		Case 3:17-cv-00043-JLS-WVG Document 1	Filed 01/10/17 Page 1 of 11					
HYDE & SWIGART Consumer Protection Attorneys	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Joshua B. Swigart, Esq. (SBN: 225557) josh@westcoastlitigation.com Yana A. Hart, Esq. (SBN: 306499) yana@westcoastlitigation.com HYDE & SWIGART 2221 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 101 San Diego, CA 92108 Telephone: (619) 233-7770 Facsimile: (619) 297-1022 Additional Attorneys for Plaintiff on Signature Page <i>Attorneys for Plaintiff</i> , Michael Doherty	Daniel G. Shay, Esq. (SBN: 250548) danielshay@tcpafdcpa.com LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL G. SHAY 409 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 101B San Diego, CA 92108 Telephone: (619) 222-7429 Facsimile: (866) 431-3292					
	9 10	9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
	10	SOUTHERN DISTRICT	OF CALIFORNIA					
	12							
	13	MICHAEL DOHERTY, individually and on behalf of others similarly	Case No: 17CV0043 JLS WVG					
	14	situated	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF					
DE	15	Plaintiff,	FOR:					
HY	16	V.	1. NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE					
	17 18	Firstsource Advantage, LLC,	CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT (TCPA), 47 U.S.C. § 227					
	10	Defendant.	ET SEQ.					
	20		2. WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE					
	21		CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT (TCPA), 47 U.S.C. § 227					
	22		ET SEQ.					
	23		CLASS ACTION					
	24		JURY TRIAL DEMANDED					
	25							
	26 27							
	27 28							
	20							

INTRODUCTION

- 1. Michael Doherty, ("Plaintiff" or "Doherty"), through Plaintiff's attorneys, brings this Complaint for damages, injunctive relief, and any other available legal or equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal actions of Firstsource Advantage, LLC ("Defendant"), in negligently or intentionally contacting Plaintiff on Plaintiff's cellular telephones using an automatic telephone dialing system without consent, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., ("TCPA"), thereby invading Plaintiff's privacy. Plaintiff allege as follows upon personal knowledge as to himself and his own acts and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief, including investigation conducted by his attorneys.
- 2. The TCPA was designed to prevent calls like the ones described within this complaint, and to protect the privacy of citizens like Plaintiff. "Voluminous consumer complaints about abuses of telephone technology for example, computerized calls dispatched to private homes prompted Congress to pass the TCPA." *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740, 744 (2012).
- 3. In enacting the TCPA, Congress intended to give consumers a choice as to how creditors and telemarketers may call them, and made specific findings that "[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. TCPA, Pub.L. No. 102–243, § 11. Toward this end, Congress found that

[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 affecting the health and safety of the consumer, is the only effective means of protecting telephone consumers from this nuisance and privacy invasion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Id. at § 12; see also *Martin v. Leading Edge Recovery Solutions, LLC*, 2012 WL 3292838, at* 4 (N.D.Ill. Aug. 10, 2012) (citing Congressional findings on TCPA's purpose).

- 4. Congress also specifically found that "the evidence presented to the Congress indicates that automated or prerecorded calls are a nuisance and an invasion of privacy, regardless of the type of call...." *Id.* at §§ 12-13. *See also, Mims*, 132 S. Ct. at 744.
- 5. As Judge Easterbrook of the Seventh Circuit recently explained in a TCPA case regarding calls similar to this one:

The Telephone Consumer Protection Act ... is well known for its provisions limiting junk-fax transmissions. A less-litigated part of the Act curtails the use of automated dialers and prerecorded messages to cell phones, whose subscribers often are billed by the minute as soon as the call is answered—and routing a call to voicemail counts as answering the call. An automated call to a landline phone can be an annoyance; an automated call to a cell phone adds expense to annoyance.

