JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

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				DEFENDANTS					
Irina Mushaeva				Certified Credit & Collection Bureau					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff New York, NY (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Branchburg, NJ (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) Kalikhman & Rayz, LLC 1051 County Line Road Suite A Huntingdon Valley, PA 19006 (215) 364-5030				Attorneys (If Known)	1				
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				TIZENSHIP OF F	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box fo		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	✓ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)				TF DEF	Incorporated or Pri		nt) DEF 4	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)				of Business In Another State			□ 5 _.	
	8000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000			n or Subject of a	3 0 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6 ———	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	FO	Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions. FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES							
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment Œ Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans Œ (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise ■ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY Product Liability Product Liability Personal Injury Product Liability 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 560 Civil Detainee Conditions of Confinement	TY = 710 740 75 79	DATE TURE PENALTY 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 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	422 Appe	cal 28 USC 158 drawal ISC 157 RTY RIGHTS rrights att - Abbreviated Drug Application emark SECURITY (1395ff) k Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g))	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) □ 400 State Reapportion □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Bankin □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenc Corrupt Organizati □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Common Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Ac □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Mat □ 895 Freedom of Inform Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Pro Act/Review or App Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	ed and ons dities/ tions ters aution cedure	
	moved from	Appellate Court	Reop	(specify	er District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer		n -	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N Fair Debt Collecti Brief description of ca	on Practices Act, 1	5 U.S.C.		itutes unless di	versity):			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.				DEMAND S CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes ONo					
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER									
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD FOR OFFICE USE ONLY									
Ť	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE _		MAG. JUD	GE .		

Case 2:18-cv-01540-JD Document 1 Filed 04/12/18 Page 2 of 19

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar. Address of Plaintiff: C/o Kalikhman & Rayz, LLC 1051 County Line Rd., Suite "A" Huntingdon Valley, PA Address of Defendant: 69 Readington Road Branchburg, NJ 08876 Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Bucks County (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? $_{\mathrm{Yes}}\square$ No 🖾 (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) N_0 Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? Yes□ RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: _ Judge Date Terminated: Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes□ No□ 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes□ No□ 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously $_{
m Yes}\square$ terminated action in this court? 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? $_{\rm Yes}\Box$ $N_0\square$ CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. □ FELA 2. □ Airplane Personal Injury 3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. □ Assault, Defamation 4. □ Antitrust 4. □ Marine Personal Injury 5. □ Patent □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. □ Labor-Management Relations 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7.

Civil Rights 7. □ Products Liability 8. □ Habeas Corpus 8.

Products Liability — Asbestos 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11.

△ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. DATE: 4/5/2018 87976 Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.# NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

Attorney-at-Law

87976

Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (6/08)

DATE: 4/5/2018

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Mushaeva		:	CIVIL ACTION					
		:						
V.		:						
Certified Credit & Collect	ion Bureau	:	NO.					
plaintiff shall complete a Ca filing the complaint and serv side of this form.) In the designation, that defendant	se Management to a copy on all devent that a def shall, with its first tries, a Case Ma	t Track Desible fendants. (Sendant does rst appearant magement T	by Reduction Plan of this court, counsing ignation Form in all civil cases at the time (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reson to agree with the plaintiff regarding the, submit to the clerk of court and ser Track Designation Form specifying the igned.	me of everse g said ve on				
SELECT ONE OF THE F	OLLOWING C	CASE MAN	AGEMENT TRACKS:					
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.								
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.								
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2								
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvexposure to asbestos.	ing claims for p	personal inju	ry or property damage from	()				
	complex and the	hat need spe	acks (a) through (d) that are scial or intense management by ed explanation of special					
management cases.)				(x)				
(f) Standard Management –	Cases that do r	ot fall into	any one of the other tracks.	()				
4/5/2018			Plaintiff					
Date	Attorney-	-at-law	Attorney for					
(215) 364-5030	(215) 364	-5029	erayz@kalraylaw.com					
Telephone	FAX Nu	mber	E-Mail Address					

