UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

) Case No.) CLASS ACTION) COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS		
OF:		
1. NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C. §227(b)] 2. WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C. §227(b)] 3. NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C. §227(c)] 4. WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C. §227(c)] DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		

Plaintiff TENLEY HARDIN ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, alleges the following upon information and belief based upon personal knowledge:

NATURE OF THE CASE

1. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated seeking damages and any other available legal or equitable remedies resulting from the illegal actions of CASH FUND, LLC ("Defendant Cash Fund") and ADAM NELSON ("Defendant Nelson"), in negligently,

knowingly, and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff on Plaintiff's cellular telephone in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47. U.S.C. § 227 et seq. ("TCPA") and related regulations, specifically the National Do-Not-Call provisions, thereby invading Plaintiff's privacy.

JURISDICTION & VENUE

- 2. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) because Plaintiff, a resident of California, 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 Nevada company. 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 District of Colorado pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and because Defendant's principal place of business is located within the State of Colorado.

PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff, TENLEY HARDIN ("Plaintiff"), is a natural person residing in Venice, California and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).
- 5. Defendant, CASH FUND, LLC ("Defendant Cash Fund") is an online business loan company, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).
- 6. Defendant, ADAM NELSON ("Defendant Nelson"), is an individual who at all relevant times was the president, chief executive officer ("CEO") of Defendant Cash Fund. As president of Defendant Cash Fund, Defendant Nelson was responsible for the overall success of the company. Defendant Nelson materially participated in marketing and soliciting loan services to the public by occupying a position of critical importance to Defendant Cash Fund's business. As the CEO of Defendant Cash Fund, Defendant Nelson is liable for the nefarious

conduct engaged in by Defendant Cash Fund and its agents acting on Defendant Cash Fund's behalf. Defendant Nelson continued to play a key role in maintaining and expanding Defendant Cash Fund's activities throughout the time in question. Furthermore, Defendant Nelson is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).

- 7. Plaintiff believes, and thereupon alleges, that Defendants Cash Fund and Defendant Nelson were acting for the mutual benefit of one another and in concert at all times relevant herein, and will therefore be referred to hereinafter and collectively as "Defendants".
- 8. The above named Defendants, 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.
- 9. 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

- 10. Beginning in or around April 2017, Defendants contacted Plaintiff on Plaintiff's cellular telephone number ending in -2480, in an attempt to solicit Plaintiff to purchase Defendant's services.
- 11. Defendants used an "automatic telephone dialing system" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1) to place its call to Plaintiff seeking to solicit its services.

- 12. Defendants contacted or attempted to contact Plaintiff from multiple telephone numbers, including (435) 557-3010, (330) 382-5659, and (936) 213-8059, confirmed to be Defendants' number.
- 13. Defendants' calls constituted calls that were not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 14. Defendants' calls were placed to telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls pursuant to $47 U.S.C. \ \S \ 227(b)(1)$.
- 15. During all relevant times, Defendants did not possess Plaintiff's "prior express consent" to receive calls using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice on her cellular telephone pursuant to $47\ U.S.C.\ \S$ 227(b)(1)(A).
- 16. Further, Plaintiff's cellular telephone number ending in -2480 was added to the National Do-Not-Call Registry on or about September 15, 2008.
- 17. Defendants placed multiple calls soliciting its business to Plaintiff on his cellular telephone ending in -2480 in or around April 2017.
- 18. Such calls constitute solicitation calls pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2) as they were attempts to promote or sell Defendants' services.
- 19. Plaintiff received numerous solicitation calls from Defendants within a 12-month period.
- 20. Defendants continued to call Plaintiff in an attempt to solicit its services and in violation of the National Do-Not-Call provisions of the TCPA.
- 21. Upon information and belief, and based on Plaintiff's experiences of being called by Defendants after being on the National Do-Not-Call list for several years prior to Defendants' initial call, and at all relevant times, Defendants 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

- 22. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, as a member the two proposed classes (hereafter, jointly, "The Classes").
- 23. 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 solicitation/telemarketing telephone calls from Defendants to said person's cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such person had not previously consented to receiving such calls within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint

24. 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 Defendants prior express consent nor had a prior established business relationship, who received more than one call made by or on behalf of Defendants that promoted Defendants' products or services, within any twelve-month period, within four years prior to the filing of the complaint.

25. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The ATDS Class, consisting of all persons within the United States who received any collection telephone calls from Defendants to said person's cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such person had not previously not provided their cellular telephone number to Defendants within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

