FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT ARKANSAS

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS CENTRAL DIVISION

STAN HASTINGS, individually and on behalf of other similarly situated.

No. 4:22cV228-LPR

Plaintiff,

v. : **COMPLAINT – CLASS ACTION** 

SMARTMATCH INSURANCE AGENCY, LLC

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED** 

Defendant. : This case assigned to District and

and to Magistrate Judge\_

Plaintiff Stan Hastings, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, alleges on personal knowledge, investigation of his counsel, and on information and belief, as follows:

## **NATURE OF ACTION**

- 1. As the Supreme Court has explained, "Americans passionately disagree about many things. But they are largely united in their disdain for robocalls. The Federal Government receives a staggering number of complaints about robocalls—3.7 million complaints in 2019 alone. The States likewise field a constant barrage of complaints. For nearly 30 years, the people's representatives in Congress have been fighting back. As relevant here, the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, known as the TCPA, generally prohibits robocalls to cell phones and home phones." *Barr v. Am. Ass'n of Political Consultants*, 140 S. Ct. 2335, 2343 (2020).
- 2. This case involves a campaign by SmartMatch Insurance Agency, LLC ("SmartMatch") to market insurance services through the use of pre-recorded telemarketing

calls, including to numbers on the National Do Not Call Registry, in plain violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. (hereinafter referred to as the "TCPA").

- 3. Because the calls to Plaintiff were transmitted using technology capable of generating thousands of similar calls per day, Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of proposed nationwide classes of other persons who were sent the same illegal telemarketing calls.
- 4. A class action is the best means of obtaining redress for the Defendant's illegal telemarketing and is consistent both with the private right of action afforded by the TCPA and the fairness and efficiency goals of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

## **PARTIES**

- 5. Plaintiff, Stan Hastings, resides in this District.
- 6. Defendant SmartMatch Insurance Agency, LLC is a Missouri limited liability company.

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This Court has federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.
- 8. This Court has personal jurisdiction over SmartMatch because the company makes telemarketing calls into this District.
- 9. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) because the telephone calls at issue were sent into this District.

## **TCPA BACKGROUND**

## The TCPA Prohibits Automated Telemarketing Calls

- 10. The TCPA makes it unlawful to make any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice to any telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service or that is charged per the call. See 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).
- 11. The TCPA provides a private cause of action to persons who receive calls in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A) or 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B). See 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).
- 12. According to findings by the Federal Communication Commission ("FCC"), the agency Congress vested with authority to issue regulations implementing the TCPA, such calls are prohibited because, as Congress found, automated or prerecorded telephone calls are a greater nuisance and invasion of privacy than live solicitation calls, and such calls can be costly and inconvenient.
- 13. In 2013, the FCC required prior express written consent for all autodialed or prerecorded telemarketing calls ("robocalls") to wireless numbers and residential lines.

  Specifically, it ordered that:
  - [A] consumer's written consent to receive telemarketing robocalls must be signed and be sufficient to show that the consumer: (1) received "clear and conspicuous disclosure" of the consequences of providing the requested consent, i.e., that the consumer will receive future calls that deliver prerecorded messages by or on behalf of a specific seller; and (2) having received this information, agrees unambiguously to receive such calls at a telephone number the consumer designates.[] In addition, the written agreement must be obtained "without requiring, directly or indirectly, that the agreement be executed as a condition of purchasing any good or service.[]"

In the Matter of Rules & Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991, 27 F.C.C. Rcd. 1830, 1844 (2012) (footnotes omitted).

## The National Do Not Call Registry

- 14. The National Do Not Call Registry allows consumers to register their telephone numbers and thereby indicate their desire not to receive telephone solicitations at those numbers. See 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2).
- 15. A listing on the Registry "must be honored indefinitely, or until the registration is cancelled by the consumer or the telephone number is removed by the database administrator." *Id*.
- 16. The TCPA and implementing regulations prohibit the initiation of telephone solicitations to residential telephone subscribers to the Registry and provides a private right of action against any entity that makes those calls, or "on whose behalf" such calls are promoted. 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2).

