¢	ase 3:19-cv-01613-BEN-WVG	Document 1	Filed 08/27/19	PageID.1	Page 1 of 16		
1 2 3 4 5	Todd D. Carpenter (CA 23446 tcarpenter@carlsonlynch.com Scott G. Braden (CA 305051) sbraden@carlsonlynch.com CARLSON LYNCH, LLP 1350 Columbia St. Ste. 603 Tel: (619) 762-1900 Fax: (619) 756-6991	54) 1					
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class						
7							
8 9	UNIT	ΓED STATES	DISTRICT CO	URT			
10			ICT OF CALIFO				
11							
12	BRITTANY COVELL, indivibehalf of all others similarly s	dually and on ituated		Case No. <u>'19CV1613 BEN WVG</u>			
13 14	Plair	ntiff,	CLASS ACT	TON COM	IPLAINT		
15	V.	ED ANGUIGE	[DEMAND F	OR JURY	TRIAL]		
16	AMAZING LASH STUDIO F LLC and DOES 1-100, inclusion	ive,					
17	Defe	endant.	_				
18 19							
20							
21							
22							
23 24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
			1 -	T			

Plaintiff Brittany Covell brings this action on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated against Defendant Amazing Lash Studio Franchise LLC and Does 1 through 100 and states:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. Defendant Amazing Lash Studio Franchise LLC ("Lash Studio") obtained its customers' cellular telephone number through its website and in its retail locations. Lash Studio then sent marketing messages to its customers via text without obtaining their prior express written consent. Lash Studio did not provide adequate disclosures about its telemarketing messages. After acquiring its customers' information, including cellular telephone numbers, Defendant repeatedly and intentionally violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ("TCPA"), and 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200 by sending marketing and advertising messages to its customers' cell phone via SMS texting.
- 2. Congress was prompted to pass the TCPA due to "[v]oluminous consumer complaints about abuses of telephone technology—for example, computerized calls dispatched to private homes" *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC,* 132 S.Ct. 740, 744 (2012). The TCPA was designed to prevent calls and messages like the ones described within this Complaint, and to protect the privacy of citizens like Plaintiff.
- 3. In enacting the TCPA, Congress intended to give consumers a choice as to how telemarketers and creditors can contact them, and made specific findings that "residential telephone subscribers consider automated or prerecorded telephone calls, regardless of the content or the initiator of the message, to be a nuisance and an invasion of privacy." TCPA, Pub. L. No. 102–243, § 2 (10), 105 Stat. 2394 (1991). And since "[t]echnologies that might allow consumers to avoid receiving such calls are not universally available, are costly, are unlikely to be enforced, or place an inordinate burden on the consumer," then "[b]anning 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 . . . is the only effective means of protecting telephone consumers from this nuisance and privacy invasion." *Id* §§ 2(11)-(12), 105 Stat. 2394-95.

The Ninth Circuit has held that under the TCPA, it is "unlawful 'to make any

1 call' using an [automatic telephone dialing system]," and "[w]hile the TCPA does not 2 3 define 'call,' the FCC has explicitly stated that the TCPA's prohibition on ATDSs 4 'encompasses both voice calls and text calls to wireless numbers including, for example, 5 short message service (SMS) calls " Satterfield v. Simon & Schuster, Inc., 569 F.3d 946, 952 (9th Cir. 2009) (quoting In re Rules and Regulations Implementing the Tel. 6 7 Consumer Prot. Act of 1991, Report and Order, 18 FCC Rcd. 14014, 14115 (July 3, 2003)). 8 Therefore, "a text message [SMS message] is a 'call' within the meaning of the TCPA."

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

4.

Id.An "automatic telephone dialing system" means "equipment which has the capacity—(A) to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator; and (B) to dial such numbers." 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1). The "clear language of the TCPA 'mandates that the focus must be on whether the equipment has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator." Meyer v. Portfolio Recovery Assocs., LLC, 707 F.3d 1036, 1043 (9th Cir. 2012) (quoting Satterfield, 569 F.3d at 951) (emphasis in original) (internal quotations omitted). The system "need not actually store, produce, or call randomly or

sequentially generated telephone numbers, it need only have the capacity to do it." *Id.*

6. Effective October 16, 2013, prior express written consent is required to initiate or cause to be initiated any telephone call (or text) that includes or introduces an advertisement or constitutes telemarketing, using an automatic telephone dialing system to any telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service. See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1200(a)(1)(iii) and (2). Under this regulation, the only instances in which the prior express consent does not need to be in writing are when a call is made for emergency purposes, when a call is made by or on behalf of a tax-exempt nonprofit organization, or when a call that delivers a health care message is made by, or on behalf of, a covered entity or its business associate, as those terms are defined in the HIPAA Privacy Rule. See 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1200(a)(2).

