UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

VIVIAN EZENWA, individually and) Case No.
on behalf of all others similarly situated,	CLASS ACTION
Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF:
VS.) 1. NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C.
ICAN BENEFIT GROUP LLC;) §227 ET SEQ.]
DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,	2. WILLFUL VÌÓLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C.
Defendant(s).) §227 ET SEQ.]
	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, VIVIAN EZENWA ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of itself and all others similarly situated, alleges the following upon information and belief based upon personal knowledge:

NATURE OF THE CASE

1. Plaintiff brings this action for itself and others similarly situated seeking damages and any other available legal or equitable remedies resulting from the illegal actions of ICAN BENEFIT GROUP LLC ("Defendant"), in negligently, knowingly, and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff via "telephone facsimile machine" in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47. U.S.C. § 227 et seq. ("TCPA"), thereby causing Plaintiff and all others similarly situated to incur the costs of receiving unsolicited advertisement messages via "telephone facsimile machines" and invading their privacy.

JURISDICTION & VENUE

2. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) because Plaintiff, a resident of Texas, seeks relief on behalf of a Class, which will result in at least

one class member belonging to a different state than that of Defendant, a Florida Corporation. Plaintiff also seeks up to \$1,500.00 in damages for each call in violation of the TCPA, which, when aggregated among a proposed class in the thousands, exceeds the \$5,000,000.00 threshold for federal court jurisdiction. Therefore, both diversity jurisdiction and the damages threshold under the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA") are present, and this Court has jurisdiction.

3. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) because all defendants reside in Florida, and Defendant is headquartered within this District.

PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff, VIVIAN EZENWA ("Plaintiff"), is a person residing in Houston, Texas and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).
- 5. Defendant, ICAN BENEFIT GROUP LLC ("Defendant"), is a marketer of medical products and medical related financial services, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).
- 6. The above named Defendant, and its subsidiaries and agents, are collectively referred to as "Defendants." The true names and capacities of the Defendants sued herein as DOE DEFENDANTS 1 through 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues such Defendants by fictitious names. Each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible for the unlawful acts alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend the Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when such identities become known.
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all relevant times, each and every Defendant was acting as an agent and/or employee of each of the other Defendants and was acting within the course and scope of said agency and/or employment with the full knowledge and consent of each of the other Defendants.

Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the acts and/or omissions complained of herein was made known to, and ratified by, each of the other Defendants.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 8. On or around July 31, 2017, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on Plaintiff's cellular telephone number, ending in -7137, through text message, in an attempt to solicit Plaintiff to purchase Defendant's services.
- 9. During this time, Defendants began to use Plaintiff's cellular telephone for the purpose of sending Plaintiff spam advertisements and/or promotional offers, via text messages, including a text message sent to and received by Plaintiff in or around July 2017.
- 10. On or around July 31, 2017, Plaintiff received the following text message from Defendant that read:

"I'm running new rated on the insurance. Big Difference. Call me – we'll lower them now. Wow. 800-601-0543"

- 11. These text messages placed to Plaintiff's cellular telephone were placed via an "automatic telephone dialing system," ("ATDS") as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (a)(1) as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).
- 12. Defendant contacted or attempted to contact Plaintiff from telephone number (561) 220-6332 confirmed to be Defendant's number.
- 13. The telephone number that Defendants, or their agent called was assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1).
- 14. These telephone calls constituted calls that were not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A)(i).
- 15. During all relevant times, Defendant did not possess Plaintiff's "prior express consent" to receive calls or text messages using an automatic telephone

dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice on his cellular telephone pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