(Civ. 660) 10/02

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IRINA MUSHAEVA, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

CERTIFIED CREDIT & COLLECTION BUREAU a/k/a Certified Credit & Collection Bureau, Inc.; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

Jury Trial Demanded

Plaintiff Irina Mushaeva ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, alleges as follows:

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

- 1. This is an action for damages brought by a consumer pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (hereinafter "FDCPA"), 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq.
- 2. In effectuating the FDCPA, Congress sought to limit the tactics a debt collector could use. Despite these plain truths, Defendant (defined herein) used inappropriate tactics to collect Plaintiff's debt.
- 3. Upon information and belief, Defendant used these very same tactics across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania against hundreds, if not thousands, of individuals who, fall within the ambit of the protections of the FDCPA.
 - 4. Absent this action, Defendant's inappropriate tactics would continue unabated.
- 5. Indeed, as set forth below in detail, Defendant has continued its illegal tactics despite a recent court order, asserting that Defendant's actions violate the FDCPA.

II. THE PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff is an adult individual, who is currently a resident of the State of New York.
- 7. Plaintiff is a "consumer," as that term is defined and/or contemplated within the scope of FDCPA.
- 8. Defendant Certified Credit & Collection Bureau a/k/a Certified Credit & Collection Bureau, Inc. is a commercial entity that regularly conducts business in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, is engaged in the business of debt collection within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and may be served at 69 Readington Rd, Branchburg, NJ 08876.
 - 9. Indeed, on its own website, Defendant describes itself as follows:



See http://www.certifiedcollection.com/, last visited on April 5, 2018.

10. Further, on the same website, Defendants provides a detailed description of the

following services that it offers:



<u>Id.</u>

- 11. Plaintiff is unaware of the names and capacities of those defendants sued as DOES 1 through 10, but will seek leave to amend this complaint once their identities become known to Plaintiff. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that at all relevant times each defendant, including the DOE defendants 1 through 10, was the officer, director, employee, agent, representative, alter ego, or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, and in engaging in the conduct alleged herein was in the course and scope of and in furtherance of such relationship.
- 12. Unless otherwise specified, Plaintiff will refer to all defendants collectively as "Defendant" and each allegation pertains to each Defendant.
- 13. Defendant is a "debt collector," as that term is defined and/or contemplated within the scope of FDCPA.

- 14. Defendant uses instrumentalities of interstate commerce and mail in a business, whose principal purpose is collection of debts and/or regularly collects (or attempts to collect), directly or indirectly, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another.
- 15. At all times material hereto, Defendant acted and/or failed to act in person and/or through duly authorized agents, servants, workmen, and/or employees, acting within the scope and course of their authority and/or employment for and/or on behalf of Defendant.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 16. This Honorable Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k and 28 U.S.C. § 1337.
- 17. The Eastern District of Pennsylvania is the proper venue for this litigation, because:
 - a. Defendant's wrongful conduct was directed to and was undertaken within the territory of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania; and
 - Defendant conducts a substantial portion of its business in the Eastern
 District of Pennsylvania.

IV. STATEMENT OF CLAIMS

A. BACKGROUND

- 18. On April 28, 2017, Plaintiff was involved in a motor vehicle accident that caused Plaintiff to suffer from various physical injuries.
- 19. Although Plaintiff's injuries were not life-threatening, immediately after the accident, Plaintiff went to a hospital ("Provider") for evaluation and treatment.
- 20. At the time of the accident, Plaintiff was covered by an automobile liability insurance policy, provided by Erie Insurance Company to her daughter, who resides in Bucks

4

County, Pennsylvania.

