CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1	Richard Bright (SBN: 2005076)	EII ED
2	richardbright@taylorkinglaw.com TAYLOR KING LAW, PA	U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT ARKANSAS
3	820 W. 3rd St.	JUL 1 0 2020
4	Little Rock, AR 72201 Telephone 870.246.0505	JAMES W. MCCORMACK, CLERK
5	Facsimile 870.345.4873	By: DEP CLERK
6 7	Attorneys for Plaintiff, Jason Fields	
8		DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTR	ICT OF ARKANSAS
10		
11	JASON FIELDS, individually, and on behalf others similarly situated	Case No.:
12	benair others similarly situated	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOI VIOLATIONS OF:
13	Plaintiff,	THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER
14	vs.	PROTECTION ACT of 1991, 47 U.S.C § 227 et seq.
15	JP MORGAN CHASE BANK,	47 Cisie y 227 criseq.
16	NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,	<b>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</b>
17	Defendant.	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22	4:20-6	cv-823 - BSM
23		
24		
25	This o	case assigned to District Judge Miller o Magistrate Judge <b>Volpe</b>
26		J
27		
28		

Jason Fields v. JP Morgan Chase Bank, NA

#### INTRODUCTION

- Jason Fields ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated (the "Class"), brings this action for damages and injunctive relief against JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Association ("Defendant") and its present, former, or future direct and indirect parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, agents, related entities for entities for negligently or intentionally contacting Plaintiff and Class members on their cellular telephones, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., ("TCPA").
- 2. Plaintiff alleges 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.
- 3. The United States congress enacted TCPA in order eliminate the abuse and to prevent unauthorized calls from creditors and telemarketers in order to protect the privacy of consumers. "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).
- 4. The TCPA was designed to prevent calls like the ones described within this complaint, and to protect the privacy of citizens like Plaintiff herein.
- 5. 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. To 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.

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).

- 6. 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.
- 7. As Judge Easterbrook of the Seventh Circuit 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).

- 8. To state a claim for a violation of the TCPA, a plaintiff must only show that he or she received a call made using an ATDS or featuring a prerecorded voice; "[c]onsent is an affirmative defense to liability under the TCPA." *Cartrett v. Time Warner Cable, Inc.*, 157 F. Supp. 3d 448 (E.D. N.C. January 14, 2016); *See also Meyer v. Portfolio Recovery Assocs.*, LLC, 707 F.3d 1036, 1042 (finding Defendant "did not show a single instance where express consent was given before the call was placed.")
- 9. While many violations are described below with specificity, this Complaint alleges violations of the statute cited in its entirety.

- -

10.	Unless	otherwise	stated,	all	the	conduct	engaged	in	by	Defendant	took	place	in
	Arkans	as.											

- 11. All violations by Defendant were knowing, willful, and intentional, and Defendant did not maintain procedures reasonably adapted to avoid any such violation.
- 12. Unless otherwise indicated, the use of Defendant's name in this Complaint includes all agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers of Defendant.
- 13. Plaintiff brings this case as a class action seeking damages for himself and all others similarly situated.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 14. The Court has federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this case arises out of violation of federal law: the TCPA.
- 15. Because Defendant's principal place of business is in the City of New York, State of New York and Defendant conducts business within the State of New York, personal jurisdiction is established.
- 16. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because the conduct complained of herein occurred within this judicial district; and Defendant conducted business within this judicial district at all times relevant to this action.

