

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

MANUEL MENDOZA, individually and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

CLASS ACTION

Plaintiff,

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

vs.

FRED HAAS MOTORS, LTD., a Texas corporation,

Defendant.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Manuel Mendoza (“Plaintiff”), files this Class Action Complaint against Defendant, Fred Haas Motors, Ltd. (“Defendant”), and alleges as follows upon personal knowledge, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief, including investigation conducted by his attorneys.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Defendant knowingly and willfully violated of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., (“TCPA”), by making unsolicited prerecorded telemarketing calls¹ in violation of consumers’ privacy rights.

1. Defendant – an automotive dealership – knew that it was prohibited by the TCPA from contacting consumers on their cellular telephones with prerecorded calls, without their prior express consent.

2. Nevertheless, in a failed attempt to circumvent the TCPA, Defendant did just that by

¹ The term “call” is not defined by the TCPA. See *Satterfield v. Simon & Schuster, Inc.*, 569 F.3d 946, 953 (9th Cir. 2009). “Webster's defines ‘call’...as ‘to communicate with or try to get into communication with a person by a telephone.’” *Id.* (citing *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* 318 (2002)).

utilizing “ringless”² voicemail technology to place calls to Plaintiff and members of the Class (defined below) to promote its products and services.

3. Through this action, Plaintiff seeks to hold Defendant accountable for its violations of the TCPA, and for willfully and knowingly violating the privacy of hundreds or thousands of consumers.

4. Plaintiff, for himself and a Class of similarly situated individuals, seeks injunctive relief to halt Defendant’s unlawful conduct. Plaintiff also seeks statutory damages on behalf of himself and members of the Class, and any other legal or equitable remedies to redress Defendant’s violations of the TCPA.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, given Defendant’s alleged violations of a federal statute. This Court also has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act (“CAFA”) 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(d)(2) and (d)(6), because there is diversity of citizenship and the claims of individual class members, in the aggregate, exceed the jurisdictional minimum of \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

6. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) because Defendant is deemed to reside in any judicial district in which it is subject to the court’s personal jurisdiction, and because Defendant provides and markets its services within this District thereby establishing sufficient contacts to subject it to personal jurisdiction. Further, Defendant’s tortious conduct against Plaintiff and other members of the Class occurred within the State of Texas, thereby subjecting Defendant to jurisdiction in the State of Texas.

² The term “ringless” was self-servingly coined by companies that peddle this technology, and is simply false. It is common knowledge that every cellular telephone audibly alerts a consumer when a voicemail is received.

PARTIES

7. Plaintiff is a natural person who, at all times relevant to this action, was a citizen of the State of Texas residing in Harris County, Texas.

9. Defendant is a Texas corporation with its principal place of business located at 20400 Interstate 45, Spring Texas 77373. Defendant directs, markets, and provides its business activities throughout the State of Texas.

THE TCPA

9. The TCPA prohibits: (1) any person from calling a cellular telephone number; (2) using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice. 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

10. Accordingly, the TCPA exists to prevent communications like the ones made by Defendant that are at issue in this Complaint. “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).

11. In an action under the TCPA, a plaintiff must only show that the defendant “called a number assigned to a cellular telephone service using an automatic dialing system or prerecorded voice.” *Breslow v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 857 F. Supp. 2d 1316, 1319 (S.D. Fla. 2012), *aff’d*, 755 F.3d 1265 (11th Cir. 2014).

12. The Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) is empowered to issue rules and regulations implementing the TCPA. According to the FCC’s findings, calls in violation of the TCPA are prohibited because, as Congress found, automated or prerecorded telephone calls are a greater nuisance and invasion of privacy than live solicitation calls, and such calls can be costly and inconvenient. The FCC also recognized that wireless customers are charged for incoming calls whether they pay in advance or after the minutes are used. *Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, CG Docket No. 02-278, Report and Order, 18 FCC Rcd 14014 (2003).

