

EDELSBERG LAW, P.A.

Scott Edelsberg, Esq. (CA Bar No. 330990)
20900 NE 30th Ave, Suite 417
Aventura, FL 33180
Telephone: 305-975-3320
scott@edelsberglaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiff and Proposed Class

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

TIANA TORREZ,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DELIVERMD d/b/a
SMOAKLAND, a California
company,

Defendant.

Case No.

CLASS ACTION

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS
OF THE TELEPHONE
CONSUMER PROTECTION
ACT, 47 U.S.C. §§ 227, ET SEQ.
(TCPA)**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 **CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

2 1. Plaintiff, Tiana Torrez (“Plaintiff”), brings this action against Defendant,
3 DeliverMD d/b/a Smoakland (“Defendant”), to secure redress for violations of the
4 Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227.

5 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

6 2. This is a putative class action pursuant to the Telephone Consumer
7 Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 227, *et seq.* (the “TCPA”).

8 3. Defendant is a cannabis delivery service. To promote its services,
9 Defendant engages in aggressive unsolicited marketing, harming thousands of
10 consumers in the process.

11 4. Through this action, Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief to halt Defendant’s
12 illegal conduct, which has resulted in the invasion of privacy, harassment, aggravation,
13 and disruption of the daily life of thousands of individuals. Plaintiff also seeks statutory
14 damages on behalf of herself and members of the Class, and any other available legal
15 or equitable remedies.

16 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

17 5. This Court has federal question subject matter jurisdiction over this action
18 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as the action arises under the Telephone Consumer
19 Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 227, *et seq.* (“TCPA”).

20 6. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant and venue is proper
21 in this District because Defendant directs, markets, and provides its business activities
22 to this District, and because Defendant’s unauthorized marketing scheme was directed
23 by Defendant to consumers in this District, including Plaintiff.

24 **PARTIES**

25 7. Plaintiff is a natural person who, at all times relevant to this action, was a
26 resident of Contra Costa County, California.

1 8. Defendant is a California corporation whose principal office is located at
2 7850 Edgewater Drive, Oakland, California 94621. Defendant directs, markets, and
3 provides its business activities throughout the United States, including throughout the
4 state of California.

5 9. Unless otherwise indicated, the use of Defendant’s name in this
6 Complaint includes all agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs,
7 successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, vendors,
8 and insurers of Defendant.

9 **THE TCPA**

10 10. The TCPA prohibits: (1) any person from calling a cellular telephone
11 number; (2) using an automatic telephone dialing system; (3) without the recipient’s
12 prior express consent. 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

13 11. The TCPA defines an “automatic telephone dialing system” (“ATDS”) as
14 “equipment that has the capacity - (A) to store or produce telephone numbers to be
15 called, using a random or sequential number generator; and (B) to dial such numbers.”
16 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1).

17 12. In an action under the TCPA, a plaintiff must only show that the
18 defendant “called a number assigned to a cellular telephone service using an automatic
19 dialing system or prerecorded voice.” *Breslow v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 857 F. Supp. 2d
20 1316, 1319 (S.D. Fla. 2012), *aff’d*, 755 F.3d 1265 (11th Cir. 2014).

21 13. The Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) is empowered to
22 issue rules and regulations implementing the TCPA. According to the FCC’s findings,
23 calls in violation of the TCPA are prohibited because, as Congress found, automated
24 or prerecorded telephone calls are a greater nuisance and invasion of privacy than live
25 solicitation calls, and such calls can be costly and inconvenient. The FCC also
26 recognized that wireless customers are charged for incoming calls whether they pay in
27 advance or after the minutes are used. *Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone*

1 *Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, CG Docket No. 02-278, Report and Order, 18 FCC Rcd
2 14014 (2003).

3 14. In 2012, the FCC issued an order tightening the restrictions for automated
4 telemarketing calls, requiring “prior express **written** consent” for such calls to wireless
5 numbers. *See In the Matter of Rules & Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of*
6 *1991*, 27 F.C.C.R. 1830, 1838 ¶ 20 (Feb. 15, 2012) (emphasis supplied).

7 15. To obtain express written consent for telemarketing calls, a defendant
8 must establish that it secured the plaintiff’s signature in a form that gives the plaintiff a
9 “‘clear and conspicuous disclosure’ of the consequences of providing the requested
10 consent....and having received this information, agrees unambiguously to receive such
11 calls at a telephone number the [plaintiff] designates.” *In re Rules & Regulations*
12 *Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 27 F.C.C.R. 1830, 1837 ¶ 18, 1838 ¶ 20,
13 1844 ¶ 33, 1857 ¶ 66, 1858 ¶ 71 (F.C.C. Feb. 15, 2012).

