UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

DZIYANA EISENBAND, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

CLASS ACTION

Plaintiff,

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

v.

BPCL MANAGEMENT, LLC f/k/a BAHAMAS PARADISE CRUISE LINE, LLC d/b/a BAHAMA ISLAND CRUISES,

Defendant.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Dziyana Eisenband, brings this class action against Defendant BPCL Management, LLC f/k/a Bahamas Paradise Cruise Line, LLC d/b/a Bahama Island Cruises, and alleges as follows upon personal knowledge as to herself and her own acts and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief, including investigation conducted by her attorneys.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

This is a putative class action under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47
 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., ("TCPA"), arising from Defendant's knowing and willful violations of the TCPA.

2. In 2017, the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") received 7,157,370 consumer complaints regarding unsolicited "robocalls," *an increase of almost 2 million from the prior year.*¹ Despite efforts by the FTC, the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC"), and even telephone

¹ See <u>https://www.ftc.gov/policy/reports/policy-reports/commission-staff-reports/national-do-not-call-registry-data-book-fy-2</u>.

carriers, unscrupulous companies continue to violate the TCPA because they are simply unable to resist the temptation of exploiting a direct line of communication to new consumers.

3. Such was the case here. Defendant – the marketing arm for the owner operators of the M/S Grand Celebration cruise ship – engaged in a wide-scaling telemarketing campaign consisting of prerecorded calls to the cellular telephones of Plaintiff and others, without their prior express written consent.

4. Through this action, Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief to halt Defendant's unlawful conduct which has resulted in the invasion of privacy, harassment, aggravation, and disruption of the daily life of thousands of individuals. Plaintiff also seeks statutory damages on behalf of herself and members of the class, and any other available legal or equitable remedies.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 as Plaintiff alleges violations of a federal statute. Jurisdiction is also proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) because Plaintiff alleges a national class, which will result in at least one class member belonging to a different state than that of Defendant. Plaintiff seeks up to \$1,500.00 (one-thousand-five-hundred dollars) in damages for each violation of the TCPA, which, when aggregated among a proposed class numbering in the tens of thousands, or more, exceeds the \$5,000,000.00 (five-million dollars) threshold for federal court jurisdiction under the Class Action Fairness Act ("CAFA"). Therefore, both the elements of diversity jurisdiction and CAFA jurisdiction are present.

6. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) because Defendant is deemed to reside in any judicial district in which it is subject to the court's personal jurisdiction, and because Defendant provides and markets its services within this district thereby establishing sufficient contacts to subject it to personal jurisdiction. Further, Defendant's tortious conduct against Plaintiff occurred within the State of Florida and, on information and belief, Defendant has sent the same calls complained of by Plaintiff to other individuals within this judicial district, such that some of Defendant's acts in making such calls have occurred within this district, subjecting Defendant to jurisdiction in the State of Florida.

PARTIES

7. Plaintiff is a natural person who, at all times relevant to this action, was a resident of Palm Beach County, Florida.

8. Defendant is a Florida limited liability company with its principal place of business located at 2419 E. Commercial Blvd., Suite 100, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33308. Defendant is the marketing and shore side personnel management company for the M/S Grand Celebration cruise ship. Defendant directs, markets, and provides its business activities throughout the State of Florida.

THE TCPA

9. The TCPA prohibits: (1) any person from calling a cellular telephone number; (2) using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice; (3) without the recipient's prior express consent. 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

10. The TCPA exists to prevent communications like the ones described within this Complaint. "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).

11. In an action under the TCPA, a plaintiff must only show that the defendant "called a number assigned to a cellular telephone service using an automatic dialing system or prerecorded voice." *Breslow v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 857 F. Supp. 2d 1316, 1319 (S.D. Fla. 2012), *aff'd*, 755 F.3d 1265 (11th Cir. 2014). 12. The Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") is empowered to issue rules and regulations implementing the TCPA. According to the FCC's findings, calls in violation of the TCPA are prohibited because, as Congress found, automated or prerecorded telephone calls are a greater nuisance and invasion of privacy than live solicitation calls, and such calls can be costly and inconvenient. The FCC also recognized that wireless customers are charged for incoming calls whether they pay in advance or after the minutes are used. *Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, CG Docket No. 02-278, Report and Order, 18 FCC Rcd 14014 (2003).

