

1 **Hirald P.A.**

2 Manuel S. Hirald, Esq.
3 Florida Bar No. 030380
4 401 E. Olas Blvd., Ste. 1400
5 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
6 mhirald@hirdolaw.com
7 954.400.4713

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff and Proposed Class*

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

11 **Michelle Wheeldon**, individually and on
12 behalf of all others similarly situated,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 **Drivetime Automotive Group, Inc.**,

16 Defendant.

Case No.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)

17 **CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

18 Plaintiff Michelle Wheeldon brings this action against Defendant Drivetime
19 Automotive Group, Inc., to secure redress for violations of the Telephone Consumer
20 Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227.

21 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

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

24 2. Defendant operates as an automotive retailer with approximately 137
25 locations nationwide.

26 3. To promote its business, Defendant sends prerecorded marketing voice
27 messages to the cellular telephones of consumers without consent to do so.

1 11. When Plaintiff listened to the prerecorded message, she was easily able to
2 determine that it was prerecorded. *Rahn v. Bank of Am.*, No. 1:15-CV-4485-ODE-JSA,
3 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 186171, at *10-11 (N.D. Ga. June 23, 2016) (“When one receives
4 a call, it is a clear-cut fact, easily discernible to any lay person, whether or not the recipient
5 is speaking to a live human being, or is instead being subjected to a prerecorded message.”).

6 12. Defendant’s prerecorded voice call constitutes telemarketing because the
7 purpose of the message was to encourage Plaintiff to buy from Defendant.

8 13. Specifically, the prerecorded message states “hey this is Mackenzie from
9 Drivetime... we have a vehicle selection and programs from you to choose from.”

10 14. Plaintiff received the prerecorded message from the telephone number 417-
11 450-6740 which upon information and belief is owned and or operated by or on behalf of
12 Defendant.

13 15. Upon information and belief, Defendant caused other prerecorded messages
14 to be sent to individuals residing within this judicial circuit.

15 16. Plaintiff never gave Defendant her prior express written consent to call her
16 on her cellular telephone utilizing marketing prerecorded voice messages.

17 17. Plaintiff is the sole user and/or subscriber of the 4191 Number.

18 18. Defendant’s prerecorded message calls caused Plaintiff additional harm,
19 including invasion of privacy, aggravation, annoyance, intrusion on seclusion, trespass,
20 and conversion. Defendant’s call also inconvenienced Plaintiff and caused disruption to
21 her daily life.

22 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

23 **PROPOSED CLASS**

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

26 20. Plaintiff brings this case on behalf of the Class defined as follows:
27
28

1 **All persons within the United States who, within the four**
2 **years prior to the filing of this Complaint, received a**
3 **prerecorded voice call on their telephone from Defendant**
4 **or anyone on Defendant's behalf, promoting and/or**
5 **advertising Defendant's goods and/or services.**

6 21. Plaintiff reserves the right to modify the Class definitions as warranted as
7 facts are learned in further investigation and discovery.

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

11 **NUMEROSITY**

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

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

19 **COMMON QUESTIONS OF LAW AND FACT**

20 25. There are numerous questions of law and fact common to the Class which
21 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. Among
22 the questions of law and fact common to the Class are: [1] Whether Defendant made non-
23 emergency calls to Plaintiff and Class members' telephones using a prerecorded message;
24 [2] Whether Defendant can meet its burden of showing that it had express written consent
25 to make such calls; [3] Whether Defendant's conduct was knowing and willful; [4]
26 Whether Defendant is liable for damages, and the amount of such damages; and [5]
27 Whether Defendant should be enjoined from such conduct in the future.
28

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

5 **TYPICALITY**

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

8 **PROTECTING THE INTERESTS OF THE CLASS MEMBERS**

9 28. Plaintiff is a representative who will fully and adequately assert and protect
10 the interests of the Class, and has retained competent counsel. Accordingly, Plaintiff is an
11 adequate representative and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class.

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

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

22 30. The prosecution of separate actions by members of the Class would create a
23 risk of establishing inconsistent rulings and/or incompatible standards of conduct for
24 Defendant. For example, one court might enjoin Defendant from performing the
25 challenged acts, whereas another may not. Additionally, individual actions may be
26 dispositive of the interests of the Class, although certain class members are not parties to
27 such actions.

COUNT I
Violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b) & 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and Class)

1
2
3 31. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates the foregoing as if fully set forth herein.

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

8 33. It is a violation of the TCPA regulations promulgated by the FCC to “initiate
9 any telephone call...using an... artificial or prerecorded voice to any telephone number
10 assigned to a paging service, cellular telephone service, specialized mobile radio service,
11 or other radio common carrier service, or any service for which the called party is charged
12 for the call.” 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(1)(iii).