7. Lash Studio sends its texts using an automatic telephone dialing system to its customers' cellular telephones for advertising and marketing purposes *only*—not for emergency purposes. Lash Studio is not a tax-exempt nonprofit organization—it is a forprofit corporation. And since Lash Studio is not a covered entity or a business associate under HIPAA, it does not deliver health care messages to customers. Therefore, Lash Studio must—but does not—obtain prior express written consent from its customers prior to sending texts to them.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 8. This Court has original jurisdiction over Defendant and the claims set forth below pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this action arises from a violation of federal law.
- 9. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Lash Studio does business in the State of California, including within the Southern District of California. Lash Studio has accepted payment in this District for the transaction of business, which has caused Lash Studio to incur both obligations and liabilities in this District.
- 10. Venue is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this District. Plaintiff resides in this District, and the harm occurred in this District because Plaintiff was texted by Defendant here.

PARTIES

- 11. Plaintiff Brittany Covell resides in San Diego, California. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a "person" as that term is defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39). Plaintiff was contacted by Lash Studio using an automatic telephone dialing system to send advertising and marketing texts to her cellular telephone even though she did not grant prior express written consent to Lash Studio to do so.
- 12. Defendant Lash Studio is a limited liability company operating at 9383 East Bahia Drive, Ste. 100, Scottsdale, Arizona 85260. Defendant manufactures beauty care products, including mascara, cleanser, and eyelash extensions. Lash Studio operates as an

eyelash extension salon and is the franchisor of over 200 independently owned and operated Lash Studio locations throughout the nation. Defendant markets and sells its products and eyelash extension services to thousands of consumers in California through its locations, on its website, and via marketing text messages. Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a "person" as that term is defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).

- 13. The true names and capacities, whether individual corporate, associate, or otherwise, of defendants sued herein as a Doe is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the defendants designated hereinafter as Does when such identities become known.
- 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that all times material hereto and mentioned herein, each defendant sued herein was the agent, servant, employer, joint venture, partner, subsidiary, parent, division, alias, and/or alter ego of each of the remaining defendants and was, at all times, acting within the purpose and scope of such agency, servitude, employment, ownership, subsidiary, alias, and/or alter ego and with the authority, consent, approval, control, influence, and ratification of each remaining defendant sued herein.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 15. On several occasions, Plaintiff visited the Lash Studio located at in La Costa Town Square, 3457 Via Montebello Suite 152, Carlsbad, California 92009 to receive an eyelash extension service.
- 16. On one occasion, Plaintiff was required to input her personal information, including her cell phone number into Defendant's point of sale registry.
- 17. Plaintiff did not provide express written consent to receive Defendant's SMS text message marketing and advertisement messages.
- 18. Between October 12, 2018 and March 25, 2019 Plaintiff received several advertising and marketing SMS text messages on her personal cell phone. For instance, the advertising and marketing SMS text message Plaintiff received on October 12, 2018

read:

Want Full Luxurious Lashes? Don't miss our HALLOWEEN Special! FREE Volume Upgrade (\$65 Value) w/Our Intro Offer of \$89.99 for Full Set of Lashes. http://bit.ly/BookOnlineLC Amazing Lash Studio La Costa 760-452-4522 Reply STOP to stop msgs.

19. On each relevant occasion alleged herein, Plaintiff received SMS text messages from Defendant that included similar advertising and marketing content as that alleged above.

The Delivery Restrictions On Telemarketing Require Prior Express Written Consent Before Sending Marketing Text Messages to Cellular Telephones

20. On October 16, 2013, the amendments to 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(2) became effective. The regulation now requires express written consent before a text message introducing an advertisement or other telemarketing is sent, it states:

No person or entity may: . . . Initiate, or cause to be initiated, any telephone call that includes or introduces an advertisement or constitutes telemarketing, using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, to any of the lines or telephone numbers described in paragraphs (a)(1)(i) through (iii) of this section, other than a call made with the *prior express written consent* of the called party or the prior express consent of the called party when the call is made by or on behalf of a tax-exempt nonprofit organization, or a call that delivers a "health care" message made by, or on behalf of, a "covered entity" or its business associate," as those terms are defined in the HIPAA Privacy Rule, 45 CFR 160.13.