13. In 2012, the FCC issued an order tightening the restrictions for automated telemarketing calls, requiring “prior express **written** consent” for such calls to wireless numbers. *See In the Matter of Rules & Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 27 F.C.C.R. 1830, 1838 ¶ 20 (Feb. 15, 2012) (emphasis supplied).

14. To obtain express written consent for telemarketing calls, a defendant must establish that it secured the plaintiff’s signature in a form that gives the plaintiff a “‘clear and conspicuous disclosure’ of the consequences of providing the requested consent....and having received this information, agrees unambiguously to receive such calls at a telephone number the [plaintiff] designates.” *In re Rules & Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 27 F.C.C.R. 1830, 1837 ¶ 18, 1838 ¶ 20, 1844 ¶ 33, 1857 ¶ 66, 1858 ¶ 71 (F.C.C. Feb. 15, 2012).

15. The TCPA regulations promulgated by the FCC define “telemarketing” as “the initiation of a telephone call or message for the purpose of encouraging the purchase or rental of, or investment in, property, goods, or services.” 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(f)(12). In determining whether a communication constitutes telemarketing, a court must evaluate the ultimate purpose of the communication. *See Golan v. Veritas Entm’t, LLC*, 788 F.3d 814, 820 (8th Cir. 2015).

16. “Neither the TCPA nor its implementing regulations ‘require an explicit mention of a good, product, or service’ where the implication of an improper purpose is ‘clear from the context.’” *Id.* (citing *Chesbro v. Best Buy Stores, L.P.*, 705 F.3d 913, 918 (9th Cir. 2012)).

17. “‘Telemarketing’ occurs when the context of a call indicates that it was initiated and transmitted to a person for the purpose of promoting property, goods, or services.” *Golan*, 788 F.3d at 820 (citing 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(2)(iii); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(f)(12); *In re Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, 18 F.C.C. Rcd at 14098 ¶ 141, 2003 WL 21517853, at *49).

18. The FCC has explained that calls motivated in part by the intent to sell property, goods, or services are considered telemarketing under the TCPA. *See In re Rules and Regulations*

Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, 18 FCC Rcd. 14014, ¶¶ 139-142 (2003). This is true whether call recipients are encouraged to purchase, rent, or invest in property, goods, or services during the call *or in the future*. *Id.*

19. In other words, offers “that are part of an overall marketing campaign to sell property, goods, or services constitute” telemarketing under the TCPA. *See In re Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, 18 FCC Rcd. 14014, ¶ 136 (2003).

20. If a call is not deemed telemarketing, a defendant must nevertheless demonstrate that it obtained the plaintiff’s prior express consent. *See In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 30 FCC Rcd. 7961, 7991-92 (2015) (requiring express consent “for non-telemarketing and non-advertising calls”).

21. Further, Section 227(c) of the TCPA and the related regulations protect the privacy of residential telephone subscribers, which includes cell phone subscribers, and allow them to register their numbers on the National Do Not Call registry. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(c); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2) (“No person or entity shall initiate any telephone solicitation to ... [a] residential telephone subscriber who has registered his or her telephone number on the [NDNC list]”). Under 47 U.S.C. § 227(c) and the related regulations, it is a violation of the TCPA for parties to make more than one call within a twelve-month period to a number listed on a do-not-call registry provided for by the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) without the residential telephone subscriber’s prior express written consent. 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(e). A telemarketer is not liable under this provision if it can show that it has obtained the subscriber’s prior express written consent. 47 U.S.C. § 64.1200(c)(ii)

22. As recently held by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit: “Unsolicited telemarketing phone calls or text messages, by their nature, invade the privacy and disturb the solitude of their recipients. A plaintiff alleging a violation under the TCPA ‘need not allege any

additional harm beyond the one Congress has identified.” *Van Patten v. Vertical Fitness Grp.*, No. 14-55980, 2017 U.S. App. LEXIS 1591, at *12 (9th Cir. May 4, 2016) (quoting *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, 136 S. Ct. 1540, 1549 (2016) (emphasis original)).

