

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

BRETMICHAEL HOOD, individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

CLASS ACTION

Plaintiff,

Case No.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

vs.

THE LAMPO GROUP, LLC d/b/a
RAMSEY SOLUTIONS,

Defendant.

_____ /

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1. Plaintiff, Bretmichael Hood (“Plaintiff”), brings this action against Defendant, The Lampo Group, LLC d/b/a Ramsey Education (“Defendant”), to secure redress for violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

2. This is a putative class action pursuant to the TCPA.
3. Defendant is a financial guidance and financial planning company that sells a variety of different financial planning products and services to consumers. To promote its services, Defendant engages in unsolicited marketing, harming thousands of consumers in the process.
4. Through this action, Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief to halt Defendant’s illegal conduct, which has resulted in the invasion of privacy, harassment, aggravation, and disruption of the daily life of thousands of individuals. Plaintiff also seeks statutory damages on behalf of himself and members of the class, and any other available legal or equitable remedies.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 and Fla. Stat. § 26.012(2). The matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$50,000 exclusive of interest, costs, and attorney's fees.

6. Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in Florida because this suit arises out of and relates to Defendant's contacts with this state. Defendant made or caused to be made telephonic sales calls into Florida without regards to consumers rights' in violation of the TCPA. Plaintiff received such calls while residing in and physically present in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

7. Venue for this action is proper in this Court pursuant to Fla. Stat. § 47.051 because the cause of action accrued in Miami-Dade County.

PARTIES


8. Plaintiff is a natural person and Florida resident who, at all times relevant to this action, was physically present in Miami-Dade County, Florida when he received Defendant's telemarketing text messages..

9. Defendant is a Tennessee LLC whose principal office is located at 1011 Reams Fleming Blvd., Franklin, TN 37064. Defendant directs, markets, and provides its business activities throughout the State of Florida.

10. 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, vendors, and insurers of Defendant.


FACTS

11. On or about June 18, 2024, Defendant began sending numerous telemarketing text messages to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number ending in 3829 (the "3829 Number"):




12. Defendant's text messages concluded with the following opt-out instructions: "Reply STOP to stop receiving messages".

13. On June 24, 2024, Plaintiff responded with the word "Stop" in an attempt to opt-out of any further text message communications with Defendant:




14. Plaintiff never opted back in to Defendant's texts messages by any other means.

15. Despite Plaintiff's use of Defendant's preferred opt-out language, Defendant ignored Plaintiff's opt-out demand and continued to send Plaintiff further telemarketing text messages on or about June 28, 2024:



16. On June 28, 2024, Plaintiff again responded with the word “Stop” in another attempt to opt-out of any further text message communications with Defendant:



17. Despite Plaintiff's repeated use of Defendant's preferred opt-out language, Defendant ignored Plaintiff's opt-out demands and continued to send Plaintiff another telemarketing text message on or about September 23, 2024.

18. Defendant has the capability of immediately complying with Plaintiff's opt-out request.

19. These facts strongly suggest that Defendant fails to ensure that requests by Plaintiff and the Class members to opt-out of future communications are honored within a reasonable time.

20. For example, these facts suggest that Defendant has failed to maintain a master opt-out list and/or failed to maintain internal policies to sufficiently honor the opt-out requests made by Plaintiff and members of the Class.

21. Plaintiff's and the Class members' opt-out requests were not honored within a reasonable time from when the opt-out request was made.

22. Defendant's text messages were transmitted to Plaintiff's residential cellular telephone, and within the time frame relevant to this action.

23. Defendant's text messages constitute telemarketing because they encouraged the future purchase or investment in property, goods, or services, i.e., promoting Defendant's financial planning and financial education services and products.

24. Further, as demonstrated by the above screenshots, the purpose of Defendant's text messages was to solicit the sale of consumer goods and/or services – in this case Defendant's personal financial planning and financial education services and products, including physical books.

