UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

RICHARD FROST, individually and on)
behalf of all others similarly situated,) Case No.:
Plaintiff,))
v.)) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
NATIONAL AUTO PROTECTION CORP, a Florida corporation,))
a Florida Corporation,)
Defendant.)

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Richard Frost ("Frost" or "Plaintiff") brings this Class Action Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial ("Complaint") against Defendant National Auto Protection Corp ("NAPC" or "Defendant") to: (1) stop its practice of placing calls using an "automatic telephone dialing system" ("ATDS") and/or using "an artificial or prerecorded voice" to the telephones of consumers nationwide without their prior express consent, (2) stop its practice of placing calls to telephone numbers listed on the National Do Not Call Registry, (3) enjoin Defendant from continuing to place such calls to consumers, and (4) obtain redress for all persons injured by its conduct. Plaintiff, for his Complaint, 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.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Defendant National Auto Protection Corp is a company that offers to consumers extended warranties for their automobiles.

- 2. Unfortunately for consumers, Defendant's aggressive attempts to sell its products and services (namely extended automobile warranties) involves an unlawful telemarketing campaign through which they make, or have their agents make on their behalf and with their knowledge, robocalls and unsolicited telemarketing calls to telephone numbers listed on the National Do Not Call Registry.
- 3. Defendant and/or its agents failed to obtain prior express written consent from consumers to make such telephone calls and therefore have violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ("TCPA").
- 4. The TCPA was enacted to protect consumers from unsolicited and repeated telephone calls exactly like those alleged in this case. Defendant and/or its agents made these calls despite the fact that neither Plaintiff nor the other members of the Classes (defined below), provided Defendant with prior express written consent to receive such calls. By making the phone calls at issue in this Complaint, Defendant caused Plaintiff and the other members of the Classes actual harm, including the aggravation and nuisance that necessarily accompanies the receipt of unsolicited phone calls and the monies paid to their telephone carriers for the receipt of such calls.
- 5. In response to Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff filed the instant lawsuit seeking an injunction requiring Defendant to cease all unsolicited calling activities as well as an award of statutory damages to the members of the Classes as provided under the TCPA, together with costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

PARTIES

6. Plaintiff Richard Frost is a natural person and a resident of Bloomfield Hills, Michigan.

7. Defendant National Auto Protection Corp is a company incorporated and existing under the laws of the State of Florida with its principal place of business located at 1665 Palm Breach Lakes Blvd., Suite 215, West Palm Beach, Florida 33401. Defendant conducts business throughout this District, the State of Florida, and the United States.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as the action arises under the TCPA, which is a federal statute. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it conducts significant amounts of business transactions within this District, and the wrongful conduct giving rise to this case occurred in and/or was directed to this District.
- 9. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because Defendant conducts significant amounts of business transactions within this District and because the wrongful conduct giving rise to this case occurred in and/or emanated from this District. Venue is additionally proper because Defendant resides in this District.

COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 10. Defendant National Auto Protection Corp is a company that offers consumers extended warranties for their automobiles.
- 11. Unfortunately for consumers, Defendant, on its own and/or through its agents, has turned to a tried and true, albeit unlawful, method of reaching new customers: unsolicited telemarketing.
- 12. Specifically, Defendant and/or its agents place thousands of outbound telemarketing calls each day to consumers nationwide. Many of these calls are placed to numbers

3

¹http://search.sunbiz.org/Inquiry/CorporationSearch/SearchResultDetail?inquirytype=EntityName&directionType=Initial&searchNameOrder=NATIONALAUTOPROTECTION%20P150000458560&aggregateId=domp-p15000045856-cb4b1733-accb-41d9-a097-

