

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT D1
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
Abbas Kazerounian, Esq. (SBN: 249203)
ak@kazlg.com
245 Fischer Avenue, Unit D1
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Telephone: (800) 400-6808
Facsimile: (800) 520-5523

HYDE & SWIGART
Joshua B. Swigart, Esq. (SBN: 225557)
josh@westcoastlitigation.com
Bonnie McKnight, Esq. (SBN: 306562)
bonnie@westcoastlitigation.com

Hyde & Swigart
2221 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 101
San Diego, CA 92108
Telephone: (619) 233-7770
Facsimile: (619) 297-1022

Additional Attorneys for Plaintiffs on Signature Page

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs,
Trevor DeClue and Katherine DeClue*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

TREVER DECLUE and
KATHERINE DECLUE,
individually and behalf of those
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED CONSUMER
FINANCIAL SERVICES
COMPANY,

Defendant.

Case No.: '16CV2833 BEN JMA

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

VIOLETIONS OF THE TELEPHONE
CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT,
47 U.S.C. 227 ET SEQ.

CLASS ACTION

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT D1
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

INTRODUCTION

1. Trever DeClue and Katherine DeClue (Plaintiffs) bring this action for damages and any other available legal or equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal actions of United Consumer Financial Services Company (“Defendant”) for willfully violating the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. Plaintiffs allege as follows upon personal knowledge as to himself and his own acts and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief, including investigation conducted by his attorneys.
2. The TCPA was designed to prevent calls and messages like the ones described within this complaint, and to protect the privacy of citizens like Plaintiffs. “Voluminous consumer complaints about abuses of telephone technology – for example, computerized calls dispatched to private homes – prompted Congress to pass the TCPA.” *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740, 744 (2012).
3. In enacting the TCPA, Congress intended to give consumers a choice as to how creditors and telemarketers may call them, and made specific findings that “[t]echnologies that might allow consumers to avoid receiving such calls are not universally available, are costly, are unlikely to be enforced, or place an inordinate burden on the consumer. TCPA, Pub.L. No. 102–243, § 11. Toward this end, Congress found that

[b]anning such automated or prerecorded telephone calls to the home, except when the receiving party consents to receiving the call or when such calls are necessary in an emergency situation affecting the health and safety of the consumer, is the only effective means of protecting telephone consumers from this nuisance and privacy invasion.

//

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT D1
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

1 4. *Id.* at § 12; see also *Martin v. Leading Edge Recovery Solutions, LLC*, 2012
2 WL 3292838, at* 4 (N.D.Ill. Aug. 10, 2012) (citing Congressional findings on
3 TCPA’s purpose).

4 5. Congress also specifically found that “the evidence presented to the Congress
5 indicates that automated or prerecorded calls are a nuisance and an invasion of
6 privacy, regardless of the type of call....” *Id.* at §§ 12-13. See also, *Mims*, 132
7 S. Ct. at 744.

8 6. As Judge Easterbrook of the Seventh Circuit recently explained in a TCPA
9 case regarding calls similar to this one:

10
11 The Telephone Consumer Protection Act ... is well
12 known for its provisions limiting junk-fax transmissions.
13 A less-litigated part of the Act curtails the use of
14 automated dialers and prerecorded messages to cell
15 phones, whose subscribers often are billed by the minute
16 as soon as the call is answered—and routing a call to
17 voicemail counts as answering the call. An automated
call to a landline phone can be an annoyance; an
automated call to a cell phone adds expense to
annoyance.

18 7. *Soppet v. Enhanced Recovery Co., LLC*, 679 F.3d 637, 638 (7th Cir. 2012).

19 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

20 8. This Court has federal question jurisdiction because this case arises out of
21 violation of federal law. 47 U.S.C. §227(b); *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*,
22 132 S. Ct. 740 (2012).

23 9. Plaintiffs are natural persons who resides in the City of San Diego, County of
24 San Diego, State of California.

25 10. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391b(2) because Defendant is, and at
26 all relevant times herein was, an entity doing business in the State of
27 California, in the County of San Diego.

