

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----  
YISROEL GEISINSKY  
on behalf of himself and  
all other similarly situated consumers

Plaintiff,

-against-

ENHANCED RECOVERY COMPANY, LLC

Defendant.

-----  
**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

***Introduction***

1. Plaintiff Yisroel Geisinsky seeks redress for the illegal practices of Enhanced Recovery Company, LLC, concerning the collection of debts, in violation of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.* (“FDCPA”).

***Parties***

2. Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of New York who resides within this District.
3. Plaintiff is a consumer as that term is defined by Section 1692(a)(3) of the FDCPA, in that the alleged debt that Defendant sought to collect from Plaintiff is a consumer debt.
4. Upon information and belief, Defendant's principal place of business is located in Elmsford, New York.
5. Defendant is regularly engaged, for profit, in the collection of debts allegedly owed by consumers.
6. Defendant is a “debt collector” as that term is defined by the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692(a)(6).

*Jurisdiction and Venue*

7. This Court has federal question jurisdiction under 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
8. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), as the acts and transactions that give rise to this action occurred, in substantial part, in this district.

*Allegations Particular to Yisroel Geisinsky*

9. Upon information and belief, on a date better known by Defendant, Defendant began to attempt to collect an alleged consumer debt from the Plaintiff.
10. On or about November 20, 2017, Defendant sent the Plaintiff a collection letter seeking to collect a balance allegedly incurred for personal purposes.
11. Said letter directed the Plaintiff to visit its website, www.ercbpo.com, “for self-service options.”
12. The Plaintiff went onto www.ercbpo.com whereby he accessed his account.
13. While viewing his account, the Plaintiff observed that by choosing the online payment option, the page then stated: “Convenience Fee \$8.95.”
14. The Defendant’s statement and collection of the said convenience fee violated the FDCPA.<sup>1</sup>
15. The Defendant’s convenience fee was neither expressly authorized by an agreement

---

<sup>1</sup> *Schwartz v. I.C. Sys., Inc.*, No. 16-CV-5173 (DLI)(LB), 2018 BL 114013 (E.D.N.Y. Mar.30, 2018). (“Explicit reference to a processing fee in a collection letter is not necessary to show that a defendant has attempted to collect a debt. If a collection letter directs a debtor to a website which charges a processing fee, then the fact that the collection letter itself did not disclose the fee is not dispositive of whether the defendant attempted to collect an impermissible fee under § 1692f(1).”), *Campbell v. MBI Assocs., Inc.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 44811 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2015), *Acosta v. Credit Bureau*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 55870 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 29, 2015), *Shami v. National Enter. Sys.*, 2010 WL 3824151 (E.D.N.Y. Sept.23, 2010). (The court concluded that the complaint sufficiently pleaded a cause of action for violation of §§ 1692f(1) and 1692e(2). The complaint involved a collection letter including the language “you can now pay by automated phone system . . . or on the internet. Transaction fees will be charged if you use the automated phone system or the internet to make payment on this account. You are not required to use the automated phone system or the internet to make payment on this account.”), *McCutcheon v. Finkelstein, Kern, Steinberg & Cunningham*, 2012 WL 266893 (M.D. Tenn. Jan.30, 2012). (The plaintiff stated a viable FDCPA claim by alleging that the defendant, collected or attempted to collect a \$4.24 payment processing fee not expressly authorized by the agreement creating the debt.), *Quinteros v. MBI Assocs.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27735 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 27, 2014) (FDCPA violated by Collector’s Fee to process payments by credit card, or checks over phone.)

between the Defendant and/or the creditor, and the Plaintiff, nor permitted by law.

16. The Defendant's convenience fee was prohibited and was in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692f(1).

17. 15 U.S.C. 1692e of the FDCPA states:

A debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt. Without limiting the general application of the foregoing, the following conduct is a violation of this section:

(2) The false representation of –

(A) the character, amount, or legal status of any debt; or

(B) any services rendered or compensation which may be lawfully received by any debt collector for the collection of a debt.

18. 15 U.S.C. 1692f of the FDCPA states:

A debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt. Without limiting the general application of the foregoing, the following conduct is a violation of this section:

(1) The collection of any amount (including any interest, fee, charge, or expense incidental to the principal obligation) unless such amount is expressly authorized by the agreement creating the debt or permitted by law.

19. The Defendant's statement on its website leads the least sophisticated consumer to conclude that the Defendant was authorized to collect such a fee.