⁰ acfdce 64015 & search Term=national % 20 auto % 20 protection % 20 & list Name Order=NATIONAL AUTOPROTECTION % 20 protection % 20 & list Name Order=NATIONAL AUTOPROTECTION % 20 protection % 20 & list Name Order=NATIONAL AUTOPROTECTION % 20 protection % 20 & list Name Order=NATIONAL AUTOPROTECTION % 20 protection % 20 & list Name Order=NATIONAL AUTOPROTECTION % 20 protection % 20 & list Name Order=NATIONAL AUTOPROTECTION % 20 protection % 20 & list Name Order=NATIONAL AUTOPROTECTION % 20 protection % 20 & list Name Order=NATIONAL AUTOPROTECTION % 20 protection % 20 & list Name Order=NATIONAL AUTOPROTECTION % 20 protection % 20 & list Name Order=NATIONAL AUTOPROTECTION % 20 protection % 20 & list Name Order=NATIONAL AUTOPROTECTION % 20 protection % 20 & list Name Order=NATIONAL AUTOPROTECTION % 20 protection % 20 & list Name Order=NATIONAL AUTOPROTECTION %

that are listed on the National Do Not Call Registry.

- These calls are made for the express purpose of soliciting the call recipients to 13. purchase marketing services or other products from or through Defendant, namely extended automobile warranties.
- 14 Not surprisingly, consumers have repeatedly spoken out against Defendant's pervasive and widespread telemarketing practices:
 - "Extended warranty robocall, Remember, ompanies don't sell extended warranties to be benevolent. They sell extended warranties to make money, and they only make money if they take in more than they pay out."2
 - "Illegal telemarketer my vehicle is new so there is no "expired warranty". When I pressed 1 to speak to a person I asked them why they were calling a number on the federal do-not-call list and they this call was being recorded for use in legal proceedings...and gee, they hung up."³
 - "Answered their call. Gleefully waited on hold to be connected to a representative. I asked for permission to record the call, and was immediately disconnected."4
 - "Asked to be put on Do Not Call 3 time via automated options. Asked once verbally. I am on the National Do Not Call Registry. They are still calling me."⁵
 - "Robo call for SCAM car warranties. Blocked now.6"
 - "I am on the do not call list."
 - "I have no extended car warranty issues. I asked to speak to someone and the line went dead."8

⁴ *Id*.

² http://800notes.com/Phone.aspx/1-912-549-7008.

 $^{^{3}}$ Id.

⁵ *Id*.

⁶*Id*.

⁷ *Id*.

⁸ *Id*.

- "Pleas respect my selection to be a member of the "do not call list!" 9
- "Call after call after call for a warranty on a car I sold 4 months ago." ¹⁰
- 15. Telemarketers who wish to avoid calling numbers listed on the National Do Not Call Registry can easily and inexpensively do so by "scrubbing" their call lists against the National Do Not Call Registry database. The scrubbing process identifies those numbers on the National Do Not Call Registry, allowing telemarketers to remove those numbers and ensure that no calls are placed to consumers who opt-out of telemarketing calls.
- 16. To avoid violating the TCPA by calling registered numbers, telemarketers must scrub their call lists against the Registry at least once every thirty-one days. *See* 16 C.F.R. § 310.4(b)(3)(iv).
- 17. Neither Plaintiff nor the other members of the proposed Classes ever provided Defendant and/or its agents with express written consent to receive the telephone calls at issue in this Complaint. Defendant does not have any record of express written consent to place autodialed and/or prerecorded calls to Plaintiff or the members of the proposed Classes.

FACTS SPECIFIC TO PLAINTIFF FROST

- 18. On September 8, 2008, Plaintiff Frost registered his landline telephone number with the National Do Not Call Registry for the express purpose of avoiding unwanted telemarketing calls.
- 19. On January 31, 2017, after more than 30 days of Plaintiff having registered his landline telephone number on the Do Not Call Registry, he received a call on said landline from NAPC using phone number 912-549-7008.
 - 20. When he answered said call, Plaintiff was met with a prerecorded message that

⁹ *Id*.

¹⁰ *Id*.

explained that the call's purpose was to sell an extended warranty for Plaintiff's vehicle. The prerecorded voice further requested that Plaintiff either press #1 to speak with an agent or contact their service number, 800-297-4044. They identified themselves as National Auto Protection. Plaintiff had not been looking for an extended warranty, nor was he interested in purchasing one, and Plaintiff hung up the phone.