Soppet v. Enhanced Recovery Co., LLC, 679 F.3d 637, 638 (7th Cir. 2012).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- This Court has federal question jurisdiction because this case arises out of violation of federal law. 47 U.S.C. §227(b); *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740 (2012).
- 7. This action arises out of Defendant's violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., ("TCPA").
- 8. Plaintiff is a natural person who resided in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California at the time of the Defendant's illegal acts within this judicial district, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391c(1).
- P. Defendant regularly attempts to collect alleged debts against consumers in
 San Diego County by making phone calls to consumers, as Defendant did to
 Plaintiff as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

HYDE & SWIGART

Case 3:17-cv-00043-JLS-WVG Document 1 Filed 01/10/17 Page 4 of 11

- Defendant made unwanted autodialed and often abandoned calls to Plaintiff
 where it had no permission to do so, and therefore failed to comply with
 federal laws.
- 4 11. Because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim
 5 occurred in this judicial district and Plaintiff reside in City and County of San
 6 Diego, venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391b(2).
- 7 12. At all times relevant, Defendant conducted business within the State of
 8 California.
- 9 13. Because Defendant continuously and systematically conducts business in the
 10 State of California, personal jurisdiction is established.

PARTIES

- 14. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, "persons" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).
- 15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a New York limited liability company registered to conduct business in California.
- 16. Defendant, is and at all times mentioned herein was, a limited liability company, and is a "person," as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 20 17. On or about January 11, 2016, Doherty began receiving telephone calls from
 21 Defendant on his cellular telephone ending with "7814."
- 18. Upon information and belief, Defendant's calls were made via an "automatic telephone dialing system" ("ATDS"), as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1).
- 24 19. On or about January 11, 2016, at 10:25 am, Defendant left a voicemail to
 25 Plaintiff's cellular number ending with "7814," during which following a
 26 couple of seconds of silence with no human voice or any indication that a live
 27 person was on the other line, the call was abandoned.

28

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Case 3:17-cv-00043-JLS-WVG Document 1 Filed 01/10/17 Page 5 of 11

- On or about January 12, 2016, at 9:47 am, Defendant left a voicemail to 20. Plaintiff's cellular number ending with "7814," during which following 32 2 seconds of silence "music on hold" began to play, after a few seconds of 3 which the call was disconnected. 4
 - 21. On or about January 13, 2016 at 8:58 am and 2:01 pm, Defendant again called to Plaintiff's cellular phone using an ATDS.
 - On or about January 15, 2016, at 8:19 am, Defendant left a voicemail to 22. Plaintiff's cellular number ending with "7814," during which following a couple of seconds of silence with no human voice or any indication that a live person is on the other line, the call was abandoned.
 - 23. On or about January 18, 2016, at 12:29 pm, Defendant left a four (4) minute long voicemail of silence.
 - Doherty did not provide "prior express consent" to Defendant to place 24. telephone calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone utilizing an ATDS as proscribed under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
 - The calls from Defendant came from phone numbers including, but not 25. limited to, 866-451-0677 and 866-517-7458.
- Upon information and belief, Defendant's ATDS has the capacity to store or 18 26. 19 produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number 20 generator.
- Through this action. Doherty suffered an invasion of his legally protected 21 27. 22 interest in privacy, which is specifically addressed and protected by the TCPA. 23
- Doherty was personally affected because he was frustrated and distressed that 28. 24 despite having no permission nor "prior express consent" to contact Plaintiff, 25 Defendant continued to harass Doherty with abandoned/silent calls without 26 27 any human interaction using an ATDS.

28

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Case 3:17-cv-00043-JLS-WVG Document 1 Filed 01/10/17 Page 6 of 11

- Defendant's calls forced Doherty to live without the utility of Plaintiff's cell 29. phone by forcing him to silence his cell phone and/or block incoming numbers. 3
 - Doherty is informed and believes and here upon alleges, that these calls were 30. made by Defendant or Defendant's agent, with Defendant's permission, knowledge, control and for Defendant's benefit.
- Doherty's telephone number Defendant called was assigned to a cellular 7 31. 8 telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls 9 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1).
- 10 32. These telephone calls constitute calls that were not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(i). 11
 - 33. These telephone calls by Defendant or its agents violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b) (1).
- Through Defendant's aforementioned conduct, Plaintiff suffered an invasion 34. of a legally protected interest in privacy, which is specifically addressed and 16 protected by the TCPA.
- Plaintiff was personally affected by Defendant's aforementioned conduct 17 35. 18 because Plaintiff was frustrated and distressed that, Defendant interrupted 19 Plaintiff with unwanted calls using an ATDS.
- 20 36. Defendant's calls forced Plaintiff and other similarly situated class members to live without the utility of their cellular phones by occupying their cellular 21 telephone with one or more unwanted calls, causing a nuisance and lost time. 22