20. The least sophisticated consumer would likely be deceived in a material way by Defendant's conduct.

21. Upon information and belief, it is the Defendant's pattern and practice to collect such convenience fees from hundreds of consumers who reside in the State of New York.

22. Defendant's website fee demand was in violation of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(2)(A),

1692e(2)(B), 1692e(10), 1692f, and 1692f(1).

23. Plaintiff suffered injury in fact by being subjected to unfair and abusive practices of the Defendant.
24. Plaintiff suffered actual harm by being the target of the Defendant's misleading debt collection communications.
25. Defendant violated the Plaintiff's right not to be the target of misleading debt collection communications.
26. Defendant violated the Plaintiff's right to a truthful and fair debt collection process.
27. Defendant used materially false, deceptive, misleading representations and means in its attempted collection of Plaintiff's alleged debt.
28. Defendant's communications were designed to cause the debtor to suffer a harmful disadvantage in charting a course of action in response to Defendant's collection efforts.
29. The FDCPA ensures that consumers are fully and truthfully apprised of the facts and of their rights, the act enables them to understand, make informed decisions about, and participate fully and meaningfully in the debt collection process. The purpose of the FDCPA is to provide information that helps consumers to choose intelligently. The Defendant's false representations misled the Plaintiff in a manner that deprived him of his right to enjoy these benefits, these materially misleading statements trigger liability under section 1692e of the Act.
30. These deceptive communications additionally violated the FDCPA since they frustrate the consumer's ability to intelligently choose his or her response.
31. As an actual and proximate result of the acts and omissions of Defendant, Plaintiff has suffered including but not limited to, fear, stress, mental anguish, emotional stress and

acute embarrassment for which he should be compensated in an amount to be established by a jury at trial.

**AS AND FOR A CAUSE OF ACTION**

***Violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act brought by Plaintiff on behalf of himself and the members of a class, as against the Defendant.***

32. Plaintiff re-states, re-alleges, and incorporates herein by reference, paragraphs one (1) through thirty one (31) as if set forth fully in this cause of action.
33. This cause of action is brought on behalf of Plaintiff and the members of a class.
34. The class consists of all persons whom Defendant's records reflect resided in the State of New York and who were sent a collection letter in substantially the same form letter as the letter sent to the Plaintiff on or about November 20, 2017; and (a) the collection letter was sent to a consumer seeking payment of a personal debt purportedly owed to Comcast Cable Communications, LLC; and (b) the collection letter was not returned by the postal service as undelivered; (c) and the Plaintiff asserts that the Defendant's actions violated 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(2)(A) and 1692e(10) of the FDCPA for the use of any false representation or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect any debt and for misrepresenting the amount of the debt owed by the Plaintiff.
35. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, a class action is appropriate and preferable in this case because:
  - A. Based on the fact that a form collection letter is at the heart of this litigation, the class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.
  - B. There are questions of law and fact common to the class and these questions predominate over any questions affecting only individual class members. The

principal question presented by this claim is whether the Defendant violated the FDCPA.

- C. The only individual issue is the identification of the consumers who received such collection letters (*i.e.* the class members), a matter capable of ministerial determination from the records of Defendant.
- D. The claims of the Plaintiff are typical of those of the class members. All are based on the same facts and legal theories.
- E. The Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent the class members' interests. The Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in bringing class actions and collection-abuse claims. The Plaintiff's interests are consistent with those of the members of the class.

- 36. A class action is superior for the fair and efficient adjudication of the class members' claims. Congress specifically envisions class actions as a principal means of enforcing the FDCPA. 15 U.S.C. § 1692(k). The members of the class are generally unsophisticated individuals, whose rights will not be vindicated in the absence of a class action. Prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the classes would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications resulting in the establishment of inconsistent or varying standards for the parties and would not be in the interest of judicial economy.
- 37. If the facts are discovered to be appropriate, the Plaintiff will seek to certify a class pursuant to Rule 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 38. Collection attempts, such as those made by the Defendant are to be evaluated by the objective standard of the hypothetical "least sophisticated consumer."

*Violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act*

39. The Defendant's actions as set forth above in the within complaint violates the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.
40. Because the Defendant violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, the Plaintiff and the members of the class are entitled to damages in accordance with the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, respectfully requests preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, and that this Court enter judgment in his favor and against the Defendant and award damages as follows:

- A. Statutory damages provided under the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692(k);
- B. Attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs incurred in bringing this action;  
and
- C. Any other relief that this Court deems appropriate and just under the circumstances.

