

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

ANTHONY BAKSH, on behalf of herself  
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

CAPITAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES,  
LP,

Defendant.

Civil Action Number:

**CIVIL ACTION  
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT  
AND  
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff ANTHONY BAKSH (hereinafter, “Plaintiff”), a New York resident, brings this class action complaint by and through his attorneys, The Law Office of Alan J. Sasson, P.C., against Defendant CAPITAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LP (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 in violation of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.* (“FDCPA”).
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 its principal office located in Buffalo, 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 by 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 a collection letter and/or notice from Defendant indicating that “Citibank, N.A. will report forgiveness of debt as required by IRS regulations,” 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 was 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 ANTHONY BAKSH**

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 a debt allegedly owing to Citibank, N.A.
17. On February 3, 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. 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."
20. Defendant's Letter states in pertinent part: "Citibank, N.A. will report forgiveness of debt as required by IRS regulations."
21. This is effectively a threat to take action that Defendant does not intend on taking, precisely because said debt does not meet the minimum amount required by IRS regulations.

22. 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.”
23. Defendant’s violations of the FDCPA created the risk of real harm that the Plaintiff would perceive Defendant’s statement as a threat to report potential forgiveness of debt to the Internal Revenue Service when in reality, the amount allegedly owed on the debt would preclude such action.
24. Defendant’s actions as described herein are part of a pattern and practice used to collect debts.
25. The letter is a “communication” as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(2).
26. As a result of the following Counts Defendant violated the FDCPA.

**First Count**  
**Violation of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, et seq**  
**Threatening to Take Unintended Action**

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(5) prohibits debt collectors from “threat[ening] to take any action that cannot legally be taken or that is not intended to be taken.”
29. Defendant’s statement that “Citibank, N.A. will report forgiveness of debt as required by IRS regulations” may, to the least sophisticated consumer, be perceived as a threat to take action that Defendant does not actually intend to take.
30. Defendant has absolutely no intention of reporting Plaintiff’s alleged debt, because said debt does not meet the minimum amount required by IRS regulations.
31. Here, the total amount allegedly owed to Defendant is \$500.00.
32. Further, Defendant’s letter to Plaintiff provided a “Discounted Settlement offer of \$205.00.”

33. Because Defendant offered to forgive only \$295.00 of Plaintiff's alleged debt, an amount significantly short of the \$600.00 principal forgiveness requirement, there is no possibility that Defendant would be required to report any portion of Plaintiff's forgiven debt to the IRS.
34. The least sophisticated consumer would likely be deceived by Defendant's communications to Plaintiff.
35. The least sophisticated consumer would likely be deceived in a material way by Defendant's communications to Plaintiff.
36. The least sophisticated consumer would likely be deceived into believing that there might be a tax consequence upon settling the alleged debt, when in reality said tax consequence is wholly inapplicable to Plaintiff and to all putative class members.
37. Such a statement is entirely unfounded, misleading and deceitful in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5), and is the very kind of abusive debt collection practice that the FDCPA was designed to eradicate.
38. 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, *et seq***

**False or Misleading Representations as to the Rights of the Consumer**

39. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs numbered "1" through "38" herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.
40. 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.

41. 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.
42. Collection letters are deceptive if they can be reasonably read to have two or more different meanings, one of which is inaccurate.
43. 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.
44. 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).
45. It is thus entirely conceivable to forgive amounts of a debt and yet not report the balances forgiven to the Internal Revenue Service.
46. In addition, it is highly improbable for one who is in debt to have income as a result of settling a debt, as that person is more likely to be insolvent; so such a discharge would not be considered as income.
47. A collection notice is deceptive when it reasonably can be read to have two or more different meanings, one of which is inaccurate.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *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.)



48. The question of whether a collection letter is deceptive is determined from the perspective of the “least sophisticated consumer.”
49. The language in the letter that states “Citibank, N.A. will report forgiveness of debt as required by IRS regulations” could reasonably be understood by the least sophisticated consumer to mean that IRS regulations require that it report all forgiveness of debt.
50. The words “Citibank, N.A. will report forgiveness of debt as required by IRS regulations” is reasonably read to mean that it will report all forgiveness of debt.
51. The least sophisticated consumer would understand this statement to mean that the creditor is required by IRS regulations to report all forgiveness of debt.
52. Although Defendant had no duty to disclose any potential tax ramifications,<sup>2</sup> when Defendant 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.
53. 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.
54. Here, the total amount allegedly owed to Defendant is \$500.00.
55. Further, Defendant’s letter to Plaintiff provided a “Discounted Settlement offer of \$205.00.”

