

1 Frank S. Hedin (SBN 291289)  
HEDIN HALL LLP  
2 1395 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1140  
Miami, Florida 33131  
3 Telephone: + 1 (305) 357-2107  
4 Email: fhedin@hedinhall.com

5 *Counsel for Plaintiff and the Putative Class*

6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
7 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

8 SANDRA DIAZ, individually and on  
9 behalf of all others similarly situated,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 CHIPOTLE MEXICAN GRILL, INC.,

13 Defendant.

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

CLASS ACTION

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

14 Plaintiff Sandra Diaz, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  
15 complains and alleges as follows based on personal knowledge as to herself, on the  
16 investigation of her counsel, and on information and belief as to all other matters.  
17

18 **NATURE OF ACTION**

19 1. Plaintiff brings this Class Action Complaint for legal and equitable  
20 remedies resulting from the illegal actions of Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc.  
21 (“Defendant”) in sending automated telephonic sales calls, in the form of text  
22 messages, to her cellular telephone and the cellular telephones of numerous other  
23  
24

1 individuals across Florida, in clear violation of the Florida Telephone Solicitation Act,  
2 Fla. Sta § 501.059 (“FTSA”).

3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4 2. The Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28  
5 U.S.C. § 1332(d) because there are more than 100 class members and the aggregate  
6 amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest, fees, and costs, and  
7 at least one Class member is a citizen of a state different from Defendant.  
8

9 3. Personal jurisdiction and venue are proper because Defendant maintains  
10 its headquarters and principal place of business in Newport Beach, California, within  
11 this judicial District.

12 **PARTIES**

13 4. Plaintiff is a resident and citizen of Florida. Plaintiff was at all times  
14 mentioned herein the regular user of the telephone number (786) \*\*\*-9446 (the “9446  
15 Number”).  
16

17 5. Defendant Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc. is an American chain of fast  
18 casual restaurants specializing in bowls, tacos and Mission burritos made to order in  
19 front of the customer. Defendant is organized and incorporated under the laws of  
20 Delaware and maintains its corporate headquarters and principal place of business in  
21 Newport Beach, California. Defendant is a “person” within the meaning of Fla. Stat.  
22 § 501.059(8)(a).  
23  
24

**THE FLORIDA TELEPHONE SOLITATION ACT**

1  
2 6. “Americans passionately disagree about many things. But they are largely  
3 united in their disdain for robocalls. The Federal Government receives a staggering  
4 number of complaints about robocalls—3.7 million complaints in 2019 alone. The  
5 States likewise field a constant barrage of complaints.” *Barr v. Am. Ass'n of Political*  
6 *Consultants*, 140 S. Ct. 2335, 2343 (2020).

7  
8 7. Thus, on July 1, 2021, to better protect its residents’ privacy from intrusive  
9 calls and text messages, Florida enacted an amendment to the FTSA to prohibit, *inter*  
10 *alia*, the transmission of unsolicited sales calls and text messages to its residents’  
11 telephones.

12 8. As amended, the FTSA provides, in pertinent part: “A person may not  
13 make or knowingly allow a telephonic sales call to be made if such call involves an  
14 automated system for the selection or dialing of telephone numbers or the playing of a  
15 recorded message when a connection is completed to a number called without the prior  
16 express written consent of the called party.” Fla. Stat. § 501.059(8)(a).

17 9. “Telephonic sales call” is defined, in pertinent part, as a “telephone call  
18 [or] text message . . . to a consumer for the purpose of soliciting a sale of any consumer  
19 goods or services . . . or obtaining information that will or may be used for the direct  
20 solicitation of a sale of consumer goods or services[.]” *Id.* § 501.059(1)(i).

1           10. “Prior express written consent” is defined, in pertinent part, as “a written  
2 agreement that . . . [b]ears the signature of the called party[,] [c]learly authorizes the  
3 person making or allowing the placement of a telephonic sales call by telephone call  
4 [or] text message . . . to deliver or cause to be delivered to the called party a telephonic  
5 sales call using an automated system for the selection or dialing of telephone  
6 numbers[,] . . . [i]ncludes the telephone number to which the signatory authorizes a  
7 telephonic sales call to be delivered[,] and [i]ncludes a clear and conspicuous disclosure  
8 informing the called party that”:

9  
10                   A. By executing the agreement, the called party authorizes  
11 the person making or allowing the placement of a telephonic sales  
12 call to deliver or cause to be delivered a telephonic sales call to the  
13 called party using an automated system for the selection or dialing  
14 of telephone numbers . . . ; and

15                   B. He or she is not required to directly or indirectly sign the  
16 written agreement or to agree to enter into such an agreement as a  
17 condition of purchasing any property, goods, or services.

