Section 227(b)(3)(B) of the TCPA, Plaintiff and the other members of the putative Class are each entitled to a minimum of \$500.00 in damages for each violation.

47. Because Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other members of the Class had not given prior express consent to receive the calls to their cell phones and/or willfully used an automatic telephone dialing system to call the cell phones of Plaintiff and the other members of the Class without prior express permission, the Court should treble the amount of statutory damages available to Plaintiff and the other members of the Class pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).

48. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the other members of the Class, pray for the following relief against Defendant:

- a. An order certifying the Class defined above, appointing Plaintiff as representatives of the Class, and appointing their attorneys as class counsel;

- b. An injunction prohibiting Defendant from calling Plaintiff's and the other Class members' cell phone numbers using an automatic telephone dialing system;
- c. An award of statutory damages; and
- d. Such further and other relief the Court deems reasonable and just.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

AGRUS LAW FIRM, LLC

Dated: April 24, 2017

By: /s/ Michael S. Agruss

Michael S. Agruss

SBN: 6281600

Agruss Law Firm, LLC

4809 N. Ravenswood Ave.

Suite 419

Chicago, IL 60640

Tel: 312-224-4695

Fax: 312-253-4451

michael@agrusslawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

Lisa Clay

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

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Michael Agruss 4809 N. Ravenswood Ave, Suite 419, Chicago, IL 60640 Telephone: 312-224-4695

DEFENDANTS

Colony Brands, Inc.

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, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, TORTS, PERSONAL INJURY, PERSONAL INJURY, 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

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): ("TCPA), 47 U.S.C. § 227

Brief description of cause: Debt collection harassment

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

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

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE, DOCKET NUMBER

DATE: 04/24/2017, SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD: /s/ Michael S. Agruss

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT #, AMOUNT, APPLYING IFP, JUDGE, MAG. JUDGE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading 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. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

I. (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.

(b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, (except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)

(c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.C.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.

IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerks in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.

V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.**

Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553
Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service

VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

Demand. In this space enter the dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) being demanded or indicate other demand such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Western District of Wisconsin

Lisa Clay

Plaintiff

v.

Colony Brands, Inc.

Defendant

Civil Action No. 3:17-cv-307

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) Colony Brands, Inc. Corporation Service Company 8040 Excelsior Drive, Suite 400 Madison, WI 53717

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Michael Agruss Agruss Law Firm, LLC 4809 N. Ravenswood Ave, Suite 419 Chicago, IL 60640 312-224-4695

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: _____

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No. 3:17-cv-307

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:

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Not Gouda! Mail-Order Cheese Company Hit with TCPA Lawsuit](#)