- 21. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff has received approximately ten calls from NAPC over the course of the previous year and a half.
- 22. At no time did Plaintiff consent in writing or orally to receive calls on his landline phone from NAPC.
- 23. Plaintiff had no existing business relationship with NAPC or its agents at the time of the aforementioned calls and had not entered into any business transactions with NAPC or its agents within the previous eighteen months.
- 24. As a result of NAPC's intrusive calls, Plaintiff suffered harm and an invasion of his privacy.
- 25. NAPC is and was aware that the above-described telephone calls were being made either by it directly, or made on its behalf, and that the telephone calls were being made to consumers who had not consented to receive them.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

26. **Class Definitions**: Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(2) and Rule 23(b)(3) on behalf of himself and two Classes of similarly situated individuals, defined as follows:

Do Not Call Class: All individuals in the United States who during the four years prior to the filing of the initial complaint in this action: (1) received more than one telephone call made by or on behalf of Defendant within a 12-month period; (2) promoting Defendant's products or services; (3) at a telephone number that had

been registered with the National Do Not Call Registry for at least 30 days at the time of each call; (4) where such individual had not entered into any purchase or transaction with Defendant within the 18 months immediately preceding such calls; and (5) where neither Defendant nor its agents had any current record of express consent to place such calls at the times such calls were made.

Robocall Class: All individuals in the United States who during the four years prior to the filing of the initial complaint in this action who (1) received a telephone call made by or on behalf of Defendant; (2) promoting Defendant's products or services; (3) where such call featured an artificial or prerecorded voice; and (4) where neither Defendant nor its agents had any current record of prior express written consent to place such call at the times such call was made.

- 27. The following people are excluded from the Classes: (1) any Judge or Magistrate presiding over this action and members of their families; (2) Defendant, its subsidiaries, parents, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the Defendant or its parents have a controlling interest and its current or former employees, officers, and directors; (3) persons who properly execute and file a timely request for exclusion from the Classes; (4) the legal representatives, successors, or assigns of any such excluded persons; and (5) Plaintiff's counsel and Defendant's counsel.
- 28. **Numerosity**: The exact sizes of the Classes are unknown and not available to Plaintiff at this time, but it is clear that individual joinder is impracticable. On information and belief, Defendant has made telephone calls to thousands of consumers who fall into the Classes. Members of the Classes can be identified through Defendant's records.
- 29. **Commonality and Predominance**: There are many questions of law and fact common to the claims of Plaintiff and the Classes, and those questions predominate over any questions that may affect individual members of the Classes. Common questions for the Classes include, but are not necessarily limited to the following:

The Do Not Call Class:

(a) Whether Defendant's conduct violated the TCPA:

- (b) Whether Defendant and/or its agents made more than one telephone call within a 12-month period to consumers whose telephone numbers were registered with the National Do Not Call Registry (for at least thirty days, at the time of each call);
- (c) Whether Defendant and/or its agents systematically made such telephone calls to consumers who did not previously provide Defendant or its agents with prior written express consent to receive such calls; and
- (d) Whether Plaintiff and members of the Do Not Call Class are entitled to treble damages based on the willfulness of Defendant's conduct.

Robocall Class:

- (a) Whether Defendant's conduct violated the TCPA;
- (b) Whether Defendant and/or its agents systematically made telephone calls to consumers who did not previously provide Defendant or its agents with prior express consent to receive such telephone calls;
- (c) Whether Defendant's telephone calls featured an artificial or prerecorded voice; and
- (d) Whether Plaintiff and the members of the Robocall Class are entitled to treble damages based on the willfulness of Defendant's conduct.
- 30. **Typicality**: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of other members of the Classes, in that Plaintiff and the members of the Classes sustained damages arising out of Defendant's uniform wrongful conduct toward Plaintiff and each of the other members of the Classes.
 - 31. **Adequate Representation**: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and

protect the interests of the Classes, and has retained counsel competent and experienced in complex class actions. Plaintiff has no interest antagonistic to those of the Classes, and Defendant has no defenses unique to Plaintiff.