## **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 17. Defendant SmartMatch is a "person" as the term is defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).
- 18. Mr. Hastings' telephone number, (501) 680-XXXX, is registered to a cellular telephone service.
- 19. Mr. Hastings telephone number has been on the National Do Not Call Registry since 2005.
- 20. Despite this, Mr. Hastings believes he received approximately a dozen prerecorded telemarketing calls from the Defendant.

- 21. The calls all came from the same Caller ID, 501-289-5947.
- 22. This is a local "spoofed" Caller ID, which is utilized by telemarketing companies that desire to hide their identity.
  - 23. Using such a "spoofed" Caller ID is also evidence of en masse calling.
  - 24. The pre-recorded calls stated that the caller was with "Senior Medical Group".
- 25. Upon information and belief, this is a false name used by the Defendant as part of its telemarketing to conceal its true identity.
- 26. Finally, on the March 27, 2021 call, Mr. Hastings responded to the telemarketer in hopes of identifying the caller.
- 27. The pre-recorded message stated that the purpose of the call was to reduce costs that "seniors experience".
- 28. Indeed, the fact that the call was made using pre-recorded messages was confirmed when the Plaintiff asked the recording "are you a real person"?
  - 29. In response, another recorded message was played.
  - 30. Eventually, the Plaintiff spoke with a live person.
  - 31. That individual was Brian Riley of SmartMatch.
  - 32. Mr. Riley informed the Plaintiff that he was a "professional Medicare Advisor".
- 33. The call advertised the ability of SmartMatch to reduce the costs of deductibles, copays and prescription drugs.
- 34. Mr. Riley informed the Plaintiff that his company's website was SmartMatch.com.
  - 35. Mr. Riley then provided his direct call back number of 844-495-2100.

- 36. That is SmartMatch's telephone number.
- 37. Indeed, other individuals have complained of telemarketing calls associated with that number. *See e.g.* <a href="https://directory.youmail.com/directory/phone/8444952100">https://directory.youmail.com/directory/phone/8444952100</a> (Last Visited March 8, 2022).
  - 38. SmartMatch relies on pre-recorded telemarketing to generate new customers.
- 39. Indeed, SmartMatch has previously been sued in lawsuits alleging violations of the TCPA.
  - 40. The calls were not necessitated by an emergency.
- 41. Plaintiff and all members of the Class, defined below, have been harmed by the acts of Defendant because their privacy has been violated, they were annoyed and harassed, and, in some instances, they may have been charged for incoming calls. Plaintiff and the Class Members were also harmed by use of their telephone power and network bandwidth and the intrusion on their telephone that occupied it from receiving legitimate communications.

## **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

- 42. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and the following class (the "Class") pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.
- 43. Plaintiff proposes the following Class definition, subject to amendment as appropriate:

Robocall Class: All persons within the United States: (1) to whose cellular telephone number or other number for which they are charged for the call (2) Defendant (or an agent acting on behalf of Defendant) placed a telemarketing call (3) within the four years prior to the filing of the Complaint and through trial (4) using an identical or substantially similar pre-recorded message used to place a telephone call to Plaintiff.

- 44. Plaintiff is a member of and will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of this class as he has no interests that conflict with any of the class members.
- 45. Excluded from the Class are counsel, the Defendant, and any entities in which the Defendant has a controlling interest, the Defendant's agents and employees, any judge to whom this action is assigned, and any member of such judge's staff and immediate family.
- 46. Plaintiff and all members of the Class have been harmed by the acts of the Defendant, including, but not limited to, the invasion of their privacy, annoyance, waste of time, the use of their telephone power and network bandwidth, and the intrusion on their telephone that occupied it from receiving legitimate communications.
  - 47. This Class Action Complaint seeks injunctive relief and money damages.
- 48. The Class as defined above are identifiable through the Defendant' dialer records, other phone records, and phone number databases.
- 49. Plaintiff does not know the exact number of members in the Class, but Plaintiff reasonably believes Class members number, at minimum, in the hundreds in each class.
- 50. The joinder of all Class members is impracticable due to the size and relatively modest value of each individual claim.
- 51. Additionally, the disposition of the claims in a class action will provide substantial benefit to the parties and the Court in avoiding a multiplicity of identical suits.
- 52. There are well defined, nearly identical, questions of law and fact affecting all parties. The questions of law and fact, referred to above, involving the class claims predominate over questions which may affect individual Class members.