- 16. Further, Plaintiff's cellular telephone number ending in -7137 was added to the National Do-Not-Call Registry on or about January 20, 2005.
- 17. Defendant sent a text message soliciting its business to Plaintiff on his cellular telephone ending in -7137 on or around July 31, 2017.
- 18. Such text messages constitute solicitation calls pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2) as they were attempts to promote or sell Defendant's services.
- 19. Defendant continued to call Plaintiff in an attempt to solicit its services and in violation of the National Do-Not-Call provisions of the TCPA.
- 20. Upon information and belief, and based on Plaintiff's experiences of being called by Defendant after being on the National Do-Not-Call list for several years prior to Defendant's initial call, and at all relevant times, Defendant failed to establish and implement reasonable practices and procedures to effectively prevent telephone solicitations in violation of the regulations prescribed under 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

- 21. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, as a member the two proposed classes (hereafter, jointly, "The Classes").
- 22. The class concerning the ATDS claim for no prior express consent (hereafter "The ATDS Class") is defined as follows:

All persons within the United States who received any unsolicited text messages from Defendants which text message was not made for emergency purposes or with the recipient's prior express consent within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

23. The class concerning the National Do-Not-Call violation (hereafter "The DNC Class") is defined as follows:

All persons within the United States registered on the National Do-Not-Call Registry for at least 30 days, who had not granted Defendant prior express consent nor had a prior established business relationship, who received more than one call made by or on behalf of Defendant that promoted Defendant's products or services, within any twelve-month period, within four years prior to the filing of the complaint.

- 24. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The ATDS Class, consisting of all persons within the United States who received any unsolicited text messages from Defendants which text message was not made for emergency purposes or with the recipient's prior express consent within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint..
- 25. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The DNC Class, consisting of all persons within the United States registered on the National Do-Not-Call Registry for at least 30 days, who had not granted Defendant prior express consent nor had a prior established business relationship, who received more than one call made by or on behalf of Defendant that promoted Defendant's products or services, within any twelve-month period, within four years prior to the filing of the complaint.
- 26. Defendant, its employees and agents are excluded from The Classes. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in The Classes, but believes the Classes members number in the thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should be certified as a Class Action to assist in the expeditious litigation of the matter.
- 27. This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of economic injury on behalf of the Class, and it expressly is not intended to request any recovery for personal injury and claims related thereto. Plaintiff reserves the

right to expand the Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional persons as warranted as facts are learned in further investigation and discovery.

- 28. The Classes are so numerous that the individual joinder of all of its members is impractical. While the exact number and identities of The Classes members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through appropriate discovery, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that The Classes includes thousands of members. Plaintiff alleges that The Classes members may be ascertained by the records maintained by Defendant.
- 29. Plaintiff and members of the Class were harmed by the acts of Defendants in at least the following ways: Defendants, either directly or through their agents, illegally contacted Plaintiff and the Class members via their cellular telephones by using marketing and text messages, thereby causing Plaintiff and the Class members to incur certain cellular telephone charges or reduce cellular telephone time for which Plaintiff and the Class members previously paid, and invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and the Class members. Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby.
- 30. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented. The questions of law and fact to the Class predominate over questions which may affect individual Class members, including the following:
 - a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, Defendants or their agents sent any text messages to the Class (other than a message made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) to a Class member using any automatic dialing system to any telephone number assigned to a cellular phone service;
 - b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and

- c. Whether Defendants and their agents should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.
- 31. As a person that received at least one marketing and text message without Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of the Class. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class in that Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to any member of the Class.
- 32. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have all suffered irreparable harm as a result of the Defendants' unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class action, the Class will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy and Defendants will likely continue such illegal conduct. Because of the size of the individual Class member's claims, few, if any, Class members could afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.
- 33. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in handling class action claims and claims involving violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.
- 34. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce Defendants to comply with federal and California law. The interest of Class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendants are small because the maximum statutory damages in an individual action for violation of privacy are minimal. Management of these claims is likely to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class claims.
- 35. Plaintiff and members of The DNC Class were harmed by the acts of Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant illegally contacted Plaintiff and DNC Class members via their telephones for solicitation purposes, thereby invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and the DNC Class members whose telephone

numbers were on the National Do-Not-Call Registry. Plaintiff and the DNC Class members were damaged thereby.