47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(2), effective October 16, 2013 (emphasis added).

21. Defendant cannot send SMS text messages containing advertisements or which constitute telemarketing to its customers' cell phones. Paragraphs (a)(1)(i) through (iii) of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200 read as follows:

No person or entity may: (1) Except as provided in paragraph (a)(2) of this section, initiate any telephone call *(other than a call made for emergency purposes* or is made with the prior express consent of the called party) using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice:

///

- (i) To any emergency telephone line, including any 911 line and any emergency line of a hospital, medical physician or service office, health care facility, poison control center, or fire protection or law enforcement agency;
- (ii) To the telephone line of any guest room or patient room of a hospital, health care facility, elderly home, or similar establishment; or
- (iii) To any telephone number assigned to a paging service, *cellular telephone service*, specialized mobile radio service, or other radio common carrier service, or any service for which the called party is charged for the call.
- 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(1)(i) through (iii) (emphasis added).
- 22. Defendant does not acquire express written consent from its customers prior to sending the offending SMS text messages. According to 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(f)(8):

As used in this section: . . . The term prior express written consent means an agreement, in writing, bearing the signature of the person called that clearly authorizes the seller to deliver or cause to be delivered to the person called advertisements or telemarketing messages using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, and the telephone number to which the signatory authorizes such advertisements or telemarketing messages to be delivered.

- (i) The written agreement shall include a *clear and conspicuous disclosure* informing the person signing that:
 - (A) By executing the agreement, such person authorizes the seller to deliver or cause to be delivered to the signatory telemarketing calls using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice; and
 - (B) The person is not required to sign the agreement (directly or indirectly), or agree to enter into such an agreement as a condition of purchasing any property, goods, or services.
- (ii) The term "signature" shall include an electronic or digital form of signature, to the extent that such form of signature, to the extent that such form of signature is recognized as a valid signature under applicable federal law or state contract law.

5

6 7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26 27

28

47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(f)(8) (emphasis added).

- As indicated by 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(1)(iii), Defendant's texts using an automatic telephone dialing system to the cellular telephones belonging to Plaintiff and the Class are covered by this regulation.
- As stated by 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(1) and the amendments to 47 C.F.R. § 24. 64.1200(a)(2), Defendant is required to obtain prior express written consent before sending texts using an automatic telephone dialing system to the cellular telephones belonging to Plaintiff and the Class because Defendant does not send its texts for emergency purposes, it is not a tax-exempt nonprofit organization, and it does not deliver health care messages to customers as a covered entity or a business associate under HIPAA.
- As stated by 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(f)(8), prior express written consent means "an agreement, in writing, bearing the signature of the person called." The agreement must contain a "clear and conspicuous disclosure" informing the signatory that she is authorizing the seller to deliver telemarketing calls using an automatic telephone dialing system and that she is not required to sign the agreement as a condition of making a purchase from the seller. Defendant has not met any of these requirements—there are no disclosures regarding the texts on Defendant's website or in its privacy policy, and Plaintiff and the Class have not provided their signatures, whether in hard copy, electronically, or digitally, to Defendant. There is no "clear and conspicuous" disclosure.
- 26. In direct disregard of these regulations, Defendant sent text messages to Plaintiff and putative Class members. Plaintiff did not provide her prior express written consent to Defendant to receive these texts.

Defendant's Website And Privacy Policy Demonstrate It Does Not Receive Prior Express Written Consent Before Sending Marketing Texts To Its Customers

27. Defendant's website indicates that it does not obtain prior express written consent before sending promotions and updates via email and text to customers. On its

1

3 4

567

8

101112

1314

1516

17 18

19 20

21

2223

24

2526

27

28

homepage, a customer has an option to "Request Appoint" and receive the "Intro Offer" by entering her name, email address, phone number, service, and selecting her preferred contact method.