- 26. 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 Defendants prior express consent nor had a prior established business relationship, who received more than one call made by or on behalf of Defendants that promoted Defendants' products or services, within any twelve-month period, within four years prior to the filing of the complaint.
- 27. Defendants, 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.
- 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 ATDS Class were harmed by the acts of Defendants in at least the following ways: Defendants illegally contacted Plaintiff and ATDS Class members via their cellular telephones thereby causing Plaintiff and ATDS Class members to incur certain charges or reduced telephone time for which Plaintiff and ATDS Class members had previously paid by having to retrieve or administer messages left by Defendants during those illegal calls, and invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and ATDS Class members.
- 30. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of The ATDS Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of The ATDS Class. These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary between ATDS Class members, and which may be determined without

reference to the individual circumstances of any ATDS Class members, include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, Defendants made any telemarketing/solicitation call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) to a ATDS Class member using any automatic telephone dialing system or any artificial or prerecorded voice to any telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service;
- b. Whether Plaintiff and the ATDS Class members were damaged thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
- c. Whether Defendants should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.
- 31. As a person that received numerous telemarketing/solicitation calls from Defendants using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, without Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of The ATDS Class.
- 32. Plaintiff and members of The DNC Class were harmed by the acts of Defendants in at least the following ways: Defendants 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.
- 33. 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, Defendants 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 Defendants and did not have an established business relationship with Defendants;
- Whether Defendants 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 Defendants and its agents should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.
- 34. As a person that received numerous solicitation calls from Defendants within a 12-month period, who had not granted Defendants prior express consent and did not have an established business relationship with Defendants, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of the DNC Class.
- 35. 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.
- 36. 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.

- 37. 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.
- 38. Defendants 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

- 39. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-38.
- 40. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants 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).
- 41. As a result of Defendants' 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).
- 42. 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

- 43. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-42.
- 44. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants 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).
- 45. As a result of Defendants' 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).
- 46. 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

- 47. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-46.
- 48. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants 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).
 - 49. As a result of Defendants' 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).

50. 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

- 51. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-50.
- 52. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants 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).
- 53. As a result of Defendants' 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).
- 54. 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 Defendants 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 Defendants' 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 Defendants' 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 Defendants' negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. \$227(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 Defendants' willful and/or knowing violations of 47 U.S.C. §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 $U.S.C.\ \S227(c)(5)$.

- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.
- 55. 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 8th Day of January, 2018.

LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.

By: /s/ Todd M. Friedman
Todd M. Friedman
Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman, P.C.
21550 Oxnard St., Suite 780
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Phone: 877-206-4741 Fax: 866-633-0228

tfriedman@ toddflaw.com Attorney for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Dist	rict of Colorado								
TENLEY HARDIN, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated Plaintiff(s) v. CASH FUND, LLC; ADAM NELSON; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and each of them,)))) (-)) Civil Action No.))))								
SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION									
To: (Defendant's name and address) Cash Fund LLC c/o Adam Nelson 110 16th St., Suite 90: Adam Nelson 110 16th St. Ste. 901, Denver, CO 80202									
A lawsuit has been filed against you.									
are the United States or a United States agency, or an ep. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff at the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or rewhose name and address are: TODD M. FRIEDMAN	DDD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C. ite 780								
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will You also must file your answer or motion with the cou	ll be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. urt.								
	CLERK OF COURT								
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk								
	Signature of Clerk of Deputy Clerk								

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

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	ne of individual and title, if any)						
was re	ceived by me on (date)							
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individu	ual at (place)					
	-		on (date)	; or				
	☐ I left the summons a	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) designated by law to accept service of process on behalf 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	0			
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this informat	tion is true.					
D .								
Date:			Server's signature					
			Printed name and title					
			Server's address					

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Case 1:18-cv-00048 Document 1-2 Filed 01/08/18 USDC Colorado Page 1 of 3

District of Colorado Form JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

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.)

,	of First Listed Plaintiff <u>I</u> XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA Address, and Telephone Number 1. Friedman, P.C., 215 CA 91367, (877)206-	Los Angeles (SES) 50 Oxnard St., 4741		inclusive, and ea County of Residence NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT Attorneys (If Known) FIZENSHIP OF PI For Diversity Cases Only) P1	ch of them of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES OF LAND INVOLVED. RINCIPAL PARTIES	O (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF	
Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party) 2 U.S. Government '4 Diversity Defendant (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)				n of This State ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' '	of Business In	This State Principal Place ' 5 ' 5	
				n or Subject of a ' eign Country	3 ' 3 Foreign Nation	' 6 ' 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT						of Suit Code Descriptions.	
CONTRACT	TO	ORTS	FO	RFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
 □ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise 	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERT 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 70 Jamage 71 Truth in Lending 72 Personal Property Damage 73 Jamage 74 Product Liability	90 690 Y 710 720 740 751	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act	' 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ' 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY ' 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) ' 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI ' 865 RSI (405(g))	375 False Claims Act '376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information	
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	□ 791 □ 462	Other Labor Litigation I Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	■ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) ■ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
	moved from 3	Remanded from Appellate Court	4 Reins Reop		erred from		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	47 U.S.C. 8227 et al.		filing (De	o not cite jurisdictional statu	tes unless diversity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 23, F.R.Cv.P.	Di	EMAND \$5000000	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	y if demanded in complaint: Yes 'No	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE January 8, 2018		SIGNATURE OF ATTO	ORNEY O	FRECORD s/Todd M. Fried	dman		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY							
RECEIPT# AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JU	DGE	

Case 1:18-cv-00048 Document 1-2 Filed 01/08/18 USDC Colorado Page 2 of 3

Print Sav

Save As...

Reset

JS 44 Reverse (Rev. 06/17)

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 there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.
- **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.

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 – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.

Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. **PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.

- 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: <u>Cash Fund Accused of Placing Illegal Robocalls</u>