Dated: Woodmere, New York  
November 21, 2018

/s/ Adam J. Fishbein  
Adam J. Fishbein, P.C. (AF-9508)  
Attorney At Law  
**Attorney for the Plaintiff**  
735 Central Avenue  
Woodmere, New York 11598  
Telephone: (516) 668-6945  
Email: fishbeinadamj@gmail.com

Plaintiff requests trial by jury on all issues so triable.

/s/ Adam J. Fishbein  
Adam J. Fishbein (AF-9508)

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

for the

Eastern District of New York

YISROEL GEISINSKY

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Plaintiff(s)*

v.

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Defendant(s)*

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

Civil Action No.

**SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION**

To: *(Defendant's name and address)*

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:

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.

**DOUGLAS C. PALMER**  
*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 (l))*

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* \_\_\_\_\_  
was received by me on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ .

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,  
on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* \_\_\_\_\_ , who is  
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 information is true.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Printed name and title*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's address*

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

**Print**

**Save As...**

**Reset**

CIVIL COVER SHEET

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
YISROEL GEISINSKY
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

DEFENDANTS
County of Residence of First Listed Defendant
NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.
Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
2 U.S. Government Defendant
3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)
PTF DEF
Citizen of This State
Citizen of Another State
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country
Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State
Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State
Foreign Nation

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)
Table with columns: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES. Includes codes like 110 Insurance, 310 Airplane, 625 Drug Related Seizure, etc.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)
1 Original Proceeding
2 Removed from State Court
3 Remanded from Appellate Court
4 Reinstated or Reopened
5 Transferred from Another District (specify)
6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer
8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION
Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
Brief description of cause: unlawful charge

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:
CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$
CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY
(See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE 11/21/2018
SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

None

**CERTIFICATION OF ARBITRATION ELIGIBILITY**

Local Arbitration Rule 83.10 provides that with certain exceptions, actions seeking money damages only in an amount not in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs, are eligible for compulsory arbitration. The amount of damages is presumed to be below the threshold amount unless a certification to the contrary is filed.

I, \_\_\_\_\_, counsel for \_\_\_\_\_, do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is ineligible for compulsory arbitration for the following reason(s):

- monetary damages sought are in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs,
- the complaint seeks injunctive relief,
- the matter is otherwise ineligible for the following reason class action

**DISCLOSURE STATEMENT - FEDERAL RULES CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1**

Identify any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more of its stocks:

**RELATED CASE STATEMENT (Section VIII on the Front of this Form)**

Please list all cases that are arguably related pursuant to Division of Business Rule 50.3.1 in Section VIII on the front of this form. Rule 50.3.1 (a) provides that "A civil case is "related" to another civil case for purposes of this guideline when, because of the similarity of facts and legal issues or because the cases arise from the same transactions or events, a substantial saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to the same judge and magistrate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that " A civil case shall not be deemed "related" to another civil case merely because the civil case: (A) involves identical legal issues, or (B) involves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that "Presumptively, and subject to the power of a judge to determine otherwise pursuant to paragraph (d), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still pending before the court."

**NY-E DIVISION OF BUSINESS RULE 50.1(d)(2)**

- 1.) Is the civil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk County?  Yes  No
- 2.) If you answered "no" above:
  - a) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffolk County?  Yes  No
  - b) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern District?  Yes  No
  - c) If this is a Fair Debt Collection Practice Act case, specify the County in which the offending communication was received: \_\_\_\_\_.

If your answer to question 2 (b) is "No," does the defendant (or a majority of the defendants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or Suffolk County, or, in an interpleader action, does the claimant (or a majority of the claimants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or Suffolk County?  Yes  No  
(Note: A corporation shall be considered a resident of the County in which it has the most significant contacts).

**BAR ADMISSION**

I am currently admitted in the Eastern District of New York and currently a member in good standing of the bar of this court.

- Yes  No

Are you currently the subject of any disciplinary action (s) in this or any other state or federal court?

- Yes (If yes, please explain  No

I certify the accuracy of all information provided above.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Print

Save As...

Reset

# ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Enhanced Recovery Company Charged Unauthorized Convenience Fee, Consumer Alleges](#)

---