- 36. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of The DNC Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of The DNC Class. These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary between DNC Class members, and which may be determined without reference to the individual circumstances of any DNC Class members, include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, Defendant or its agents placed more than one solicitation call to the members of the DNC Class whose telephone numbers were on the National Do-Not-Call Registry and who had not granted prior express consent to Defendant and did not have an established business relationship with Defendant;
 - Whether Defendant obtained prior express written consent to place solicitation calls to Plaintiff or the DNC Class members' telephones;
 - c. Whether Plaintiff and the DNC Class member were damaged thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
 - d. Whether Defendant and its agents should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.
- 37. As a person that received numerous solicitation calls from Defendant within a 12-month period, who had not granted Defendant prior express consent and did not have an established business relationship with Defendant, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of the DNC Class.

- 38. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of The Classes. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of class actions.
- 39. A class action is superior to other available methods of fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy, since individual litigation of the claims of all Classes members is impracticable. Even if every Classes member could afford individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome to the courts in which individual litigation of numerous issues would proceed. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent, or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex factual issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action presents fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court system, and protects the rights of each Classes member.
- 40. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Classes members would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other Classes members not parties to such adjudications or that would substantially impair or impede the ability of such non-party Class members to protect their interests.
- 41. Defendant has acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable to The Classes, thereby making appropriate final and injunctive relief with regard to the members of the Classes as a whole.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. §227(b).

On Behalf of the ATDS Class

- 42. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-41.
- 43. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b), and in particular 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).
- 44. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b), Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 45. Plaintiff and the ATDS Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection

Act

47 U.S.C. §227(b)

On Behalf of the ATDS Class

- 46. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-41.
- 47. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b), and in particular 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).
- 48. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b), Plaintiff and the ATDS Class members are entitled an award of \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
- 49. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. §227(c)

On Behalf of the DNC Class

- 50. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-41.
- 51. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), and in particular 47 U.S.C. § 227 (c)(5).
- 52. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), Plaintiff and the DNC Class Members are entitled an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(B).
- 53. Plaintiff and the DNC Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act

47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.

On Behalf of the DNC Class

- 54. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-41.
- 55. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), in particular 47 U.S.C. § 227 (c)(5).
- 56. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), Plaintiff and the DNC Class members are entitled an award of

- \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. \$ 227(c)(5).
- 57. Plaintiff and the DNC Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendant for the following:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. §227(b)

- As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. \$227(b)(1), Plaintiff and the ATDS Class members are entitled to and request \$500 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 227(b)(3)(B).
- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act

47 U.S.C. §227(b)

- As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of 47 *U.S.C.* §227(b)(1), Plaintiff and the ATDS Class members are entitled to and request treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 *U.S.C.* §227(b)(3)(B) and 47 *U.S.C.* §227(b)(3)(C).
- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. §227(c)

• As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C.

 $\S227(c)(5)$, Plaintiff and the DNC Class members are entitled to and request \$500 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 227(c)(5).

• Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act

47 U.S.C. §227(c)

- As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of 47 $U.S.C.\ \S 227(c)(5)$, Plaintiff and the DNC Class members are entitled to and request treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 $U.S.C.\ \S 227(c)(5)$.
- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.
- 58. Pursuant to the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demands, a trial by jury.

Respectfully Submitted this 1st Day of December, 2017.

By: /s/ Raymond R. Dieppa
Raymond R. Dieppa
FLORIDA LEGAL, LLC
Attorney for Plaintiff

Raymond R. Dieppa (SBN 27690) FLORIDA LEGAL, LLC 14 NE First Ave, Suite 1001 Miami, FL 33132 Phone: (305) 901-2209 Ray.dieppa@floridalegal.law SJS 44 (Rev. 2/08)

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 THE REVIEWS OF THE FORM.)