#### **PARTIES**

- 17. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a natural person and resident of the County of Saline, State of Arkansas.
- 18. Defendant is, and all times mentioned herein was, a national bank incorporated in Delaware, and holds its principal place of business in the City of New York, State of New York.
- 19. Defendant is, and at all times mentioned was, a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

FA	CT	TT	۸	T	٨	T	T	F	$\mathbf{C}$	٨	T	T	n	N	J	ς
rА	C I	U	4		А	L	L	Ľ	CT.	А	ш	ľ	U	ıΓ	۷,	

- 20. Upon information and belief, Defendant regularly makes autodialed telephone calls to consumers in order to solicit business.
- 21. Plaintiff is, and has been at all times relevant to this action, the regular and sole user of his cellular telephone number—(501) 655-XXXX.
- 22. At no point did Plaintiff inquire Defendant about its services or provide authorization to receive autodialed calls on his cellular telephone from Defendant.
- 23. Nonetheless on December 26, 2019, Defendant initiated a marketing telephone call to Plaintiff's cellular telephone using an automatic telephone dialing system ("ATDS") as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1).
- 24. On December 26, 2019 at approximately 10:31 a.m., Defendant made an outbound call to Plaintiff's cellular telephone from the phone number 1 (800) 945-2000.
- 25. Shortly thereafter, Plaintiff called the 1 (800) 945-2000 number and was directed through an automated system where a pre-recorded voice stated, "Welcome to Chase card services..."
- 26. Upon information and belief, Defendant places these calls to solicit consumers to open accounts with Defendant.
- 27. Upon information and belief, Defendant has a policy and regular practice of placing calls, or knowingly sanctioning such calls, to consumers using a pre-recorded or automated voice and an ATDS.
- 28. The TCPA clearly prohibits making non-emergency calls "using any [ATDS] or an artificial or prerecorded voice . . . to any telephone number assigned to a . . . cellular telephone service . . . " 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A). The statute provides for \$500.00 in statutory damages for each negligent violation, id. § 227(b)(3)(B). However, if the court finds that the Defendant "willfully or knowingly" violated the TCPA, it can award up to \$1,500 in statutory damages. Id.
- 29. Plaintiff was personally affected by Defendant's actions because Defendant's use of an ATDS and pre-recorded voice forced Plaintiff to live without the utility of

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

- Plaintiff's cell phone by forcing him to silence his cell phone and/or block incoming numbers.
- 30. Plaintiff was further personally affected because he was frustrated and distressed that despite never having any contact with Defendant, Defendant harassed Plaintiff with a call using an ATDS and/or pre-recorded voice.
- 31. Defendant, upon information and belief, used an ATDS as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1), as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 32. Upon information and belief, Defendant's ATDS has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator.
- 33. Upon information and belief, Defendant's ATDS also has the capacity to and does, dial telephone numbers stored as a list or in a database without human intervention.
- 34. Plaintiff's cellular telephone, which Defendant called, was assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).
- 35. Receiving Defendant's unauthorized call drained Plaintiff's phone battery and caused Plaintiff wear and tear on his phone and battery.
- 36. The unwanted telephone call constitutes a call that was not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(i).
- 37. Plaintiff did not provide express consent to Defendant to receive calls on Plaintiff's cellular telephone, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).
- 38. Through Defendant's aforementioned conduct, Plaintiff suffered an invasion of a legally protected interest in privacy, which is specifically addressed and protected by the TCPA.
- 39. Moreover, Plaintiff is informed and believes and here upon alleges, that Defendant or Defendant's agent, with Defendant's permission, knowledge, control and for the Defendant's benefit, "willfully or knowingly" utilized a pre-recorded voice in

١	conjunction with its ATDS in violation of well-established federal law prohibitin
	such conduct.
l	40. As a weget the wood Disjutiff has been demaged as set forth in the Dreyer for Police

- 40. As a result thereof, Plaintiff has been damaged as set forth in the Prayer for Relief herein.
- 41. Plaintiff seeks statutory damages and injunctive relief under 47 U.S.C § 227(b)(3).

#### **STANDING**

- 42. Standing is proper under Article III of the Constitution of the United States of America because Plaintiff's claims state:
  - a. a valid injury in fact;
  - b. which is traceable to the conduct of Defendant;
  - c. and is likely to be redressed by a favorable judicial decision.

See Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins, 136 S. Ct. 1540, 1549 (2016); Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992).