18 *Id.* § 501.059(1)(g).

19           11. “There is a rebuttable presumption that a telephonic sales call made to any  
20 area code in this state is made to a Florida resident or to a person in this state at the  
21 time of the call.” *Id.* § 501.059(8)(d)

22           12. Any person aggrieved by a violation of the FTSA may recover \$500.00  
23 for each violation pursuant to § 501.059(10)(a), or up to \$1,500.00 for each violation  
24 committed knowingly or willfully pursuant to § 501.059(10)(b).

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS**

1  
2 13. Since July 1, 2021, Plaintiff has received, at the 9446 Number, at least one  
3 text message that Defendant made or knowingly allowed another person to make on its  
4 behalf.

5 14. For example, on or about October 31, 2022, Defendant made, or  
6 knowingly allowed to be made on its behalf, a text message to the 9446 Number that  
7 stated as follows:  
8

9 Happy Boorito! Visit any U.S. Chipotle in costume & get a \$6  
10 entrée after 3pm. Rewards member exclusive. Info:  
11 chipotle.com/rewards&utm\_source=Vibes&utm\_medium=SMS&  
utm\_campaign=10312022\_Boorito.Txt HELP4help STOP2quit

12 15. At the time the subject text messages were made to and received by  
13 Plaintiff, Plaintiff was “an actual or prospective purchaser, lessee, or recipient of  
14 consumer goods or services.” *Id.* § 501.059(1)(b).

15 16. The text messages that Defendant made or knowingly allowed another  
16 person to make on its behalf to Plaintiff’s 9446 Number were sent to Plaintiff for the  
17 purpose of “soliciting a sale of . . . consumer goods or services” to Plaintiff, or  
18 “obtaining information [from Plaintiff] that w[ould] or m[ight] be used for the direct  
19 solicitation of a sale of consumer goods or services” to Plaintiff. *Id.* § 501.059(1)(b) &  
20 (1)(i).  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 17. Accordingly, the text messages that Defendant made or knowingly  
2 allowed another person to make on its behalf to Plaintiff's 9446 Number constituted  
3 "telephonic sales calls." Fla. Stat. § 501.059(1)(i).

4 18. Plaintiff is the "regular user of" the 9446 Number, and is therefore the  
5 "called party" with respect to the subject text messages made by or on behalf of  
6 Defendant to the 9446 Number. *See* Fla. Stat. § 501.059(1)(a).

7 19. Each text message sent by or on behalf of Defendant to Plaintiff's 9446  
8 Number originated from the telephone number 88822, which is number leased or  
9 owned by or on behalf of Defendant that Defendant uses or knowingly allows another  
10 person to use to transmit telephonic sales calls, in the form of text messages, to  
11 consumers in an automated and *en masse* fashion.

12 20. Indeed, all telephone contact by Defendant or affiliates, subsidiaries, or  
13 agents of Defendant to Plaintiff's 9446 Number occurred using an "automated system  
14 for the selection or dialing of telephone numbers" within the meaning of Fla. Stat. §  
15 501.059(8)(a). Specifically, Defendant utilized an "automated system for the selection  
16 or dialing of telephone numbers" to transmit the subject text messages to Plaintiff's  
17 9446 Number because such messages were sent from telephone numbers used to  
18 message consumers *en masse*; because Defendant's dialing equipment includes  
19 features substantially similar to a predictive dialer, inasmuch as it is capable of making  
20 numerous calls or texts simultaneously; and because the hardware and software used  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 by Defendant to send such messages have the capacity to both select numbers to be  
2 dialed and to dial such numbers in an automated fashion. And indeed, Defendant (or  
3 another person Defendant knowingly allowed to act on its behalf) actually transmitted  
4 the text messages at issue in this case to Plaintiff in an automated fashion, with  
5 hardware and software that automatically selected and dialed Plaintiff's 9446 Number  
6 and the other telephone numbers to which it transmitted such text messages.  
7

8 21. Because Plaintiff's cellular phone alerts her whenever she receives a text  
9 message, each telephonic sales call by or on behalf of Defendant to Plaintiff's 9446  
10 Number invaded Plaintiff's privacy and intruded upon Plaintiff's seclusion upon  
11 receipt.

