

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SHEVA GOLDMAN
on behalf of herself and
all other similarly situated consumers

Plaintiff,

-against-

MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC.,
MIDLAND FUNDING, LLC,
AND ENCORE CAPITAL GROUP, INC.

Defendants.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Introduction

1. Plaintiff Sheva Goldman seeks redress for the illegal practices of Midland Credit Management, Inc., Midland Funding, LLC, and Encore Capital Group, Inc. (herein after referred to as “Defendants”) 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 Defendants sought to collect from Plaintiff a consumer debt.
4. Defendant Midland Credit Management, Inc. is an affiliate of Defendant Midland Funding, LLC and is also a “debt collector” as that term is defined by the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692(a)(6).

5. Defendant Midland Credit Management, Inc. is engaged in the business of collecting or attempting to collect debts on behalf of Midland Funding, LLC as one of its principal areas of business.
6. Defendant Encore Capital Group, Inc. is the parent company of Midland Credit Management, Inc. and Midland Funding, LLC.
7. Upon information and belief, Defendants' principal place of business is located in San Diego, California.
8. Defendants are regularly engaged, for profit, in the collection of debts allegedly owed by consumers.
9. Defendant Midland Funding, LLC is a bad debt buyer that specializes in buying large portfolios of delinquent consumer debts for pennies on the dollar, which it then collects upon through other collection agencies, such as its sister corporation, Midland Credit Management, Inc.
10. This is an action for, statutory damages, injunctive relief, declaratory judgment, attorney fees and costs brought by an individual consumer for Defendants' violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA") which prohibits debt collectors from engaging in abusive deceptive and unfair practices.
11. According to 15 U.S.C. § 1692:
 - a) There is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors. Abusive debt collection practices contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy;

- b) Means other than misrepresentation or other abusive debt collection practices are available for the effective collection of debts;
- c) Abusive debt collection practices are carried on to a substantial extent in interstate commerce and through means and instrumentalities of such commerce. Even where abusive debt collection practices are purely intrastate in character, they nevertheless directly affect interstate commerce;
- d) The FDCPA requires debt collectors identify themselves as such in all messages to prevent consumers from being tricked into communicating with debt collectors regarding a debt.

- 12. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief and declaratory relief. Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the class as a whole.
- 13. As a result of the violations of the FDCPA, Defendants is liable to Plaintiff and the class for declaratory judgment that Defendants' conduct violated the FDCPA, and actual damages, statutory damages, and costs and attorney's fees.

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 14. This Court has federal question jurisdiction under 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 15. 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 Sheva Goldman

16. Upon information and belief, on a date better known by Defendants, Defendants began to attempt to collect an alleged consumer debt from the Plaintiff.
17. The Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' collection practices violate the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"). Such collection practices include, inter alia:
 - (a) Leaving messages for consumers, which fail to provide meaningful disclosure of Defendants' identity;
 - (b) Leaving messages for consumers, which fail to disclose that the call is from a debt collector; and
 - (c) Leaving messages for consumers, which fail to disclose the purpose or nature of the communication (i.e. an attempt to collect a debt).
18. The FDCPA requires debt collectors identify themselves as such in all messages to prevent consumers from being tricked into communicating with debt collectors regarding a debt. The United States and Congress have found that:

[T]his regulation directly advances the governmental interest of preventing abusive or deceptive debt collection practices such as anonymous telephone messages. Congress has specifically declared the prohibited activity of failing to make the necessary disclosures as inherently misleading. "The argument is that prohibiting debt collectors from leaving anonymous messages directly advances the governmental interests because allowing a debt collector to leave such messages could result in consumers being tricked into calling back and being forced to communicate with the debt collector, which could be an abusive practice since some consumers prefer written contact or to have an attorney or other representative engage in discussions with the debt collector on the consumer's behalf."... "Requiring a debt collector to identify itself as such appears to be a direct and narrow method of preventing consumers from being tricked into communicating with debt collectors regarding a debt. Furthermore, debt collectors have several forms of communication available to them in their efforts to collect a debt, including live conversation over the telephone, in person

communication, and the mail. The FDCPA is no more extensive than necessary to achieve the asserted governmental interests of preventing abusive or deceptive debt collection practices such as anonymous telephone calls.”

Mark v. J.C. Christensen & Assocs., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 67724, 26-27, 2009 WL 2407700 (D. Minn. Aug. 4, 2009).