25. Plaintiff received the subject texts within this judicial district and, therefore, Defendant's violation of the TCPA occurred within this district. Upon information and belief, Defendant caused other text messages to be sent to individuals residing within this judicial district.

26. Defendant's texts were not made for an emergency purpose or to collect on a debt pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B).

27. Upon information and belief, Defendant does not have a written policy for maintaining an internal do not call list pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 64.1200(d)(1).

28. Upon information and belief, Defendant does not inform and train its personnel engaged in telemarketing in the existence and the use of any internal do not call list pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 64.1200(d)(2).

29. Defendant's refusal to honor Plaintiff's opt-out requests demonstrates that Defendant does not maintain a standalone do-not-call list. The precise details regarding its lack of training are solely within Defendant's knowledge and control.

30. Defendant did not maintain the required procedures for handling and processing opt-out requests prior to the initiation of the violative text messages it sent to Plaintiff as reflected by the fact that Plaintiff made repeated opt-out requests and those requests were never processed; they were ignored by Defendant and its employees and Defendant escalated the volume of its text message solicitations.

31. Defendant sent at least two solicitations after Plaintiff's initial opt-out requests.

32. Defendant sent Plaintiff text message solicitations more than 15 (fifteen) days after Plaintiff's first "stop" request.

33. At no point in time did Plaintiff provide Defendant with his express written consent to be contacted.

34. To the extent that Defendant had express consent to contact Plaintiff, that consent was expressly revoked when Plaintiff responded "Stop" on June 24, 2024.

35. Plaintiff is the subscriber and sole user of the 3829 Number and is financially responsible for phone service to the 3829 Number.

36. Defendant's text messages originated from telephone number 615-777-0425, a number which upon information and belief are owned and operated by Defendant or on behalf of Defendant for Defendant's financial benefit.

37. Upon information and belief, Defendant has access to outbound transmission reports for all text messages sent advertising/promoting its services and goods. These reports show the dates, times, target telephone numbers, and content of each message sent to Plaintiff and the Class members. Defendant also has access to text message logs showing Plaintiff's and the Class members' inbound opt-out requests.

38. Defendant's unsolicited text messages caused Plaintiff actual harm, including invasion of his privacy, aggravation, annoyance, intrusion on seclusion, trespass, and conversion. Defendant's text messages also inconvenienced Plaintiff and caused disruption to his daily life.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

PROPOSED CLASS

39. Plaintiff brings this case as a class action pursuant to Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220(b)(2) and (b)(3), on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated.

40. Plaintiff brings this case on behalf of the Class defined as follows:

Internal Do Not Call Class: From four years before the filing of the Complaint, all persons in the United States who (1) were sent more than one text message by or on behalf of Defendant within any 12-month period; (2) regarding Defendant's goods or services, to said person's cellular telephone number; and (3) while Lampo did not maintain the required procedures under 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d) for maintaining a list of persons who request not to receive such calls.

41. Defendant and its employees or agents are excluded from the Class. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in the Class, but believes the Class members number in the several thousands, if not more.

NUMEROSITY

42. Upon information and belief, Defendant has placed violative calls to cellular telephone numbers belonging to thousands of consumers throughout the United States who have opted out from further text messages from Defendant. The members of the Class, therefore, are believed to be so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.

43. The exact number and identities of the Class members are unknown at this time and can only be ascertained through discovery. Identification of the Class members is a matter capable of ministerial determination from Defendant's call records.

COMMON QUESTIONS OF LAW AND FACT

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

- a) Whether Defendant violated 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d);
- b) Whether Defendant's conduct was knowing and willful;
- c) Whether Defendant adhered to requests by class members to stop sending text messages to their telephone numbers;
- d) Whether Defendant keeps records of text recipients who revoked consent to receive texts.
- e) Whether Defendant has any written policies for maintaining an internal do not call list.
- f) Whether Defendant violated the privacy rights of Plaintiff and members of the class;
- g) Whether Defendant is liable for damages, and the amount of such damages; and
- h) Whether Defendant should be enjoined from such conduct in the future.