- 21. Also, at the time of the accident, Plaintiff resided in the State of New Jersey, but has since relocated to the State of New York.
- 22. All automobile liability insurance policies in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania include medical benefit coverage. See 75 Pa.C.S. §§ 1702, 7111.
- 23. After the accident, Plaintiff was provided medical benefit coverage by Erie Insurance Company, as required by Pennsylvania law. Notably, Erie Insurance Company does not issue policies in the State of New Jersey.
- 24. On or about February 12, 2018, Defendant sent a letter to Plaintiff, written on behalf of the Provider, regarding Plaintiff's alleged obligation to pay the Provider for the above-referenced evaluation and treatment ("Demand Letter"). A true and correct copy of this document (redacted for purposes of privacy) is marked and attached hereto as Exhibit "A."
 - 25. At the time of Defendant's correspondence, the alleged obligation was in default.
- 26. The Demand Letter was addressed to Plaintiff, but was sent to her daughter's residence in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. <u>See</u> Exhibit "A."
- 27. Defendant's correspondence explicitly identifies \$100.00 as the "Balance Due." See Exhibit "A."
- 28. Accordingly, Defendant's correspondence explicitly stated and/or otherwise implied that Plaintiff owed the "Balance Due" and that Defendant was entitled to collect that amount from Plaintiff. See Exhibit "A."
- 29. Indeed, by sending the Demand Letter, Defendant sought to collect the "Balance Due" from Plaintiff.
 - 30. With respect to automobile insurance policies issued in the Commonwealth of

Pennsylvania, the extent of liability for the cost of treatment received for an injury incurred in a motor vehicle accident is limited by the cost containment provisions of the Motor Vehicle Financial Responsibility Law (hereinafter "MVFRL"), 75 Pa.C.S. § 1701 et seq.

- 31. The specific provision of the MVFRL, in relevant part, declares:
 - [a] person or institution providing treatment, accommodations, products or services to an injured person for an injury covered by liability or uninsured and underinsured benefits or first party medical benefits . . . **shall not require, request or accept payment** for the treatment, accommodation, products or services in excess of 110% of the prevailing charge at the 75th percentile; 110% of the applicable fee schedule, the recommended fee or the inflation index charge; or 110% of the diagnostic-related groups (DRG) payment; whichever pertains to the specialty service involved, determined to be applicable in this Commonwealth under the Medicare program for comparable services at the time the services were rendered, or the provider's usual and customary charge, whichever is less.

75 Pa.C.S. § 1797(a)(emphasis supplied).

- 32. This cost containment provision, commonly known as the "Act 6 Reduction," has been interpreted to mean that, "if Medicare makes any payment for a particular service, then reimbursement for purposes of automobile insurance will be limited to 110% of that amount." Hospital Association of Pennsylvania, Inc. v. Foster, 629 A.2d 1055, 1057-8 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1993); see also Pittsburgh Neurosurgery Associates, Inc. v. Danner, 733 A.2d 1279 (Pa. Super. 1999).
- 33. Here, the alleged "Balance Due" that Defendant sought to collect \$100.00 is the total outstanding balance claimed by the Provider, without application of the Act 6 Reduction.
- 34. In fact, neither the Provider nor the Defendant even attempted to re-calculate the "Balance Due" to determine what the Provider may ask for, much less is entitled to receive,

under the MVFRL.

- 35. Indeed, the actual amount that the Provider is entitled to under the MVFRL is significantly less than the "Balance Due" stated in Defendant's correspondence.
- 36. As the Demand Letter demonstrates, Defendant was clearly acting on the Provider's behalf.
- 37. The MVRFL explicitly forbids Provider and, correspondingly, anyone acting on Provider's behalf, to "require, request or accept payment" of more than the statute allows. 75 Pa.C.S. § 1797(a).
- 38. Section 1692f(1) of the FDCPA specifically prohibits "[t]he collection of any amount (including any interest, fee, charge, or expense incidental to the principal obligation) unless such amount is expressly authorized by the agreement creating the debt or permitted by law." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f(1).
- 39. As described herein, Defendant's actions violated the applicable provisions of the FDCPA, in that, Defendant explicitly claimed that Plaintiff owed an amount that was in excess of what its client the Provider was permitted by law to collect (or even ask for) under the MVFRL.
- 40. Moreover, it is believed and, therefore, averred that Defendant has no procedures to avoid collecting more than what is permitted under the MVFRL.
- 41. Accordingly, Defendant systematically and as a matter of practice, ignores the MVFRL and its Act 6 Reduction.
- 42. Further, upon information and belief, Defendant did nothing to investigate the entities or persons that hired, retained, or engaged Defendant to collect the alleged debt at issue in Plaintiff's Complaint, before first contacting Plaintiff.

