

A400

LS

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ROBERT W. MAUTHE, M.D., P.C.,
individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

**NATIONAL IMAGING ASSOCIATES,
INC.,**

Defendant.

Civil Action No.

17 1916

CLASS ACTION

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Robert W. Mauthe, M.D., P.C. ("Mauthe" or "Plaintiff"), brings this action on behalf of itself and all other persons similarly situated and, except for those allegations pertaining to Plaintiff or its attorneys, which are based upon personal knowledge, alleges the following upon information and belief against defendant National Imaging Associates, Inc. ("NIA" or "Defendant"):

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. Defendant has sent advertisements by facsimile in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, and the regulations the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") has prescribed thereunder, 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200 (collectively, the "TCPA").

2. Defendant sent Plaintiff at least one advertisement by facsimile and in violation of the TCPA. Exhibit A. Plaintiff did not expressly consent to receive

Defendant's advertisement by fax and does not have an established business relationship with Defendant.

3. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant on behalf of a class of all persons or entities that Defendant sent one or more telephone facsimile messages ("faxes") about radiology benefits management services available through www.radmd.com, seeking statutory damages for each violation of the TCPA, trebling of the statutory damages if the Court determines Defendant's violations were knowing or willful, injunctive relief, compensation and attorney fees (under the conversion count), and all other relief the Court deems appropriate under the circumstances.

4. Defendant's unsolicited faxes damaged Plaintiff and the other class members. Unsolicited faxes tie up the telephone lines, prevent fax machines from receiving authorized faxes, prevent their use for authorized outgoing faxes, cause undue wear and tear on the recipients' fax machines, and require additional labor to attempt to discern the source and purpose of the unsolicited message. The recipient of a "junk" fax loses the use of its fax machine, and many lose their paper and ink toner in printing the fax. Such an unsolicited fax interrupts the recipient's privacy. A junk fax wastes the recipient's valuable time that would have been spent on something else.

5. Defendant NIA is in the business of providing radiology and specialty medical management services to the healthcare industry. NIA facilitates medical services by offering prior authorization of radiologic and other specialty medical

services, offering consulting services, and scheduling services through contracted providers.

6. Defendant's "Satisfaction Survey" fax is a pretext to increase awareness and use of Defendant's healthcare management services and to increase traffic to Defendants' website, www.RadMD.com

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

7. Plaintiff, Robert W. Mauthe, M.D., P.C., is a private medical practice in Center Valley, Pennsylvania.

8. On information and belief, National Imaging Associates, Inc. ("NIA") is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Columbia, Maryland.

9. On information and belief, NIA does business as "NIA Magellan" and is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Magellan Health Inc.

10. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 47 U.S.C. § 227.

11. Personal jurisdiction exists over Defendant in Pennsylvania because Defendant has transacted business and committed tortious acts within the State.

12. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, because Defendant committed statutory torts within this District and a significant portion of the events took place here.

FACTS

13. Defendant sent advertisements by facsimile to Plaintiff and a class of similarly-situated persons. Whether Defendant did so directly or with the

assistance of a third party (yet unknown to Plaintiff), Defendant is directly liable for violating the TCPA.

14. Plaintiff has received at least one of Defendant's advertisements by facsimile. A true and correct copy of the fax Plaintiff received on September 23, 2014 is attached as Exhibit A.

15. Exhibit A is a one-page document Defendant sent by fax about NIA's management services available for through Defendant's website, www.RadMD.com.

16. Exhibit A promotes NIA's name and website.

17. Exhibit A advertises the commercial availability or quality of services available through www.RadMD.com.

18. Exhibit A informs readers that they may complete the survey at Defendant's website www.RadMD.com.

19. Featured prominently at the top of Defendant's www.RadMD.com page are links to "Join The Network" and to learn more about NIA. To get to the survey from the weblink provided on the fax, one must scroll down the page past those links.

20. In the guise of a survey, Defendant's fax promotes the quality of NIA's services as easy to access, consistent, provider-friendly, and efficient.

21. Exhibit A does not include the opt-out notice required by the TCPA. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b) (2) (D) & (E) and 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200 (a) (4) (iii) & (v).

22. On information and belief, Defendant sent advertisements by facsimile to Plaintiff and more than 39 other persons in violation of the TCPA.

23. Plaintiff and the other class members owe no obligation to protect their fax machines from Defendant. Their fax machines are ready to send and receive their urgent communications, or private communications about patients' medical needs, not to receive Defendant's unlawful advertisements.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

24. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action on behalf of itself and all others similarly situated as members of a class, initially defined as follows:

Each person or entity that was sent one or more telephone facsimile messages ("faxes") about healthcare services available through www.RadMD.com.

