

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Shlomy Halawani, individually and on behalf of a
class of others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 0:18cv61540

v.

CLASS ACTION

Frisbid Services, LLC,

Jury Trial Demanded

Defendant.

COMPLAINT

1. Aimed at protecting consumer privacy, the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (“TCPA”) prohibits, except in limited circumstances, the use of “automatic telephone dialing systems” to call cellular telephones. Specifically, the TCPA prohibits “any person within the United States . . . to make any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice . . . to any telephone number assigned to a paging service, cellular telephone service, specialized mobile radio service, or other radio common carrier service, or any service for which the called party is charged for the call” 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A). The TCPA also bans unsolicited telephone marketing calls, including text messages, to members on the national Do-Not-Call list, regardless whether those calls are made using an automatic telephone dialing system or manually dialed.

2. On or about July 6, 2018, Plaintiff Shlomy Halawani (“Plaintiff”) began receiving unsolicited text message solicitations on his cellular telephone. The content of the messages indicate that they were placed by or on behalf of Frisbid Services, LLC (“Defendant”).

3. At all times relevant herein, including at least the 31 days prior to receipt of the first alleged text message, Plaintiff's cellular telephone number was registered with the national do-not-call registry of persons who do not wish to receive telephone solicitations. Such do-not-call registrations must be honored indefinitely, or until the registration is cancelled by the consumer or the telephone number is removed by the database administrator. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2).

4. Accordingly, Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant under the TCPA on behalf of himself and others similarly situated. Plaintiff seeks statutory damages for himself and the classes defined below, along with an injunction prohibiting Defendant from making impermissible, TCPA violative calls in the future.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. The Court has federal question subject matter jurisdiction over these TCPA claims. *Mims v. Arrow Financial Services, LLC*, 132 S.Ct. 740 (2012).

6. Venue is proper in the District because a substantial portion of the events complained of occurred here, i.e., Defendant directed their telemarketing text messages into this judicial district.

PARTIES

7. Plaintiff Shlomy Halawani ("Plaintiff") is a natural person whom, at all times relevant to this action, was and is a resident of Broward County, Florida.

8. Defendant is a Florida limited liability company whose principal office is located 4917 N. University Drive Lauderhill, FL 33351, and whose registered agent for service of process is Joseph D. Pena, 355 Alhambra Circle, Suite 801, Coral Gables, FL 33134.

9. Defendant owns and operates automotive care centers in the South Florida region of the United States.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS RELATING TO PLAINTIFF

10. On or about July 6, 2018, Plaintiff began receiving unsolicited text message solicitations on his cellular telephone. The content of the messages indicate that they were placed by or on behalf of Frisbid Services, LLC. The first such message encouraged Plaintiff to “Get a \$12.50 Oil Change before you take off on your summer destination!”

11. The following is representative of the complete message received on July 6, 2018:



12. The text messages were sent from the short code 474747, which upon information and belief, is registered to mobile marketing provider, CallFire, Inc, which hold themselves out as “leading providers of easy-to-use, self-service text and voice marketing solutions for thousands of businesses across the US & Canada.”¹

13. “CallFire provides the most powerful and versatile SMS text messaging platform

¹ <https://www.callfire.com/about> (Last viewed July 7, 2018).

on the market. Whether you want to send out promotions, discounts, updates or notifications - text marketing lets you reach thousands instantly.”²

14. The impersonal nature of the text messages, along with the fact that the CallFire text messaging platform used by Defendant is able to “reach thousands instantly,” plausibly suggests that the text messages at issue were placed using an Automatic Telephone Dialing System as defined by federal law.

15. At no time did Plaintiff ever provide consent for Defendant to send Plaintiff marketing text messages.

16. At all times relevant herein, including at least the 31 days prior to receipt of the first alleged text message, Plaintiff’s cellular telephone number was registered with the national do-not-call registry of persons who do not wish to receive telephone solicitations.