28 //

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT D1
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

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

PARTIES

11.Plaintiffs are, and at all times mentioned herein were, individual citizens and resident of the State of California, County of San Diego, in this judicial district. Plaintiffs are, and at all times mentioned herein was, a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

12.Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that United Consumer Financial Services Company is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation registered in Delaware with its principal place of business located in Ohio. Plaintiff alleges that at all times relevant herein it conducted business in the State of California, in the County and City of San Diego, within this judicial district. It is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a “person,” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

13.Sometime on or about March 2014, Defendant began calling Plaintiff Trever DeClue’s personal cell phone ending in 6931 regarding allegedly owed obligations.

14.This cell phone ending in 6931 was and is included in Plaintiff’s Katherine DeClue’s subscription with her telephone provider. Therefore, Plaintiff Katherine DeClue also has standing under *Gutierrez v. Barclays Grp.*, No. 10cv1012 DMS (BGS), 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12546, at *15 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 9, 2011).

15. Plaintiffs never provided Defendant with this cellular phone number and do not know how Defendant accessed it.

16.Furthermore, Plaintiffs revoked any express consent, which may have been mistakenly believed, when they told Defendant to stop calling.

17.However, Defendant continued to call Plaintiff Trever DeClue’s personal cell phone ending in 6931.

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT D1
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

1 18. For instance, on April 23, 2014 at 7:06 AM, Defendant called Plaintiff Trever
2 DeClue's personal cellular telephone from a number ending in 2163.

3 19. On May 15, 2014, Defendant again called Plaintiff Trever DeClue's personal
4 cellular telephone 2 (two) times from a number ending in 2180.

5 20. Yet again, on May 16, 2014, Defendant called Plaintiff Trever DeClue's
6 personal cellular telephone 3 (three) times from a number ending in 2181.

7 21. From May 17, 2014 to May 19, 2014, Defendant called Plaintiff Trever
8 DeClue's personal cellular telephone 3 (three) times from a number ending in
9 2162 attempting to collect the debt.

10 22. On May 20, 2014, Defendant called Plaintiff Trever DeClue's personal cellular
11 telephone 2 (two) times from a number ending in 2164 attempting to collect
12 the debt.

13 23. On May 21, 2014, Defendant called Plaintiff Plaintiff Trever DeClue's
14 personal cellular telephone 2 (two) times from a number ending in 2165
15 attempting to collect the debt.

16 24. On May 22, 2014, Defendant called Plaintiff Trever DeClue's personal cellular
17 telephone 2 (two) times from a number ending in 2166 attempting to collect
18 the debt.

19 25. On May 23, 2014, Defendant called Plaintiff Trever DeClue's personal cellular
20 telephone 2 (two) times from a number ending in 2167 attempting to collect
21 the debt.

22 26. All of the calls originated from numbers beginning with a "314" area code,
23 which is the area code for Saint Louis, Missouri, where Plaintiff's cellular
24 telephone was registered.

25 27. However, Defendant is located in Ohio and has a "440" area code. It does not
26 have any locations or call centers in Missouri. Defendant used automatic
27 dialer technology to not only initiate the calls, but also to "spoof" its number.
28

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT D1
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

1 This is a common tactic used by collection companies to trick debtors into
2 answering the telephone.

3 28. On information and belief, Defendant called Plaintiffs' cellular telephone using
4 an "automatic telephone dialing system" ("ATDS") as defined by 47 U.S.C. §
5 227(a)(1) without prior express consent.

6 29. This ATDS has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be
7 called, using a random or sequential number generator.

8 30. The telephone number Defendant called was assigned to a cellular telephone
9 service for which Plaintiffs incur a charge for incoming calls pursuant to 47
10 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1).

11 31. These telephone calls constitute calls that were not for emergency purposes as
12 defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(i).

