

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

YVONNE MOSSERI, on behalf of herself
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

KIRSCHENBAUM, PHILLIPS & LEVY,
P.C.

Defendant.

Civil Action Number:

CIVIL ACTION
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
AND
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff YVONNE MOSSERI (hereinafter, “Plaintiff”), a New York resident, brings this class action complaint by and through her attorneys, The Law Office of Alan J. Sasson, P.C., against Defendant KIRSCHENBAUM, PHILLIPS & LEVY, P.C. (hereinafter “Defendant”), individually and on behalf of a class of all others similarly situated, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, based upon information and belief of Plaintiff’s counsel, except for allegations specifically pertaining to Plaintiff, which are based upon Plaintiff’s personal knowledge.

INTRODUCTION/PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. Congress enacted the FDCPA in 1977 in response to the “abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors.” 15 U.S.C. § 1692(a). At that time, Congress was concerned that “abusive debt collection practices contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to material instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy.” *Id.* Congress concluded that “existing laws . . . [we]re inadequate to protect consumers,” and that “the effective collection of debts” does not require “misrepresentation or other abusive debt collection practices.” 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692(b) & (c).
2. Congress explained that the purpose of the Act was not only to eliminate abusive debt collection practices, but also to “insure that those debt collectors who refrain from using

abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged.” *Id.* § 1692(e). After determining that the existing consumer protection laws were inadequate, *id.* § 1692(b), Congress gave consumers a private cause of action against debt collectors who fail to comply with the Act. *Id.* § 1692k.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The Court has jurisdiction over this class action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq.* and 28 U.S.C. § 2201. If applicable, the Court also has pendent jurisdiction over the state law claims in this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).
4. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

NATURE OF THE ACTION

5. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of a class of New York consumers seeking redress for Defendant’s illegal practices, in connection with the collection of a debt allegedly owed by Plaintiff.
6. Defendant's actions violated § 1692 *et seq.* of Title 15 of the United States Code, commonly referred to as the Fair Debt Collections Practices Act (“FDCPA”) which prohibits debt collectors from engaging in abusive, deceptive and unfair practices.
7. Plaintiff is seeking damages, and declaratory and injunctive relief.

PARTIES

8. Plaintiff is a natural person and a resident of the State of New York, and is a “Consumer” as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692(a)(3).
9. Defendant is a collection agency with an office maintained in Farmingdale, New York.
10. Defendant is a company that uses the mail, telephone, and facsimile and regularly engages in business the principal purpose of which is to attempt to collect debts alleged to be due another.
11. Defendant is a “debt collector,” as defined under the FDCPA under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

12. Plaintiff brings claims, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (hereinafter “FRCP”)

Rule 23, individually and on behalf of the following nationwide consumer class (the “Class”):

- All New York consumers who were sent collection letters and/or notices from Defendant attempting to collect an obligation owed to or allegedly owed to Discover Bank, in which Defendant improperly attempted to collect same, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692 *et seq.*
- The Class period begins one year to the filing of this Action.

13. The Class satisfies all the requirements of Rule 23 of the FRCP for maintaining a class action:

- Upon information and belief, the Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable because there are hundreds and/or thousands of persons who have received debt collection letters and/or notices from Defendant that violate specific provisions of the FDCPA. Plaintiff is complaining of a standard form letter and/or notice that is sent to hundreds of persons (*See **Exhibit A***, except that the undersigned attorney has, in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2 partially redacted the financial account numbers in an effort to protect Plaintiff’s privacy);
- There are questions of law and fact which are common to the Class and which predominate over questions affecting any individual Class member. These common questions of law and fact include, without limitation:
 - a. Whether Defendant violated various provisions of the FDCPA;
 - b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class have been injured by Defendant’s conduct;
 - c. Whether Plaintiff and the Class have sustained damages and are entitled to restitution as a result of Defendant’s wrongdoing and if so, what is the proper measure and appropriate statutory formula to be applied in

determining such damages and restitution; and

d. Whether Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to declaratory and/or injunctive relief.

- Plaintiff's claims are typical of the Class, which all arise from the same operative facts and are based on the same legal theories.
- Plaintiff has no interest adverse or antagonistic to the interest of the other members of the Class.
- Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interest of the Class and has retained experienced and competent attorneys to represent the Class.
- A Class Action is superior to other methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims herein asserted. Plaintiff anticipates that no unusual difficulties are likely to be encountered in the management of this class action.
- A Class Action will permit large numbers of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously and without the duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would engender. Class treatment will also permit the adjudication of relatively small claims by many Class members who could not otherwise afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein. Absent a Class Action, class members will continue to suffer losses of statutory protected rights as well as monetary damages. If Defendant's conduct is allowed proceed to without remedy they will continue to reap and retain the proceeds of their ill-gotten gains.