**TEXT MESSAGES PROVIDE TELEMARKETERS WITH INSTANT
COMMUNICATION TO CONSUMERS TO PROMOTE GOODS AND SERVICES**

17. In recent years, marketers stymied by federal laws limiting solicitation by telephone, facsimile machine, and email have increasingly looked to alternative technologies through which to send bulk solicitations to consumers easily and cheaply.

18. One of the newest methods of bulk marketing is to advertise through text messages sent to mobile phones.

19. Unlike faxes and unanswered phone calls, a text message allows virtually instantaneous communication with the recipient, almost anywhere in the world, day or night. Many cell phones immediately alert the recipient of new text messages. Consumers frequently use text messaging to stay in close contact with business colleagues and associates, family members, and friends. Text messaging is also used by schools, police departments, fire departments, and

² <https://www.callfire.com/products/text-messaging> (Last viewed July 7, 2018).

emergency medical services across the country.

20. The instantaneous nature of text message communication makes it very appealing to telemarketers—and very annoying to consumers subjected to spam text messages.

21. And unlike other forms of advertisement, spam texts can cost its recipients money.

22. Spam text messages are a burgeoning phenomenon. One authority estimates that Americans received more than four billion spam texts in 2011 more than double the number sent just two years earlier.

OVERVIEW OF THE TCPA

23. In 1991, Congress enacted the TCPA to regulate the explosive growth of the telemarketing industry. In so doing, Congress recognized that “[u]nrestricted telemarketing . . . can be an intrusive invasion of privacy” Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, Pub. L. No. 102-243, § 2(5) (1991) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 227). Specifically, in enacting the TCPA, Congress outlawed telemarketing via unsolicited automated or pre-recorded telephone calls (“Robocalls”), finding:

Evidence compiled by the Congress indicates that residential telephone subscribers consider automated or prerecorded telephone calls, regardless of the content or the initiator of the message, to be a nuisance and an invasion of privacy.

....

Banning such automated or prerecorded telephone calls to the home, except when the receiving party consents to receiving the call . . . , is the only effective means of protecting telephone consumers from this nuisance and privacy invasion.

Id. § 2(10) and (12); *See also Mims v. Arrow Financial Services, Inc.*, 132 S.Ct. 740 (Jan. 18, 2012).

24. While imposing general restrictions on a wide set of telemarketing practices, the TCPA’s strictest provisions apply to telemarketing by automatic telephone dialing system. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

25. The statutory definition of an automatic telephone dialing system (sometimes called “autodialer”) is “equipment which has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator to dial the numbers[,]” and has the capacity to dial such numbers. *Id.* § 227(a)(1). The term also extends to predictive dialers and equipment that has the capacity to dial numbers without human intervention. *See In The Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, 18 F.C.C.R. 14014, 14093 (2003).

26. With the limited exception of calls made for emergency purposes, the TCPA bans all calls to cell phones placed through an autodialer, regardless of whether they solicit the sale of goods or services, unless the recipient of the call provides “prior express consent” to receive the calls. 47 U.S.C. § 227(b); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(1).

27. “Prior express consent” exists where a consumer has (a) clearly stated that the telemarketer may call, and (b) clearly expressed an understanding that the telemarketer’s subsequent call will be made for the purpose of encouraging the purchase of goods or services. *See In The Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, 10 F.C.C.R. 12391, 12396, para. 11 (1995).

28. Under FCC regulations, telemarketing calls require prior express **written** consent. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(a)(2).

29. “Prior express written consent” means an agreement, in writing, bearing the signature of the person called that clearly authorizes the seller to deliver or cause to be delivered to the person called advertisements or telemarketing messages using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, and the telephone number to which the

signatory authorizes such advertisements or telemarketing messages to be delivered. 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(f)(8).

30. A text message is a call within the meaning of the TCPA. *Satterfield v. Simon & Schuster, Inc.*, 569 F.3d 946, 952 (9th Cir.2009).