FACTS

“RINGLESS” VOICEMAILS ARE REGULATED BY THE TCPA

23. “Ringless” voicemail technology was created, and is presently being used by unscrupulous companies, including Defendant, in an attempt to circumvent the TCPA.

24. Unfortunately for Defendant, “ringless” voicemails are regulated by the TCPA and it is liable under the TCPA for invading consumers’ privacy rights by utilizing such technology when engaging in its telemarketing practices.

25. “Ringless” voicemail technology works by delivering prerecorded messages *en masse* to the voicemail boxes of cellular subscribers.


26. However, calls made by utilizing this technology are not actually “ringless” since the prerecorded message that results triggers an audible notification to the consumer once the message is received.

27. Further, the method by which “ringless” voicemails are transmitted to cellular telephones is essentially the same as the method for transmitting text messages to cellular phones. This is significant because consumers are entitled to the same consent-based protections for text messages as they are for voice calls to wireless numbers. *See Satterfield*, 569 F.3d at 952 (noting that the FCC has determined that a text message falls within the meaning of “to make any call” in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)); *Toney v. Quality Res., Inc.*, 2014 WL 6757978, at *3 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 1, 2014) (holding that defendant bears the burden of showing that it obtained plaintiff’s prior express consent before sending her a text message).


28. As illustrated below, “ringless” voicemails, including the prerecorded messages at issue in this case, are delivered just like text messages by “establishing a direct Internet-based computer-to-

computer data connection to the respective voicemails systems of the cellular carries. As part of the protocol for this data communication, subscribers' cellular telephone numbers are used to identify each voicemail box so that the pre-recorded voice messages are inserted into each voicemail box *en masse*.³

RVM Voice Message Call to Subscriber



Text Message Call to Subscriber



29. Unlike robocalls and text messages, however, consumers are left powerless to block “ringless” voicemails from being transmitted to their phones. Thus, a consumer’s voicemail box could be rendered useless by just a handful of companies using the technology to market their businesses.

30. The purpose of a “ringless” voicemail is to communicate with or try to get into

³ Comments Opposing the Petition for Declaratory Ruling and Waiver by National Consumer Law Center, CG Docket No. 02-278, DA 17-364 (May 18, 2017) available at <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/filing/105180243621422> (last accessed on December 7, 2017).

communication with a consumer through the consumer's cellular telephone.

31. The FCC has previously rejected the argument that technologies such as “ringless” voicemails are not regulated by the TCPA because they are not traditional “calls.” Particularly, in the context of Internet-to-phone text messaging, which is essentially the same technology at issue in this case, the FCC has ruled:

From the recipient's perspective, Internet-to-phone text messaging is functionally equivalent to phone-to-phone text messaging, which the Commission has already confirmed falls within the TCPA's protection. And the potential harm is identical to consumers; unwanted text messages pose the same cost and annoyance to consumers, regardless of whether they originate from a phone or the Internet. Finding otherwise—that merely adding a domain to the telephone number means the number has not been “dialed”—when the effect on the recipient is identical, would elevate form over substance, thwart Congressional intent that evolving technologies not deprive mobile consumers of the TCPA's protections, and potentially open a floodgate of unwanted text messages to wireless consumers.⁴

FAILED FCC “RINGLESS” VOICEMAIL PETITION

32. On January 9, 2017, a putative class action lawsuit under the TCPA was filed against TT of Pine Ridge, Inc., a vehicle dealership located in Naples, Florida, styled *Mahoney v. TT of Pine Ridge, Inc.*, Case No. 9:17-cv-80029-DMM (S.D. Fla. 2017) (“*Mahoney*”).