Plaintiff reserves the right to modify the proposed class definition or propose subclasses after discovery about Defendant's fax advertising program and will do so through a motion for class certification pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23.

25. Excluded from the class are Defendant, Defendant's officers, directors, legal representatives, heirs, successors, and assigns, any entity in which Defendant has a controlling interest, any parent, subsidiary or affiliated company of Defendant's, and any Judge assigned to this action, including his or her immediate family.

26. In this action, Plaintiff intends to discover, include, and resolve the merits of claims about all advertisements Defendant sent to Plaintiff by fax, as well as all advertisements Defendant sent to the other class members.

27. Defendant's fax advertising program involved other, substantially-similar advertisements sent to increase purchases from Defendant's website,

www.RadMD.com. Plaintiff intends to locate those advertisements in discovery. Exhibit B, a Demand for Preservation of All Tangible Documents Including Electronically Stored Information.

28. This action is brought and may properly be maintained as a class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23. This action satisfies Rule 23 (a)'s numerosity, commonality, typicality, and adequacy requirements. Additionally, prosecution of Plaintiff's claims separately from the putative class's claims would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications under Rule 23 (b) (1) (A). Furthermore, the questions of law or fact that are common in this action predominate over any individual questions of law or fact making class representation the superior method to adjudicate this controversy under Rule 23 (b) (3).

29. Numerosity/impracticability of joinder. On information and belief, the class consists of more than 39 persons and, thus, is so numerous that individual joinder of each member is impracticable. The precise number of class members and their identities are unknown to Plaintiff, but will be obtained from Defendant's records or the records of third parties.

30. Commonality and predominance. There is a well-defined community of interest and common questions of law and fact that predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the class. These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary from one class member to another, and which may be determined without reference to the individual circumstances of any class member, include, but are not limited to the following:

a. Whether Exhibit A and other yet-to-be-discovered facsimiles sent by or on behalf of Defendant advertised the commercial availability or quality of property, goods or services;

b. Whether Defendant sent advertisements by facsimile promoting the commercial availability or quality of property, goods, or services;

c. The manner and method Defendant used to compile or obtain the list(s) of fax numbers to which it sent fax advertisements;

d. Whether Plaintiff and the other class members should be awarded statutory damages;

e. If the Court finds that Defendant willfully or knowingly violated the TCPA, whether the Court should exercise its discretion to increase the amount of the statutory damages award to an amount equal to not more than three times the amount;

f. Whether the Court should enjoin Defendant from faxing advertisements in the future; and

g. Whether Defendant's conduct as alleged herein constituted conversion.

31. **Typicality of claims.** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the other class members, because Plaintiff and all class members were injured by the same wrongful practices. Plaintiff and the members of the class were sent Defendant's advertisements by facsimile and those advertisements did not contain the opt-out notice required by the TCPA. Under the facts of this case, because the

focus is upon Defendant's conduct, if Plaintiff prevails on its claims, then the other putative class members will prevail as well.

32. **Adequacy of representation.** Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the class because its interests do not conflict with the interests of the class it seeks to represent. Plaintiff has retained undersigned counsel, who are competent and experienced in complex class action litigation, and in TCPA litigation in particular, and Plaintiff intends to vigorously prosecute this action. Plaintiff and its counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interest of members of the class.

33. **Prosecution of separate claims would yield inconsistent results.** Even though the questions of fact and law in this action are predominantly common to Plaintiff and the putative class members, separate adjudication of each class member's claims would yield inconsistent and varying adjudications. Such inconsistent rulings would create incompatible standards for Defendant to operate under if/when class members bring additional lawsuits concerning the same unsolicited fax advertisements of if Defendant choose to advertise by fax again in the future.

34. **A class action is the superior method of adjudicating the common questions of law or fact that predominate over individual questions.** A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this lawsuit, because individual litigation of the claims of all class members is economically unfeasible and procedurally impracticable. The likelihood of individual class members prosecuting separate claims is remote, and even if every class

member could afford individual litigation, the court system would be unduly burdened by individual litigation of such cases. Plaintiff knows of no difficulty to be encountered in the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action. Relief concerning Plaintiff's rights under the laws herein alleged and with respect to the class would be proper. Plaintiff envisions no difficulty in the management of this action as a class action.

COUNT I
TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 47 U.S.C. § 227

35. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

36. Plaintiff brings Count I on behalf of itself and a class of similarly situated persons against Defendant.

37. The TCPA prohibits the "use of any telephone facsimile machine, computer or other device to send an unsolicited advertisement to a telephone facsimile machine...." 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b) (1).