Vicarious Liability

31. Under the TCPA, as interpreted by the FCC, a person or entity can be liable for calls made on its behalf even if that person or entity did not directly dial those calls.

32. The FCC has explained that its “rules generally establish that the party on whose behalf a solicitation is made bears ultimate responsibility for any violations.” *See In the Matter of Rules & Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 10 F.C.C Rcd. 12391, 12397 (1995).

33. In 2008, the FCC reiterated that “a company on whose behalf a telephone solicitation is made bears the responsibility for any violations.” *See In the Matter of Rules & Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 23 F.C.C. Rcd. 559, 565 (2008) (specifically recognizing “on behalf of” liability in the context of a robocall sent to a consumer by a third party on another entity’s behalf under 47 U.S.C. 227(b)).

34. In May of 2013, the FCC reinforced this issue. *See In the Matter of the Joint Petition Filed by Dish Network, LLC*, 28 F.C.C. Rcd. 6574 (2013) (hereinafter “2013 FCC Ruling Order”) (clarifying that “a seller ... may be vicariously liable under federal common law agency-related principles for violations of either section 227(b) or 227(c) committed by telemarketers that initiate calls to market its products or services.”). The FCC rejected a narrow view of TCPA liability, including the assertion that a seller’s liability requires a finding of formal agency and immediate direction and control over the third-party who placed the telemarketing call. *Id.* n.107.

35. The 2013 FCC Order further explained:

“To provide guidance in this area, we find that the following are illustrative examples of evidence that may demonstrate that the telemarketer is the seller’s authorized representative with apparent authority to make the seller vicariously liable for the telemarketer’s section 227(b) violations. For example, apparent authority may be supported by evidence that the seller allows the outside sales entity access to information and systems that normally would be within the seller’s exclusive control, including: access to detailed information regarding the nature and pricing of the seller’s products and services or to the seller’s customer information. The ability by the outside sales entity to enter consumer information into the seller’s sales or customer systems, as well as the authority to use the seller’s trade name, trademark and service mark may also be relevant. It may also be persuasive that the seller approved, wrote or reviewed the outside entity’s telemarketing scripts. Finally, a seller would be responsible under the TCPA for the unauthorized conduct of a third-party telemarketer that is otherwise authorized to market on the seller’s behalf if the seller knew (or reasonably should have known) that the telemarketer was violating the TCPA on the seller’s behalf and the seller failed to take effective steps within its power to force the telemarketer to cease that conduct. At a minimum, evidence of these kinds of relationships – which consumers may acquire through discovery, if they are not independently privy to such information – should be sufficient to place upon the seller the burden of demonstrating that a reasonable consumer would not sensibly assume that the telemarketer was acting as the seller’s authorized agent.

“[] In sum, under our current rules and administrative precedent interpreting and implementing sections 227(b) and 227(c), we do not think that an action taken for the benefit of a seller by a third-party retailer, without more, is sufficient to trigger the liability of a seller under section either section 227(c) or section 227(b). **However, we see no reason that a seller should not be liable under those provisions for calls made by a third-party telemarketer when it has authorized that telemarketer to market its goods or services.** In that circumstance, the seller has the ability, through its authorization, to oversee the conduct of its telemarketers, even if that power to supervise is unexercised. In the case of either actions to enforce section 227(b) or actions to enforce do-not-call restrictions under section 227(c), we stress that nothing in this order requires a consumer to provide proof – at the time it files its complaint – that the seller should be held vicariously liable for the offending call. (emphasis added)

Id. at ¶¶ 46-47).

36. Accordingly, it is undeniably clear, that an entity can be liable under the TCPA for a call made on its behalf even if the entity did not directly place the call under a number of theories,

including vicarious liability. Under those circumstances, the entity is properly deemed to have initiated the call through the person or entity that actually placed the calls.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

37. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of two (2) nationwide classes of similarly situated individuals, the first of which consists of:

The ATDS Class: All persons in the United States to whom, within the four years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint, Defendant or some person acting on Defendant's behalf sent one or more text messages to their cellular telephone advertising Defendant's goods and/or services, through the use of the same or materially similar telephone dialing equipment as that which was used to send the texts at issue to the Plaintiff.