14 16. The TCPA regulations promulgated by the FCC define “telemarketing”
15 as “the initiation of a telephone call or message for the purpose of encouraging the
16 purchase or rental of, or investment in, property, goods, or services.” 47 C.F.R. §
17 64.1200(f)(12). In determining whether a communication constitutes telemarketing, a
18 court must evaluate the ultimate purpose of the communication. *See Golan v. Veritas*
19 *Entm’t, LLC*, 788 F.3d 814, 820 (8th Cir. 2015).

20 17. “Neither the TCPA nor its implementing regulations ‘require an explicit
21 mention of a good, product, or service’ where the implication of an improper purpose
22 is ‘clear from the context.’” *Id.* (citing *Chesbro v. Best Buy Stores, L.P.*, 705 F.3d 913, 918
23 (9th Cir. 2012)).

24 18. “‘Telemarketing’ occurs when the context of a call indicates that it was
25 initiated and transmitted to a person for the purpose of promoting property, goods, or
26 services.” *Golan*, 788 F.3d at 820 (citing 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(2)(iii); 47 C.F.R. §
27

1 64.1200(f)(12); *In re Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act*
2 *of 1991*, 18 F.C.C. Rcd at 14098 ¶ 141, 2003 WL 21517853, at *49).

3 19. The FCC has explained that calls motivated in part by the intent to sell
4 property, goods, or services are considered telemarketing under the TCPA. *See In re*
5 *Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, 18 FCC Rcd.
6 14014, ¶¶ 139-142 (2003). This is true whether call recipients are encouraged to
7 purchase, rent, or invest in property, goods, or services during the call *or in the future*. *Id.*

8 20. In other words, offers “that are part of an overall marketing campaign to
9 sell property, goods, or services constitute” telemarketing under the TCPA. *See In re*
10 *Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, 18 FCC Rcd.
11 14014, ¶ 136 (2003).

12 21. If a call is not deemed telemarketing, a defendant must nevertheless
13 demonstrate that it obtained the plaintiff’s prior express consent. *See In the Matter of*
14 *Rules and Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 30 FCC Rcd. 7961,
15 7991-92 (2015) (requiring express consent “for non-telemarketing and non-advertising
16 calls”).


17 22. Further, the FCC has issued rulings and clarified that consumers are
18 entitled to the same consent-based protections for text messages as they are for calls to
19 wireless numbers. *See Satterfield v. Simon & Schuster, Inc.*, 569 F.3d 946, 952 (9th Cir. 2009)
20 (The FCC has determined that a text message falls within the meaning of “to make any
21 call” in 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)); *Toney v. Quality Res., Inc.*, 2014 WL 6757978, at *3
22 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 1, 2014) (Defendant bears the burden of showing that it obtained
23 Plaintiff’s prior express consent before sending him the **text message**). (emphasis
24 added).


25 23. As recently held by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth
26 Circuit: “Unsolicited telemarketing phone calls or text messages, by their nature, invade
27 the privacy and disturb the solitude of their recipients. A plaintiff alleging a violation
28

1 under the TCPA ‘need not allege any *additional* harm beyond the one Congress has
 2 identified.’” *Van Patten v. Vertical Fitness Grp.*, No. 14-55980, 2017 U.S. App. LEXIS
 3 1591, at *12 (9th Cir. May 4, 2016) (quoting *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, 136 S. Ct. 1540, 1549
 4 (2016) (emphasis original)).

5 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

6 24. Over the past year, Defendant sent numerous telemarketing text messages
 7 to Plaintiff’s cellular telephone number ending in 3024 (the “3024 Number”), including
 8 but not limited to the following:





25. Defendant’s text messages were transmitted to Plaintiff’s cellular telephone, and within the time frame relevant to this action.

26. Defendant’s text messages constitute telemarketing because they encouraged the future purchase or investment in property, goods, or services, i.e., selling Plaintiff cannabis products.

27. The information contained in the text message advertises Defendant’s various discounts and promotions, which Defendant sends to promote its business.

28. Plaintiff received the subject texts within this judicial district and, therefore, Defendant’s violation of the TCPA occurred within this district. Upon information and belief, Defendant caused other text messages to be sent to individuals residing within this judicial district.

