CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

9

10

11

2

3

4

12 13 14

15 16

> 18 19

17

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

Introduction

- Plaintiff Margaret McKenna ("Plaintiff") brings this Class Action Complaint for damages, injunctive relief, and any other available legal or equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal actions of defendant DialAmerica Marketing, Inc. (hereinafter, referred to as "Defendant") in negligently and/or willfully or knowingly contacting Plaintiff on Plaintiff's cellular telephone, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq., ("TCPA"), thereby invading Plaintiff's privacy. Plaintiff alleges as follows upon personal knowledge as to herself and her own acts and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief, including investigation conducted by her attorneys.
- 2. The TCPA was designed to prevent calls like the ones described within this complaint, and to protect the privacy of citizens like Plaintiff. "Voluminous consumer complaints about abuses of telephone technology – for example, computerized calls dispatched to private homes – prompted Congress to pass the TCPA." Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC, 132 S. Ct. 740, 744 (2012).
- In enacting the TCPA, Congress intended to give consumers a choice as to 3. how creditors and telemarketers may call them, and made specific findings that "[t]echnologies that might allow consumers to avoid receiving such calls are not universally available, are costly, are unlikely to be enforced, or place an inordinate burden on the consumer. TCPA, Pub.L. No. 102–243, § 11. Toward this end, Congress found that:

[b]anning such automated or prerecorded telephone calls to the home, except when the receiving party consents to receiving the call or when such calls are necessary in an emergency situation affecting the health and safety of the consumer, is the only effective means of protecting telephone consumers from this nuisance and privacy invasion.

Id. at § 12; see also Martin v. Leading Edge Recovery Solutions, LLC, 2012 WL 3292838, at* 4 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 10, 2012) (citing Congressional findings

4. Congress also specifically found that "the evidence presented to the Congress indicates that automated or prerecorded calls are a nuisance and an invasion of privacy, regardless of the type of call...." *Id.* at §§ 12-13. *See also, Mims*, 132 S. Ct. at 744.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. This Court has federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this case arises out of violation of federal law. *See* 47 U.S.C. §227(b).
- 6. Defendant continuously conducts business in California. Defendant is also registered in the State of California.
- 7. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 for the following reasons: (i) at all material times hereto, Plaintiff resided in the County of San Diego, State of California which is within this judicial district; (ii) the conduct complained of herein occurred within this judicial district; and, (iii) many of the acts and transactions giving rise to this action occurred in this district because Defendant placed unlawful calls to Plaintiff in this judicial district.
- 8. Upon information and belief, Defendant regularly and continuously conducts business in the State of California, and thus, personal jurisdiction is established.

PARTIES

- 9. Plaintiff is and was, at all times mentioned herein, is a natural person that resided in the County of San Diego, State of California. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).
- 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon allege, that Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware, registered to conduct business in the State of California, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

23

24

25

26

27

28

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

11. Plaintiff alleges that at all times relevant herein Defendant conducted business in the State of California and in the County of San Diego, and within this judicial district.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 12. Defendant is a telemarketing company, which provides domestic call center services for a variety of industries. Defendant offers call center agents to accommodate various companies such as Highlights for Children, Inc. (hereinafter, referred to as "Highlights").
- 13. Defendant regularly makes autodialed telephone calls to consumers in order to market Highlights.
- 14. On or about October 25, 2016, Defendant initiated a marketing telephone call from 800-419-8251 to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number ending "5269," using an automatic telephone dialing system ("ATDS") as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1).
- 15. During Defendant's telephone call to Plaintiff's cellular telephone on or about October 25, 2016, no one was on the line when Plaintiff answered and the call was abandoned, suggesting use of automated equipment to place the calls.
- 16. According to a job posting on or about April 9, 2015 from a former employee of Defendant, the job duties for Defendant were as follows: "Sat in rows of computers on an automated dialer waiting for calls to come through then proceed to read a script trying to complete a magazine renewal. Managers left you alone for the most part and the job was straight forward and was not overly difficult, Just incredibly repetitive."
- 17. On information and belief, this indicates an ATDS was used to call Plaintiff.
- 18. Plaintiff did not provide Defendant or its agent with a "prior express consent" nor written consent to receive calls to her cellular telephone, including those calls by means of an ATDS as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 19. On or about October 28, 2016, Plaintiff called Defendant back at Defendant's