38. Plaintiff is a member of the ATDS Class.

39. The second class consists of:

The DNC Class: All persons in the United States to whom, within the four years immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint, Defendant or some person acting on Defendant's behalf sent one or more text messages to their cellular telephone advertising Defendant's goods and/or services, while the subject cellular telephone number was registered on the National Do-Not-Call list for more than 31 days.

40. Plaintiff is a member of the DNC Class.

41. Defendant and their employees or agents, Plaintiff's attorneys and their employees, the Judge to whom this action is assigned and any member of the Judge's staff and immediate family, and claims for personal injury, wrongful death, and/or emotional distress are excluded from the Classes.

42. The Classes are so numerous and geographically widespread that joinder is impracticable. Upon information and belief, as well as common experience of the size of automated dialing campaigns, there are easily more than one thousand persons in each Class.

43. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Classes and predominate over any questions solely affecting any individual member of the Classes, including Plaintiff. Such questions common to the Classes include, but are not limited to:

- a. Whether the calls that are the subject of this lawsuit were made using an “automatic telephone dialing system” as proscribed by the TCPA and applicable FCC regulations and orders;
- b. Whether the calls that are the subject of this lawsuit were made to individuals whose cellular telephone was registered on the national do not call registry.
- c. Whether the violation was negligent or willful.

44. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Classes. Plaintiff has no interests that might conflict with the interests of the Class. Plaintiff is interested in pursuing his claims vigorously and has retained counsel competent and experienced in class and complex litigation.

45. Class action treatment is superior to the alternatives for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy alleged herein. Such treatment will permit a large number of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously, efficiently, and without the duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would entail.

46. No difficulties are likely to be encountered in the management of this class action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action, and no superior alternative exists for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.

47. Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to the Classes, thereby making relief appropriate with respect to the Classes as a whole.

48. Prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Classes, should they realize their rights have been violated, would likely create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Classes that would establish incompatible standards of conduct.

49. The identity of the Class Members is likely readily identifiable from Defendant's records, or the records of other person(s) involved with making the calls.

50. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy since joinder of all members is impracticable.

COUNT I

Violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b) and the Regulations Promulgated Thereunder **(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the ATDS Class)**

51. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

52. It is a violation of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. §227(b) to call a person's cellular telephone using an automatic telephone dialing system. The TCPA also specifically prohibits the use of an unsolicited text messages to advertise the sale of goods and services. 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200.

53. Defendant, or some person on its behalf, sent one or more text messages to plaintiff and others' cellular telephones, using an automatic telephone dialing system and/or an artificial or prerecorded voice without Plaintiff's or the class members' express written consent.

54. The Defendant's text messages were negligently placed, or alternatively, willfully placed despite prior knowledge of the TCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that the Court enter judgment in favor of himself and the class and against Defendant that provides the following relief:

- a. Statutory damages of \$500 per violation, and up to \$1,500 per violation if proven to be willful;
- b. A permanent injunction prohibiting Defendant from violating the TCPA in the future through calling cell phones using an automatic telephone dialing system and/or a prerecorded voice message;
- c. A declaration that Defendant used an automatic telephone dialing system and artificial or prerecorded voice, and violated the TCPA in using such for calls to the cell phones of plaintiff and the class; and
- d. Any other relief the Court finds just and proper.