- 53. There are numerous questions of law and fact common to Plaintiff and to the proposed Class, including but not limited to the following:
  - (a) Whether the Defendant used pre-recorded message to send telemarketing calls;
  - (b) whether Defendant made calls to Plaintiff and members of the Class without first obtaining prior express written consent to make the calls;
  - (c) whether Defendant' conduct constitutes a violation of the TCPA; and
  - (d) whether members of the Class are entitled to treble damages based on the willfulness of Defendant' conduct.
- 54. Further, Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff has no interests which are antagonistic to any member of the Class.
- 55. Plaintiff has retained counsel with substantial experience in prosecuting complex litigation and class actions, and especially TCPA class actions. Plaintiff and his counsel are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the other members of the Class, and have the financial resources to do so.
- 56. Common questions of law and fact predominate over questions affecting only individual class members, and a class action is the superior method for fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy. The only individual question concerns identification of class members, which will be ascertainable from records maintained by Defendant and/or its agents.
- 57. The likelihood that individual members of the Class will prosecute separate actions is remote due to the time and expense necessary to prosecute an individual case.
- 58. Plaintiff is not aware of any litigation concerning this controversy already commenced by others who meet the criteria for class membership described above.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

## Violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (47 U.S.C. 227(b)) on behalf of the Robocall Class

- 59. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations from the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 60. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf constitute numerous and multiple violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, by making calls, except for emergency purposes, to the cellular telephone numbers of Plaintiff and members of the Class delivering pre-recorded messages.
- 61. As a result of Defendant's and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf's violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, Plaintiff and members of the Class presumptively are entitled to an award of \$500 in damages for each and every call made to their residential or cellular telephone numbers using an artificial or prerecorded voice in violation of the statute, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 62. If the Defendant's conduct is found to be knowing or willful, the Plaintiff and members of the Class are entitled to an award of up to treble damages.
- 63. Plaintiff and members of the Class are also entitled to and do seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf from violating the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, by making calls, except for emergency purposes, to any cellular telephone numbers using an artificial or prerecorded voice in the future.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the Class, prays for the following relief:

- A. Injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant from calling telephone numbers advertising their goods or services, except for emergency purposes, using a pre-record message in the future;
- B. That the Court enter a judgment awarding Plaintiff and all class members statutory damages of \$500 for each violation of the TCPA and \$1,500 for each knowing or willful violation; and
- C. An order certifying this action to be a proper class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, establishing an appropriate Classes the Court deems appropriate, finding that Plaintiff is a proper representative of the Class, and appointing the lawyers and law firms representing Plaintiff as counsel for the Class;
  - D. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

## **JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff requests a jury trial as to all claims of the complaint so triable.

Respectfully Submitted,

**Plaintiff Hastings**, individually and on behalf of those similarly situated individuals

Dated: March 11, 2022

Jason Ryburn, # 2012148 and, Zach Ryburn, # 2015061 Ryburn Law Firm 650 S. Shackleford Rd., Ste. 231 Little Rock, AR 72211 [o] (501) 228-8100 [f] (501) 228-7300 jason@ryburnlawfirm.com

Anthony I. Paronich (subject to pro hac vice)
Paronich Law, P.C.
350 Lincoln Street, Suite 2400
Hingham, MA 02043
[o] (617) 485-0018
[f] (508) 318-8100
anthony@paronichlaw.com

JS 44 (Rev. 04/21)