33. At issue in *Mahoney* was the use of Stratics' voicemail platform by TT of Pine Ridge to promote its dealership's inventory and related services. [*See id.* at ECF No. 1].

34. On March 31, 2017, All About the Message, LLC, a distributor for Stratics' ringless voicemail platform, filed a Petition for Declaratory Ruling with the FCC seeking a declaration that the TCPA does not apply to “ringless” voicemails (the “FCC RVM Petition”). The FCC RVM Petition appears to have been initiated and/or coordinated by TT of Pine Ridge as a Motion for Stay pending resolution of the FCC RVM Petition was filed on the same by TT of Pine Ridge in the *Mahoney* lawsuit. [*See id.* at ECF No. 33].

⁴ *See In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 30 FCC Rcd. 7961 (2015)

35. The FCC RVM petition received significant media attention,⁵ and fierce opposition by members of Congress, State Attorney Generals, and consumer protection groups, including the National Consumer Law Center.

36. For example, several members of Congress wrote a letter to the Chairman of the FCC describing “ringless” voicemails as “a clear-cut attempt at an end-run around legal and technological protections against spam and unwanted phone communications.”⁶

37. Similarly, the Attorney Generals for Massachusetts, New York, and Kentucky filed an opposition to the FCC RVM Petition stating in pertinent part:

Ringless voicemails are prerecorded calls within the meaning of the TCPA. All About the Message seeks to avoid this conclusion by stating that ringless voicemail “bypasses the wireless telephone and telephone subscriber altogether,” and by narrowly construing its conduct to include only the delivery of the voicemail message to a server and not to the consumer. This is a distinction without a difference.⁷

38. Ultimately, on June 20, 2017, the FCC RVM Petition was withdrawn after a class-wide settlement was reached in *Mahoney*, and the FCC did not issue a ruling with respect to the petition.

39. Upon information and belief, Defendant was aware of the FCC RVM Petition and its withdrawal prior to sending the subject prerecorded telemarketing calls to Plaintiff and members of the Class.

FACTS SPECIFIC TO PLAINTIFF MANUEL MENDOZA

40. On April 16, 2019, Defendant, transmitted a prerecorded telemarketing call to Plaintiff’s cellular telephone number ending in 9564 (the “9564 Number”) which contained a message

⁵ See e.g. <https://www.bostonglobe.com/business/2017/05/24/you-can-sound-off-fcc-about-ringless-voicemail/buOKWDgr06Fxb1m0qk2ZCK/story.html> and <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/03/business/phone-ringless-voicemail-fcc-telemarketer.html>.

⁶ See Correspondence dated June 21, 2017 available at <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/filing/1072811351675>; (last accessed on December 7, 2017).

⁷ Comments Opposing the Petition for Declaratory Ruling and Waiver by Massachusetts, New York, and Kentucky, CG Docket No. 02-278 (June 2, 2017) available at <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/filing/10602714924246>; (last accessed on December 7, 2017).

substantially similar to the following:

This is Jim Wilkerson, General Sales Manager at Fred Haas Toyota in Spring. It's time to upgrade your 2015 Toyota Corolla for a new Toyota. Please call me at 832-764-8900 for more information.

41. Additionally, Defendant caused similar prerecorded telemarketing ringless voicemails to be sent to Plaintiff's cellular phone on May 9, 2019, May 18, 2019, and July 31, 2019.

42. Upon information and belief, the individual identified in the above prerecorded messages is Jim Wilkerson, one of the general managers of Fred Haas Toyota.

43. The prerecorded telemarketing call was transmitted to Plaintiff's cellular telephone, and within the time frame relevant to this action.

44. Defendant's prerecorded telemarketing call constitutes telemarketing because it encouraged the future purchase, sell, or investment in property, goods, and/or services, i.e., selling Plaintiff one of Defendant's vehicles.

45. The prerecorded telemarketing call originated from telephone a telephone number which upon information and belief is owned and/or operated by or on behalf of Defendant.