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- number 800-419-8251 for more information as to why Defendant called Plaintiff multiple times and how Defendant obtained her cellular telephone number.
- 20. During Plaintiff's call with Defendant, prior to any individuals answering Plaintiff's call, an automatic pre-recorded message played stating that all phone calls are being recorded, and only after the automatic message finished playing, Plaintiff was transferred to a live person.
- 21. Defendant's agent told Plaintiff they were calling on behalf of Highlights for Children magazine and wanted Plaintiff to subscribe again.
- 22. Plaintiff did not consent to be called on her cellular telephone by Defendant for marketing or any other purpose.
- 23. Upon information and belief, Defendant's telephone equipment has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator.
- 24. Upon information and belief, the telephone equipment used by Defendant to place the calls at issue has the capacity to dial telephone numbers automatically from a stored list or database without human intervention, using a random or sequential number generator.
- 25. Defendant did not have written consent to place calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone for the purpose of marketing Defendant's products or services.
- 26. Defendant's telemarketing calls were not made for emergency purposes, as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 27. Defendant's telemarketing call was placed to a telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).
- 28. Plaintiff was personally affected by Defendant's aforementioned conduct because Plaintiff was frustrated and distressed that Defendant interrupted

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Plaintiff with unwanted telemarketing calls using an ATDS for marketing purposes.
- 29. Through Defendant's aforementioned conduct, Plaintiff suffered an invasion of a legally protected interest in privacy, which is specifically addressed and protected by the TCPA.
- 30. Defendant's calls forced Plaintiff and other similarly situated class members to live without the utility of their cellular phones by occupying their cellular telephone with one or more unwanted calls, causing a nuisance and lost time.
- 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes and here upon alleges, that the calls were made by Defendant and/or Defendant's agent(s), with Defendant's permission, knowledge, control and for Defendant's benefit.
- 32. Through the aforementioned conduct, Defendant or its agent(s) has violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 33. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of all others similarly situated (the "Class").
- 34. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of the Class, consisting of:

All persons within the United States who received any telephone call from Defendant or its agent/s and/or employee/s, not sent for emergency purposes, to said person's cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system and/or with an artificial or prerecorded voice within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

35. 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 thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should be certified as a Class action to assist in the expeditious litigation of this matter.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 36. Plaintiff and members of the Class were harmed by the acts of Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant, either directly or through their agents, illegally contacted Plaintiff and the Class members via their cellular telephones for marketing purposes by using an ATDS, thereby causing Plaintiff and the Class members to incur certain cellular telephone charges or reduce cellular telephone time for which Plaintiff and the Class members previously paid, and invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and the Class members. Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby.
- 37. This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of economic injury on behalf of the Class, and it expressly is not intended to request any recovery for personal injury and claims related thereto. Plaintiff reserves the right to expand the Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional persons as warranted as facts are learned in further investigation and discovery.
- 38. The joinder of the Class members is impractical and the disposition of their claims in the Class action will provide substantial benefits both to the parties and to the court. The Class can be identified through Defendant's records or Defendant's agents' records.
- 39. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented. The questions of law and fact to the Class predominate over questions which may affect individual Class members, including the following:
 - Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, a) Defendant or their agents initiated any telephonic communications to the Class (other than a message made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using any automatic dialing system or prerecorded voice to any telephone number assigned to a cellular phone service;

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Whether Defendant can meet its burden of showing Defendant b) obtained prior express written consent;
- Whether Defendant's conduct was knowing and/or willful; c)
- Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby, and d) the extent of damages for such violation; and
- Whether Defendant and their agents should be enjoined from e) engaging in such conduct in the future.
- 40. As a person that received at least one telephonic communication from Defendant's ATDS without Plaintiff's prior express written consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of the Class. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class in that Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to any member of the Class.
- 41. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have all suffered irreparable harm as a result of Defendant's unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class action, the Class will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy and Defendant will likely continue such illegal conduct. Because of the size of the individual Class member's claims, few, if any, Class members could afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.
- 42. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in handling class action claims and claims involving violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.
- 43. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce Defendant to comply with federal and California law. The interest of Class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendant is small because the maximum statutory damages in an individual action for violation of privacy are minimal. Management of these claims is likely to

1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2

24

25

26

27

28

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

present	significantly	fewer	difficulties	than	those	presented	in	many	class
claims									

44. Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TCPA

47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

- 45. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 46. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.
- 47. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq., Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 48. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE TCPA

47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

- 49. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 50. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.

- 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- 13 14 15

12

- 16 17
- 18
- 1920
- 21
- 2223
- 24
- 2526
- 27
- 28

- 51. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq., Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to an award of \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
- 52. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and the Class members pray for judgment as follows against Defendant:

- Certify the Class as requested herein;
- Appoint Plaintiff to serve as the Class Representative in this matter;
- Appoint Plaintiff's Counsel as Class Counsel in this matter;
- Provide such further relief as may be just and proper.