13 32. Plaintiffs did not provide "prior express consent" to Defendant to place
14 telephone calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone with an artificial or prerecorded
15 voice utilizing an ATDS as proscribed under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

16 33. Further, Plaintiffs specifically revoked any consent which may have been
17 mistakenly believed, when he informed Defendant to stop calling.

18 34. These telephone calls by Defendant or its agents violated 47 U.S.C. §
19 227(b)(1).

20 35. Defendant called Plaintiffs' cellular telephone at least 17 (seventeen) times via
21 an ATDS.

22 36. Plaintiffs were injured because their privacy rights were infringed upon in the
23 form of harassment by Defendant.

24 37. Through this action, Plaintiffs suffered an invasion of their legally protected
25 interest in privacy, which is specifically addressed and protected by the TCPA.

26 38. They were personally affected because they were frustrated and distressed that
27 Defendant harassed Plaintiffs with a call using an ATDS.
28

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT D1
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

1 39. Defendant's call forces Plaintiffs and class members to live without the utility
2 of Plaintiff's cell phone by forcing them to silence their cell phone and/or
3 block incoming numbers.

4 40. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of and all others
5 similarly situated (the "Class"). The proposed Class that Plaintiff seeks to
6 represent are defined as follows:

7 41. Plaintiffs represent, and are members of the Class, consisting of:

8 All persons within the United States who received any telephone
9 call/s from Defendant or its agent/s and/or employee/s to said
10 person's cellular telephone made through the use of any
11 automatic telephone dialing system or with an artificial or
prerecorded voice within the four years prior to the filing of the
Complaint.

12 42. Plaintiffs represent, and are members of, the Class, because Plaintiffs received
13 telephone calls from Defendant to Plaintiffs' cellular telephone using a
14 prerecorded voice, some or all of which Plaintiffs were billed for receiving
15 such calls.

16 43. Defendant and its employees or agents are excluded from the Class. Plaintiffs
17 do not know the number of members in the Class, but believes the Class
18 members number in the several thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter
19 should be certified as a Class action to assist in the expeditious litigation of this
20 matter.

21 44. Plaintiffs and members of the Class were harmed by the acts of Defendant in at
22 least the following ways:

23 45. Plaintiffs and members of the Class were harmed by the acts of Defendants in
24 at least the following ways: Defendant, either directly or through its agents,
25 illegally contacting Plaintiffs and the Class members via their cellular
26 telephones by using an ATDS, thereby causing Plaintiffs and the Class
27 members to incur certain cellular telephone charges or reduce cellular
28

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT D1
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

1 telephone time for which Plaintiffs and the Class members previously paid, and
2 invading the privacy of said Plaintiffs and the Class members. Plaintiff and the
3 Class members were damaged thereby.

4 46. This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of economic
5 injury on behalf of the Class and it expressly is not intended to request any
6 recovery for personal injury and claims related thereto. Plaintiffs reserve the
7 right to expand the Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional
8 persons as warranted as facts are learned in further investigation and discovery.

9 47. The joinder of the Class members is impractical and the disposition of their
10 claims in the Class action will provide substantial benefits both to the parties
11 and to the court. The Class can be identified through Defendant's records.

12 48. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact
13 involved affecting the parties to be represented. The questions of law and fact
14 to the Class predominate over questions which may affect individual Class
15 members, including, but not limited to, the following:

- 16 • Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint,
17 Defendant made any call (other than a call made for emergency
18 purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) to
19 a Class member using any automatic telephone dialing system or an
20 artificial or prerecorded voice to any telephone number assigned to a
21 cellular telephone service.
- 22 • Whether Plaintiffs and the Class were damaged thereby, and the
23 extent of damages for such violation; and
- 24 • Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in such
25 conduct in the future.

26 49. As a person that received numerous calls using an automatic telephone dialing
27 system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, without Plaintiffs' express prior
28 consent, Plaintiffs are asserting claims that are typical of the Class. Plaintiffs

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT D1
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

1 will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class in that
2 Plaintiffs have no interests antagonistic to any member of the Class.