46. Plaintiff received the subject prerecorded telemarketing call within this District and, therefore, Defendant's violation of the TCPA occurred within this District. Upon information and belief, Defendant caused other prerecorded telemarketing calls to be sent to individuals residing within this judicial district.

47. At no point in time did Plaintiff provide Defendant with his express consent to be contacted using an ATDS.

48. Plaintiff is the subscriber and sole user of the 9564 Number and is financially responsible for phone service to the 9564 Number.

49. Plaintiff has been registered with the national do-not-call registry since 2009.

50. Defendant's unsolicited prerecorded message caused Plaintiff actual harm, including invasion of his privacy, aggravation, annoyance, intrusion on seclusion, trespass, and conversion.

Defendant's prerecorded message also inconvenienced Plaintiff and caused disruption to his daily life. *See Patriotic Veterans, Inc. v. Zoeller*, No. 16-2059, 2017 WL 25482, at *2 (7th Cir. Jan. 3, 2017) ("Every call uses some of the phone owner's time and mental energy, both of which are precious.").

51. Defendant's unsolicited text messages caused Plaintiff actual harm. Specifically, Plaintiff estimates that he has wasted three minutes reviewing all of Defendant's unwanted messages. Each time, Plaintiff had to stop what he was doing to either retrieve his phone to review the message.

52. Plaintiff was at work when he received many of these messages, which resulted in substantial disruption to his work days.

53. Plaintiff also wasted approximately 10-13 hours, including telephone calls with his cell phone provider, determining how to opt out of further communications, given that the messages do not provide a mechanism for opting out.

54. Next, Plaintiff wasted approximately 60 minutes locating and retaining counsel for this case in order to stop Defendant's unwanted calls.

55. In all, Defendant's violations of the TCPA caused Plaintiff to waste at least 11-14 hours of his time in addressing and attempting to stop Defendant's solicitations.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

PROPOSED CLASS

56. Plaintiff brings this case as a class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated.

57. Plaintiff brings this case on behalf of a Class defined as follows:

No Consent Class: All persons within the United States who, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, were sent a prerecorded message, from Defendant or anyone on Defendant's behalf, to said person's cellular telephone number, without emergency purpose and without the recipient's prior express written consent.

Do Not Call Registry Class: All persons in the United States who

from four years prior to the filing of this action (1) were sent a prerecorded message by or on behalf of Defendant; (2) more than one time within any 12-month period; (3) where the person's telephone number had been listed on the National Do Not Call Registry for at least thirty days; (4) for the purpose of selling Defendant's products and services; and (5) for whom Defendant claims (a) it did not obtain prior express written consent, or (b) it obtained prior express written consent in the same manner as Defendant claims it supposedly obtained prior express written consent to call the Plaintiff.

58. Excluded from the Class is Defendant, its officers, directors, affiliates, legal representatives, employees, successors, subsidiaries and assigns, as well as the judge and court staff to whom this case is assigned. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the right to amend the Class definition if discovery of further investigation reveals that the Class should be modified.

NUMEROSITY

59. Upon information and belief, Defendant has transmitted prerecorded telemarketing calls to cellular telephone numbers belonging to thousands of consumers throughout the United States without their prior express written consent. The members of the Class, therefore, are believed to be so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.

60. The exact number and identities of the Class members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time, but can 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

61. 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:

- (1) Whether Defendant made non-emergency prerecorded telemarketing calls to Plaintiff's and Class members' cellular telephones;
- (2) Whether Defendant can meet its burden of showing that it obtained prior express written consent to make such calls;

- (3) Whether Defendant's conduct was knowing and willful;
- (4) Whether Defendant is liable for damages, and the amount of such damages; and
- (5) Whether Defendant should be enjoined from such conduct in the future.