38. The TCPA defines "unsolicited advertisement" as "any material advertising the commercial availability or quality of any property, goods, or services which is transmitted to any person without that person's express invitation or permission." 47 U.S.C. § 227 (a) (4).

39. The TCPA provides a private right of action as follows:

3. Private right of action. A person may, if otherwise permitted by the laws or rules of court of a state, bring in an appropriate court of that state:

(A) An action based on a violation of this

subsection or the regulations prescribed under this subsection to enjoin such violation,

(B) An action to recover for actual monetary loss from such a violation, or to receive \$500 in damages for each such violation, whichever is greater, or

(C) Both such actions.

47 U.S.C. § 227 (b) (3).

40. The Court, in its discretion, may treble the statutory damages if it determines that a violation was knowing or willful. 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b) (3).

41. Here, Defendant violated 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b) (1) (C) by sending an advertisement by facsimile (such as Exhibit A) to Plaintiff and the other class members without their prior express invitation or permission.

42. Furthermore, the TCPA requires that every advertisement sent by facsimile on the basis of an “established business relationship” (“EBR”) must include an opt-out notice clearly and conspicuously displayed on the bottom of its first page. 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b) (2) (D) and (E); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200 (a) (4).

43. Defendant’s failure to include a compliant opt-out notice on its fax advertisements makes irrelevant any EBR that otherwise might have justified Defendant’s fax advertising campaigns. 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b) (2) (D) and (E); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200 (a) (4).

44. Because Defendant will not be able to prove that it obtained Plaintiff’s prior express invitation or permission before sending an advertisement by fax, and because Defendant will not be able to prove its fax contained a compliant opt-out

notice, Defendant will not be able to prove any defense against Plaintiff's TCPA claim.

45. Facsimile advertising imposes burdens on recipients that are distinct from the burdens imposed by other types of advertising. The required opt-out notice provides recipients the necessary information to opt-out of future fax transmissions, including a notice that the sender's failure to comply with the opt-out request will be unlawful. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200 (a) (4) (iii).

46. The TCPA is a strict liability statute and Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the other class members even if Defendant's actions were negligent. 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b) (3).

47. Even if Defendant did not intend to injure Plaintiff and the other class members, did not intend to violate their privacy, and did not intend to waste their valuable time with Defendant's advertisements, those facts are irrelevant because the TCPA is a strict liability statute.

48. If Defendant's actions were knowing or willful, then the Court has the discretion to increase the statutory damages up to 3 times the amount. 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b) (3).

49. Defendant is liable for the fax advertisements at issue because it sent the faxes, caused the faxes to be sent, participated in the activity giving rise to or constituting the violation, or the faxes were sent on its behalf.

50. Defendant's actions damaged Plaintiff and the other class members. Receiving Defendant's junk faxes caused the recipients to lose paper and toner

consumed in the printing of Defendant's faxes. Defendant used the fax machines of Plaintiff and the other class members. The subject faxes wasted Plaintiff's valuable time; time that otherwise would have been spent on Plaintiff's business activities. Defendant's faxes unlawfully interrupted Plaintiff and the other class members' privacy interests in being left alone. Finally, the injury and property damage sustained by Plaintiff and the other class members from the sending of unlawful fax advertisements occurred outside Defendant's premises.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, demands judgment in its favor and against Defendant as follows:

A. That the Court adjudge and decree that the present case may be properly maintained as a class action, appoint Plaintiff as the representative of the class, and appoint Plaintiff's counsel as counsel for the class;

B. That the Court award \$500.00 in statutory damages for each of Defendant's violations of the TCPA;

C. That, if it finds Defendant willfully or knowingly violated the TCPA, the Court exercise its discretion to increase the amount of the statutory damages award to an amount equal to not more than 3 times the amount (Plaintiff requests trebling);

D. That the Court enter an injunction prohibiting Defendant from violating the TCPA; and

E. That the Court award costs and such further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT II
CONVERSION

51. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

52. Plaintiff brings Count II on behalf of itself and a class of similarly situated persons and against Defendant.

53. By sending advertisements to their fax machines, Defendant improperly and unlawfully converted the class's fax machines to Defendant's own use. Where printed (as in Plaintiff's case), Defendant also improperly and unlawfully converted the class members' paper and toner to Defendant's own use. Defendant also converted Plaintiff's time to Defendant's own use, as they did with the valuable time of the other class members.

54. Immediately prior to the sending of the unsolicited faxes, Plaintiff and the other class members each owned an unqualified and immediate right to possession of their fax machines, paper, toner, and employee time.