12 22. Plaintiff has never provided her prior "prior express written consent" to  
13 Defendant or any other party acting on Defendant's behalf to authorize the subject  
14 telephonic sales calls to the 9446 Number by means of an "automated system for the  
15 selection or dialing of telephone numbers" within the meaning of Fla. Stat. §  
16 501.059(8)(a). Indeed, prior to making (or knowingly allowing another person to make  
17 on its behalf) the subject telephonic sales calls to Plaintiff's 9446 Number, Defendant  
18 lacked a signed written agreement with Plaintiff that complies with the requirements  
19 of Fla. Stat. § 501.059(1)(g).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

1  
2 23. Class Definition. Plaintiff brings this civil class action on behalf of herself  
3 individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated persons as a class action  
4 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23. The “Class” which Plaintiff seeks to  
5 represent is comprised of and defined as follows:

6 All persons in Florida who, at any time since July 1, 2021, received  
7 a telephonic sales call made by or on behalf of Defendant using the  
8 same type of equipment used to make telephonic sales calls to  
9 Plaintiff.

10 24. Excluded from the class are Defendant, its officers and directors, members  
11 of the immediate families of the foregoing, legal representatives, heirs, successors, or  
12 assigns of the foregoing, and any entity in which Defendant has a controlling interest.

13 25. Plaintiff reserves the right to modify the definition of the Class (or add  
14 one or more subclasses) after further discovery.

15 26. Plaintiff and all Class members have been impacted and harmed by the  
16 acts of Defendant or its affiliates, agents, or subsidiaries acting on its behalf.

17 27. This Class Action Complaint seeks injunctive relief and monetary  
18 damages.

19 28. Defendant or any affiliates, subsidiaries, or agents of Defendant have  
20 acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making final injunctive  
21 relief and corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole  
22 appropriate. Moreover, on information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that the FTSA  
23  
24



1 violations complained of herein are substantially likely to continue in the future if an  
2 injunction is not entered.

3 29. This action may properly be brought and maintained as a class action  
4 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b). This class action satisfies  
5 the numerosity, typicality, adequacy, commonality, predominance, and superiority  
6 requirements.

7  
8 30. On application by Plaintiff's counsel for class certification, Plaintiff may  
9 also seek certification of subclasses in the interests of manageability, justice, or judicial  
10 economy.

11 31. Numerosity. The number of persons within the Class is substantial,  
12 believed to amount to at least several thousand persons dispersed throughout Florida,  
13 who collectively received at least tens of thousands of telephonic sales calls by or on  
14 behalf of Defendant since July 1, 2021. It is, therefore, impractical to join each member  
15 of the Class as a named plaintiff. Further, the size and relatively modest value of the  
16 claims of the individual members of the Class renders joinder impractical. Accordingly,  
17 utilization of the class action mechanism is the most economically feasible means of  
18 determining and adjudicating the merits of this litigation.

19  
20 32. Typicality. Plaintiff received at least one telephonic sales call from  
21 Defendant since July 1, 2021 while in Florida, and Defendant lacks any record  
22 establishing Plaintiff's "prior express written consent." Consequently, the claims of  
23  
24

1 Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the members of the Class, and Plaintiff's interests  
2 are consistent with and not antagonistic to those of the other Class members she seeks  
3 to represent. Plaintiff and all members of the Class have been impacted by, and face  
4 continuing harm arising out of, Defendant's FTSA-violative misconduct as alleged  
5 herein.

6  
7 33. Adequacy. As the proposed Class representative, Plaintiff has no interests  
8 adverse to or which conflict with the interests of the absent members of the Class, and  
9 she is able to fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of such a Class.  
10 Plaintiff has raised viable statutory claims of the type reasonably expected to be raised  
11 by members of the Class and will vigorously pursue these claims. If necessary as the  
12 litigation (including discovery) progresses, Plaintiff may seek leave to amend this Class  
13 Action Complaint to modify the Class definition set forth above, add additional Class  
14 representatives, or assert additional claims.  
15

16 34. Competency of Class Counsel. Plaintiff has retained and is represented  
17 by experienced, qualified, and competent counsel committed to prosecuting this action.  
18 Plaintiff's counsel are experienced in handling complex class action claims, including  
19 in particular claims brought under consumer protection and data-privacy statutes  
20 similar to the FTSA.  
21

22 35. Commonality and Predominance. There are well-defined common  
23 questions of fact and law that exist as to all members of the Class and predominate over  
24

1 any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. These common legal  
2 and factual questions, which do not vary from Class member to Class member and may  
3 be determined without reference to the individual circumstances of any Class member,  
4 include (but are not limited to) the following:

