

1 Todd M. Friedman (216752)  
 2 Adrian R. Bacon (280332)  
**Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman, P.C.**  
 3 21550 Oxnard St., Suite 780  
 4 Woodland Hills, CA 91367  
 5 Phone: (323) 306-4234  
 6 Fax: (866)633-0228  
 tfriedman@toddfllaw.com  
 abacon@toddfllaw.com  
 7 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

8  
 9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 WILLIAM LOFTUS, individually and )	Case No. 2:21-cv-6585
11 on behalf of all others similarly )	
12 situated, )	<b><u>CLASS ACTION</u></b>
13 )	
14 Plaintiff, )	<b>COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS</b>
15 )	<b>OF:</b>
16 vs. )	
17 )	1. NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF
18 )	THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER
19 )	PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C.
20 )	§227 ET SEQ.]
21 )	2. WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE
22 )	TELEPHONE CONSUMER
23 )	PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C.
24 )	§227 ET SEQ.]
25 )	
26 )	<b><u>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</u></b>
27 )	
28 )	

23 Plaintiff, WILLIAM LOFTUS (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all  
 24 others similarly situated, allege the following upon information and belief based  
 25 upon personal knowledge:

26 **NATURE OF THE CASE**

27 1. Plaintiff brings this action individually and others similarly situated  
 28 seeking damages and any other available legal or equitable remedies resulting from

1 the illegal actions of CLIPPER MAGAZINE LLC (“Defendant”), in negligently,  
2 knowingly, and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff on Plaintiff’s cellular telephone in  
3 violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, *47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.*  
4 (“TCPA”), thereby invading Plaintiff’ privacy.

5  
6 **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

7 2. Jurisdiction is proper under *28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)* because Plaintiff,  
8 a resident of California, seeks relief on behalf of a Class, which will result in at  
9 least one class member belonging to a different state than that of Defendant, a  
10 company with its principal place of business and State of Incorporation in Delaware  
11 state. Plaintiff also seeks up to \$1,500.00 in damages for each call in violation of  
12 the TCPA, which, when aggregated among a proposed class in the thousands,  
13 exceeds the \$5,000,000.00 threshold for federal court jurisdiction. Therefore, both  
14 diversity jurisdiction and the damages threshold under the Class Action Fairness  
15 Act of 2005 (“CAFA”) are present, and this Court has jurisdiction.

16 3. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Central  
17 District of California pursuant to *18 U.S.C. 1391(b)* and *18 U.S.C. § 1441(a)*  
18 because Defendant does business within the state of California and Plaintiff resides  
19 within this District.

20 **PARTIES**

21 4. Plaintiff, WILLIAM LOFTUS (“Plaintiff”), is a natural person  
22 residing in Thousand Oaks, California and is a “person” as defined by *47 U.S.C. §*  
23 *153 (39)*.

24 5. Defendant, CLIPPER MAGAZINE LLC (“Defendant”), is a  
25 magazine publishing company and is a “person” as defined by *47 U.S.C. § 153*  
26 *(39)*.

27 6. The above named Defendant, and its subsidiaries and agents, are  
28 collectively referred to as “Defendants.” The true names and capacities of the

1 Defendants sued herein as DOE DEFENDANTS 1 through 10, inclusive, are  
2 currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues such Defendants by fictitious  
3 names. Each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible  
4 for the unlawful acts alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend the  
5 Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when  
6 such identities become known.

7 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all relevant times, each and  
8 every Defendant was acting as an agent and/or employee of each of the other  
9 Defendants and was acting within the course and scope of said agency and/or  
10 employment with the full knowledge and consent of each of the other Defendants.  
11 Plaintiff are informed and believe that each of the acts and/or omissions complained  
12 of herein was made known to, and ratified by, each of the other Defendants.

13 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

14 8. Beginning in or around January 15, 2020, Defendant contacted  
15 Plaintiff on his cellular telephones, numbers ending in -4665 and -8898 in an effort  
16 to sell or solicit its services.

17 9. Defendant called Plaintiff once on January 15, 2020, once on January  
18 17, 2020, once on January 31, 2020, and once on August 6, 2020.

19 10. The phone calls placed to Plaintiff's cellular telephone were placed  
20 via an "automatic telephone dialing system," ("ATDS") as defined by 47 U.S.C. §  
21 227 (a)(1) as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).

22 11. Defendant's calls constituted calls that were not for emergency  
23 purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

24 12. Defendant's calls were placed to telephone number assigned to a  
25 cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incur a charge for incoming calls  
26 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

27 13. Plaintiff is not a customer of Defendant's services and has never  
28 provided any personal information, including his cellular telephone numbers, to

1 Defendant for any purpose whatsoever. In addition, Plaintiff told Defendant at  
2 least once to stop contacting them and Plaintiff has been registered on the Do-Not-  
3 Call Registry for at least thirty (30) days prior to Defendant contacting him.  
4 Accordingly, Defendant never received Plaintiff “prior express consent” to receive  
5 calls using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded  
6 voice on their cellular telephone pursuant to *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)*.