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

ALLEGATIONS PARTICULAR TO YVONNE MOSSERI

14. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs numbered “1” through “13” herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.
15. Defendant collects and attempts to collect debts incurred or alleged to have been incurred for personal, family or household purposes on behalf of creditors using the United States Postal Services, telephone and Internet.
16. Upon information and belief, within the last year Defendant commenced efforts to collect an alleged consumer “debt” as defined by 15 U.S.C. 1692a(5), when it mailed a Collection Letter to Plaintiff seeking to collect an unpaid debt allegedly owing to Barclays Bank Delaware.
17. On or around January 18, 2016, Defendant sent Plaintiff a collection letter. *See Exhibit A.*
18. The letter was sent or caused to be sent by persons employed by Defendant as a “debt collector” as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(6).
19. The letter is a “communication” as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(2).
20. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5) prohibits debt collectors from making a “threat to take any action that cannot legally be taken or that is not intended to be taken.”
21. Said letter states in pertinent part: “You pay 50% of the balance in one (1) payment of \$1,943.58. Payment must be received on or before February 17, 2016.”
22. This is effectively a threat to take action that Defendant does not intend to take, precisely because Defendant is authorized, and upon information and belief, will accept the proffered settlement at any time.

23. Congress adopted the provisions of section 1692e(5) with the stated intent to prohibit debt collectors from making a “threat to take any action that cannot legally be taken or that is not intended to be taken.”
24. Defendant’s violations of the FDCPA created the risk of real harm that the Plaintiff would perceive Defendant’s statement as a threat to take further action on the account when in reality Defendant’s offer is not a “take it or leave it” offer as it implies by its communication.
25. Defendant’s actions as described herein are part of a pattern and practice used to collect debts.
26. As a result of the following Counts Defendant violated the FDCPA.

First Count

Violation of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, *et seq*

False or Misleading Representations as to the Rights of the Consumer

27. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs numbered “1” through “26” herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.
28. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e prohibits a debt collector from using any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.
29. While § 1692e specifically prohibits certain practices, the list is non-exhaustive, and does not preclude a claim of falsity or deception based on any non-enumerated practice.
30. Collection letters are deceptive if they can be reasonably read to have two or more different meanings, one of which is inaccurate.
31. Said offer falsely states or implies that the respective settlement offer is valid only if “Payment [is] received on or before February 17, 2016.”
32. Statements that a settlement offer is a “limited time offer,” or that the offer expires on a specific date, or that payments must be received by that date, are false and misleading because the same offer is, upon information and belief, available at any time.

33. Such false statements are materially false statements, as they impart in the unsophisticated consumer, a false belief that he or she must hurry to take advantage of a limited time opportunity, when in reality, there is no such time limit.
34. The Seventh Circuit has established “safe harbor” language regarding settlement offers in collection letters: As in previous cases in which we have created safe-harbor language for use in cases under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, we think the present concern can be adequately addressed yet the unsophisticated consumer still be protected against receiving a false impression of his options by the debt collector's including with the offer the following language: “We are not obligated to renew this offer.” The word “obligated” is strong and even the unsophisticated consumer will realize that there is a renewal possibility but that it is not assured. *Evory v. RJM Acquisitions Funding L.L.C.*, 505 F.3d 769, 775-76 (7th Cir. 2007).
35. Even more confounding to the least sophisticated consumer is when in fact payment may be *sent*, albeit not yet received, without losing the opportunity to accept the offer.
36. Defendant did not use the safe harbor language in its communication to Plaintiff.
37. Upon information and belief, the deadline in Exhibit A to respond to the settlement offer is a sham. There is no actual deadline. The sole purpose of the purported deadline is to impart in the consumer a false sense of urgency.
38. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e generally prohibits “any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.”
39. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) specifically prohibits the “use of any false representation or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect any debt.”
40. 15 U.S.C. § 1692f generally prohibits “unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt.”

41. The statement in Defendant's March 23, 2016 Letter is false and misleading, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(2), and 1692e(10).
42. Defendant could have taken the steps necessary to bring its actions within compliance of the FDCPA, but neglected to do so and failed to adequately review its actions to ensure conformance to the law.