13. In 2012, the FCC issued an order tightening the restrictions for automated telemarketing calls, requiring "prior express <u>written</u> consent" for such calls to wireless numbers. *See In the Matter of Rules & Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 27 F.C.C.R. 1830, 1838 ¶ 20 (Feb. 15, 2012)(emphasis supplied).

14. To obtain express written consent for telemarketing calls, a defendant must establish that it secured the plaintiff's signature in a form that gives the plaintiff a "'clear and conspicuous disclosure' of the consequences of providing the requested consent....and having received this information, agrees unambiguously to receive such calls at a telephone number the [plaintiff] designates." *In re Rules & Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 27 F.C.C.R. 1830, 1837 ¶ 18, 1838 ¶ 20, 1844 ¶ 33, 1857 ¶ 66, 1858 ¶ 71 (F.C.C. Feb. 15, 2012).

15. The TCPA regulations promulgated by the FCC define "telemarketing" as "the initiation of a telephone call or message for the purpose of encouraging the purchase or rental of, or investment in, property, goods, or services." 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(f)(12). In determining whether a communication constitutes telemarketing, a court must evaluate the ultimate purpose of the communication. *See Golan v. Veritas Entm't, LLC*, 788 F.3d 814, 820 (8th Cir. 2015).

16. "Neither the TCPA nor its implementing regulations 'require an explicit mention of a good, product, or service' where the implication of an improper purpose is 'clear from the context." *Id.* (citing *Chesbro v. Best Buy Stores, L.P.*, 705 F.3d 913, 918 (9th Cir. 2012)).

17. "Telemarketing' occurs when the context of a call indicates that it was initiated and transmitted to a person for the purpose of promoting property, goods, or services." *Golan*, 788 F.3d at 820 (citing 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(2)(iii); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(f)(12); *In re Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, 18 F.C.C. Rcd at 14098 ¶ 141, 2003 WL 21517853, at *49).

18. The FCC has explained that calls motivated in part by the intent to sell property, goods, or services are considered telemarketing under the TCPA. *See In re Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, 18 FCC Rcd. 14014, ¶¶ 139-142 (2003). This is true whether call recipients are encouraged to purchase, rent, or invest in property, goods, or services during the call *or in the future. Id.*

19. In other words, offers "that are part of an overall marketing campaign to sell property, goods, or services constitute" telemarketing under the TCPA. *See In re Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, 18 FCC Rcd. 14014, ¶ 136 (2003).

20. If a call is not deemed telemarketing, a defendant must nevertheless demonstrate that it obtained the plaintiff's prior express consent. *See In the Matter of Rules and Regulaions Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 30 FCC Rcd. 7961, 7991-92 (2015) (requiring express consent "for non-telemarketing and non-advertising calls").

21. As held by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit: "Unsolicited telemarketing phone calls or text messages, by their nature, invade the privacy and disturb the solitude

of their recipients. A plaintiff alleging a violation under the TCPA 'need not allege any *additional* harm beyond the one Congress has identified." *Van Patten v. Vertical Fitness Grp.*, No. 14-55980, 2017 U.S. App. LEXIS 1591, at *12 (9th Cir. May 4, 2016) (quoting *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, 136 S. Ct. 1540, 1549 (2016) (emphasis original)).

FACTS

22. On January 13, 2018 at 11:58 a.m., Defendant transmitted a prerecorded call to Plaintiff's telephone number ending in 6997 (the "6997 Number").

23. The call originated from telephone number 609-369-6620, a spoofed number owned and/or operated by Defendant.

24. In placing the call, Defendant used "neighbor spoofing," a new form of number spoofing that attempts to match the recipients' telephone number to trick the recipient into answering the call.