- 43. Additionally, upon information and belief, Defendant has never made any inquiry or otherwise investigate the legitimacy or accuracy of Plaintiff's alleged debt, before first contacting Plaintiff.
- 44. Defendant, therefore, could not have reasonably relied upon the information provided to Defendant about the alleged debt at issue in Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 45. Moreover, Defendant's reliance on the information provided by the Provider was not reasonable or justified, as even a cursory review of Plaintiff's alleged obligation would have revealed that: (a) Plaintiff was covered by an automobile liability insurance policy issued in Pennsylvania; (b) the "Balance Due" that Defendant was being asked to collect is the total outstanding balance claimed by the Provider, without application of the Act 6 Reduction; and (c) Defendant was attempting to collect from Plaintiff more than what is allowed under Pennsylvania law.
- 46. Indeed, it appears that Defendant has deliberately ignored and/or willfully avoided any investigation or inquiry of the underlying debt, as well as the entities or persons that hired, retained, or engaged Defendant to collect it.
- 47. In fact, Defendant regularly sends letters to individuals, who are covered by an automobile liability insurance policy issued in Pennsylvania, that seek payment of a balance without the Act 6 Reduction being applied.
- 48. Upon information and belief, Defendant has no procedures in place that are designed to avoid collecting more than what is permitted under the MVFRL.
- 49. Further, upon information and belief, Defendant has never attempted to apply the Act 6 Reduction to any balances it has sought to collect.
 - 50. Defendant's conduct, as alleged herein, is (and was) deliberate, intentional,

8

reckless, willful, and wanton.

- 51. Defendant's conduct, as alleged herein, is unfair, misleading, deceptive, and unconscionable.
- 52. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have been (and will continue to be) financially damaged due to Defendant's conduct, as set forth herein.
- 53. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have suffered and will continue to suffer actual damages due to Defendants' conduct, as set forth herein.
- 54. As such, Plaintiff avers that Defendant's conduct, as described herein, was not limited to the circumstances described herein, but was, and is, habitual, systematic, ongoing, and unrelenting in Defendant's business model and practice.
- 55. Plaintiff avers that the purpose of Defendant's behavior described herein (as well as their day-to-day business operation), is to deceive unsuspecting consumers, wherever and whenever possible, to achieve, *inter alia*, the objectives of obtaining additional revenue and profit for Defendant's business enterprise.
- 56. Plaintiff avers that Defendant has utilized various methods calculated to confuse, mislead, distract, coerce, and convert consumers' funds for Defendant's benefit, by employing unethical business practices to secure pure financial gain and unjust financial enrichment.
- 57. Plaintiff further states that Defendant's practices continue unabated, and will continue well beyond the end of this case, for which Defendants have and/or will reap hundreds of thousands of dollars in unearned ill-gotten gains from unsuspecting consumers.
- 58. Irrespective of Plaintiff's and the Class members' actions, the aforementioned correspondence sent by Defendant to Plaintiff and members of the Class was false, misleading, and, at a minimum, in violation of the FDCPA.

9

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 59. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and a class of similarly-situated individuals pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23.
- 60. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action for Defendant's violations of the FDCPA on behalf of the following class of individuals: All natural persons, who do not reside in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, who were sent a letter, substantially in the form represented by Exhibit "A" (the "Class"), concerning a debt for medical treatment or evaluation that were incurred following a motor vehicle accident, where no Act 6 Reduction was applied, during the statutory period covered by this Complaint.
- 61. The number of individuals in the Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. The exact number of members of the Class can be determined by reviewing Defendant's records. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that there are over a hundred individuals in the defined Class.
- 62. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class and have retained counsel that is experienced and competent in class action and FDCPA litigation. See, e.g., Magness v. Bank of America, N.A., et al., Docket No. 12-cv-6586 (Davis, J.)(final approval granted); Volyansky v. Hayt, Hayt & Landau, LLC, Docket No. 2:13-cv-03360 (McHugh, J.)(final approval granted); Ebner v. United Recovery Systems, LP, et al., Docket No. 14-cv-06881 (Beetlestone, J.)(final approval granted).
- 63. Plaintiff has no interests that are contrary to, or in conflict with, members of the Class.
- 64. A class action suit, such as the instant one, is superior to other available means for fair and efficient adjudication of this lawsuit. The damages suffered by individual members of

