

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA**

DIANA MEY, individually and on behalf of all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

NO.

v.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

RADIAL INSIGHT LLC,

Defendant.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Preliminary Statement

1. Plaintiff Diana Mey, brings this action under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227, a federal statute enacted in response to widespread public outrage about the proliferation of intrusive, nuisance telephone practices. *See Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740, 745 (2012).

2. “Month after month, unwanted robocalls and texts, both telephone and informational, top the list of consumer complaints received by” the Federal Communications Commission.¹

3. The TCPA is designed to protect consumer privacy by prohibiting unsolicited, autodialed telephone calls to cellular telephones, unless the caller has the “prior express written consent” of the called party.

4. Plaintiff alleges that Radial Insight LLC, made an automated telephone call to her, despite the fact that Radial Insight lacked valid consent, and despite the fact that her number was on the National Do Not Call Registry.

¹ *Omnibus TCPA Order*, GC Docket 02-278, FCC 15-72, 2015 WL 4387780, ¶1 (July 10, 2015).

5. Because the call to Plaintiff was transmitted using technology capable of generating thousands of similar calls per day, Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of a proposed nationwide class of other persons who were sent the same illegal telephone call.

6. A class action is the best means of obtaining redress for the Defendant's illegal telephone calls, 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

7. Plaintiff Diana Mey lives in Wheeling, West Virginia.

8. Defendant Radial Insight is a Virginia corporation that does business nationwide, including in this District.

Jurisdiction & Venue

9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2). The matter in controversy exceeds \$5 million, exclusive of interest and costs, as each member of the proposed class of at least tens of thousands is entitled to up to \$1,500 in statutory damages for each illegal call. Further, Plaintiff seeks certification of a national class, which will likely result in at least one class member from a different state.

10. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because Plaintiff's claims arise under the laws of the United States.

11. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it operates, conducts, engages in, and/or carries on business activities in this District

12. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this district.

TCPA Background

13. In 1991, Congress enacted the TCPA to regulate the explosive growth of the telephone industry. In so doing, Congress recognized that “[u]nrestricted telephone calls. . . 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).

14. 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.” *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii). The TCPA provides a private cause of action to persons who receive calls in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A). *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).

15. According to findings by the FCC, the agency Congress vested with authority to issue regulations implementing the TCPA, such calls are prohibited because automated or prerecorded telephone calls are a greater nuisance and invasion of privacy than live solicitation calls, and can be costly and inconvenient.

16. The FCC also recognized that “wireless customers are charged for incoming calls whether they pay in advance or after the minutes are used.” *In re Rules and Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, CG Docket No. 02-278, Report and Order, 18 F.C.C. Rcd. 14014, 14115 ¶ 165 (2003).

17. In 2013, the FCC required prior express written consent for all autodialed or prerecorded telephone calls (or “robocalls”) to wireless numbers and residential lines.

Specifically, it ordered that:

[A] consumer’s written consent to receive telephone 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).

Factual Allegations

18. Radial Insight provides research services for its clients. Radial Insight’s telephone efforts include the use of automated dialing equipment to send automated calls.

19. On September 5, 2017, the Plaintiff received a telephone call on her telephone assigned to a cellular service, (304) 280-XXXX.

20. Ms. Mey had registered this number on the National Do Not Call Registry prior to the call.

21. The call began with a distinctive click and pause after the Plaintiff answered.

22. Furthermore, when a representative finally appeared on the other end of the telephone, the representative informed Ms. Mey that the call has been “autodialed” and that the call was made using an “automatic dialer.”

23. Radial Insight had manipulated the Caller ID to make it appear that the caller was calling from West Virginia, even though the caller was not calling from West Virginia. This fact is indicative of a computer automated telephone dialer.

24. These facts, as well as the geographic distance between the Plaintiff and the Defendant and the fact that this call was part of a broad telephone campaign, demonstrate that the call was made using an automatic telephone dialing system (“ATDS” or “autodialer”) as that term is defined in 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1).

25. Plaintiff had never done business with Radial Insight, and Plaintiff never gave Radial Insight her cellular telephone number.

26. Radial Insight did not have Plaintiff's prior express written consent to make this call.

27. Before filing this lawsuit, Plaintiff wrote to Radial Insight to ask if it had prior express written consent to make the call, but Radial Insight provided no such evidence.

28. Indeed, during the call the Plaintiff was informed that her information was acquired from voter registration data.

29. Plaintiff and the other call recipients were harmed by these calls. They were temporarily deprived of legitimate use of their phones because the phone line was tied up, they were charged for the calls, and their privacy was invaded.

30. Moreover, the calls injured Plaintiff and other recipients because the calls were frustrating, obnoxious, annoying, were a nuisance, and disturbed the solitude of Plaintiff and the class.

Class Action Allegations

31. As authorized by Rules 23(b)(2) and 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of all other persons or entities similarly situated throughout the United States.

32. The proposed class includes:

All persons within the United States to whom: (a) Defendant and/or a third party acting on its behalf made one or more non-emergency telephone calls; (b) to their cellular telephone number; (c) using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice; and (d) at any time in the period that begins four years before the date of the filing of this Complaint to trial.

33. Excluded from the class are Defendant, any entities in which Defendant has a controlling interest, Defendant's agents and employees, any Judge to whom this action is assigned, and any member of the Judge's staff and immediate family.

34. The proposed class members are identifiable through phone records and phone number databases.

35. The automated technology used to contact Plaintiff is capable of contacting hundreds of thousands of people a day, and so the potential class members number in the thousands, at least. Individual joinder of these persons is impracticable.