- 5
- 6 a) Whether Defendant made or knowingly allowed another person to make  
7 the subject text messages to Plaintiff's and Class members' cellular  
8 telephones;
- 9 b) Whether such text messages were sent using an "automated system for the  
10 selection or dialing of telephone numbers" within the meaning of Fla. Stat.  
11 § 501.059(8)(a);
- 12 c) Whether Defendant can meet its burden to show that it obtained "prior  
13 express written consent" to transmit the subject text messages within the  
14 meaning of Fla. Stat. § 501.059(1)(g), assuming such an affirmative  
15 defense is timely raised;
- 16
- 17 d) Whether any of the violations of the FTSA committed by or on behalf of  
18 Defendant were knowing or willful;
- 19 e) The amount of statutory damages to which Plaintiff and the Class are  
20 entitled as a result of any violations of the FTSA committed by or on  
21 behalf of Defendant; and  
22  
23  
24

1 f) Whether Defendant or any affiliates, subsidiaries, or agents of Defendant  
2 should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.

3 36. Superiority. A class action is superior to other available methods for the  
4 fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because the prosecution of individual  
5 litigation on behalf of each Class member is impracticable. Even if every member of  
6 the Class could afford to pursue individual litigation, the court system could not;  
7 multiple trials of the same factual issues would magnify the delay and expense to all  
8 parties and the court system. Individualized litigation would also present the potential  
9 for varying, inconsistent or contradictory judgments. By contrast, the maintenance of  
10 this action as a class action, with respect to some or all of the issues presented herein,  
11 presents few management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and the  
12 court system and protects the rights of each member of the Class. Plaintiff anticipates  
13 no difficulty in the management of this action as a class action. Class wide relief is  
14 essential to compel compliance with the FTSA and thus protect consumers' privacy.  
15 The interests of Class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate  
16 claims is small because the statutory damages recoverable in an individual action for  
17 violation of the FTSA are likewise relatively small. Management of these claims is  
18 likely to present significantly fewer difficulties than are presented in many class actions  
19 because the text messages at issue are all automated and because Defendant lacks any  
20 record reflecting that it obtained the requisite prior express written consent from any  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 Class member to be sent such messages. Class members can be readily located and  
2 notified of this class action by reference to Defendant's records and, if necessary, the  
3 records of Defendant's affiliates, agents, or subsidiaries and cellular telephone  
4 providers.

5 37. Additionally, the prosecution of separate actions by individual Class  
6 members would create a risk of multiple adjudications with respect to them that would,  
7 as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members of the Class who  
8 are not parties to such adjudications, thereby substantially impairing or impeding the  
9 ability of such nonparty Class members to protect their interests. The prosecution of  
10 individual actions by Class members could also establish inconsistent results and/or  
11 establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant.  
12

13  
14 **CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
15 **VIOLATION OF THE FLORIDA**  
16 **TELEPHONE SOLICITATION SALES ACT**  
17 **(FLA. STAT. § 501.059)**

18 38. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs of this Class  
19 Action Complaint as if fully stated herein.

20 39. Since July 1, 2021, Defendant has made, or knowingly allowed to be made  
21 on its behalf by another person, at least one text message to the 9446 Number, and  
22 Plaintiff received such text messages in Florida. The 9446 Number is assigned an area  
23 code that corresponds to a range of geographic locations in Florida.  
24

1           40. Likewise, since July 1, 2021, Defendant has made, or knowingly allowed  
2 to be made on its behalf by another person, at least one text message to each of the  
3 telephone numbers regularly used by the members of the Class in Florida.

4           41. Because Plaintiff is, and at all relevant times referenced herein was, the  
5 “regular user of” the 9446 Number, Plaintiff was the “called party” with respect to each  
6 of the text messages made by Defendant (or knowingly allowed to be made on its behalf  
7 by another person) to the 9446 Number.