Second Count
Violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e
False or Misleading Representations as to Plaintiff's Rights

43. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs numbered "1" through "42" herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.
44. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e prohibits a debt collector from using any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.
45. While § 1692e specifically prohibits certain practices, the list is non-exhaustive, and does not preclude a claim of falsity or deception based on any non-enumerated practice.
46. For purposes of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e, the failure to clearly provide the consumer with complete and accurate information notifying them of their rights and obligations is unfair and deceptive to the least sophisticated consumer.
47. Under 26 C.F.R. §1.6050P-1(d)(2) and (3), only the discharge of principal need be reported:
 - (2) Interest. The discharge of an amount of indebtedness that is interest **is not required to be reported** under this section.
 - (3) Non-principal amounts in lending transactions. In the case of a lending transaction, the discharge of an amount other than stated principal **is not required to be reported** under this section. For this purpose, a lending transaction is any transaction in which a lender loans money to, or makes advances on behalf of, a borrower (including revolving credits and lines of credit).

48. It is thus entirely conceivable to forgive amounts of a debt and yet not report the balances forgiven to the Internal Revenue Service.
49. A collection notice is deceptive when it reasonably can be read to have two or more different meanings, one of which is inaccurate.¹
50. The question of whether a collection letter is deceptive is determined from the perspective of the “least sophisticated consumer.”
51. The language in the letter that states “This settlement may have tax consequences” could reasonably be understood by the least sophisticated consumer to mean that IRS regulations require that it report *all* forgiveness of debt.
52. The least sophisticated consumer would understand this statement to mean that the creditor is required by IRS regulations to report forgiveness of debt.
53. Although Defendant had no duty to disclose any potential tax ramifications,² when FIA chooses to give tax disclosures, it must do so in a way that it will not mislead the least sophisticated consumer as to his or her tax consequences.
54. Current case law has made clear, that if debt collectors are providing tax advice with regards to the reporting of forgiveness of debt, they cannot provide vague, incomplete and misleading disclosures that leave out the essential element that the reporting of forgiveness of a debt happens **only if** the principal forgiven exceeds \$600, and that reporting of forgiveness of a debt would not happen even if the amount is greater than \$600, if the \$600 or greater amount forgiven contained interest forgiveness, so long as the principal was less than \$600.

¹ *Pipiles v. Credit Bureau of Lockport, Inc.*, 886 F.2d 22, 25 (2d Cir. 1989). (Because the collection notice was reasonably susceptible to an inaccurate reading, it was deceptive within the meaning of the Act.); *Clomon v. Jackson*, 988 F.2d 1314, 1319 (2d Cir. 1993). (Collection notices are deceptive if they are open to more than one reasonable interpretation, at least one of which is inaccurate.); *Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.*, 74 F.3d 30, 34 (2d Cir. N.Y. 1996). (A collection notice is deceptive when it can be reasonably read to have two or more different meanings, one of which is inaccurate. The fact that the notice's terminology was vague or uncertain will not prevent it from being held deceptive under § 1692e(10) of the Act.)

² See. *Altman v. J.C. Christensen & Assocs.*, 786 F.3d 191, 194, 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 7980, *7 (2d Cir. N.Y. 2015). “[T]he FDCPA does not require a debt collector to make any affirmative disclosures of potential tax consequences when collecting a debt.”)

55. The statement “This settlement may have tax consequences” is ambiguous, yet the vagueness and uncertainty does not erase the fundamental mischief and deception that the statement intends to cause to the consumer.
56. A consumer reading this statement will be led to believe that if a settlement erases any amount of the debt, then the creditor is required to report the forgiveness of debt to the IRS, per the IRS regulations (creating by fear of the IRS another incentive for the consumer to pay the debt without erasing any amount through settlement).
57. However, this statement is inherently deceptive and misleading, by giving erroneous and incomplete tax information, because in actual fact and according to IRS regulations, the creditor "**will not**" be required to report to the IRS report forgiveness of debt less than \$600, nor would the creditor be required to report an amount greater than \$600 in forgiveness if the amount contained interest.
58. If the creditor legitimately wishes to give tax advice in a sincere manner, one that does not mislead the consumer, then that creditor should specify and make clear to the least sophisticated consumer that only certain amounts require reporting, and that this applies only to principle and not to interest forgiveness.
59. The creditor should also specify what amount is principle and what part of it is interest owed. Any tax advice that does not specify the tax consequences as it applies to the consumer's circumstances is nothing more than a ploy to elicit a more substantial payment from the consumer than the consumer would have paid, had he or she understood the tax reporting consequences.
60. The use of the words “**This settlement may have tax consequences**” is an attempt by the debt collector to make the debtor think that the IRS regulations require the reporting of all

forgiveness of debt above a certain amount. The least sophisticated consumer would reasonably read the letter to mean that the creditor will report all forgiveness of debt above a certain amount as is required by IRS regulations.³