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of and all others 24 37. similarly situated (the "Class"). The proposed Class that Plaintiff seeks to 25 represent are defined as follows: 26
 - All persons within the United States who received any telephone call from Defendant or its agent/s and/or employee/s, not sent for emergency purposes, to said

1

2

4

5

6

12

13

14

15

23

27

person's cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system and/or with an artificial or prerecorded message within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

38. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, the Class, because Plaintiff received telephone calls from Defendant to Plaintiff's cellular telephone using an ATDS, some or all of which Plaintiff was billed for receiving such calls.

39. Defendant and its employees or agents are excluded from the Class. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in the Class, but believes the Class members number in the several thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should be certified as a Class action to assist in the expeditious litigation of this matter.

40. 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 contacting Plaintiff and the Class members via their cellular telephones by using an ATDS, thereby causing Plaintiff and the Class members to incur certain cellular telephone charges or reduce cellular telephone time for which Plaintiff and the Class members previously paid, and invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and the Class members. Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby.
- 41. This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of economic
 injury on behalf of the Class 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 in further investigation and
 discovery.
- 42. The joinder of the Class members is impractical and the disposition of their
 claims in the Class action will provide substantial benefits both to the parties
 and to the court. The Class can be identified through Defendant's records.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented. The questions of law and fact to the Class predominate over questions which may affect individual Class members, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, Defendant made any 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.
 - Whether Plaintiff and the Class were damaged thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
 - Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.
 - 44. As a person that received numerous calls using an automatic telephone dialing system, without Plaintiff's express prior consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of the Class. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class in that Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to any member of the Class.
- 45. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have all suffered irreparable harm as a
 result of the Defendant's unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class
 action, the Class will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In
 addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy
 and Defendant will likely continue such illegal conduct. Because of the size
 of the individual Class member's claims, few, if any, Class members could
 afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

27

Case 3:17-cv-00043-JLS-WVG Document 1 Filed 01/10/17 Page 9 of 11

- Plaintiff have retained counsel experienced in handling class action claims 1 46. 2 and claims involving consumer actions and violations of the Telephone 3 Consumer Protection Act.
- A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of 47. this controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce Defendant to comply with federal and California law. The interest of Class members in 6 individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendant is small because the maximum statutory damages in an individual action for 8 violation of privacy are minimal. Management of these claims is likely to 9 present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class 10 claims.
 - Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby 48. making appropriate final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE

TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT (TCPA)

47 U.S.C. § 227

- 19 49. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein. 20
- 21 50. The foregoing acts and omissions constitute numerous and multiple violations 22 of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the abovecited provisions of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. 227 et. seq. 23
- As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., 24 51. 25 Plaintiff is 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). 26
- 27 52. Plaintiff is also entitled to and seeks injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future. 28

4

5

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

HYDE & SWIGART

	Case 3:17-cv-00043-JLS-WVG Document 1 Filed 01/10/17 Page 10 of 11										
1	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION										
2	KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE										
3	TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT (TCPA)										
4	47 U.S.C. § 227										
5	53. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, all of the above										
6	paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.										
7	54. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and										
8	multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but no										
9	limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. §										
10	227 et seq.										
11	55. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. §										
12	227 et seq., Plaintiff is entitled to treble damages, as provided by statute, up to										
13	\$1,500.00, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B)										
14	and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).										
15	PRAYER FOR RELIEF										
16	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant, and										
17	Plaintiff be awarded damages from Defendant, as follows:										
18	• That the action regarding each violation of the TCPA be certified as a										
19	class action on behalf of the Class and requested herein;										
20	• That Plaintiff be appointed as representatives of the Class;										
21	• That Plaintiff's counsel be appointed as counsel for the Class;										
22	• Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each negligent violation of the TCPA										
23	pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) for each plaintiff and putative										
24	class member;										
25	• Statutory damages of \$1,500.00 for each knowing and/or willful										
26	violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47										
27	U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C);										
28											