- 32. **Policies Generally Applicable to the Classes:** This class action is appropriate for certification because the Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Classes as a whole, thereby requiring the Court's imposition of uniform relief to ensure compatible standards of conduct toward the members of the Classes, and making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the Classes as a whole. Defendant's practices challenged herein apply to and affect the members of the Classes uniformly, and Plaintiff's challenge of those practices hinges on Defendant's conduct with respect to the Classes as a whole, not on facts or law applicable only to Plaintiff.
- 33. **Superiority**: This case is also appropriate for class certification because class proceedings are superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy and because joinder of all parties is impracticable. The damages suffered by the individual members of the Classes will likely be relatively small, especially given the burden and expense of individual prosecution of the complex litigation necessitated by Defendant's actions. Thus, it would be virtually impossible for the individual members of the Classes to obtain effective relief from Defendant's misconduct. Even if members of the Classes could sustain such individual litigation, it would still not be preferable to a class action, because individual litigation would increase the delay and expense to all parties due to the complex legal and factual controversies presented in this Complaint. By contrast, a class action presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefits of single adjudication, economy of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court. Economies of time, effort, and expense will be

fostered and uniformity of decisions ensured.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION Violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. (On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Do Not Call Class)

- 34. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.
- 35. 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5) provides that any "person who has received more than one telephone call within any 12-month period by or on behalf of the same entity in violation of the regulations prescribed under this subsection may" bring a private action based on a violation of said regulations, which were promulgated to protect telephone subscribers' privacy rights to avoid receiving telephone solicitations to which they object.
- 36. The TCPA's implementing regulation—47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)—provides that "[n]o person or entity shall initiate any telephone solicitation" to "[a] residential telephone subscriber who has registered his or his telephone number on the national do-not-call registry of persons who do not wish to receive telephone solicitations that is maintained by the Federal Government." *See* 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c).
- 37. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(e) provides that 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1200(c) and (d) "are applicable to any person or entity making telephone solicitations or telemarketing calls to wireless telephone numbers to the extent described in the Commission's Report and Order, CG Docket No. 02-278, FCC 03-153, 'Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991," and the Commission's Report and Order, in turn, provides as follows:

The Commission's rules provide that companies making telephone solicitations to residential telephone subscribers must comply with time of day restrictions and must institute procedures for maintaining do-not-call lists. For the reasons described above, we conclude that these rules apply to calls made to wireless

telephone numbers. We believe that wireless subscribers should be afforded the same protections as wireline subscribers. 11

- 38. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d) further provides that "[n]o person or entity shall initiate any call for telemarketing purposes to a residential telephone subscriber unless such person or entity has instituted procedures for maintaining a list of persons who request not to receive telemarketing calls made by or on behalf of that person or entity. The procedures instituted must meet the following minimum standards:
 - (1) Written policy. Persons or entities making calls for telemarketing purposes must have a written policy, available upon demand, for maintaining a do-not-call list.
 - (2) Training of personnel engaged in telemarketing. Personnel engaged in any aspect of telemarketing must be informed and trained in the existence and use of the do-not-call list.
 - (3) Recording, disclosure of do-not-call requests. If a person or entity making a call for telemarketing purposes (or on whose behalf such a call is made) receives a request from a residential telephone subscriber not to receive calls from that person or entity, the person or entity must record the request and place the subscriber's name, if provided, and telephone number on the do-not-call list at the time the request is made. Persons or entities making calls for telemarketing purposes (or on whose behalf such calls are made) must honor a residential subscriber's do-not-call request within a reasonable time from the date such request is made. This period may not exceed thirty days from the date of such request
 - (4) Identification of sellers and telemarketers. A person or entity making a call for telemarketing purposes must provide the called party with the name of the individual caller, the name of the person or entity on whose behalf the call is being made, and a telephone number or address at which the person or entity may be contacted. The telephone number provided may not be a 900 number or any other number for which charges exceed local or long distance transmission charges.
 - (5) Affiliated persons or entities. In the absence of a specific request by the subscriber to the contrary, a residential subscriber's do-not-call request shall apply to the particular business entity making the call (or on whose behalf a call is made), and will not apply to affiliated entities unless the consumer reasonably

_

¹¹ 68 Fed. Reg. 44143, 44166 (July 25, 2003).