61. In a recent decision, this court found in the case of *Kaff v. Nationwide Credit, Inc.*, 1:13-cv-05413, No. 32 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2015) (Towns, J.) that a statement regarding the requirement to file a 1099: "was not strictly true under all circumstances because **it failed to apprise debtors** that possible exceptions could apply to the creditor's mandatory reporting requirement, such as the exceptions **for interest and other non-principal debts.**" *Kaff v. Nationwide Credit, Inc.*, 1:13-cv-05413, No. 32 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2015) (Towns, J.) (emphasis added); see also *Good v. Nationwide Credit, Inc.*, No. 14-4295, 2014 BL 302150 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 24, 2014). (finding that the statement "American Express is required to file a form 1099C with the Internal Revenue Service for any cancelled debt of \$600 or more. Please consult your tax advisor concerning any tax questions" is not true and does not accurately reflect the relevant law the court also found that the statement's invocation of the IRS was deceptive and materially misleading in violation of the FDCPA).
62. Defendant tends to give erroneous and/or incomplete tax advice to consumers.
63. Such a statement in a collection letter suggests to the least sophisticated consumer that failure to pay will get the consumer into trouble with the IRS.⁴
64. The statement in said January 18, 2016 letter is false and misleading, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(2), and 1692e(10).

³ *Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.*, 74 F.3d 30, 35, 1996 U.S. App. LEXIS 1042, *13 (2d Cir. N.Y. 1996). (That a notice's terminology is vague or uncertain will not prevent it from being held deceptive under 1692e.)

⁴ *Kaff v. Nationwide Credit, Inc.*, 1:13-cv-05413, No. 32 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2015) (Towns, J.); *Wagner v. Client Services, Inc.*, No. 08-5546, 2009 WL 839073, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26604 (E.D.Pa., March 26, 2009); *Sledge v. Sands*, 182 F.R.D. 255 (N.D.Ill. 1998).

65. Defendant could have taken the steps necessary to bring its actions within compliance of the FDCPA, but neglected to do so and failed to adequately review its actions to ensure conformance to the law.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant as follows:

- (a) Declaring that this action is properly maintainable as a Class Action and certifying Plaintiff as Class representative, and Alan J. Sasson, Esq., as Class Counsel;
- (b) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class statutory damages;
- (c) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class actual damages;
- (d) Awarding Plaintiff costs of this Action, including reasonable attorney fees and expenses;
- (e) Awarding pre-judgment interest and post-judgment interest; and
- (f) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Alan J. Sasson
Alan J. Sasson, Esq. (AS8452)
Law Office of Alan J. Sasson, P.C.
2687 Coney Island Avenue, 2nd Floor
Brooklyn, New York 11235
Phone: (718) 339-0856
Facsimile: (347) 244-7178
Attorney for Plaintiff

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

/s/ Alan J. Sasson

Alan J. Sasson, Esq.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
November 25, 2016

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

YVONNE MOSSERI, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,

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

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

LAW OFFICE OF ALAN J. SASSON, P.C., 2687 Coney Island Avenue, 2nd Floor, Brooklyn, NY 11235

DEFENDANTS

KIRSCHENBAUM, PHILLIPS & LEVY, P.C.

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.

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)

- Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, PTF DEF, 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)

Table with 5 columns: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES. Contains various legal categories and checkboxes.

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, 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): 15 USC 1692

Brief description of cause: Defendant violated the FDCPA

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

11/25/2016

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

/s/ Alan J. Sasson

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

CERTIFICATION OF ARBITRATION ELIGIBILITY

Local Arbitration Rule 83.10 provides that with certain exceptions, actions seeking money damages only in an amount not in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs, are eligible for compulsory arbitration. The amount of damages is presumed to be below the threshold amount unless a certification to the contrary is filed.