## A. The "Injury in Fact" Prong

- 43. In order to meet the standard laid out in *Spokeo* and *Lujan*, Plaintiff must clearly allege facts demonstrating all three prongs above.
- 44. Plaintiff's injury in fact must be both "concrete" and "particularized" in order to satisfy the requirements of Article III of the Constitution, as laid out in *Spokeo. Id.*
- 45. For an injury to be "concrete" it must be a *de facto* injury, meaning that it actually exists. *Soppet v. Enhanced Recovery Co., LLC*, 679 F.3d 637, 638 (7th Cir. 2012). In this case, Plaintiff was called on his cellular telephone by Defendant, who utilized an ATDS, without Plaintiff's authorized consent. Such calls are a nuisance, an invasion of privacy, and an expense to Plaintiff. Furthermore, Plaintiff was distracted and annoyed by having to take time to call back the missed number. All these injuries are concrete and *de facto*.
- 46. For an injury to be "particularized" means that the injury must "affect the Plaintiff in a personal and individual way." *Spokeo*, 578 U.S. at 1548. In this case, Defendant invaded Plaintiff's privacy and peace by calling his cellular phone using

an ATDS and/or pre-recorded voice, without Plaintiff's consent. All of these injuries are particularized and specific to Plaintiff, and will be the same injuries suffered by each member of the putative class.

#### B. The "Traceable to the Conduct of Defendant" Prong

- 47. The second prong required to establish standing at the pleadings phase is Plaintiff must allege facts to show that his injuries are traceable to the conduct of the Defendant.
- 48. Here, the unwarranted phone call described above is explicitly linked to Defendant. When calling the 1 (800) 945-2000 telephone number used by Defendant, a prerecorded message expressly identifies itself as Chase Bank. Therefore, Plaintiff has alleged facts that show his injuries are traceable to the conduct of Defendant.

### C. The "Injury is Likely to be Redressed by a Favorable Judicial Opinion"

- 49. The third prong to establish standing at the pleading phase requires Plaintiff to allege facts to show that the injury is likely to be redressed by a favorable judicial opinion.
- 50. In the present case, Plaintiff's Prayers for Relief includes a request for damages for each call made by Defendant, as authorized by statute in 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq. The statutory damages were set by Congress and specifically redress the financial and emotional damages suffered by Plaintiff.
- 51. Furthermore, Plaintiff's Prayers for Relief requests for injunctive relief to restrain Defendant from the alleged practices in the future. The award of monetary damages and the order for injunctive relief redress the injuries of the past and prevent further injury in the future.
- 52. Because all standing requirements of Article III of the U.S. Constitution have been met, as laid out in *Spokeo*, Plaintiff has standing to sue Defendant on the stated claims.

# CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 53. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit as a class action on behalf of himself and on behalf of all others similarly situated in the United States.
- 54. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of the Class, consisting of:

All persons within the United States who received any call from Defendant or its agent/s and/or employee/s, to said person's cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone system and/or with an artificial or prerecorded voice within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

- 55. Excluded from the Class are: (1) Defendant, any entity or division in which Defendant has a controlling interest, and its legal representatives, officers, directors, assigns, and successors; (2) the Judge to this case is assigned and the Judge's staff; and (3) those persons who have suffered personal injuries as a result of the facts alleged herein.
- 56. Plaintiff reserves the right to redefine the Class as appropriate based on discovery and specific theories of liability.
- 57. This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of economic injury on behalf of the Class members, and it expressly is not intended to request any recovery for personal injury claims related thereto. Plaintiff reserves the right to expand the Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional persons as warranted from facts learned in further investigation and discovery.
- 58. Numerosity: The membership of the Class is currently unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, given that, on information and belief, Defendant called thousands of the proposed Class members nationwide, it is reasonable to presume that the proposed Class members are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. The disposition of their claims in a class action will provide substantial benefits to the parties and the Court. Class members can be identified through Defendant's records or Defendant's agents' records.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 59. **Commonality:** There are common questions of law and fact as to Class members that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including, but not limited to:
  - Whether, within four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, Defendant or its agents initiated any telephonic communications to Class members (other than a message made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using any ATDS or prerecorded voice to any telephone number assigned to a cellular phone service;
  - Whether Defendant has, and continues to have, a policy during the relevant period, of making unsolicited telephone calls to the Class members;
  - Whether Defendant's policy or practice of utilizing an ATDS and/or prerecorded message to initiate telephone communications with Class members caused any damages to Class members thereby, and the extent of damages for such violations;
  - Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future;
  - Whether Defendant can meet its burden of showing Defendant obtained prior express written consent; and
  - Whether Defendant's conduct was knowing and/or willful.
- 60. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class. Plaintiff has had to suffer the burden of receiving at least one phone call to his cellular telephone from an ATDS and/or pre-recorded voice. Thus, his injuries are typical to Class Members. As it did for all members of the Class, Defendant used an ATDS and/or pre-recorded message to call Plaintiff's cellular telephone.
- 61. 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 Class members via their cellular telephones for telemarketing purposes by using an ATDS and/or prerecorded message, thereby