- would expect them to be included given the identification of the caller and the product being advertised.
- (6) Maintenance of do-not-call lists. A person or entity making calls for telemarketing purposes must maintain a record of a consumer's request not to receive further telemarketing calls. A do-not-call request must be honored for 5 years from the time the request is made."
- 39. Defendant and/or its agents made more than one unsolicited telemarketing call to Plaintiff and members of the Do Not Call Class within a 12-month period without having prior express written consent to place such calls. Each such call was directed to a telephone number that had been registered with the National Do Not Call Registry for at least 30 days. Plaintiff and members of the Do Not Call Class did not provide consent to receive such telemarketing calls from Defendant or its agents and/or neither Defendant nor its agents have any record of consent to place such telemarketing calls to Plaintiff or the members of the Do Not Call Class.
- 40. Defendant violated 47 C.F.R. §§ 64.1200(d) and (e) by causing calls to be initiated for telemarketing purposes to residential and wireless telephone subscribers, such as Plaintiff and the Do Not Call Class, without instituting procedures that comply with the regulatory minimum standards for maintaining a list of persons who request not to receive telemarketing calls.
- 41. Defendant violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5) because Plaintiff and the members of the Do Not Call Class received more than one telephone call in a 12-month period made by or on behalf of Defendant in violation of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200, as described above. As a result of Defendant's conduct as alleged herein, Plaintiff and the members of the Do Not Call Class suffered actual damages and, under section 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), are each entitled to, *inter alia*, receive at least \$500 in damages for each such violation of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200.

42. To the extent Defendant's misconduct is determined to be willful and knowing, the Court should, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5), treble the amount of statutory damages recoverable by Plaintiff and the members of the Do Not Call Class.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION Violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. (On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Robocall Class)

- 43. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.
- 44. Defendant and/or its agents made unsolicited and unwanted telemarketing calls to telephone numbers belonging to Plaintiff and the other members of the Robocall Class—without their prior express consent—in an effort to sell products and/or services.
 - 45. These calls featured artificial and/or prerecorded voices.
- 46. By having unsolicited telephone calls made to Plaintiff's and the Robocall Class members' telephones without prior express written consent, and by using artificial and/or prerecorded voices when placing such calls, Defendant violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B).
- 47. As a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and the members of the Robocall Class suffered actual damages and, under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B), are each entitled to, *inter alia*, a minimum of \$500 in damages for each such violation of the TCPA.
- 48. To the extent Defendant's misconduct is determined to be willful and knowing, the Court should, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3), treble the amount of statutory damages recoverable by Plaintiff and the other members of the Robocall Class.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Richard Frost, individually and on behalf of the Classes, prays for the following relief:

1. An order certifying the Classes as defined above, appointing Plaintiff Richard

13

Frost as the Class Representative for the Classes, and appointing his counsel as Class Counsel for the Classes;