I, ALAN J. SASSON, counsel for PLAINTIFF, do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is ineligible for compulsory arbitration for the following reason(s):

- monetary damages sought are in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs,
the complaint seeks injunctive relief,
the matter is otherwise ineligible for the following reason: Question of law rather than question of fact predominates

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT - FEDERAL RULES CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1

Identify any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more of its stocks:

NONE

RELATED CASE STATEMENT (Section VIII on the Front of this Form)

Please list all cases that are arguably related pursuant to Division of Business Rule 50.3.1 in Section VIII on the front of this form. Rule 50.3.1 (a) provides that "A civil case is "related" to another civil case for purposes of this guideline when, because of the similarity of facts and legal issues or because the cases arise from the same transactions or events, a substantial saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to the same judge and magistrate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that " A civil case shall not be deemed "related" to another civil case merely because the civil case: (A) involves identical legal issues, or (B) involves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that "Presumptively, and subject to the power of a judge to determine otherwise pursuant to paragraph (d), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still pending before the court."

NY-E DIVISION OF BUSINESS RULE 50.1(d)(2)

- 1.) Is the civil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk County? NO
2.) If you answered "no" above:
a) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffolk County? NO
b) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern District? YES

If your answer to question 2 (b) is "No," does the defendant (or a majority of the defendants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or Suffolk County, or, in an interpleader action, does the claimant (or a majority of the claimants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or Suffolk County?

(Note: A corporation shall be considered a resident of the County in which it has the most significant contacts).

BAR ADMISSION

I am currently admitted in the Eastern District of New York and currently a member in good standing of the bar of this court.

- Yes No

Are you currently the subject of any disciplinary action (s) in this or any other state or federal court?

- Yes (If yes, please explain) No

I certify the accuracy of all information provided above.

Signature: /s/ Alan J. Sasson

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

YVONNE MOSSERI, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

KIRSCHENBAUM, PHILLIPS & LEVY, P.C.

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) KIRSCHENBAUM, PHILLIPS & LEVY, P.C. 40 DANIEL STREET SUITE 7 FARMINGDALE, NEW YORK 11735

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

LAW OFFICE OF ALAN J. SASSON, P.C. 2687 CONEY ISLAND AVENUE, 2ND FLOOR BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11235

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT

Date:

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received by me on *(date)* _____ .

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____ ; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* _____
_____, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,
on *(date)* _____ , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* _____ , who is
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____ ; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because _____ ; or

Other *(specify)*:

My fees are \$ _____ for travel and \$ _____ for services, for a total of \$ _____ 0.00 _____ .

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Kirschenbaum, Phillips & Levy, P.C.

Attorneys at Law

40 Daniel Street, Suite 7, P.O. Box 9000 Farmingdale, NY 11735-9000

Telephone: (516) 746-1144 Fax: (516) 742-2735 Toll Free: (866) 746-1144

January 18, 2016

Re: Our File Number: [REDACTED] 43
DISCOVER BANK
YVONNE A MOSSERI
Account Number: *****2193
Current Balance: \$3,887.15
Default Date: May 14, 2014
Original Creditor: DISCOVER BANK
Creditor: DISCOVER BANK

Dear YVONNE A MOSSERI,

INCOME TAX SEASON IS HERE. A PERFECT TIME TO RESOLVE YOUR FINANCIAL MATTERS

We are authorized to extend to you the opportunity to settle this debt.

Below are the options, please select one:

- A. _____ One payment: You pay 50% of the balance in one (1) payment of \$1,943.58. Payment must be received on or before February 17, 2016
- B. _____ Three payments: You pay 60% of the balance \$2,332.29 in three (3) monthly payments of \$777.43 each. First payment due February 17, 2016 followed by two (2) consecutive payments of \$777.43 due on the same day each successive month.
- C. _____ Nine payments: You pay 70% of the balance \$2,721.01 in nine (9) monthly payments of \$302.33 each. First payment of \$302.33 due on or before February 17, 2016 followed by eight (8) consecutive payments of \$302.33 due on the same day each successive month.

Please forward the payment payable to KIRSCHENBAUM, PHILLIPS & LEVY, P.C., to P.O. Box 9000, Farmingdale, NY 11735-9000. Please be sure to include our file number DC13243 on the payment to ensure prompt crediting.

This settlement may have tax consequences.

We accept various methods of payment for your convenience. You can also make payments online from your bank account at www.kppayment.com. Please use our Reference Number DC13243.

You may also contact our office at 866-746-1144 to setup a repayment plan on full balance.

Very truly yours,
Kirschenbaum, Phillips & Levy, P.C.

WE ARE DEBT COLLECTORS. THIS IS AN ATTEMPT TO COLLECT A DEBT AND ANY INFORMATION OBTAINED WILL BE USED FOR THAT PURPOSE.

400CLKIRP01A-TAX3

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Debt Collection Class Action Filed Against Kirschenbaum, Phillips & Levy](#)