7 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

8 14. Plaintiff bring this action on behalf of themselves and all others  
9 similarly situated, as a member of the proposed class (hereafter “The Class”)  
10 defined as follows:

11 All persons within the United States who received any  
12 telephone calls from Defendant to said person’s cellular  
13 telephone made through the use of any automatic  
14 telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded  
15 voice and such person had not previously consented to  
16 receiving such calls within the four years prior to the  
filing of this Complaint

17 15. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The Class, consisting of All  
18 persons within the United States who received any telephone calls from Defendant  
19 to said person’s cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone  
20 dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such person had not  
21 previously not provided their cellular telephone number to Defendant within the  
22 four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

23 16. Defendant, its employees and agents are excluded from The Class.  
24 Plaintiff do not know the number of members in The Class, but believes the Class  
25 members number in the thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should be  
26 certified as a Class Action to assist in the expeditious litigation of the matter.

27 17. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all of its  
28 members is impractical. While the exact number and identities of The Class

1 members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through  
2 appropriate discovery, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that  
3 The Class includes thousands of members. Plaintiff alleges that The Class  
4 members may be ascertained by the records maintained by Defendant.

5 18. Plaintiff and members of The Class were harmed by the acts of  
6 Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant illegally contacted Plaintiff  
7 and Class members via their cellular telephones thereby causing Plaintiff and Class  
8 members to incur certain charges or reduced telephone time for which Plaintiff and  
9 Class members had previously paid by having to retrieve or administer messages  
10 left by Defendant during those illegal calls, and invading the privacy of said  
11 Plaintiff and Class members.

12 19. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of The  
13 Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of  
14 The Class. These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary between  
15 Class members, and which may be determined without reference to the individual  
16 circumstances of any Class members, include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 17
- 18 a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this  
19 Complaint, Defendant made any call (other than a call made for  
20 emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of  
21 the called party) to a Class member using any automatic  
22 telephone dialing system or any artificial or prerecorded voice  
23 to any telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone  
24 service;
  - 25 b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged  
26 thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
  - 27 c. Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in such  
28 conduct in the future.

26 20. As someone that received phone calls from Defendant using an  
27 automatic telephone dialing system, without Plaintiff's prior express consent,  
28 Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of The Class.

1 21. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members  
2 of The Class. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of  
3 class actions.

4 22. A class action is superior to other available methods of fair and  
5 efficient adjudication of this controversy, since individual litigation of the claims  
6 of all Class members is impracticable. Even if every Class member could afford  
7 individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome  
8 to the courts in which individual litigation of numerous issues would proceed.  
9 Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent,  
10 or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties  
11 and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex factual  
12 issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action presents fewer  
13 management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court  
14 system, and protects the rights of each Class member.

15 23. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members  
16 would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical  
17 matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other Class members not parties to such  
18 adjudications or that would substantially impair or impede the ability of such non-  
19 party Class members to protect their interests.

20 24. Defendant has acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable  
21 to The Class, thereby making appropriate final and injunctive relief with regard to  
22 the members of the California Class as a whole.

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**  
25 **47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

26 25. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of  
27 action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-24.

28 26. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous

1 and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each  
2 and every one of the above cited provisions of *47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.*

3 27. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of *47 U.S.C. § 227 et*  
4 *seq.*, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled an award of \$500.00 in statutory  
5 damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B)*.

6 28. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek  
7 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

8  
9 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**  
11 **47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

12 29. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of  
13 action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-28.

14 30. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous  
15 and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not  
16 limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of *47 U.S.C. § 227 et*  
17 *seq.*

18 31. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of *47*  
19 *U.S.C. § 227 et seq.*, Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled an award of  
20 \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C.*  
21 *§ 227(b)(3)(B)* and *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C)*.

22 32. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek  
23 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

24 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

25 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendant for the following:

26 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

27 **Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**  
28 **47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

- As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of *47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)*, Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled to and

1 request \$500 in statutory damages, for each and every violation,  
2 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 227(b)(3)(B); and

- 3 • Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

4 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**  
6 **47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

- 7 • As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of 47  
8 U.S.C. §227(b)(1), Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled to  
9 and request treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500, for  
10 each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(B) and 47  
11 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(C); and

- 12 • Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

13 Respectfully Submitted this 13<sup>th</sup> Day of August, 2021.

14 LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.

15 By: s/ Todd M. Friedman  
16 Todd M. Friedman  
17 Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman  
18 Attorney for Plaintiff



# ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Clipper Magazine Hit with Class Action Over Alleged Telemarketing Robocalls](#)

---