45. The common questions in this case are capable of having common answers. If Plaintiff's claim that Defendant routinely transmits text messages to telephone numbers who have opted out from further text messages from Defendant is accurate, Plaintiff and the Class members will have identical claims capable of being efficiently adjudicated and administered in this case.

TYPICALITY

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

PROTECTING THE INTERESTS OF THE CLASS MEMBERS

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

PROCEEDING VIA CLASS ACTION IS SUPERIOR AND ADVISABLE

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

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

COUNT I
Violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(2)
(On Behalf of the Plaintiff and the Internal Do Not Call Class)

50. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates the foregoing allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 49 as is fully set forth herein.

51. The TCPA 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. 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

52. Under 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d), "[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 certain minimum standards, including:

(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

(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.

47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d)(3), (6).

53. Under 47 C.F.R § 64.1200(e) the rules set forth in 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d) are applicable to any person or entity making telephone solicitations or telemarketing calls to wireless telephone numbers:

(e) The rules set forth in paragraph (c) and (d) of this section 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.

47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(e).

54. Plaintiff and the Internal Do Not Call Class members made requests to Defendant not to receive calls from Defendant.

55. Defendant failed to honor Plaintiff and the Internal Do Not Call Class members' requests.

56. Upon information and belief, Defendant has not instituted procedures for maintaining a list of persons who request not to receive telemarketing calls made by or on behalf of their behalf, pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d).

57. Because Plaintiff and the Internal Do Not Call Class members received more than one text message in a 12-month period made by or on behalf of Defendant in violation of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d), as described above, Defendant violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

58. As a result of Defendant's violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5), Plaintiff and the Internal Do Not Call Class members are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every negligent violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

59. As a result of Defendant's violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5), Plaintiff and the Internal Do Not Call Class members are entitled to an award of \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every knowing and/or willful violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

60. Plaintiff and the Internal Do Not Call Class members also suffered damages in the form of invasion of privacy.

61. Plaintiff and the Internal Do Not Call Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant's illegal conduct in the future, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the Class, prays for the following relief:

- a) An order certifying this case as a class action on behalf of the Class as defined above, and appointing Plaintiff as the representative of the Class and Plaintiff's counsel as Class Counsel;
- b) An award of actual and statutory damages for Plaintiff and each member of the Class under the TCPA;
- c) An order declaring that Defendant's actions, set out above, violate the TCPA;
- d) An injunction requiring Defendant to cease all unsolicited text messaging activity, and to otherwise protect the interests of the Class;
- e) Such further and other relief as the Court deems necessary.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff and Class Members hereby demand a trial by jury.

DOCUMENT PRESERVATION DEMAND

Plaintiff demands that Defendant take affirmative steps to preserve all records, lists, electronic databases or other itemizations associated with the allegations herein, including all records, lists, electronic databases or other itemizations in the possession of any vendors, individuals, and/or companies contracted, hired, or directed by Defendant to assist in sending the alleged communications.

Dated: August 6, 2025

Shamis & Gentile, P.A.

/s/ Andrew J. Shamis

Andrew J. Shamis, Esq.

Florida Bar No. 101754

ashamis@shamisgentile.com

/s/ Christopher Berman

Florida Bar No. 1010654

cberman@shamisgentile.com

14 NE 1st Avenue, Suite 705

Miami, FL 33132

Telephone: 305-479-2299

EDELSBERG LAW P.A.

/s/ Scott Edelsberg

Scott Edelsberg, Esq.

Florida Bar No. 0100537

20900 NE 30th Ave., Suite 417

Aventura, Florida 33180

Telephone: 305-975-3320

Email: scott@edelsberglaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiff and the Class

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [\\$1.09M+ Ramsey Solutions Settlement Resolves Class Action Lawsuit Over Alleged Marketing Texts](#)