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

causing Plaintiff and Class Members to incur certain cellular telephone charges of
reduce cellular telephone time for which Plaintiff and Class members previously
paid. Plaintiff and Class Members were damaged thereby.

- 62. Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect the interests of each Class member with whom he is similarly situated, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff acknowledges that he has an obligation to make known to the Court any relationships, conflicts, or differences with any Class member.
- 63. Plaintiff's interests in this matter are not directly or irrevocably antagonistic to the interests of the members of the class.
- 64. Plaintiff will vigorously pursue the claims of the members of the class.
- 65. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced and competent in class action litigation. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. In addition, the proposed class counsel is experienced in handling claims involving consumer actions such as the TCPA.
- 66. Plaintiff's counsel will vigorously pursue this matter.
- 67. Plaintiff's counsel will assert, protect and otherwise represent the members of the class.
- 68. Plaintiff has incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur costs and attorney's fees that have been, are, and will be, necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each Class member.
- 69. Superiority: A class action is the superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because:
  - a. Class-wide damages are essential to induce Defendant to comply with federal law.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- b. The relatively small size of the individual Class members' claims, it is likely that only a few Class members could afford to seek legal redress for Defendant's misconduct.
- c. Management of these claims is likely to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class claims.
- d. Absent a class action, most Class members would likely find the cost of litigating their claims prohibitively high and would therefore have no effective remedy at law.
- e. Class action treatment is manageable because it will permit a large number of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously, efficiently, and without the unnecessary duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would endanger.
- f. Absent a class action, Class members will continue to incur damages, and Defendant's misconduct will continue without remedy.
- 70. The Class may also be certified because:
  - a. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudication with respect to individual Class Members, which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant:
  - b. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other Class members not parties to the adjudication, or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests; and
  - c. Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class members, thereby making appropriate final and injunctive relief with respect to the members of the Class as a whole.

## 

### 

### 

# 

## 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

## 

#### 

#### 

## 

# 

## 

# 

## 

# 

### 

# 

#### 

#### 

## 

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

#### NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TCPA

### 47 U.S.C. § 227, ET SEQ.

- 71. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, all other paragraphs.
- 72. 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, et seq.
- 73. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq., Plaintiff and the Class members 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).
- 74. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

#### **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

# KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE TCPA

### 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

- 75. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, all other paragraphs.
- 76. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitutes 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, et seq.
- 77. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq., Plaintiff and the Class members 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 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
- 78. Plaintiff and Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

2

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PRAYER FOR RELI
-----------------

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and the Class members pray judgment be entered against Defendant, and be awarded damages from Defendant, as follows:

- Certify the Class as requested herein;
- Appoint Plaintiff to serve as the Class Representative in this matter;
- Appoint Plaintiff's Counsel as Class Counsel in this matter; and
- Provide such further relief as may be just and proper.

In addition, Plaintiff and the Class members pray for further judgment as follows against Defendant:

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

#### NEGLIGENT VIOLATION OF THE TCPA

47 U.S.C. § 227, ET SEQ.

- As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for himself and each Class member \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B);
- Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future; and
- Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

# FOR KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATION OF THE TCPA 47 U.S.C. § 227, ET SEQ.

- As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for himself and each Class member treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500.00 for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C);
- Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future; and
- Any other relief this Court should deem just and proper.

79. Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiff and Class members are entitled to, and demands, a trial by jury.

TRIAL BY JURY

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 10, 2020

TAYLOR KING LAW, PA

By:

Richard Bright, Esq. SBN:2005076 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class

The JS 44 (Rev. 09/19)

CIVIL COVER SHEET 4: 20 - CV - 823 - 85 M

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									
Jason Fields, individually	, and on behalf of oth	er similarly situated		JP Morgan Chase Bank, National Association								
(b) County of Residence of	of First Listed Plaintiff	Saline County, Arka	nsas_									
(E.	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	ASES)		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)								
				NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT	ONDEMNATION CASES, USE TO LAND INVOLVED.	THE LOCATION OF						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,				Attorneys (If Known)								
Taylor King Law P.A., Ri 820 West 3rd St., Little F 870-345-4847		of record		-								
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box Only)			RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintig						
☐ 1 U.S. Government				(For Diversity Cases Only) P'	rf def	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF						
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citiz	en of This State	1							
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	zen of Another State								
				en or Subject of a  oreign Country	3	06 06						
IV. NATURE OF SUIT						of Suit Code Descriptions.						
CONTRACT		ORTS		ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES						
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUR  365 Personal Injury -	Y   1 62	25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC						
☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product	Product Liability  367 Health Care/	☐ 69	90 Other	28 USC 157	3729(a))						
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability  320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical			PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust						
& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander	Personal Injury			☐ 820 Copyrights	☐ 430 Banks and Banking						
☐ 151 Medicare Act☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted☐	☐ 330 Federal Employers'  Liability	Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal			☐ 830 Patent ☐ 835 Patent - Abbreviated	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation						
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine	Injury Product			New Drug Application	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and						
(Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 345 Marine Product Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPER	TV -	LABOR	☐ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY	Corrupt Organizations  480 Consumer Credit						
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud		10 Fair Labor Standards	□ 861 HIA (1395ff)	(15 USC 1681 or 1692)						
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal	0.73	Act 20 Labor/Management	☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act						
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal	Property Damage	''	Relations	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV						
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury ☐ 362 Personal Injury -	☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability		10 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange						
	Medical Malpractice	Floduct Liability	' '	Leave Act	· ·	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions						
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION	_	00 Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	891 Agricultural Acts						
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting	Habeas Corpus:  ☐ 463 Alien Detainee	0 79	Income Security Act	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Information						
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 442 Employment	☐ 510 Motions to Vacate			☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	Act						
☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	443 Housing/ Accommodations	Sentence  530 General			26 USC 7609	☐ 896 Arbitration ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure						
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities -			IMMIGRATION	<u> </u>	Act/Review or Appeal of						
	Employment  446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Other:  540 Mandamus & Other		<ul><li>52 Naturalization Application</li><li>55 Other Immigration</li></ul>		Agency Decision ☐ 950 Constitutionality of						
	Other	550 Civil Rights	40	Actions		State Statutes						
	☐ 448 Education	☐ 555 Prison Condition										
		☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of										
		Confinement										
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" is	n One Box Only)											
		Remanded from Appellate Court	J 4 Rein Reop		r District Litigatio							
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	L47 U.S.C. 227	itute under which you ar	e filing (I	Do not cite jurisdictional stat								
	Brief description of ca	iuse: elephone Consume	r Protec	ction Act								
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	D	EMAND \$ 10,000,000.00	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	y if demanded in complaint: D:						
VIII. RELATED CASE	E(S)				*****							
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER							
DATE 07/10/2020		signature of att /s/ Richard Brig		OF RECORD								
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY												
RECEIPT # AN	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JU	DGE						

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>JPMorgan Chase Bank Hit with Class Action Over Alleged Telemarketing Calls</u>