55. By sending them unsolicited faxes, Defendant permanently misappropriated the class members' fax machines, toner, paper, and employee time to their own use. Such misappropriation was wrongful and without authorization.

56. Defendant knew or should have known that their misappropriation of paper, toner, and employee time was wrongful and without authorization.

57. Plaintiff and the other class members were deprived of the use of the fax machines, paper, toner, and employee time, which could no longer be used for any other purpose. Plaintiff and each class member thereby suffered damages as a

result of their receipt of unsolicited fax advertisements from Defendant.

58. Defendant's unsolicited faxes effectively stole Plaintiff's employees' time because persons employed by Plaintiff were involved in receiving, routing, and reviewing Defendant's illegal faxes. Defendant knew or should have known employees' time is valuable to Plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, demands judgment in its favor and against Defendant as follows:

A. That the Court adjudge and decree that the present case may be properly maintained as a class action, appoint Plaintiff as the representative of the class, and appoint Plaintiff's counsel as counsel for the class;

B. That the Court award appropriate damages;

C. That the Court award punitive damages;

D. That the Court award attorney's fees;

E. That the Court award costs of suit; and

F. That the Court award such further relief as it may deem just and proper under the circumstances.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert W. Mauthe, M.D., P.C., a Pennsylvania corporation, individually and as the representative of a class of similarly-situated persons

By: /s/ Richard Shenkan
One of its attorneys

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Richard Shenkan". The signature is written in a cursive style and extends to the right, crossing the line of the text "One of its attorneys".

Richard Shenkan (PA 79800)
Shenkan Injury Lawyers, LLC
P.O. Box 7255
New Castle, PA 16107
(248) 562-1320
(888) 769-1774 (fax)
rshenkan@shenkanlaw.com

Phillip A. Bock (*pro hac vice* admission to be requested)
Bock, Hatch, Lewis & Oppenheim, LLC
134 N. La Salle St., Ste. 1000
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 658-5500
(312) 658-5555 (fax)
phil@classlawyers.com

5.17.03 1916

JS 44 (Rev. 07/16)

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

Robert W. Mauthe, M.D., P.C.,

DEFENDANTS

National Imaging Associates, Inc.

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

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Howard County, MD (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Shenkan Injury Lawyers, LLC P.O. Box 7255, New Castle, PA 16107 (248) 562-1320

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, CIVIL RIGHTS, TORTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, 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 (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): 47 U.S.C. § 227
Brief description of cause: Violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

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 04/26/2017

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Richard Shenken

Richard Shenkan

APR 26 2017

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

17 1916

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: Robert W. Mauthe. M.D., P.C. 4676 Route 309, Center Valley, PA 18034

Address of Defendant: National Imaging Associates Inc.: 6950 COLUMBIA GATEWAY DR COLUMBIA, MD 21046

Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: 4676 Route 309, Center Valley, PA 18034
(Use Reverse Side For Additional Space)

Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Yes No

Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? Yes No

RELATED CASE, IF ANY:
Case Number: _____ Judge _____ Date Terminated: _____

Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:

- 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No
- 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No
- 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No
- 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes No

CIVIL: (Place in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)

A. Federal Question Cases:

- 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts
- 2. FELA
- 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury
- 4. Antitrust
- 5. Patent
- 6. Labor-Management Relations
- 7. Civil Rights
- 8. Habeas Corpus
- 9. Securities Act(s) Cases
- 10. Social Security Review Cases
- 11. All other Federal Question Cases
(Please specify) 47 U.S.C. § 227

B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:

- 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
- 2. Airplane Personal Injury
- 3. Assault, Defamation
- 4. Marine Personal Injury
- 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
- 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
- 7. Products Liability
- 8. Products Liability — Asbestos
- 9. All other Diversity Cases
(Please specify) _____

ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION

(Check Appropriate Category)

I, Richard Shenkan, counsel of record do hereby certify:
 Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;
 Relief other than monetary damages is sought.

DATE: 04/26/2017 Richard Shenkan 79800
Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.#

NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.

I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

DATE: 04/26/2017 Richard Shenkan 79800
Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.#

APR 26 2017

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

ROBERT W. MAUTHE, M.D., P.C.,
v.

CIVIL ACTION

NATIONAL IMAGING ASSOCIATES, INC.

NO. 17 1916

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

- (a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. ()
- (b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ()
- (c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ()
- (d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. ()
- (e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) (X)
- (f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks. ()

04/26/2017	 Richard Shenkan	Robert W. Mauthe M.D., P.C.
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for
(248)562-1320	(888) 769-1774	rshenkan@shenkanlaw.com
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address

APR 26 2017

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Look at This Photograph: National Imaging Associates Sued over Junk Faxes](#)