# Case 4:22-cv-00228-LPR Document 1-1 Filed 03/11/22 Page 1 of 1 CIVIL COVER SHEET 4:22cv228-LPR

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS						
STAN HASTINGS, individually and on behalf of other			-	SMARTMATCH INSURANCE AGENCY, LLC						
similarly situated.  (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff PULASKI				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant JACKSON						
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF						
				THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)  Ryburn Law Firm 650 S. Shackleford Rd., Ste. 231,				Attorneys (If Kn	iown)					
•	n 650 S. Snackleidic 72211, 501-228-8100									
II. BASIS OF JURISD			III. CI	FIZENSHIP O	F PRI	NCIPA	L PARTIES	Place an "X" in	One Box fo	r Plaintiff
U.S. Government	× 3 Federal Question	3 Federal Question		(For Diversity Cases Only Citizen of This State		DEF	а	nd One Box for I	Defendant) PTF	DEF
Plaintiff (U.S. Governme		ot a Party)	Citize			<u> </u>	Incorporated or Principal Place 4 of Business In This State			<u> </u>
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citize	n of Another State	<u> </u>	_ 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A		5	<b>X</b> 5
W. NATURE OF CUIT				n or Subject of a reign Country	<u></u> 3	3	Foreign Nation		6	6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		y) Vistoria	I LIK	New York of the State of the St			for: Nature of S		STATUT	
110 Insurance 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury -		5 Drug Related Seizur of Property 21 USC	e [		neal 28 USC 158	375 False (		
130 Miller Act	filler Act 315 Airplane Product Product Liab			0 Other	**** <b>L</b>	28	USC 157	376 Qui Tam (3 i USC 3729(a))		
140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment	320 Assault, Libel &					400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust				
& Enforcement of Judgmen	Slander 330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability			F	820 Cop 830 Pate		430 Banks 450 Comm	erce	ng
152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability 340 Marine	368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product	1				ent - Abbreviated v Drug Application	460 Deport		iced and
(Excludes Veterans)				840 Trademark Corrupt Organizati 880 Defend Trade Secrets 480 Consumer Credit					tions	
of Veteran's Benefits	350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending	71	0 Fair Labor Standards Act	s	Act of 2016 (15 USC 1681 or 1692)				
190 Other Contract	Product Liability	Product Liability 380 Other Personal 360 Other Personal Property Damage Injury 385 Property Damage		720 Labor/Management			Protection Act 51 HIA (1395ff) 490 Cable Sat TV			
195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	Injury			Relations 0 Railway Labor Act		862 Black Lung (923) 850 Securities/Commodities				ocities'
	362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Product Liability		1 Family and Medical Leave Act		864 SSI	WC/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	Excha 890 Other	Statutory A	
210 Land Condemnation	440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PARTE(I)  Habeas Corpus:		0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement	_	] 865 RSI	(405(g))	891 Agricu 893 Enviro		
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	441 Voting 442 Employment	463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate	. [	Income Security Act	t 📕		es (U.S. Plaintiff	895 Freedo Act	m of Infor	nation
240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	443 Housing/ Accommodations	Sentence 530 General			F	or I	Defendant) —Third Party	896 Arbitra		rocedure
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 535 Death Penalty			MANAGER OF THE		26 USC 7609 Act/F			teview or Appeal of	
	Employment  446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth		2 Naturalization Appli 5 Other Immigration	ication			950 Consti		
	Other  448 Education	550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition		Actions				State S	iatutes	
		560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of								
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X"	in One Box Only)	Confinement						1		
☐1 Original ☐2 Re	moved from 3 F	Remanded from Appellate Court	☐4 Rein Reop	ened A	ransferre nother D pecify)		6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer	1 1	Multidis Litigatio Direct F	n -
	Cite the U.S. Civil Stat 47 U.S.C. § 227	ute under which you a	re filing (I	Oo not cite jurisdiction	al statute	s unless di	iversity):			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of car Violations of the TCPA	ise:								
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.		•	CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:  JURY DEMAND: Yes No				nt:			
VIII. RELATED CAS	(See instructions):	JUDGE				DOCK	ET NUMBER			
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY (	OF RECORD						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		July 1	1//							
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDO	GE		MAG. JUI	DGE		

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>SmartMatch Insurance Hit with Class Action Over Alleged 'Senior Medical Group' Robocalls</u>