- 2. An award of actual monetary loss from such violations or the sum of five hundred dollars (\$500.00) for each violation, whichever is greater all to be paid into a common fund for the benefit of the Plaintiff and the other Class Members;
 - 3. An order declaring that Defendant's actions, as set out above, violate the TCPA;
- 4. A declaratory judgment that Defendant's telephone calling equipment constitutes an automatic telephone dialing system under the TCPA;
- 5. An order requiring Defendant to disgorge any ill-gotten funds acquired as a result of its unlawful telephone calling practices;
- 6. An order requiring Defendant to identify any third-party involved in the autodialed and/or prerecorded calling as set out above, as well as the terms of any contract or compensation arrangement it has with such third parties;
- 7. An injunction requiring Defendant to cease all unsolicited autodialed and/or prerecorded calling activities, and otherwise protecting the interests of the Classes;
- 8. An injunction prohibiting Defendant from using, or contracting the use of, an automatic telephone dialing system without obtaining, and maintaining records of, call recipient's prior express written consent to receive calls made with such equipment;
- 9. An injunction prohibiting Defendant from contracting with any third-party for marketing purposes until it establishes and implements policies and procedures for ensuring the third-party's compliance with the TCPA;
- 10. An injunction prohibiting Defendant from conducting any future telemarketing activities until it has established an internal Do Not Call List as required by the TCPA;

- 11. An injunction requiring Defendant to cease all unsolicited calling activities, and otherwise protecting the interests of the Classes;
- 12. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs to be paid out of the common fund prayed for above; and
 - 13. Such other and further relief that the Court deems reasonable and just.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff requests a trial by jury of all claims that can be so tried.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD FROST, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Dated: March 21, 2017 By: <u>/s/Stefan Coleman</u>
One of Plaintiff's Attorneys

Stefan Coleman (law@stefancoleman.com) Law Offices of Stefan Coleman, P.A. 201 S Biscayne Blvd., 28th Floor Miami, FL 33131 Telephone: (877) 333-9427

Facsimile: (888) 498-8946

Counsel for Plaintiff and the Putative Class

JS 44 (RC as 6) 9:17-cv-80367-DMM Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 03/21/2017 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 purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS RICHARD FROST, indi	ividually and on behalf		<u>-</u> .	DEFENDANT	_	TION CORP	a Florida corporation,
situated, (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Oakland							
	EXCEPT IN U.S. FLAINTIFF (County of Residence			Palm Beach
·		CAUSEY		NOTE: IN LAND (LAINTIFF CASES ON CASES, USE 1 IVOLVED.	<i>ONLY)</i> THE LOCATION OF
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name Stefan Coleman, Law C 28th floor Miami, Florida 33131 T:		_{ber)} nan, 201 S. Biscayn	e Blvd.,	Attorneys (If Known	r)		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. CI	L TIZENSHIP OF I	PRINCIPA	I. PADTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plain.
□ 1 U.S. Government		•		(For Diversity Cases Only)		I ARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plain. and One Box for Defendant)
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government	t Not a Party)	Citize		PTF DEF	Incorporated or Pr	PTF DEF
D 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizens)	hip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State C	3 2 3 2	Incorporated and I	Principal Place
		•			3 0 3	Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box O	nly)	ror ror	eign Country	Click here	for: Nature of Su	iit Code Descriptions.
□ 110 Insurance	Contract Contract Contract Contract			RFEITURE/PENALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury -	Y D 62:	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881		al 28 USC 158	☐ 375 False Claims Act
130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product	Product Liability	a 690	Other	☐ 423 Withd 28 U	irawai SC 157	☐ 376.Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	☐ 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical	- 1				☐ 400 State Reapportionment
& Enforcement of Judgmen	t Slander	Personal Injury			■ PROPER ■ 820 Copyr	TY RIGHTS	☐ 410 Antitrust☐ 430 Banks and Banking
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	☐ 330 Federal Employers'	Product Liability			☐ 830 Patent	_	450 Commerce
Student Loans	Liability 340 Marine	368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product			☐ 840 Trade	mark	☐ 460 Deportation
(Excludes Veterans)	345 Marine Product	Liability		LABOR	SOCIAL	SECURITY	470 Racketeer Influenced and
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	PERSONAL PROPER	TY 🗇 710	Fair Labor Standards	□ 861 HIA (Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit
160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle	☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending	G 220	Act Labor/Management	☐ 862 Black	Lung (923)	490 Cable/Sat TV
☐ 190 Other Contract	Product Liability	☐ 380 Other Personal	720	Relations	☐ 864 SSID	//DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	☐ 360 Other Personal Injury	Property Damage	D 740	Railway Labor Act	☐ 865 RSI (4	05(g))	₹ 890 Other Statutory Actions
	11 362 Personal Injury -	☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability	751	Family and Medical Leave Act			☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
DELY DOODS	Medical Malpractice		790	Other Labor Litigation			893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information
REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITION	IS 🗆 791	Employee Retirement		L TAX SUITS	Act
☐ 220 Foreclosure	1 440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus: ☐ 463 Alien Detainee		Income Security Act	☐ 870 Taxes		☐ 896 Arbitration
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 442 Employment	☐ 510 Motions to Vacate			or Def ☐ 871 IRS—	endant)	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure
☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	443 Housing/	Sentence			26 US	C 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision
290 All Other Real Property	Accommodations 445 Amer, w/Disabilities -	530 General 535 Death Penalty	<u> </u>	73.53.57	_		☐ 950 Constitutionality of
	Employment	Other:	□ 462	IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application			State Statutes
1	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other	☐ 540 Mandamus & Othe	r 🖸 465	Other Immigration			
		☐ 550 Civit Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition		Actions	!		
		560 Civil Detainee -	1				
		Conditions of				i	
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in	One Box Outul	Confinement			<u></u>		
😿 1 Original 🗆 🗆 2 Ren	noved from 3 I	Remanded from Appellate Court	4 Reinst Reope	ned Another	rred from [J 6 Multidistric Litigation -	
	City the U.S. Sivil Stat	ute under which you are	filing (Do	(specify) not cite jurisdictional stati	utes unless dive	Transfer rsity):	Direct File
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N	lephone Consumer					
VII. REQUESTED IN		S A CLASS ACTION		MAND \$	CIT	ECK VEC. 4 1	6.1
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 23	, F.R.Cv.P.	PE	· 41 127 ψ		ECK YES only if RY DEMAND:	f demanded in complaint: Yes No
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):				301	DEMAND	——————————————————————————————————————
DATE		JUDGE SIGNATURE OF ATTO	NDVIEW OF	NEGONE .	DOCKET	NUMBER	
3/21/17		s/Stefan Colema	ikney of in	KECORD		-	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			_	<u>-</u>	_	.	
RECEIPT# AM	OUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		мас піт	30