29. At no point in time did Plaintiff provide Defendant with her express written consent to be contacted using an ATDS.

30. Plaintiff is the subscriber and sole user of the 3024 Number and is financially responsible for phone service to the 3024 Number.

1 31. The impersonal and generic nature of Defendant's text message
2 demonstrates that Defendant utilized an ATDS in transmitting the messages. *See Jenkins*
3 *v. LL Atlanta, LLC*, No. 1:14-cv-2791-WSD, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30051, at *11
4 (N.D. Ga. Mar. 9, 2016) ("These assertions, combined with the generic, impersonal
5 nature of the text message advertisements and the use of a short code, support an
6 inference that the text messages were sent using an ATDS.") (citing *Legg v. Voice Media*
7 *Grp., Inc.*, 20 F. Supp. 3d 1370, 1354 (S.D. Fla. 2014) (plaintiff alleged facts sufficient to
8 infer text messages were sent using ATDS; use of a short code and volume of mass
9 messaging alleged would be impractical without use of an ATDS); *Kramer v. Autobytel,*
10 *Inc.*, 759 F. Supp. 2d 1165, 1171 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (finding it "plausible" that defendants
11 used an ATDS where messages were advertisements written in an impersonal manner
12 and sent from short code); *Hickey v. Voxernet LLC*, 887 F. Supp. 2d 1125, 1130; *Robbins*
13 *v. Coca-Cola Co.*, No. 13-CV-132-IEG NLS, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 72725, 2013 WL
14 2252646, at *3 (S.D. Cal. May 22, 2013) (observing that mass messaging would be
15 impracticable without use of an ATDS)).

16 32. The text messages originated from telephone numbers 510-880-1372 and
17 510-871-8927, both numbers which upon information and belief are owned and
18 operated by Defendant or on behalf of Defendant.

19 33. The numbers used by Defendant are known as a "long code," a standard
20 10-digit code that enables Defendant to send SMS text messages *en masse*, while
21 deceiving recipients into believing that the message was personalized and sent from a
22 telephone number operated by an individual.

23 34. Long codes work as follows: Private companies known as SMS gateway
24 providers have contractual arrangements with mobile carriers to transmit two-way SMS
25 traffic. These SMS gateway providers send and receive SMS traffic to and from the
26 mobile phone networks' SMS centers, which are responsible for relaying those messages
27

1 to the intended mobile phone. This allows for the transmission of a large number of
2 SMS messages to and from a long code.

3 35. Specifically, upon information and belief, Defendant utilized a
4 combination of hardware and software systems to send the text messages at issue in
5 this case. The systems utilized by Defendant have the capacity to store telephone
6 numbers using a random or sequential number generator, and to dial such numbers
7 from a list without human intervention.

8 36. To send the text messages, Defendant used a messaging platform (the
9 “Platform”) that permitted Defendant to transmit thousands of automated text
10 messages without any human involvement.

11 37. The Platform has the capacity to store telephone numbers, which capacity
12 was in fact utilized by Defendant.

13 38. The Platform has the capacity to generate sequential numbers, which
14 capacity was in fact utilized by Defendant.

15 39. The Platform has the capacity to dial numbers in sequential order, which
16 capacity was in fact utilized by Defendant.

17 40. The Platform has the capacity to dial numbers from a list of numbers,
18 which capacity was in fact utilized by Defendant.

19 41. The Platform has the capacity to dial numbers without human
20 intervention, which capacity was in fact utilized by Defendant.

21 42. The Platform has the capacity to schedule the time and date for future
22 transmission of text messages, which occurs without any human involvement.

23 43. To transmit the messages at issue, the Platform automatically executed the
24 following steps:

- 25 a) The Platform retrieved each telephone number from a list of numbers
26 in the sequential order the numbers were listed;
27


- 1 b) The Platform then generated each number in the sequential order
2 listed and combined each number with the content of Defendant’s
3 message to create “packets” consisting of one telephone number and
4 the message content;
- 5 c) Each packet was then transmitted in the sequential order listed to an
6 SMS aggregator, which acts an intermediary between the Platform,
7 mobile carriers (e.g. AT&T), and consumers.
- 8 d) Upon receipt of each packet, the SMS aggregator transmitted each
9 packet – automatically and with no human intervention – to the
10 respective mobile carrier for the telephone number, again in the
11 sequential order listed by Defendant. Each mobile carrier then sent
12 the message to its customer’s mobile telephone.