3 50. Plaintiffs and the members of the Class have all suffered irreparable harm as a
4 result of the Defendant's unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class
5 action, the Class will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In
6 addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy
7 and Defendant will likely continue such illegal conduct. Because of the size of
8 the individual Class member's claims, few, if any, Class members could afford
9 to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.

10 51. Plaintiffs have retained counsel experienced in handling class action claims
11 and claims involving consumer actions and violations of the Telephone
12 Consumer Protection Act.

13 52. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this
14 controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce Defendant to comply
15 with federal and California law. The interest of Class members in individually
16 controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendant is small
17 because the maximum statutory damages in an individual action for violation
18 of privacy are minimal. Management of these claims is likely to present
19 significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class claims.

20 53. Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby
21 making appropriate final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory relief
22 with respect to the Class as a whole.

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **NEGLIGENT VIOLATION OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION**

25 **ACT,**

26 **47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

27 54. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the above paragraphs of this Complaint as
28 though fully stated herein.

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT D1
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

1 55.The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and
2 multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each
3 and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

4 56.As a result of Defendant’s negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq,
5 Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each
6 and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B). Plaintiff is also
7 entitled to seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

8 57.Plaintiffs are also entitled to an award of attorney fees and costs.

9 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATION OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER**
11 **PROTECTION ACT,**
12 **47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

13 58.Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the above paragraphs of this Complaint as
14 though fully stated herein.

15 59.The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and
16 multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not
17 limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227
18 et seq.

19 60.As a result of Defendant’s knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. §
20 227 et seq., Plaintiffs are entitled to treble damages, as provided by statute, up
21 to \$1,500.00, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §
22 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

23 61.Plaintiffs are also entitled to seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in
24 the future.

25 62.Plaintiffs are also entitled to an award of attorney fees and costs

26 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

27 Wherefore, Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court grant Plaintiffs the
28 following relief against Defendant:

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT D1
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
NEGLIGENT VIOLATION OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION
ACT,
47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

- As a result of Defendant’s negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiffs seek \$500.00 (five-hundred dollars) in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B);
- Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future;
- An award of attorney fees and costs to counsel for Plaintiffs;
- Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper including interest.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATION OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER
PROTECTION ACT,
47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

- As a result of Defendant’s willful and/or knowing violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiffs seek treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500.00 (one-thousand-five-hundred dollars) for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C);
- Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.
- An award of attorney fees and costs to counsel for Plaintiffs.
- Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

//
//
//
//

1 63.Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of
2 America, Plaintiffs are entitled to, and demand, a trial by jury.

3
4 Date: November 17, 2016

5 Respectfully Submitted,

6 **KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC**

7
8 By: s/ Abbas Kazerounian

9 ABBAS KAZEROUNIAN, ESQ.

10 ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

11 Additional Attorneys for Plaintiffs:

12 Daniel G. Shay (State Bar No. 250548)

13 DanielShay@TCPAFDCPA.com

14 **LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL G. SHAY**

15 409 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 101B

16 San Diego, CA 92108

17 Telephone: (619) 222-7429

18 Facsimile: (866) 431-3292

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC
245 FISCHER AVENUE, UNIT D1
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

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
Trevor DeClue and Katherine DeClue, individually and on behalf of those similarly situated,

DEFENDANTS
United Consumer Financial Services Company

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

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.

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)
Abbas Kazerounian, Esq. (SBN: 249203)
Kazerouni Law Group, APC
245 Fischer Avenue, Unit D1, Costa Mesa, CA 92626 (800) 400-6808

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
1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State
2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State
3 3 Foreign Nation
4 4
5 5
6 6

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 like Insurance, Personal Injury, Real Estate, etc.

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

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
47 U.S.C. §§227 et seq.
Brief description of cause:
Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ 5,000,000.00 CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE 11/18/2016 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD s/Abbas Kazerounian

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading 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. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
 United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
 Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.
 Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
 Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.
 Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
 Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
 Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
 Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.
- VI. Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.
 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.
 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [United Consumer Financial Services Co. Robocall Class Action Bumped to Ohio Federal Court](#)