COUNT II

Violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c) and the Regulations Promulgated Thereunder **(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the DNC Class)**

55. Plaintiff incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
56. It is a violation of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. §227(c) to call a person who has registered his or her telephone number on the national do-not-call registry of persons who do not wish to receive telephone solicitations. 47 U.S.C. § 227(c); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200.
57. Defendant, or some person on its behalf, sent one or more marketing text messages to Plaintiff and others' cellular telephone numbers when said numbers had been registered on the national do-not-call registry for more than 31 days.
58. Such text messages were sent without Plaintiff's or the class members' express written consent.
59. The Defendant's text messages were negligently placed, or alternatively, willfully placed despite prior knowledge of the TCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that the Court enter judgment in favor of himself and the class and against Defendant that provides the following relief:

- a. Statutory damages of \$500 per violation, and up to \$1,500 per violation if proven to be willful;
- b. A permanent injunction prohibiting Defendant from violating the TCPA in the future through calling cell phones registered with the national do-not-call registry;
- c. A declaration that Defendant made calls to numbers registered with the national do-not-call registry, and violated the TCPA in making such calls to the cell phones of Plaintiff and the class; and
- d. Any other relief the Court finds just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

60. Plaintiff demands trial by jury.

Dated: July 8, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Jibrael S. Hindi
Jibrael S. Hindi, Esq.
THE LAW OFFICE OF JIBRAEL S. HINDI, PLLC
110 SE 6th Street
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301
Tel: (954) 907-1136
Fax: (855) 529-9540
jibrael@jibraellaw.com

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.) NOTICE: Attorneys MUST Indicate All Re-filed Cases Below.

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Shlomy Halawani, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated DEFENDANTS Frisbid Services, LLC

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Broward (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) The Law Office of Jibrael S. Hindi, PLLC, 610 SE 6th St., Suite 1744 Fort Lauderdale FL, 33301. (954)907-1136

(d) Check County Where Action Arose: MIAMI-DADE MONROE BROWARD PALM BEACH MARTIN ST. LUCIE INDIAN RIVER OKEECHOBEE HIGHLANDS

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

Grid for Basis of Jurisdiction and Citizenship of Principal Parties with checkboxes for U.S. Government Plaintiff/Defendant, Federal Question, Diversity, Citizen of This/Another State, Foreign Country, PTF/DEF 1-6, and Incorporated/Principal Place of Business.

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

Large grid for Nature of Suit with categories: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, CIVIL RIGHTS, TORTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) 1 Original Proceeding 2 Removed from State Court 3 Re-filed (See VI below) 4 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transferred from another district (specify) 6 Multidistrict Litigation Transfer 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File 9 Remanded from Appellate Court

VI. RELATED/ RE-FILED CASE(S) (See instructions): a) Re-filed Case YES NO b) Related Cases YES NO JUDGE: DOCKET NUMBER:

VII. CAUSE OF ACTION Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and Write a Brief Statement of Cause (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. §227 et seq. ("TCPA") LENGTH OF TRIAL via 4-5 days estimated (for both sides to try entire case)

VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

ABOVE INFORMATION IS TRUE & CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE DATE July 8, 2018 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

Handwritten signature of the attorney of record.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AMOUNT 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.C.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; 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 clerks 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 seven 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.

Refiled (3) Attach copy of Order for Dismissal of Previous case. Also complete VI.

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.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (8) Check this box if remanded from Appellate Court.

VI. Related/Refiled Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases or re-filed cases. Insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judges name for such cases.

VII. 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

VIII. 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 dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) 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.

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

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Southern District of Florida

Shlomy Halawani, individually and on behalf of a class of others similarly situated

Plaintiff(s)

v.

Frisbid Services, LLC

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No. 0:18cv61540

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) Frisbid Services, LLC
Registered Agent: JOSEPH D. PENA
355 ALHAMBRA CIRCLE
Suite 801
CORAL GABLES, FL 33134

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: The Law Offices of Jibrael S. Hindi, PLLC. 110 SE 6th St., Suite 1744, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301. Phone: (844)542-7235 Email: jibrael@jibraellaw.com Fax: (855)529-9540

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

Civil Action No. 0:18cv61540

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:

Print

Save As...

Reset

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Frisbid Services Hit with Class Action Over Alleged Unsolicited Text Messages](#)