25. The prerecorded message transmitted to Plaintiff's cellular telephone constitutes telemarketing because the ultimate purpose was to promote Defendant's services and/or the M/S Grand Celebration.

26. To determine who was harassing her, Plaintiff pressed a number as instructed in the prerecorded prompt. She was connected to a live operator who directed Plaintiff to <u>www.bahamaislandcruises.com/privacy-policy</u>, a website owned and/or operated by Defendant.

27. Plaintiff received the subject call within this judicial district and, therefore, Defendant's violation of the TCPA occurred within this district. Upon information and belief, Defendant caused other prerecorded calls to be sent to the cellular telephones of individuals residing within this judicial district.

28. At no point in time did Plaintiff provide Defendant with her express consent to be

contacted using an artificial or prerecorded voice.

- 29. Plaintiff has never had any type of relationship with Defendant.
- 30. Plaintiff is the subscriber and sole user of the 6997 Number.
- 31. Defendant's call caused Plaintiff actual harm, including invasion of her privacy,

aggravation, annoyance, intrusion on seclusion, trespass, and conversion.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

PROPOSED CLASS

32. Plaintiff brings this case as a class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated.

33. Plaintiff brings this case on behalf of a Class defined as follows:

All persons within the United States who, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, were sent a call using an artificial or prerecorded voice, from Defendant or anyone on Defendant's behalf, to said person's cellular telephone number, without emergency purpose and without the recipient's prior express written consent.

34. 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.

NUMEROSITY

35. Upon information and belief, Defendant has placed prerecorded calls to cellular telephone numbers belonging to thousands of consumers throughout the United States without their prior express written consent. The members of the Class, therefore, are believed to be so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.

36. The exact number and identities of the Class members are unknown at this time

and can only be ascertained through discovery. Identification of the Class members is a matter capable of ministerial determination from Defendant's call records.

COMMON QUESTIONS OF LAW AND FACT

37. There are numerous questions of law and fact common to the Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. Among the questions of law and fact common to the Class are:

- Whether Defendant made telemarketing calls to Plaintiff's and Class members' cellular telephones using an artificial or prerecorded voice;
- (2) Whether Defendant can meet its burden of showing that it obtained prior express written consent to make such calls;
- (3) Whether Defendant's conduct was knowing and willful;
- (4) Whether Defendant is liable for damages, and the amount of such damages; and
- (5) Whether Defendant should be enjoined from such conduct in the future.

38. The common questions in this case are capable of having common answers. If Plaintiff's claim that Defendant routinely transmits prerecorded calls to telephone numbers assigned to cellular telephone services is accurate, Plaintiff and the Class members will have identical claims capable of being efficiently adjudicated and administered in this case.

TYPICALITY

39. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class members, as they are all based on the same factual and legal theories.

PROTECTING THE INTERESTS OF THE CLASS MEMBERS

40. Plaintiff is a representative who will fully and adequately assert and protect the interests of the Class, and has retained competent counsel. Accordingly, Plaintiff is an adequate

representative and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class.

PROCEEDING VIA CLASS ACTION IS SUPERIOR AND ADVISABLE

41. A class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this lawsuit, because individual litigation of the claims of all members of the Class is economically unfeasible and procedurally impracticable. While the aggregate damages sustained by the Class are in the millions of dollars, the individual damages incurred by each member of the Class resulting from Defendant's wrongful conduct are too small to warrant the expense of individual lawsuits. The likelihood of individual Class members prosecuting their own separate claims is remote, and, even if every member of the Class could afford individual litigation, the court system would be unduly burdened by individual litigation of such cases.

42. The prosecution of separate actions by members of the Class would create a risk of establishing inconsistent rulings and/or incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant. For example, one court might enjoin Defendant from performing the challenged acts, whereas another may not. Additionally, individual actions may be dispositive of the interests of the Class, although certain class members are not parties to such actions.