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.”)

56. Because Defendant offered to forgive only \$295.00 of Plaintiff's alleged debt, an amount significantly short of the \$600.00 principal forgiveness requirement, there is no possibility that Defendant would be required to report any portion of Plaintiff's forgiven debt to the IRS.
57. The statement "Citibank, N.A. will report forgiveness of debt as required by IRS regulations" is ambiguous, yet the vagueness and uncertainty does not erase the fundamental mischief and deception that the statement intends to cause to the consumer. 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). 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 amounts are principle and what part of it is interest, in the amounts 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 “as required by IRS regulations” is an attempt by the debt collector to make the debtor think that the IRS regulations require the reporting of all forgiveness of debt. The least sophisticated consumer would reasonably read the letter to mean that the creditor will report all forgiveness of debt as is required by IRS regulations.<sup>3</sup>
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.<sup>4</sup>
64. The statement in said February 3, 2016 letter is false and misleading, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(2), and 1692e(10).

---

<sup>3</sup> *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.)

<sup>4</sup> *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.
66. Plaintiff seeks to end these violations of the FDCPA. Plaintiff and putative class members are entitled to preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, including, declaratory relief, and damages.

**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 attorneys' 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. (AS 8452)  
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 7, 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

ANTHONY BAKSH, on behalf of himself 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, (718) 339-0856

DEFENDANTS

CAPITAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LP

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. Includes 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 FDCA

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 11/07/2016 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: Questions of law rather than questions of fact predominate

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

ANTHONY BAKSH, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

CAPITAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LP

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) CAPITAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LP
698 1/2 SOUTH OGDEN STREET
BUFFALO, NEW YORK 14206

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:



**CAPITAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES, LP**

698 1/2 South Ogden Street Buffalo, NY 14206-2317

Office Hours: M-F 8 am - 9 pm ET

Sat 8 am - 1 pm ET

Toll Free: 1-888-719-2116, Fax: 716-512-6046

Reference# [REDACTED] 3294



T3 P3\*\*\*\*\*AUTO\*\*3-DIGIT 112

Anthony Baksh  
[REDACTED]

Original Creditor: Citibank, N.A.

Current Creditor: Citibank, N.A.

Description: CITIBANK, N.A.

Account #: XXXXXX7664

Amount of Debt: \$500.00

AMOUNT ENCLOSED: \_\_\_\_\_

Current Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Current Phone #: \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE DETACH AND RETURN TOP PORTION WITH PAYMENT TO ADDRESS LISTED BELOW

February 03, 2016

**\*\*\*\*\*41% SETTLEMENT OFFER\*\*\*\*\***

Dear Anthony Baksh:

On behalf of CITIBANK, N.A., Capital Management Services, LP, is willing to accept less than the full balance due as a settlement on the above mentioned account. The settlement offer shall be \$205.00 due in our office no later than TEN (10) days from the receipt of this letter. We are not obligated to renew this offer.

Upon clearance of sufficient funds, our records will be updated to reflect that the above account has been satisfied.

Our representatives are trained to offer assistance regarding this obligation. For account inquiries, you may contact Capital Management Services, LP, at 698 1/2 South Ogden Street, Buffalo, NY 14206-2317 or call 1-888-719-2116 Mon. through Fri. 8 am to 9 pm ET, Sat. 8 am to 1 pm ET. Please submit your payment and make your check or money order payable to CITIBANK to the address listed below. Payments and correspondence should be mailed to: Capital Management Services, LP, P.O. Box 120, Buffalo, NY 14220-0120. Overnight deliveries should be addressed to: Capital Management Services, LP., 698 1/2 South Ogden Street, Buffalo, NY 14206-2317.

Citibank, N.A. will report forgiveness of debt as required by IRS regulations.

This is an attempt to collect a debt; any information obtained will be used for that purpose. This communication is from a debt collector.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR NEW YORK CITY RESIDENTS**

This collection agency is licensed by the New York City Department of Consumer Affairs, License No. 1242722.

Please contact Ronnie Learman at 1-866-900-9732 with any questions or concerns.



# 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 Capital Management Services](#)

---