the Class may be relatively small when compared to the expense and burden of litigation, making it virtually impossible for members of the Class to individually seek redress for the wrongs done to them.

- 65. A class action is, therefore, superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy. Absent these actions, members of the Class likely will not obtain redress of their injuries, and Defendant will retain the proceeds of its violations of the FDCPA.
- 66. Furthermore, even if any member of the Class could afford individual litigation against Defendant, it would be unduly burdensome to the judicial system. Concentrating this litigation in one forum will promote judicial economy and parity among the claims of individual members of the Class and provide for judicial consistency.
- 67. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact affecting the Class as a whole. The questions of law and fact common to each of the Class predominate over any questions affecting solely individual members of the action. Among the common questions of law and fact are:
 - a. Whether Defendant is a "debt collector," as that term is defined under the FDCPA;
 - b. Whether Defendant's correspondence is a "communication" as that term is defined under the FDCPA;
 - c. Whether Defendant's correspondence is an attempt to collect a debt;
 - d. Whether Defendant's correspondence violated the FDCPA; and
 - e. Whether Plaintiff and the members of the Class have sustained damages and, if so, the proper measure of damages.

- 68. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of members of the Class.
- 69. Plaintiff and members of the Class have sustained damages arising out the same wrongful and uniform practices of Defendant.
- 70. Plaintiff knows of no difficulty that will be encountered in the management of this litigation that would preclude its continued maintenance.

COUNT I FDCPA (On Behalf of the Class)

- 71. Plaintiff hereby incorporates all facts and allegations of this document by reference, as if fully set forth at length herein.
 - 72. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined under the FDCPA.
- 73. An attempt to collect upon a debt incurred during the course of personal medical treatment falls within the scope of the FDCPA. See Pipiles v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 886 F.2d 22 (2nd Cir. 1989); Adams v. Law Offices of Stuckert & Yates, 926 F.Supp 521 (E.D.Pa. 1996).
- 74. As described herein, the actions of Defendant violate state law and, thus, the applicable provisions of the FDCPA. See Kojetin v. CU Recovery, Inc., 212 F.3d 1318 (8th Cir. 2000)(finding that a percentage-based collection fee violated the FDCPA when state law prohibited such a fee); Fox v. Citicorp Credit Services, Inc., 15 F.3d 1507 (9th Cir. 1994)(finding that a violation of state garnishment procedures was a violation of FDCPA); Flores v. Quick Collect, Inc., 2007 WL 433239 (D.Or. 2007)(finding that the use of illegal or improper state summons may constitute an "unfair or unconscionable means" to collect the debt under 15 U.S.C. § 1692f); Mejia v. Marauder Corp., 2007 WL 806486 (N.D.Cal. 2007)(holding that addition of extra interest to the underlying balance, which was above the state law limitation, was a violation of the FDCPA); Van Westrienen v. Americontinental Collection Corp., 94

F.Supp.2d 1087 (D.Or. 2000)(finding that a consumer established a violation of FDCPA where the debt collector threatened seizure or garnishment within five days of notice to consumer, contrary to a state-mandated waiting period).