In addition, Plaintiff and the Class members pray for further judgment as follows against Defendant:

NEGLIGENT VIOLATION OF

THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

- As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for herself and each Class member \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B);
- Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future;
- Costs;
- Attorneys' fees pursuant to the common fund doctrine and private attorney general doctrine;
- Prejudgment interest; and
- Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

KNOWING/WILLFUL VIOLATION OF THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

- As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C.
 § 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for herself and each Class member \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C.
 § 227(b)(3)(B);
- Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future;
- Costs;
- Attorneys' fees pursuant to the common fund doctrine and private attorney general doctrine;
- Prejudgment interest; and,
- Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY

53. Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demand, a trial by jury.

Dated: April 5, 2017 Respectfully submitted,

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC

By: s/ Abbas Kazerounian
Abbas Kazerounian, Esq.
Ak@Kazlg.com
Attorney for Plaintiff

	1	Additional Plaintiff's Counsel:
	2	HYDE & SWIGART
	3	Joshua B. Swigart, Esq. (SBN: 225557)
	4	josh@westcoastlitigation.com Yana A. Hart, Esq. (SBN: 306499)
	5	yana@westcoastlitigation.com 2221 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 101
	6	San Diego, CA 92108
	7	Telephone: (619) 233-7770 Facsimile: (619) 297-1022
	8	raesimile. (019) 297-1022
	9	
	10	
	11	
APC D1	12	
AZEROUNI LAW GROUP, AP 245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT D1 COSTA MESA, CA 92626	13	
7 GROUP, NUE, UNIT CA 92626	14	
I LAW R AVE MESA,	15	
ROUN TISCHE OSTA]	16	
KAZEROUNI LAW 245 FISCHER AVEN COSTA MESA,	17	
	18	
	19	
	2021	
	21 22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27	
	28	
	20	
		CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT 12

$_{ m JS~44~(Rev.~12/12)}$ as a 3:17-cv-00690-GPC-BG CIVIL Decument 1.7 Filed 04/05/17 Page I of 2

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.)

purpose of initiating the civil do					9/4, is requii	red for the use of t	the Clerk of Co	ourt for the	e	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Margaret McKenna, individually and on behalf of all others similar situated (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (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) Abbas Kazerounian, Esq., Kazerouni Law Group, APC (800) 400-6 245 Fischer Avenue, Unit D1, Costa Mesa, CA 92626
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in Or	ne Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF PI	RINCIPA	L PARTIES (Place an "X" in	One Box fc	or Plainti	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	1 U.S. Government 🔀 3 Federal Question			(For Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF Citizen of This State 1 1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State						
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship	o of Parties in Item III)						□ 5		
N. MARLIDE OF CHIE	1		Citizen or Subject of a						□ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	. (Place an "X" in One Box Onl		FC	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER	STATUTE	ES	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	□ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS □ 440 Other Civil Rights □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	71	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	□ 423 Withd 28 US PROPER □ 820 Copyr □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trader SOCIAL: □ 861 BIA (□ 862 Black □ 863 DIWC □ 864 SSID □ 865 RSI (4 FEDERA □ 870 Taxes or De □ 871 IRS—	TY RIGHTS ights mark SECURITY 1395ff) Lung (923) 2DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 105(g)) L TAX SUITS (U.S. Plaintiff fendant)	□ 480 Consum □ 490 Cable/S □ 850 Securiti Exchan ■ 890 Other S □ 891 Agricul □ 893 Enviror □ 895 Freedor □ 896 Arbitrat □ 899 Admini Act/Rev	eapportionr st and Banking erree tation eer Influence Organizati ner Credit stat TV ties/Commo nge tatutory Ac tural Acts unmental Ma n of Inform tion strative Pro view or App Decision utionality o	g ced and ions dities/ ctions atters nation ocedure peal of	
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in ▼ 1 Original □ 2 Rei		560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement Remanded from	1 4 Rein	stated or 🗖 5 Transfe	rred from	□ 6 Multidistri	ct			
		Appellate Court			r District	Litigation	Ci			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N 47 U.S.C. § 227 e ^o Brief description of car	t seq. ("TCPA")		Oo not cite jurisdictional state	utes unless div	ersity):				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS I UNDER RULE 23	IS A CLASS ACTION B, F.R.Cv.P.		EMAND \$ 5,000,000.00		HECK YES only i J RY DEMAND:	if demanded in XI Yes	complain	ıt:	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	Γ NUMBER				
DATE 04/05/2017	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD s/ Abbas Kazerounian									
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	AOLINT	ADDI VING IED		нисе		MAC HID	nGE			
RECEIPT # AN	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	/UE			

Reset

Print

Save As...

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading 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. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
 - (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
 - (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- **II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included nere. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

- Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- **III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- **IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- **V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.
 - Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.

 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- **VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>DialAmerica Faces Lawsuit Over 'Unlawful' Telemarketing Calls</u>