13 44. The above execution these instructions occurred seamlessly, with no
14 human intervention, and almost instantaneously. Indeed, the Platform is capable of
15 transmitting thousands of text messages following the above steps in minutes, if not
16 less.

17 45. Further, the Platform “throttles” the transmission of the text messages
18 depending on feedback it receives from the mobile carrier networks. In other words,
19 the platform controls how quickly messages are transmitted depending on network
20 congestion. The platform performs this throttling function automatically and does not
21 allow a human to control the function.

22 46. The following graphic summarizes the above steps and demonstrates that
23 the dialing of the text messages at issue was done by the Platform automatically and
24 without any human intervention:

25
26
27
28



47. Defendant's unsolicited text messages caused Plaintiff actual harm, including invasion of her privacy, aggravation, annoyance, intrusion on seclusion, trespass, and conversion. Defendant's text messages also inconvenienced Plaintiff and caused disruption to her daily life.

48. Defendant's unsolicited text messages caused Plaintiff actual harm. Specifically, Plaintiff estimates that she has wasted fifteen to thirty seconds reviewing each of Defendant's unwanted messages. Each time, Plaintiff had to stop what she was doing to either retrieve her phone and/or look down at the phone to review the message.

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

50. In all, Defendant's violations of the TCPA caused Plaintiff to waste at least fifteen minutes of her time in addressing and attempting to stop Defendant's solicitations.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

PROPOSED CLASS

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

52. Plaintiff brings this case on behalf of the Class defined as follows:

No Consent Class: All persons in the United States who, within four years prior to the filing of this action, (1) were sent a text message by or on behalf of Defendant, (2) using an automatic telephone

1 dialing system, (3) for the purpose of soliciting
2 Defendant's goods and services, (4) without prior
3 express consent of the recipient, or with the same
4 manner of purported consent Defendant claims to
5 have obtained from Plaintiff, if any.

6 53. Defendant and its employees or agents are excluded from the Class.
7 Plaintiff does not know the number of members in the Class but believes the Class
8 members number in the several thousands, if not more.

9 **NUMEROSITY**

10 54. Upon information and belief, Defendant has placed automated calls to
11 cellular telephone numbers belonging to thousands of consumers throughout the
12 United States without their prior express consent. The members of the Class, therefore,
13 are believed to be so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.

14 55. The exact number and identities of the members of the Class are unknown
15 at this time and can only be ascertained through discovery. Identification of the Class
16 members is a matter capable of ministerial determination from Defendant's call records.

17 **COMMON QUESTIONS OF LAW AND FACT**

18 56. There are numerous questions of law and fact common to members of
19 the Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of
20 the Class. Among the questions of law and fact common to the members of the Class
21 are:

- 22 a) Whether Defendant made non-emergency calls to Plaintiff's and Class
23 members' cellular telephones using an ATDS;
- 24 b) Whether Defendant can meet its burden of showing that it obtained
25 prior express written consent to make such calls;
- 26 c) Whether Defendant's conduct was knowing and willful;
- 27 d) Whether Defendant is liable for damages, and the amount of such
28 damages; and
- e) Whether Defendant should be enjoined from such conduct in the

1 future.

2 57. The common questions in this case are capable of having common
3 answers. If Plaintiff's claim that Defendant routinely transmits text messages to
4 telephone numbers assigned to cellular telephone services is accurate, Plaintiff and the
5 Class members will have identical claims capable of being efficiently adjudicated and
6 administered in this case.

7 **TYPICALITY**

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

10 **PROTECTING THE INTERESTS OF THE CLASS MEMBERS**

11 59. Plaintiff is a representative who will fully and adequately assert and protect
12 the interests of the Class, and has retained competent counsel. Accordingly, Plaintiff is
13 an adequate representative and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the
14 Class.

15 **PROCEEDING VIA CLASS ACTION IS SUPERIOR AND ADVISABLE**

16 60. A class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and
17 efficient adjudication of this lawsuit, because individual litigation of the claims of all
18 members of the Class is economically unfeasible and procedurally impracticable. While
19 the aggregate damages sustained by the Class are in the millions of dollars, the individual
20 damages incurred by each member of the Class resulting from Defendant's wrongful
21 conduct are too small to warrant the expense of individual lawsuits. The likelihood of
22 individual Class members prosecuting their own separate claims is remote, and, even if
23 every member of the Class could afford individual litigation, the court system would be
24 unduly burdened by individual litigation of such cases.