COUNT I <u>Violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227</u> (On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)

43. Plaintiff incorporates and re-alleges by reference paragraphs 1-42 as if fully set forth herein.

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

45. Defendant – or third parties directed by Defendant – transmitted prerecorded calls to the cellular telephone numbers of Plaintiff and members of the putative class.

46. These calls were made without regard to whether Defendant had first obtained express permission from the called party to make such calls. In fact, Defendant did not have prior express consent to call the cell phones of Plaintiff and the other members of the putative Class when its calls were made.

47. Defendant has, therefore, violated § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii) of the TCPA by an artificial or prerecorded voice to make non-emergency telephone calls to the cell phones of Plaintiff and the other members of the putative Class without their prior express written consent.

48. Defendant knew that it did not have prior express written consent to make these calls, and knew or should have known that it was using an artificial or prerecorded voice. The violations were therefore willful or knowing.

49. As a result of Defendant's conduct and pursuant to § 227(b)(3) of the TCPA, Plaintiff and the other members of the putative Class were harmed and are each entitled to a minimum of \$500.00 in damages for each violation. Plaintiff and the class are also entitled to an injunction against future calls. *Id*.

50. Because Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other members of the putative Class had not given prior express consent to receive its prerecorded calls to their cellular telephones the Court should treble the amount of statutory damages available to Plaintiff and the other members of the putative Class pursuant to § 227(b)(3) of the TCPA.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Dziyana Eisenband, on behalf of herself and the other members of the Class, prays for the following relief:

- A declaration that Defendant's practices described herein violate the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227;
- An injunction prohibiting Defendant from using an artificial or prerecorded voice to contact telephone numbers assigned to cellular telephones without the prior express written consent of the called party;
- c. An award of actual and statutory damages; and
- d. Such further and other relief the Court deems reasonable and just.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff and Class Members hereby demand a trial by jury.

DOCUMENT PRESERVATION DEMAND

Plaintiff demands that Defendant take affirmative steps to preserve all records, lists, electronic

databases or other itemization of telephone numbers associated with the Defendant and the communication or transmittal of the calls as alleged herein.

Date: February 18, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

HIRALDO P.A.	SHAMIS & GENTILE, P.A.		
	Andrew J. Shamis		
/s/ Manuel S. Hiraldo	Florida Bar No. 101754		
Manuel S. Hiraldo, Esq.	ashamis@shamisgentile.com		
Florida Bar No. 030380	14 NE 1 st Avenue, Suite 400		
401 E. Las Olas Boulevard	Miami, Florida 33132		
Suite 1400	(t) (305) 479-2299		
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33301	(f) (786) 623-0915		
mhiraldo@hiraldolaw.com			
Telephone: 954.400.4713	Counsel for Plaintiff and the Class		
Counsel for Plaintiff and the Class			

SJS 44 (R € ase 9:18-cv-80192-DMM Doc OTVENL1€10 VED Reset DIE FLSD Docket 02/18/2018 Page 1 of 2

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 THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.) **NOTICE: Attorneys MUST Indicate All Re-filed Cases Below.**