- 28. This is not at all sufficient to establish the prior express written consent required by the amendment of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(2). There is no place on the website in which customers must enter their signature, and there are no clear and conspicuous disclosures informing customers that the texts will be made using an automatic telephone dialing system introducing advertisements and/or for telemarketing purposes.
- Likewise, Defendant's privacy policy ("Policy") indicates that it does not 29. obtain prior express written consent before sending marketing texts to its customers. The Policy states that it "applies only to information collected by Amazing Lash Studio online: and that by "us[ing] our Site or Service, certain areas or features may require you to provide personal information." For example, "[i]f you request an appointment at an independently owned and operated Amazing Lash Studio franchised location, [Defendant] collect[s] your name, email address, phone number, and information about your desired appointment;" "[i]f you make a purchase through the Services, [Defendant] will collect your payment information, including your phone number and billing and shipping information;" and if you contact Defendant in general, it will "request your name [and] contact information." Defendant might also "collect information from third parties" and will "automatically collect the following information about your use of our Site or Services through cookies, web beacons, and other technologies." The Policy further states that "[u]sers who make a purchase will receive a number of emails throughout the transaction process and they may sometimes receive phone calls from our Customer Service department to ensure smooth transactions." Defendant "may also occasionally send out service-related announcements, for instance, if our service is temporarily suspended for maintenance" and "generally, these communications are not promotional in nature, and users will receive them as long as their accounts are open" (emphasis added). The Policy provides that Defendant will use customers' information in part "[f]or marketing and promotional purposes," such as, "to

send you news and newsletters, special offers, and promotions, or to otherwise contact you about products or information we think may interest you."

30. While this Policy may be sufficient to establish prior express consent, it is not adequate to establish prior express written consent. There are no clear and conspicuous disclosures in the Policy informing customers that the texts will be made using an automatic telephone dialing system and that they are not required to sign the agreement as a condition of making a purchase from the seller.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

31. This lawsuit is brought on behalf of Plaintiff and all others similarly situated pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b)(3) to recover the maximum statutory penalties permitted by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and/or 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C) for Defendant's repeated violations of the TCPA and 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200 as alleged herein. Plaintiff seeks certification of the following Class:

All consumers who received a text message which includes or introduces an advertisement or constitutes telemarketing from Defendant from four years prior to the filing of the Complaint in this matter to the present, which text message was not made for emergency purposes, was not made by a tax-exempt nonprofit organization, did not deliver a health care message, or was not made with the recipient's prior express written consent.

- 32. Excluded from the Class definition are Defendant, its corporate parents, subsidiaries and affiliates, officers and directors, and any entity in which Defendant has a controlling interest, and the legal representatives, successors, or assigns of any such excluded persons or entities. Further excluded are Plaintiff's counsel and the assigned Judge and the Judge's family.
- 33. Plaintiff and members of the Class were harmed by the acts of Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant, either directly or through its agents, illegally contacted Plaintiff and the Class members via their cellular telephones by using an automatic telephone dialing system to send marketing text messages, thereby causing Plaintiff and the Class members to incur certain cellular charges or reduce cellular

3

4

5 6

8

9

7

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

telephone time for which Plaintiff and the Class members previously paid, and in so doing, Defendant invaded the privacy of, inconvenienced and damaged Plaintiff and the Class members.

- 34. This suit seeks only damages for recovery of economic injury on behalf of the Class and injunctive relief to halt Defendant's illegal practices alleged herein, and it expressly is not intended to request any recovery for personal injury and claims related thereto. Plaintiff reserves the right to expand the Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional persons as warranted as facts are learned through further investigation and discovery.
- 35. The members of this Class are so numerous that joinder of all Numerosity. members is impracticable. While the exact number of Class members is unknown to Plaintiff at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the proposed Class contains hundreds if not thousands of members.
- 36. Existence and Predominance of Common Questions of Law and Fact. common questions of law and fact, which arise from Lash Studio's uniform pattern and practice of prohibited conduct, exist as to all members of the Class and predominate over questions affecting only individual Class members. The common legal and factual questions include, but are not limited to the following:
 - Whether each Class member provided written consent to receive a. advertising or telemarketing texts from Lash Studio;
 - b. Whether Lash Studio sent advertising or telemarketing text messages to its customers' cellular telephone lines via an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice;
 - Whether such texts were for commercial purposes; c.
 - Whether such texts were for commercial purposes but did not include or d. introduce an advertisement or constitute telemarketing;
 - Whether such texts were for emergency purposes; e.
 - f. Whether Lash Studio is a tax-exempt nonprofit organization;