25 61. The prosecution of separate actions by members of the Class would create
26 a risk of establishing inconsistent rulings and/or incompatible standards of conduct for
27 Defendant. For example, one court might enjoin Defendant from performing the
28

1 challenged acts, whereas another may not. Additionally, individual actions may be
2 dispositive of the interests of the Class, although certain class members are not parties
3 to such actions.

4 **COUNT I**
5 **Violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)**
6 **(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)**

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

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

13 64. Defendant – or third parties directed by Defendant – used equipment
14 having the capacity to dial numbers without human intervention to make non-
15 emergency telephone calls to the cellular telephones of Plaintiff and the other members
16 of the Class defined below.

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

21 66. Defendant has, therefore, violated § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii) of the TCPA by
22 using an automatic telephone dialing system to make non-emergency telephone calls to
23 the cell phones of Plaintiff and the other members of the putative Class without their
24 prior express written consent.

25 67. Defendant knew that it did not have prior express consent to make these
26 calls, and knew or should have known that it was using equipment that at constituted
27 an automatic telephone dialing system. The violations were therefore willful or
28 knowing.

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

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

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

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

12 71. Defendant knew that it did not have prior express consent to make these
13 calls, and knew or should have known that its conduct was a violation of the TCPA.

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

18 73. As a result of Defendant's violations, Plaintiff and the Class Members are
19 entitled to an award of \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation,
20 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

21 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

22 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the Class, prays for the
23 following relief:

- 24 a) An order certifying this case as a class action on behalf of the Class as
25 defined above, and appointing Plaintiff as the representative of the Class
26 and Plaintiff's counsel as Class Counsel;

- 1 b) An award of actual and statutory damages for Plaintiff and each member
2 of the Class;
- 3 c) As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. §§ 227, *et seq.*,
4 Plaintiff seeks for herself and each member of the Class \$500.00 in
5 statutory damages for each and every violation pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §
6 277(b)(3)(B);
- 7 d) As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C.
8 §§ 227, *et seq.*, Plaintiff seeks for herself and each member of the Class
9 treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500.00 for each and every
10 violation pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 277(b)(3)(B) and § 277(b)(3)(C);
- 11 e) An order declaring that Defendant's actions, as set out above, violate the
12 TCPA;
- 13 f) A declaratory judgment that Defendant's telephone calling equipment
14 constitutes an automatic telephone dialing system under the TCPA;
- 15 g) An injunction requiring Defendant to cease all unsolicited text messaging
16 activity, and to otherwise protect the interests of the Class;
- 17 h) An injunction prohibiting Defendant from using, or contracting the use
18 of, an automatic telephone dialing system without obtaining, recipient's
19 consent to receive calls made with such equipment;
- 20 i) An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to, *inter alia*,
21 California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and
- 22 j) Such further and other relief as the Court deems necessary.

23 **JURY DEMAND**

24 Plaintiff hereby demand a trial by jury.

25
26 Dated: November 3, 2020

27 Respectfully submitted,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EDELSBERG LAW, P.A.
By: /s/ Scott Edelsberg
Scott Edelsberg, Esq. (CA Bar No. 330990)
scott@edelsberglaw.com
20900 NE 30th Ave, Suite 417
Aventura, FL 33180
Telephone: 305-975-3320

Counsel for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-CAND 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 in its original form by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court to initiate the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Tiana Torrez, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Contra Costa County, CA (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

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

EDELSBERG LAW, PA 20900 NE 30th Ave., Suite 417, Aventura, FL 33180 (305) 975-332

DEFENDANTS

DeliverMd d/b/a Smoakland

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Alameda County, CA (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)

Table with columns for Plaintiff (PTF) and Defendant (DEF) citizenship: Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation.

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Large table with categories: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, HABEAS CORPUS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding 2 Removed from State Court 3 Remanded from Appellate Court 4 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transferred from Another District (specify) 6 Multidistrict Litigation-Transfer 8 Multidistrict Litigation-Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 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, Fed. R. Civ. P. DEMAND \$

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S), IF ANY (See instructions):

JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (Civil Local Rule 3-2)

(Place an "X" in One Box Only) SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND SAN JOSE EUREKA-MCKINLEYVILLE

DATE 11/03/2020

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

/s/ Scott Edelsberg

Print

Save As...

Reset

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Cannabis Delivery Service Smoakland Hit with Class Action Over Alleged Spam Texts](#)