62. The common questions in this case are capable of having common answers. If Plaintiff's claim that Defendant routinely transmits prerecorded telemarketing calls to telephone numbers assigned to cellular telephone services is accurate, Plaintiff and the Class members will have identical claims capable of being efficiently adjudicated and administered in this case.

TYPICALITY

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

ADEQUACY

64. Plaintiff is a representative who will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class because he shares common interests with Class members as a result of Defendant's misconduct.

65. In addition, Plaintiff has retained counsel with substantial experience in prosecuting complex litigation and class actions, including those involving violations of the TCPA. Plaintiff and his counsel are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the other respective members of the Class and have the financial resources to do so. Neither Plaintiff nor his counsel have any interests adverse to those of the other members of the Class.

PROCEEDING VIA CLASS ACTION IS SUPERIOR AND ADVISABLE

66. 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.

67. 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(b)
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)

68. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.

69. It is a violation of the TCPA to make “any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice ... to any telephone number assigned to a ... cellular telephone service ...” 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

70. Defendant – or third parties directed by Defendant – transmitted calls using an artificial or prerecorded voice to the cellular telephone numbers of Plaintiff and members of the putative class.

71. These calls were made without regard to whether Defendant had first obtained express permission from the called party to make such calls. In fact, Defendant did not have prior express consent to call the cell phones of Plaintiff and the other members of the putative Class when its calls were made.

72. Defendant has, therefore, violated § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii) of the TCPA by using an artificial or prerecorded voice to make non-emergency telephone calls to the cell phones of Plaintiff and the other members of the putative Class without their prior express consent.

73. As a result of Defendant's conduct and pursuant to § 227(b)(3) of the TCPA, Plaintiff and the other members of the putative Class were harmed and are each entitled to a minimum of \$500.00 in damages for each violation. Plaintiff and the class are also entitled to an injunction against future calls. *Id.*

COUNT II
Knowing and/or Willful Violation of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)

74. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate paragraphs 1-66 as if fully set forth herein.

75. At all times relevant, Defendant knew or should have known that its conduct as alleged herein violated the TCPA.

76. Defendant knew that it did not have prior express consent to transmit artificial or prerecorded voice calls and knew or should have known that its conduct was a violation of the TCPA.

77. Because Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and Class Members had not given prior express consent to receive its prerecorded calls, the Court should treble the amount of statutory damages available to Plaintiffs and the other members of the putative Class pursuant to § 227(b)(3) of the TCPA.

78. As a result of Defendant's violations, Plaintiffs and the Class Members 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).

COUNT III
Violation of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Do Not Call Registry Class)

79. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the paragraphs 1 through 66 of this Complaint and incorporates them by reference herein.

80. The TCPA's implementing regulation, 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c), provides that "[n]o person or entity shall initiate any telephone solicitation" to "[a] residential telephone subscriber who has registered his or her telephone number on the national do-not-call registry of persons who do not wish to receive telephone solicitations that is maintained by the federal government."

81. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(e), provides that § 64.1200(c) and (d) "are applicable to any person or entity making telephone solicitations or telemarketing calls to wireless telephone numbers."⁸

82. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(d) further provides that "[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."

83. 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" 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).

84. Defendant violated 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c) by initiating, or causing to be initiated, telephone solicitations to telephone subscribers such as Plaintiff and the Do Not Call Registry Class members who registered their respective telephone numbers on the National Do Not Call Registry, a listing of persons who do not wish to receive telephone solicitations that is maintained by the federal government.

⁸ *Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, CG Docket No. 02-278, Report and Order, 18 FCC Rcd 14014 (2003) Available at https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-153A1.pdf

85. Defendant violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5) because Plaintiff and the Do Not Call Registry Class received more than one telephone call in a 12-month period made by or on behalf of Defendant in violation of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200, as described above. As a result of Defendant's conduct as alleged herein, Plaintiff and the Do Not Call Registry Class suffered actual damages and, under section 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), are entitled, *inter alia*, to receive up to \$500 in damages for such violations of 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200.