- g. Whether Lash Studio is a "covered entity" or "business associate" as those terms are defined in the HIPAA Privacy Rule, 45 C.F.R. § 160.103;
- h. Whether the texts sent by Defendant were for the purpose of delivering a "health care" message as that term is defined in the HIPAA Privacy Rule, 45 C.F.R. § 160.103;
- i. Whether Defendant's text messages to its customers violate the TCPA (47 U.S.C. § 227) and 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200;
- j. Whether Class Members are entitled to statutory damages afforded under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C); and
- k. Whether Class Members are entitled to attorneys' fees under Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. § 1021.5.
- 37. *Typicality*. The claims asserted by Plaintiff in this action are typical of the claims of the members of the Class, as the claims arise from the same course of conduct by Defendant, and the relief sought is common. Plaintiff received at least one marketing text message from Defendant without providing prior express written consent to Defendant, and therefore, Plaintiff, like every other Class member, was exposed to virtually identical conduct and is entitled to civil penalties in amounts of \$500.00 up to \$1,500.00 per occurrence/violation pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
- 38. Adequacy of Representation. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the members of the Class, and she has no conflict of interest with other Class members. Plaintiff has also retained experienced counsel who are competent in multi-party, class, and civil litigation. Plaintiff seeks on behalf of herself and the entire Class, on grounds generally applicable to the entire class: a determination of liability; declaratory relief; and the maximum statutory penalty permitted by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
- 39. *Superiority*. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because the likelihood of individual Class members prosecuting separate claims is remote, and individual Class members do not have

a significant interest in individually controlling the prosecution of separate actions. In this action, the statutory damages to which each individual Class member is entitled are relatively small, and the expense and burden of individual litigation would make it impracticable for proposed Class members to prosecute their claims individually. It would thus be virtually impossible for the Class, on an individual basis, to obtain effective redress for the wrongs done to them, thereby allowing Defendant's unlawful conduct to continue unabated. Furthermore, even if Class members could afford such individualized litigation, the court system could not: individualized litigation would create the danger of inconsistent or contradictory judgments arising from the same set of facts, and it would increase the delay and expense to all parties and the court system from the issues raised by this action. By contrast, the class-action device provides the benefits of adjudication of these issues in a single proceeding, uniformity of decision, and comprehensive supervision by a single court, and it presents no unusual management difficulties under the circumstances here.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.

- 40. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as through fully stated herein.
- 41. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227.
- 42. Here, Defendant either directly or through its agents, knowingly and/or willfully contacted Plaintiff and Class members via their cellular telephones through an automatic telephone dialing system to place advertising and/or telemarketing texts. Defendant knew or should have known that none of the texts were/are exempt under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(2)(B) or 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1200(a)(2) or (a)(3). Therefore, Defendant knew that it was required to obtain prior express written consent under 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1200(a)(2) and (a)(3) prior to sending these advertising and/or telemarketing texts. Yet Defendant did not and does not obtain prior express written consent or even prior express

consent (under 47 U.S.C. §§ 227(b)(1)(A)(iii) and (b)(1)(B)). Therefore, Defendant has committed and continues to commit knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA.

- 43. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to an award of \$1,500.00 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and (b)(3)(C).
- 44. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.

- 45. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 46. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to, each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227.
- 47. Here, if the Court does not find that Defendant's violations of the TCPA were knowing and/or willful, then the Court should find that Defendant negligently violated the TCPA. Defendant, either directly or through its agents, contacted Plaintiff and the Class members via their cellular telephones through an automatic telephone dialing system to place advertising and/or telemarketing texts. None of the texts were/are exempt under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(2)(B) or 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1200(a)(2) or (a)(3). Yet Defendant did not and does not obtain prior express written consent (under 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1200(a)(2) and (a)(3)) prior to sending these texts. Therefore, Defendant has violated and continues to violate the TCPA.
- 48. As a result of Defendant's violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 49. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Violations of Restrictions on Telemarketing and Telephone Solicitation 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200