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS				
Dziyana Eisenband			BPCL Management, LLC f/k/a Bahamas Paradise Cruise Line, LLC d/b/a Bahama Island Cruises County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT			
	of First Listed Plaintiff Palm Beach	County of Residence				
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Ad	,	NOTE: IN LANI				
Hiraldo P.A., 401 E. Las (33301, 954-400-4713	Dlas Blvd., Ste. 1400, Fort Lauderda		LAND INVOLVED.			
55501, 754-400-4715						
(d) Check County Where Actio	n Arose: I MIAMI- DADE I MONROE	⊐ BROWARD 🖌 PALM BEACH □ MA	ARTIN 🗖 ST. LUCIE 🗖 INDI/	AN RIVER 🗖 OKEECHOBEE HIGHLANDS		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF (For Diversity Cases Only)	PRINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)		
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question(U.S. Government Not a Party)		PTF DEF 1 □ 1 Incorporated or Pr of Business In This	PTF DEF incipal Place		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item 	Citizen of Another State 🛛	2 🗖 2 Incorporated and F of Business In A	-		
		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation			
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FORFEITURE/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 (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL 310 Airplane 362 Personal 315 Airplane Product Med. Ma Liability 365 Personal 320 Assault, Libel & Product I Slander 330 Federal Employers' Injury ProLiability 1345 Marine Product 370 Other Pr Liability 371 Truth in 350 Motor Vehicle 380 Other Pr 355 Motor Vehicle 770 Other Property Product Liability 385 Property 360 Other Personal Product I Injury Product I CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PE 441 Voting 510 Motions 442 Employment 530 General 444 Welfare 535 Death P. 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 540 Mandam 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 550 Civil Rig 440 Other Civil Rights 555 Prison C	all Injury - 620 Other Food & Drug Ilpractice 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 Liability 630 Liquor Laws s Personal 640 R.R. & Truck oduct 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational Safety/Health raud 690 Other Lending 710 Fair Labor Standards Damage 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations Liability 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 790 Other Labor Litigation pus: 740 Railway Labor Act to Vacate 790 Other Labor Litigation ghts 462 Naturalization Act 463 Habcas Corpus-Alien Detainee 465 Other Immigration Actions Actions	Sferred from	 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 		
	emoved from 3 Re-filed- (see VI below)	4 Reinstated or 5 anoth Reopened (spec	her district D 6 Multidisti cify) Litigation	ILL / Magistrata		
VI. RELATED/RE-FII CASE(S).		ase 🗇 YES 💋 NO b) Rela	nted Cases □ YES Ø NO DOCKET NUMBER			
	diversity): ON Telephone Consumer Protectic LENGTH OF TRIAL via 10 days	estimated (for both sides to try entire ca	ise)			
VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	CTION DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:		
ABOVE INFORMATION IS THE BEST OF MY KNOWI	SIGNITOR	e of attorney of record al S Hiraldo	date February	7 18, 2018		
		FOR O	FFICE USE ONLY			
		AMOUNT	RECEIPT #	IFP		

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)".

(d) Choose one County where Action Arose.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States District Courts.

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

Refiled (3) Attach copy of Order for Dismissal of Previous case. Also complete VI.

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

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

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

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

VI. Related/Refiled Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases or re-filed cases. Insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judges name for such cases.

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

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

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

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

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

Case 9:18-cv-80192-DMM Document 1-2 Entered on FLSD Docket 02/18/2018 Page 1 of 2

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Southern District of Florida

DZIYANA EISENBAND, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,		
Plaintiff(s))	
V.		
BPCL MANAGEMENT, LLC f/k/a BAHAMAS PARADISE CRUISE LINE, LLC d/b/a BAHAMA ISLAND CRUISES,)))	
Defendant(s))	

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) BPCL MANAGEMENT, LLC f/k/a BAHAMAS PARADISE CRUISE LINE, LLC d/b/a BAHAMA ISLAND CRUISES Registered Agent: GREENSPOON MARDER, P.A. 200 E. BROWARD BOULEVARD **SUITE 1800** FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

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

Hiraldo P.A. 401 E. Las Olas Boulevard, Suite 1400 Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33301 mhiraldo@hiraldolaw.com 954-400-4713

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

CLERK OF COURT

Date:

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

	This summons for (name	e of individual and title, if any	v)						
was re	ceived by me on (date)								
	□ I personally served t	he summons on the indi	vidual at <i>(place)</i>						
			on	(date)	; or				
	□ I left the summons a	t the individual's residen	nce or usual place	of abode with (name)					
		, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,							
	on <i>(date)</i> , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or								
	□ I served the summor	ns on (name of individual)			, who is				
	designated by law to a	designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of (name of organization)							
	on (date)				; or				
	□ I returned the summons unexecuted because				; or				
	Other (specify):								
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$		for services, for a total of \$	0.00				
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this info	rmation is true.						
Date:		_							
				Server's signature					
		_		Printed name and title					

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Woman Sues Bahama Island Cruises Over Telemarketing Robocalls</u>