NOTICE: Aftorneys MUST Indicate All Re-filed Cases Below.

the civil docket sheet. (SEE In	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.	, 1401	ice. Attorneys mes	I murcate An nec men e	ases Delovi.	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	,		DEFENDANTS			
VIVIAN EZENWA, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated			ICAN BENEFIT GROUP LLC			
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff Harris County, T.	County of Residence o	f First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES	Palm Beach		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Ac	ddress, and Telephone Number)		NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT			
Florida Legal, LLC 14 N.E. 1st Avenue, Suite Miami, Florida 33132 Phone: (305) 901-2209	e 1001		LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)			
(d) Check County Where Action	on Arose: I MIAMI-DADE I MONROE I E	BROWARD ¥	5 PALM BEACH O MAI	RTIN O ST. LUCIE O INDI		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. C	ITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	HIGHLANDS (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
☐ 1 U.S. Government		Citiz	(For Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF Citizen of This State □ 1 ✓ 1 Incorporated or Principal Place □ 4 □ 4 of Business In This State			
2 U.S. Government Defendant	O 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	2	-	
	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		reign Country			
CONTRACT 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL IN		FEITURE/PENALTY 10 Agriculture	BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES 400 State Reapportionment	
□ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment Æ Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	310 Airplane	actice jury - ju	20 Other Food & Drug 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 30 Liquor Laws 40 R.R. & Truck 50 Airline Regs. 60 Occupational Safety/Health 90 Other LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 30 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 40 Railway Labor Act 90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION 162 Naturalization Application 163 Habeas Corpus-Alien Detainee 165 Other Immigration Actions	423 Withdrawal	410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice	
1 Original 2 I	an "X" in One Box Only) Removed from	Reo	stated or 5 anoth (speci	DOCKET NUMBER	n Judgment	
VIII. CAUSE OF ACT VIII. REQUESTED II COMPLAINT:	ION VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEP LENGTH OF TRIAL via 10 days es	timated (for b	ooth sides to try entire case	se)	y if demanded in complaint:	
ABOVE INFORMATION I THE BEST OF MY KNOW	S TRUE & CORRECT TO SIGNATURE O		0,000.00 Y of record	DATE	7	
			FOR OF	FICE USE ONLY		

AMOUNT

RECEIPT #

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Southern District of Florida

Southern Distr	ict of florida						
VIVIAN EZENWA, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,							
Plaintiff(s)							
v.)	Civil Action No. 9:17-cv-81316-XXX						
ICAN BENEFIT GROUP LLC,							
))							
Defendant(s)							
SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION							
To: (Defendant's name and address) ICAN BENEFIT GROUP LLC C/O REGISTERED AGENT, 5300 BROKEN SOUND BLV BOCA RATON, FL 33487	ICAN HOLDING, LLC						
A lawsuit has been filed against you.							
Within 21 days after service of this summons on you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answ the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion whose name and address are: Raymond R. Dieppa, Esq. Florida Legal, LLC 14 N.E. 1st Avenue, Suite 10 Miami, Florida 33132 Tel. (305) 901-2209 ray.dieppa@floridalegal.law	rer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,						
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.							
	CLERK OF COURT						
Date:							
	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk						

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No. 9:17-cv-81316-XXX

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

was re	This summons for (nanceived by me on (date)	ne of individual and title, if any)					
was ic	·	·					
	i personally served	the summons on the individual	on (date)				
	☐ I left the summons	at the individual's residence or		_			
		, a perso	on of suitable age and discretion who res	sides there,			
	on (date)		the individual's last known address; or				
	☐ I served the summons on (name of individual), wh						
	designated by law to a	accept service of process on beh	alf of (name of organization)				
			on (date)	; or			
	☐ I returned the summ	nons unexecuted because		; or			
	☐ Other (specify):						
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00			
	I declare under penalty	y of perjury that this information	is true.				
Date:							
			Server's signature				
			Printed name and title				
			Server's address				

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>iCan Benefit Group Pegged with TCPA Class Action Over Allegedly Unsolicited Text Messages</u>