36. Plaintiff is a member of the proposed class.

37. There are questions of law and fact common to Plaintiff and to the proposed class, including but not limited to the following:

- a. Whether Radial Insight used an automatic telephone dialing system to make the calls at issue;
- b. Whether Radial Insight placed telephone calls without obtaining the recipients' valid prior express written consent;
- c. Whether Radial Insight's violations of the TCPA were negligent, willful, or knowing; and
- d. Whether Plaintiff and the class members are entitled to statutory damages because of Radial Insight's actions.

38. Plaintiff's claims are based on the same facts and legal theories as the claims of all class members, and therefore are typical of the claims of class members, as the Plaintiff and class members all received telephone calls through the same or similar dialing system on a cellular telephone line.

39. Plaintiff is an adequate class representative because her interests do not conflict with the interests of the class, she will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class, and she is represented by counsel skilled and experienced in class actions, including TCPA class actions.

40. The actions of Radial Insight are generally applicable to the class and to Plaintiff.

41. 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 Radial Insight and/or its agents.

42. The likelihood that individual class members will prosecute separate actions is remote due to the time and expense necessary to prosecute an individual case, and given the small recoveries available through individual actions.

43. Plaintiff is not aware of any litigation concerning this controversy already commenced by others who meet the criteria for class membership described above.

Legal Claim

Violation of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)

44. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations from all previous paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

45. The acts and omissions of Radial Insight and/or its affiliates, agents, and other persons or entities acting on Radial Insight's behalf violate the TCPA's ban on making calls using ATDS to the cellular telephone numbers of Plaintiff and members of the class.

46. As a result of these violations, Plaintiff and members of the class are entitled to an award of \$500 in damages for each call made to their cellular telephone numbers using an ATDS and/or artificial or prerecorded voice in violation of the statute. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

47. Plaintiff and members of the Class are also entitled to and do seek injunctive relief prohibiting Radial Insight and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Radial Insight'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 ATDS and/or artificial or prerecorded voice in the future.

48. Defendant's violations were negligent, willful, or knowing.

Relief Sought

For herself and all class members, Plaintiff requests the following relief:

- A. Certification of the proposed class;
- B. Appointment of Plaintiff as class representative;
- C. Appointment of the undersigned counsel as class counsel;
- D. A declaration that Radial Insight and its affiliates, agents, and other related entities' actions complained of herein violate the TCPA;
- E. An order enjoining Radial Insight and its affiliates, agents, and/or other related entities, as provided by law, from engaging in the unlawful conduct set forth herein;
- F. An award to Plaintiff and the class of all damages allowed by law;
- G. Leave to amend this Complaint to conform to the evidence developed during discovery and presented at trial; and
- H. Orders granting such other and further relief as the Court deems necessary, just, and proper.

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

Plaintiff,

By Counsel.

/s/Athanasios Basdekis
Athanasios Basdekis (VA Bar No. 50913)
John W. Barrett
BAILEY & GLASSER LLP
209 Capitol Street
Charleston, WV 25301
Telephone: (304) 345-6555
Facsimile: (304) 342-1110
tbasdekis@baileyglasser.com
jbarrett@baileyglasser.com

Edward A. Broderick
Anthony Paronich
BRODERICK & PARONICH, P.C.
99 High St., Suite 304
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 738-7080
ted@broderick-law.com
anthony@broderick-law.com

Matthew P. McCue
THE LAW OFFICE OF MATTHEW P. MCCUE
1 South Avenue, Suite 3
Natick, MA 01760
Telephone: (508) 655-1415
mmccue@massattorneys.net

All Counsel except Mr. Basdekis appear pending pro hac vice admission.

CIVIL COVER SHEET

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

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

DIANA MEY

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

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

See attachment.

DEFENDANTS

RADIAL INSIGHT, LLC

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff, 2 U.S. Government Defendant, 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party), 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

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

Table with columns for Plaintiff (PTF) and Defendant (DEF) citizenship: Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation.

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

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

Large table 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 Remanded from Appellate Court, 4 Reinstated or Reopened, 5 Transferred from Another District (specify), 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer, 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):

47 U.S.C. § 227

Brief description of cause:

Violation to TCPA, including calls to phone numbers on Do Not Call Registry and use of autodialer

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

11/07/2017

Athanasios Basdekis

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
 United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
 Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If 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 statute.
- 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.

DIANA MEY v. RADIAL INSIGHT LLC

I. PLAINTIFF

(c) Attorneys (*Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number*)

Athanasios Basdekis (VA Bar No. 50913)
John W. Barrett (pro hac vice pending)
BAILEY & GLASSER LLP
209 Capitol Street
Charleston, WV 25301
Telephone: (304) 345-6555
Facsimile: (304) 342-1110
tbasdekis@baileyglasser.com
jbarrett@baileyglasser.com

Edward A. Broderick
Anthony Paronich
Broderick & Paronich, P.C.
99 High St., Suite 304
Boston, MA 02110
(508) 221-1510
ted@broderick-law.com
anthony@broderick-law.com

Matthew P. McCue, Esq.
The Law Office of Matthew P. McCue
1 South Avenue, Suite 3
Natick, MA 01760
(508) 655-1415
(508) 319-3077 *facsimile*
mmccue@massattorneys.net

All Counsel except Mr. Basdekis appear pending pro hac vice admission.

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Radial Insight Dialed Up with TCPA Complaint in Virginia](#)