8           42. Plaintiff is “an actual or prospective purchaser, lessee, or recipient of  
9 consumer goods or services” within the meaning of the FTSA. *See Fla. Stat. §*  
10 *501.059(1)(b).*

11           43. At least one of the text messages made by Defendant (or that Defendant  
12 knowingly allowed to be made on its behalf by another person) to the 9446 Number  
13 was made for the purpose of “soliciting a sale of . . . consumer goods or services” to  
14 Plaintiff, or “obtaining information [from Plaintiff] that w[ould] or m[ight] be used for  
15 the direct solicitation of a sale of consumer goods or services” to Plaintiff. *See id.* §  
16 *501.059(1)(b) & (1)(i).* Accordingly, at least one of the subject text messages that  
17 Defendant made or knowingly allowed another person to make on its behalf to  
18 Plaintiff’s 9446 Number constituted a “telephonic sales call.” *Id.* § *501.059(1)(i).*

19           44. Likewise, at least one of the text messages made by Defendant (or that  
20 Defendant knowingly allowed to be made on its behalf by another person) to each of  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 the telephone numbers regularly used by the members of the Class was made for the  
2 purpose of “soliciting a sale of . . . consumer goods or services” to the Class member  
3 to whom the message was sent, or “obtaining information [from the Class member]  
4 that w[ould] or m[ight] be used for the direct solicitation of a sale of consumer goods  
5 or services” to him or her. *See id.* § 501.059(1)(b) & (1)(i). Accordingly, at least one  
6 of the subject text messages that Defendant made or knowingly allowed another person  
7 to make on its behalf to each of the Class members’ telephone numbers constituted a  
8 “telephonic sales call.” *Id.* § 501.059(1)(i).

10 45. Each of the telephonic sales calls made by Defendant (or that Defendant  
11 knowingly allowed to be made on its behalf by another person) to Plaintiff’s 9446  
12 Number and to the Class members’ telephone numbers occurred using an “automated  
13 system for the selection or dialing of telephone numbers” within the meaning of Fla.  
14 Stat. § 501.059(8)(a).

16 46. Prior to making or knowingly allowing another person to make on its  
17 behalf the subject telephonic sales calls to Plaintiff and the members of the Class,  
18 Defendant failed to obtain the “prior express written consent” from Plaintiff or any  
19 member of the Class. Indeed, prior to making the subject telephonic sales calls to  
20 Plaintiff’s 9446 Number and to the telephone numbers regularly used by the members  
21 of the Class, Defendant lacked a signed written agreement with Plaintiff or any Class  
22 member that complies with the requirements of Fla. Stat. § 501.059(1)(g).

1 47. Plaintiff and all Class members are entitled to, and do seek, injunctive  
2 relief prohibiting Defendant's future transmission of telephonic sales calls to the  
3 telephone numbers regularly used by Plaintiff and the members of the Class absent  
4 their prior express written consent pursuant to Fla. Stat. § 501.059(10)(a)(1), as well as  
5 an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each violation of the FTSA committed  
6 by or on behalf of Defendant pursuant to Fla. Stat. § 501.059(10)(a)(2) (or \$1,500 for  
7 each such violation committed willfully or knowingly pursuant to pursuant to Fla. Stat.  
8 § 501.059(10)(b)).  
9

10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

11 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff Sandra Diaz prays for relief and judgment in favor of  
12 herself and the Class as follows:

13 A. Injunctive relief sufficient to ensure Defendant refrains from violating the  
14 FTSA in the future pursuant to Fla. Stat. § 501.059(10)(a)(1);

15 B. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for herself and each Class member for each  
16 of Defendant's violations of the FTSA (or \$1,500.00 for each such violation to the  
17 extent committed willfully or knowingly) pursuant to Fla. Stat. § 501.059(10)(a)(2) &  
18 (10)(b);  
19

20 C. An Order certifying this action to be a proper class action pursuant to  
21 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, establishing an appropriate Class and any  
22 Subclass(es) the Court deems appropriate, finding that Plaintiff is a proper  
23  
24



1 representative of the Class, and appointing the attorneys representing Plaintiff as  
2 counsel for the Class; and

3 D. An award of attorneys’ fees and costs to Plaintiff’s counsel pursuant to  
4 Fla. Stat. § 501.059(11) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.

5 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

6 On behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff demands a trial by  
7 jury pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b) on all claims and issues so  
8 triable.  
9

10 Dated: January 18, 2023

**HEDIN HALL LLP**

11 By:  /s/ Frank S. Hedin  
Frank S. Hedin

12 Frank S. Hedin (SBN 291289)  
13 fhedin@hedinhall.com  
14 Arun G. Ravindran\*  
aravindran@hedinhall.com  
15 HEDIN HALL LLP  
16 1395 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1140  
17 Miami, Florida 33131  
Telephone: + 1 (305) 357-2107  
Facsimile: + 1 (305) 200-8801  
Email:

18 \* *Pro Hac Vice* Admission Forthcoming

19 *Counsel for Plaintiff and the Putative Class*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

# ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Guac is Extra: Chipotle Hit with Class Action Over Alleged Spam Texts](#)

---