86. To the extent Defendant's misconduct is determined to be willful and knowing, the Court should, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5), treble the amount of statutory damages recoverable by the members of the Do Not Call Registry Class.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Manuel Mendoza on behalf of himself and the other members of the Class, pray for the following relief:

- a. A declaration that Defendant's practices described herein violate the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227;
- a. An injunction prohibiting Defendant from using an artificial or prerecorded voice to contact telephone numbers assigned to cellular telephones without the prior express permission of the called party;
- b. An award of actual and statutory damages; and
- c. Such further and other relief the Court deems reasonable and just.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff and the Class Members hereby demand a trial by jury.

Dated: October 22, 2019

SHAMIS & GENTILE, P.A.

By: /s/Angelica M. Gentile

Angelica M. Gentile, Esq.

Texas Bar # 24112322

Email: agentile@shamisgentile.com

14 NE 1st Ave., Suite 1205

Miami, FL 33132

Telephone (305) 479-2299
Facsimile (786) 623-0915

EDELSBERG LAW, PA

Scott Edelsberg, Esq. (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
Florida Bar No. 0100537
scott@edelsberglaw.com
20900 NE 30th Ave, Suite 417
Aventura, FL 33180
Telephone: 305-975-3320

KOZONIS & KLINGER, LTD.

Gary M. Klinger, Esq. (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
227 W. Monroe Street, Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone: 312-283-3814
gklinger@kozonislaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Manuel Mendoza and all others similarly situated

JS 44 (Rev. 08/18)

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.)

<p>I. (a) PLAINTIFFS</p> <p>Manuel Mendoza, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated</p> <p>(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff <u>Harris County, TX</u> <i>(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)</i></p> <p>(c) Attorneys <i>(Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)</i> Shamis & Gentile, P.A. 14 NE 1st Ave, STE 1205, Miami, FL 33132 (305) 479-2299</p>	<p>DEFENDANTS</p> <p>Fred Haas Motors, Ltd.</p> <p>County of Residence of First Listed Defendant <u>Harris County, TX</u> <i>(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)</i></p> <p>NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.</p> <p>Attorneys <i>(If Known)</i></p>
--	--

<p>II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION <i>(Place an "X" in One Box Only)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 Federal Question <i>(U.S. Government Not a Party)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2 U.S. Government Defendant</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4 Diversity <i>(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)</i></p>	<p>III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES <i>(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)</i></p> <table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:33%;"></td> <td style="width:10%; text-align: center;">PTF</td> <td style="width:10%; text-align: center;">DEF</td> <td style="width:33%;"></td> <td style="width:10%; text-align: center;">PTF</td> <td style="width:10%; text-align: center;">DEF</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Citizen of This State</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 1</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 1</td> <td>Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 4</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Citizen of Another State</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 2</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 2</td> <td>Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 5</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 3</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 3</td> <td>Foreign Nation</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 6</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 6</td> </tr> </table>		PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF	Citizen of This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	Citizen of Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF																				
Citizen of This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4																				
Citizen of Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5																				
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6																				

IV. NATURE OF SUIT *(Place an "X" in One Box Only)* Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions](#)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	<input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act <input type="checkbox"/> 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration <input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	LABOR	PROPERTY RIGHTS	SOCIAL SECURITY
<input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	<input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other <input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education	<input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Management Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g))	FEDERAL TAX SUITS
	PRISONER PETITIONS	IMMIGRATION		
	Habeas Corpus: <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty Other: <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition <input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	<input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions		

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):*
Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

Brief description of cause:
This is a putative class action pursuant to the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

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 10/22/2019
 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD _____

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # _____
 AMOUNT _____
 APPLYING IFP _____
 JUDGE _____
 MAG. JUDGE _____

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Suit Claims 'Ringless' Marketing Voicemails Left by Texas Auto Dealer Violated the TCPA](#)