19. To prohibit deceptive practices, the FDCPA, at 15 U.S.C. § 1692e, outlaws the use of false, deceptive, and misleading collection practices and names a non-exhaustive list of certain per se violations of false and deceptive collection conduct. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(1) (16). Among the per se violations prohibited by that section are: using any false representation or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect any debt or to obtain information concerning a consumer, 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10); the failure by debt collectors to disclose in initial oral communications that the debt collector is attempting to collect a debt and that any information obtained will be used for that purpose, 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(11); and the failure by debt collectors to disclose in subsequent oral communications with consumers that the communication is from a debt collector, 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(11).
20. The undersigned and counsel for the Defendant agreed to toll the statute of limitations period on the said case until March 23, 2017 .
21. By way of limited example only, on or about March 2, 2016, Defendants who are debt collectors, attempted to contact Plaintiff by telephone in an effort to collect a debt; this was a “communication” in an attempt to collect a debt as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2). A representative by the name of Felicity Jacobs left a message for the Plaintiff requesting a call back to the Defendants stating:

Name is Felicity Jacobs, callback number is 1(800) 265-8825, Ext. 53278, calling from MCM.

22. At the time Plaintiff received the said messages, she did not know the identity of the caller.
23. At the time Plaintiff received the said messages, she did not know that the caller was a debt collector.
24. At the time Plaintiff received the said messages, she did not know that the call concerned the collection of a debt.
25. Each of the messages is a "communication" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).
26. Defendants as a matter of pattern and practice, leaves anonymous telephone messages for consumers which in effect trick consumers into calling back and being forced to communicate with the debt collector.
27. Defendants anonymous telephone messages mislead consumers into thinking that the message could reasonably pertain to a host of issues - including family or medical matters - which may be viewed by consumers as much more pressing, than a debt owed. The apparent purpose of these messages is to be vague enough to provoke the recipient to return the calls in haste. Leaving a message that deceptively entices a consumer to communicate with a debt collector when he is caught off guard is precisely the kind of abuse the FDCPA intended to prevent.
28. A message leaving any information concerning a debt is a "communication." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2). "Any information" is construed broadly in favor of consumers and includes a callback number or a reference number.¹

¹ Edwards v. Niagara Credit Solutions, Inc., 586 F. Supp. 2d 1346 (N.D. Ga. 2008). aff'd by Edwards v. Niagara Credit Solutions, Inc., 584 F.3d 1350, 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 22500, 22 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. C 179 (11th Cir. Ga. 2009). (It is a communication whether it is from a conversation directly between a consumer and a debt collector or indirectly, such as by a message left on a telephone answering device, or with a third party.), Foti v. NCO Financial Systems, Inc., 424 F.Supp.2d 643 (S.D.N.Y. 2006).(infra), Wideman v. Monterey Fin. Svcs., Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38824 (W.D.Pa May 7, 2009) (Same), West v. Nationwide Credit, Inc., 998 F. Supp. 642, 643 (W.D. N.C. 1998) (Same), Belin v. Litton Loan Servicing, LP, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47953, 2006 WL 1992410, 5 (M.D.Fla., 2006) (Same).

29. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with the notices required by 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(11), namely, by failing to advise Plaintiff that the communication was from a debt collector or that the Defendants were attempting to collect a debt.²
30. The only way for Plaintiff and/or any least sophisticated consumer to obtain the identity of the caller leaving the messages, and to ascertain the purpose underlying the messages, was to place a return call to the telephone number provided in the messages and speak with a debt collector employed by Defendants and to provide the debt collector with personal information.
31. Defendants have engaged in a pattern of leaving messages without disclosing that the communication is from a debt collector.
32. All of the above-described collection communications made to the Plaintiff by the Defendants and other collection employees employed by the Defendant, were made in violation of numerous and multiple provisions of the FDCPA, including but not limited to 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692d, 1692e, 1692e(10), 1692e(11), and 1692f, amongst others.
33. Leaving “Anonymous Telephone Messages” in any form are in violation of the FDCPA whether the anonymous telephone message is left during a conversation directly between a consumer and a debt collector or indirectly, such as an Anonymous Telephone Message left on a telephone answering device, or with a third party.³

² See Sclafani v. BC Servs., Inc., No. 10-61360-CIV, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 115330, 2010 WL 4116471, at *3 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 18, 2010.) (“If [the defendant] could not leave voice messages that simultaneously complied with the multiple applicable provisions of FDCPA, it should not have left the offending voice messages.”), Edwards v. Niagara Credit Solutions, Inc., 584 F.3d 1350, 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 22500, 22 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. C 179 (11th Cir. Ga. 2009.) (The United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit stated “In an oft-repeated statement from the Vietnam War, an unidentified American military officer reputedly said that “we had to destroy the village to save it.” That oxymoronic explanation may be apocryphal, but the debt collection agency in this case offers up much the same logic to explain why it violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act: it was necessary to violate the Act in order to comply with the Act...”[I]f [the debt collector’s] assumption is correct, the answer is that the [FDCPA] does not guarantee a debt collector the right to leave messages.”)