HYDE & SWIGART Consumer Protection Attorneys

	Case 3:17-cv-00043-JLS-WVG Document 1 Filed 01/10/17 Page 11 of 11												
1	• Pursuant to 47 U.S.C § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such												
2 3	conduct in the future;												
3 4	 Any and all other relief that this Court deems just and proper. 72. Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States 												
5													
6	of America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demands, a trial by jury.												
7													
8	Respectfully submitted,												
9	Hyde & Swigart												
10	Date: January 10, 2017 By: <u>s/Joshua Swigart</u>												
11	Joshua B. Swigart, Esq.												
12	josh@westcoastlitigation.com Attorney for Plaintiff												
13	Additional Attorneys for Plaintiff:												
14													
15	Abbas Kazerounian, Esq. (SBN: 249203) ak@kazlg.com												
16	KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC 245 Fisher Avenue, Unite D1												
17	Costa Mesa, CA 92626												
18 19	Telephone: (800) 400-6808 Facsimile: (800) 520-5523												
19 20													
20													
22													
23													
24													
25													
26													
27													
28													
	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 11 of 11 -												

Case 3:17-cv-00043-JLSCHVIE COVERSHEET

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

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

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Michael Doherty, individu	ally and on behalf of c	others similarly siut	DEFENDANTS Display="block-color: block-color: block-color				
(b) County of Residence o (<i>E</i>)	f First Listed Plaintiff <u>S</u> XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	an Diego Ases)					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Joshua B. Swigart, Esq. Hyde & Swigart 2221 Camino Del Rio So	(225557); Yana A. Hai	rt, Esq. (306499) (619) 233-7770		Attorneys (If Known) '17CV0043 JLS WVG			
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in G	One Box Only)			RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif	
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	✗ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)				IF DEF 1 □ 1 Incorporated or Pr of Business In □		
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)			Citizen of Another State □ 2 □ 2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State □ 5 □ 5 Citizen or Subject of a □ 3 □ 3 Foreign Nation □ 6 □ 6			
	-			reign Country	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ıly) DRTS	FC	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	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 	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL ID Image:		Y □ 62 □ 69	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other	 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark 	 375 False Claims Act 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 	
 (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 	□ 345 Marine Product Liability Liability PERSONAL PRO □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 370 Other Fraud □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ 371 Truth in Len Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 385 Property Dat	Liability PERSONAL PROPEI 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability	□ 72 □ 74 □ 75	LABOR '10 Fair Labor Standards Act '20 Labor/Management Relations '40 Railway Labor Act '51 Family and Medical Leave Act '90 Other Labor Litigation	SOCIAL SECURITY □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 850 Securities/Common Exchange □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 860 Other Statutory Ar □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 890 Agricultural Acts □ 865 RSI (405(g)) □ 893 Environmental Ma	 \$50 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange \$90 Other Statutory Actions \$91 Agricultural Acts \$93 Environmental Matters \$95 Freedom of Information Act 	
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	Civil Rights PRISONER PETITION 440 Other Civil Rights 443 Alien Detainee 441 Voting 463 Alien Detainee 442 Employment 510 Motions to Vacate 443 Housing/ Sentence Accommodations 530 General 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 530 Death Penalty 0 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - 540 Mandamus & Other: 0 448 Education 550 Civil Rights 560 Civil Detainee - Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of		e □ 46	Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application S Other Immigration Actions	FEDERAL TAX SUITS 🛛 899 Administrative Proceed	950 Constitutionality of	
		Remanded from Appellate Court	⊐ 4 Rein Reor		er District Litigation		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON 47 U.S.C. §§ 227 Brief description of ca	et seq.	0.1	Do not cite jurisdictional stat	utes unless diversity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION	N D	EMAND \$ 5,000,000.00	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	if demanded in complaint: : X Yes D No	
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE 01/10/2016 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		SIGNATURE OF AT s/Joshua B. Sv					
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JU	DGE	
Print	Save As					Reset	

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.Cv.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; **NOTE: 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 clerk(s) 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 six 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.

- 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 actual dollar amount 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.

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Lawsuit Says Firstsource Advantage Violated TCPA