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.
- 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.)
- Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting (c) in this section "(see attachment)".
- 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
- Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this III. section for each principal party.
- Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code IV. that is most applicable. Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.
- ٧. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

II.

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

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 - Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C.

Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.

- 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 VI. statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- 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. VII. 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.
- 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.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

	for the
	Shistriot of Florida
RICHARD FROST, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,)))
Plaintiff(s) v. NATIONAL AUTO PROTECTION CORP, a Florida corporation,)) Civil Action No.)
Defendant(s))))
SUMMONS IN	A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address) National Protection Auto Co 1665 Palm Beach Lakes Bl West Palm Beach, Florida 3	vd., Ste. 215
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an ans the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion whose name and address are: Stefan Coleman Law Offices of Stefan Coleman Law Offices of Stefan Coleman 201 S. Biscayne Blvd., 28th Miami, Florida 33131 T: 877-333-9427 F: 888-498-8946	nan floor
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be a You also must file your answer or motion with the court.	entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	
	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

	This summons for (na	me of individual and title, if any)							
was r	eceived by me on (date)	<u> </u>							
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual a	at (place)						
			on (date)	; or					
	☐ I left the summons	at the individual's residence or u	sual place of abode with (name)						
		, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,							
	on (date)								
	☐ I served the summe	ons on (name of individual)	,						
		accept service of process on beha	If of Inama of arganization)	, who is					
		r was a process on bond	On (date)	. 02					
	☐ I returned the summ	nons unexecuted because		_ ; or					
	D I foldified the suffil	nons unexecuted because		; or					
	☐ Other (specify):								
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	2.22					
			Tor services, for a total of \$	0.00					
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this information i	s 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: National Auto Protection Corp Sideswiped with TCPA Lawsuit