- 50. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 51. The amendments to 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(2), which became effective on October 16, 2013, require that Defendant obtain prior express written consent before sending texts using an automatic telephone dialing system to the cellular telephones belonging to Plaintiff and the Class because Defendant does not send its texts for emergency purposes, is not a tax-exempt nonprofit organization, and does not deliver health care messages to customers as a covered entity or business associate under HIPAA.
- 52. Prior express written consent must constitute "an agreement, in writing, bearing the signature of the person called," with a "clear and conspicuous disclosure" informing the signatory that she is authorizing the seller to deliver telemarketing calls using an automatic telephone dialing system and that she is not required to sign the agreement as a condition of making a purchase from the seller. See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(f)(8). There are no disclosures regarding the texts on Defendant's website or in its privacy policy, and Plaintiff and the Class have not provided their signatures, whether in hard copy, electronically, or digitally, to Defendant.
- 53. Therefore, Defendant has violated 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200, and Plaintiff and the Class are entitled of an award of \$500.00 to \$1,500.00 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §§ 227(b)(3)(B) and (b)(3)(C).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for a judgment as follows:

A. Certifying this case as a class action to afford the putative class members the procedural benefit of the class-action device and to avoid the multiplicity of individual actions;

1	B.	Certifying Plaintiff the	class representative and her attorneys, Todd D		
2		Carpenter and Carlson Ly	rnch Sweet Kilpela & Carpenter, LLP, as Counse		
3		for the Class;			
4	C.	Awarding Plaintiff and th	e Class members the maximum statutory penalty		
5		permissible pursuant to	47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and/or 47 U.S.C.		
6		227(b)(3)(C);			
7	D.	A declaration of the rights	and liabilities of the parties;		
8	E.	Injunctive relief enjoining Defendant from committing further violations of			
9		law as alleged herein;			
10	F.	Awarding Plaintiff and the	e Class members pre-judgment and post-judgmen		
l 1		interest according to Calif	ornia law;		
12	G.	Awarding Plaintiff and Cl	ass members attorney's fees and costs; and		
13	H.	Awarding Plaintiff and C	lass members any such other and further relief a		
ا 4		may be appropriate.			
15					
16	Dated: Aug	ust 26, 2019	CARLSON LYNCH, LLP		
17			//T 11 D G		
ا 8			/s/ Todd D. Carpenter Todd D. Carpenter (CA 234464)		
9			Todd D. Carpenter (CA 234464) tcarpenter@carlsonlynch.com Scott G. Braden (CA 305051)		
20			sbraden@carlsonlynch.com		
21			1350 Columbia St. Ste. 603		
22	:		Tel: (619) 762-1900 Fax: (619) 756-6991		
23			Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class		
24			ana ine i roposea Ciass		
25					
26					
27					
28					

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

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				DEFENDANTS			
BRITTANY COVELL, individually and on behalf of all others similar situated				AMAZING LASH STUDIO FRANCHISE LLC			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Maricopa (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)			
(EACEL I III O.G. I BIBLITIT I CHOES)				NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,)	Address, and Telephone Number	r)		Attorneys (If Known)	'19CV1613	BEN WVG	
Todd D. Carpenter (CA 2 1350 Columbia St. Ste. 6			6		·		
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)		<u> </u>	RINCIPAL PART	TIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif	
□ 1 U.S. Government	⋨ 3 Federal Question			(For Diversity Cases Only)	rf def	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF	
Plaintiff	•		Citiz		l 🗇 l Incorporate	ed or Principal Place	
2 U.S. Government		p of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State		ed and Principal Place	
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗇 3 Foreign Na	ution ☐ 6 ☐ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		aly) RTS	1 10	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	Click here for: N BANKRUPTCY	lature of Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ∞ Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS □ 440 Other Civil Rights □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 571 Truth in Lending 480 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General es - 535 Death Penalty Other:		LABOR LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 62 Naturalization Application 65 Other Immigration	422 Appeal 28 USC 15 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHT 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 835 Patent - Abbreviat New Drug Applica 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 362 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (40 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUI 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaint or Defendant) 871 IRS — Third Party 26 USC 7609	375 False Claims Act	
	Other 448 Education	☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement		Actions		,	
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" is	••						
	te Court	Appellate Court	Rec	(specify	er District Lit	ultidistrict	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON Brief description of ca	27 & 47 C.F.R. Sec ause:	64.12		tutes unless diversity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: Violation of the Telephone Consume CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.				DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: 5,000,000 + JURY DEMAND: Yes No			
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBE	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD 8.26.2019 /s/ Todd D. Carpenter							
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		<u> </u>	,			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
RECEIPT # Al	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MA	AG. JUDGE	