³ See. Leyse v. Corporate Collection Servs., (2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 67719 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 18, 2006) (“The FDCPA requires debt collectors identify themselves as such in all messages to prevent consumers from being tricked into communicating with debt collectors regarding a debt. Anonymous telephone messages mislead consumers in to thinking that the message could reasonably pertain to a host of issues - including family or medical matters - which may be viewed by consumers as much more pressing, than a debt owed. The apparent purpose of these

34. Plaintiff suffered injury in fact by being subjected to unfair and abusive practices of the Defendant.
35. Plaintiff suffered actual harm by being the target of the Defendants' misleading debt collection communications.
36. Defendants violated the Plaintiff's right not to be the target of misleading debt collection communications.
37. Defendants violated the Plaintiff's right to a truthful and fair debt collection process.
38. Defendants used materially false, deceptive, misleading representations and means in their attempted collection of Plaintiff's alleged debt.
39. Defendants' communications were designed to cause the debtor to suffer a harmful disadvantage in charting a course of action in response to Defendants' collection efforts.
40. 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 Defendants' false representations misled the Plaintiff in a manner that deprived her of her right to enjoy these benefits, these materially misleading statements trigger liability under section 1692e of the Act.
41. These deceptive communications additionally violated the FDCPA since they frustrate the consumer's ability to intelligently choose his or her response.
42. As an actual and proximate result of the acts and omissions of Defendants, Plaintiff has suffered including but not limited to, fear, stress, mental anguish, emotional stress and

messages is to be vague enough to provoke the recipient to return the calls in haste. Leaving a message that deceptively entices a consumer to communicate with a debt collector when he is caught off guard is precisely the kind of abuse the FDCPA intended to prevent.")

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

AS AND FOR A FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

43. Plaintiff re-states, re-alleges, and incorporates herein by reference, paragraphs one (1) through forty two (42) as if set forth fully in this cause of action.
44. This cause of action is brought on behalf of Plaintiff and the members of a class.
45. The class consists of all persons whom Defendants' records reflect resided in New York who received telephonic messages from Defendants within one year prior to the date of the within complaint up to the date of the filing of the complaint; (a) the telephone call was placed to a the consumer's home or similar party seeking payment of a consumer debt by leaving a message for the Plaintiff; and (b) the Plaintiff asserts that the telephone message was in violation 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692d, 1692e, 1692e(10), 1692e(11), and 1692f.
46. 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 form telephonic messages are 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 Defendants violated the FDCPA.

C. The only individual issue is the identification of the consumers who received such telephonic messages, (*i.e.* the class members), a matter capable of ministerial determination from the records of the Defendants.

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.

47. 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.

48. 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.

49. Collection attempts, such as those made by the Defendants are to be evaluated by the objective standard of the hypothetical "least sophisticated consumer."

Violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act

50. The Defendants' actions as set forth above in the within complaint violates the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.
51. Because the Defendants 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 that this Court enter judgment in her favor and against the Defendants and award damages as follows:

- (a) Statutory and actual 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
March 23, 2017

/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

SHEVA GOLDMAN

Plaintiff(s)

v.

MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC., MIDLAND FUNDING, LLC AND ENCORE CAPITAL GROUP, INC.

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC., MIDLAND FUNDING, LLC AND ENCORE CAPITAL GROUP, INC. C/O CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY 80 STATE STREET ALBANY, NEW YORK, 12207-2543

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: Adam J. Fishbein, P.C. 735 Central Avenue Woodmere NY 11598

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

CLERK OF COURT

Date: _____

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

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

SHEVA GOLDMAN

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Kings (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Adam J. Fishbein 735 Central Avenue Woodere NY 11598 516 668 6945 fishbeinadamj@gmail.com

DEFENDANTS

MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC., MIDLAND FUNDING, LLC AND ENCORE CAPITAL GROUP INC.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant California (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

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)

Table with columns for Plaintiff (PTF) and Defendant (DEF) citizenship: 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)

Large table with categories: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES.

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, 6 Multidistrict Litigation

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 15 USC 1692 FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT. Brief description of cause: Unlawful leaving of messages

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 03/23/2017 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Adam J. Fishbein

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

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, Adam J. Fishbein, counsel for Plaintiff, 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:

None

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? 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? No
b) Did the events of omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern District? Yes

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?

(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: /s/ Adam J. Fishbein

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Midland Funding Hit with FDCPA Lawsuit Over Deceptive Phone Messages](#)