- 75. Further, courts have also held that the FDCPA is violated when a defendant mischaracterizes the debt owed. See, e.g., Stanley v. Stupar, Schuster & Cooper, S.C., 136 F. Supp. 2d 957 (E.D. Wis. 2001)(holding that a collector's description of the amount of the debt as "\$987.71, plus attorneys' fees" at the time when no attorneys' fees were owed violated the FDCPA).
- 76. Defendant's violations with respect to its collection efforts, include but are not limited to, seeking payment of an amount in excess of what Defendant was allowed to collect, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692f(1), as well as 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(prohibiting false, misleading, and/or deceptive statements concerning "the character, amount, or legal status of any debt") and 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10)(prohibiting "false representation or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect any debt").
- 77. As a result of Defendant's violations of the FDCPA, Plaintiff and the proposed Class has suffered damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

V. <u>CLAIM FOR RELIEF</u>

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully prays for:

- (a) Designation of this action as a class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23;
- (b) Designation of Plaintiff as representative of the Class;
- (c) Designation of Plaintiff's counsel as class counsel for the Class;
- (d) A Declaration that Defendant has violated the applicable provisions of the FDCPA;

- (e) An Order enjoining Defendant from any further violations of the
- FDCPA;

Date: <u>April 5, 2018</u>

- (f) Actual damages;
- (g) Statutory damages;
- (h) Attorneys' fees and costs; and
- (i) Such other relief as the Honorable Court shall deem just and appropriate.

VI. <u>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</u>

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury as to all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

KALIKHMAN & RAYZ, LLC

Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esquire Demetri A. Braynin, Esquire

1051 County Line Road, Suite "A"

Huntingdon Valley, PA 19006

Telephone: (215) 364-5030 Facsimile: (215) 364-5029 E-mail: erayz@kalraylaw.com E-mail: dbraynin@kalraylaw.com

CONNOLLY WELLS & GRAY, LLP

Gerald D. Wells, III, Esquire Robert J. Gray, Esquire

2200 Renaissance Blvd., Suite 275

King of Prussia, PA 19406

Telephone: (610) 822-3702 Facsimile: (610) 822-3800

Email: gwells@cwglaw.com Email: rgray@cwglaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiff(s) and the Proposed Class

EXHIBIT "A"

Case 2:18-cv-01540-JD Document 1 Filed 04/12/18 Page 19 of 19

CERTIFIED CREDIT & COLLECTION BUREAU

PO BOX 1750 WHITEHOUSE STATION, NJ 08889 CERTIFIEDCCB.COM | 888.750.9500 | FAX 908.707.8780

IRINA MUSHAEVA

TOLL FREE 888-750-2300
DATE: FEB 12 2018
RE: OVERLOOK HOSPITAL-OP
PATIENT: IRINA MUSHAEVA
ACCOUNT #
DATE OF SERVICE: 04/28/17

FILE #

The above account has been placed with us for collection.

Unless you notify this office within 30 days after receiving this notice that you dispute the validity of the debt or any portion thereof, this office will assume this debt is valid. If you notify this office in writing within 30 days from receiving this notice, this office will: obtain verification of the debt or obtain a copy of a judgment and mail you a copy of such verification or judgment. If you request this office in writing within 30 days after receiving this notice, this office will provide you with the name and address of the original creditor, if different from the current creditor.

This is an attempt to collect a debt by a debt collector and any information obtained will be used for that purpose.

Kindly remit payment with the bottom portion of this statement.

VERY TRULY YOURS,

WE ACCEPT ALL MAJOR CREDIT CARDS CERTIFIED CREDIT & COLLECTION BUREAU

WESTERN QUICK UNION COLLECT

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR IMPORTANT INFORMATION

PLEASE ENCLOSE THIS PORTION WITH YOUR PAYMENT

CLIENT: OVERLOOK HOSPITAL-OP

ACCOUNT #

DATE: FEB 12 2018

FILE #

BALANCE DUE: 100.00

IRINA MUSHAEVA 661 CROFT DR SOUTHAMPTON PA 18966-4045

CALL OUR 24 HOUR AUTOMATED CUSTOMER SERVICE 800-354-4744 OR VISIT OUR WEBSITE: WWW.CERTIFIEDCCB.COM

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Certified Credit & Collection Bureau Hit with FDCPA Case in Pennsylvania</u>