13 34. It is a violation of the TCPA regulations promulgated by the FCC to “initiate
14 any telephone call to any residential line using an artificial or prerecorded voice to deliver
15 a message without the prior express written consent of the called party”. 47 C.F.R. §
16 64.1200(a)(3).

17 35. It is a violation of the TCPA to “initiate any telephone call to any residential
18 telephone line using an artificial or prerecorded voice to deliver a message without the prior
19 express consent of the called party....” 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B).

20 36. Additionally, it is a violation of the TCPA regulations promulgated by the
21 FCC to “[i]nitiate, or cause to be initiated, any telephone call that includes or introduces an
22 advertisement or constitutes telemarketing, ...artificial or prerecorded voice ...other than
23 a call made with the prior express written consent of the called party or the prior express
24 consent of the called party when the call is made...” 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(2).

25 37. Defendant used prerecorded messages to make non-emergency telephone
26 calls to the telephones of Plaintiff and other members of the Class.
27

1 38. Defendant did not have prior express written consent to call the telephones
2 of Plaintiff and the other members of the putative Class when its calls were made and/or
3 failed to honor opt-out requests regarding its prerecorded solicitations.

4 39. Defendant has, therefore, violated §§ 227(b) and §§ 64.1200(a) by using an
5 prerecorded messages to make non-emergency telephone calls to the telephones of Plaintiff
6 and the other members of the putative Class without their consent.

7 40. Defendant knew that it did not have consent to make these calls, and knew
8 or should have known that it was using prerecorded messages. The violations were
9 therefore willful or knowing.

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

14 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff on behalf of herself and the other members of
15 the Class, pray for the following relief:

- 16 a. A declaration that Defendant's practices described herein violate
17 the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 and § 64.1200;
18 b. An order certifying the Class and appointing Plaintiff as Class
19 Representative and his counsel as Class Counsel;
20 c. An injunction prohibiting Defendant from using an artificial or
21 prerecorded voice to contact telephone numbers without the prior express
22 permission of the called party;
23 d. An award of actual and statutory damages; and
24 e. Such further and other relief the Court deems reasonable and just.

1 **JURY DEMAND**

2 Plaintiff hereby demand a trial by jury.

3 **DOCUMENT PRESERVATION DEMAND**

4 Plaintiff demands that Defendant take affirmative steps to preserve all records, lists,
5 electronic databases or other itemization of telephone numbers associated with Defendant
6 and the calls as alleged herein.

7
8 Respectfully submitted,

9 Dated: May 2022

10
11
12 By: /s/ Manuel S. Hiraldo
13 Manuel S. Hiraldo, Esq.
14 mhiraldo@hirdolaw.com
15 **Hiraldo P.A.**
16 401 E. Las Olas Blvd., Ste. 1400
17 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
18 954.400.4713

19 By: /s/ Ignacio Hiraldo
20 Ignacio Hiraldo, Esq.
21 IJhiraldo@Hirdolaw.com
22 **IJH Law**
23 1200 Brickell Ave.
24 Suite 1950
25 Miami, FL 33131
26 E: IJhiraldo@IJhlaw.com
27 T: 786-496-4469

28 *Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Civil Cover Sheet

This automated JS-44 conforms generally to the manual JS-44 approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974. The data is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. The information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form is authorized for use only in the District of Arizona.

The completed cover sheet must be printed directly to PDF and filed as an attachment to the Complaint or Notice of Removal.

Plaintiff(s): Michelle Wheeldon

Defendant(s): Drivetime Automotive Group, Inc.

County of Residence: Maricopa

County of Residence: Outside the State of Arizona

County Where Claim For Relief Arose: Maricopa

Plaintiff's Atty(s):

Defendant's Atty(s):

**Manuel Santiago Hiraldo (Michelle Wheeldon)
Hiraldo P.A.
401 E. Las Olas Blvd., Ste. 1400
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33316
954-400-4713**

**Ignacio J Hiraldo (Michelle Wheeldon)
IJH Law
1200 Brickell Ave.
Suite 1950, Florida 33131
786-496-4463**

II. Basis of Jurisdiction: **1. U.S. Government Plaintiff**

III. Citizenship of Principal Parties (Diversity Cases Only)

Plaintiff:- N/A
Defendant:- N/A

IV. Origin : **1. Original Proceeding**

V. Nature of Suit: **890 Other Statutory Actions**

VI. Cause of Action: **Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. § 227**

VII. Requested in Complaint

Class Action: **Yes**
Dollar Demand:

Jury Demand: **Yes**

VIII. This case is not related to another case.

Signature: /s/ Manuel S. Hiraldo

Date: 5/17/2022

If any of this information is incorrect, please go back to the Civil Cover Sheet Input form using the *Back* button in your browser and change it. Once correct, save this form as a PDF and include it as an attachment to your case opening documents.

Revised: 01/2014

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Drivetime Auto Group Hit with Class Action Over Alleged Robocalls](#)
