### SJS 44 (Rev @ase 0:17-cv-61411-KAM Doccinvent COE) neareston for Docket 07/17/2017 Page 1 of 9

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

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

the civil docket sheet. (SEE IN	STRUCTIONS ON THE REVI	ERSE OF THE FORM.)	NOTI	CE: Attorneys MUS	I Indicate All Re-filed C	ases Below.	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS			
NEW CONCEPT DENT similarly situated,	AL, individually and	on behalf of all other	rs +	DENTAL RESOURCE SYSTEMS, INC. AKA TRUDENTA			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Maricopa County, AZ  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Broward County, Florida (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)			
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Ad	dress, and Telephone Number)	,				E THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT	
DIEPPA MARTINEZ PLLC 4 NE First Ave, Suite 1001 Miami, FL 33132				Attorneys (If Known)			
Phone: (305) 901-2209			#				
(d) Check County Where Actio	n Arose:   MIAMI- DADE	□ MONROE 🗹 BROW	VARD 🗖	PALM BEACH	RTIN ST. LUCIE I INDI	AN RIVER	
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X"	in One Box Only)			RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
☐ 1 U.S. Government		Not a Party)	PTF DEF PTF			rincipal Place 🗆 4 🗖 4	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity  (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citizen of Another State   2				
				n or Subject of a	3 □ 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nly)	FORE	EITURE/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 (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise  REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	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  CIVIL RIGHTS  441 Voting  442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities Other  440 Other Civil Rights	PERSONAL INJURY  362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability  PERSONAL PROPERT  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITION  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty  540 Mandamus & Oth  550 Civil Rights	62   62   63   64   64   64   64   64   64   64	0 Agriculture 0 Other Food & Drug 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Liquor Laws 0 R.R. & Truck 0 Airline Regs. 0 Occupational Safety/Health 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 0 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 0 Railway Labor Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security tt IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization optication 3 Habeas Corpus-Alien etainee 5 Other Immigration etions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 840 Trademark  SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIW C/DIW W (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g))  FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	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   810 Selective Service   850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange   875 Customer Challenge   12 USC 3410   890 Other Statutory Actions   891 Agricultural Acts   892 Economic Stabilization Act   893 Environmental Matters   894 Energy Allocation Act   895 Freedom of Information Act   900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice   950 Constitutionality of State Statutes   Appeal to District	
∡ 1 Original □ 2 R	n "X" in One Box Only) emoved from	Re-filed- (see VI below)	4 Reins Reope	tated or 🗍 5 anothe	Terred from arr district	rict 7 Judge from	
VI. RELATED/RE-FII CASE(S).	(See instructions second page):	a) Re-filed Case	•	,	ed Cases ☐ YES Ø NO DOCKET NUMBER		
VII. CAUSE OF ACTI	diversity):  VIOLATIONS C  LENGTH OF TRIAL	DF THE TELEPHON	NE CON	NSUMER PROTEC	<u> </u>	§227	
VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P	IS A CLASS ACTION . 23		EMAND \$ 000,000	CHECK YES only  JURY DEMAND	r if demanded in complaint:  . ✓ Yes □ No	
ABOVE INFORMATION IS THE BEST OF MY KNOWI		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	of record	DATE July 17,	2017	
		$\theta$	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY				

AMOUNT

RECEIPT #

IFP

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

NEW CONCEPT DENTAL, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated	Case No.
and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	CLASS ACTION
Plaintiff,	
vs.	OF:
DENTAL RESOURCE SYSTEMS, INC. AKA TRUDENTA; DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, Defendant(s).	1. NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C. §227 ET SEQ.] 2. WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C. §227 ET SEQ.]
	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

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

### NATURE OF THE CASE

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

### **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

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

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

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

### **PARTIES**

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

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

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 8. Beginning in or around December of 2016, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on its telephone facsimile number ending in -8083 in an effort to sell or solicit its services.
- 9. Defendant contacted Plaintiff via facsimile from telephone numbers confirmed to belong to Defendant, including without limitation (801) 437-2019.
- 10. Defendant contacted Plaintiff between on or around December of 2016 in an effort to solicit its business.
- 11. Defendant's messages constituted "telephone solicitation" as defined by the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(4) and "unsolicited advertisement" as defined by the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(5).
- 12. Defendant used an "telephone facsimile machine" as defined by 47  $U.S.C. \$  227(a)(3) to place its calls to Plaintiff seeking to sell or solicit its business services.
- 13. Defendant's calls constituted calls that were not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 14. Defendant's calls were placed to telephone facsimile numbers assigned to a telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming messages.
- 15. Plaintiff is not a customer of Defendant's services and has never provided any personal information, including his telephone facsimile number(s), to Defendant for any purpose whatsoever. Accordingly, Defendant never received Plaintiff's "prior express consent" to receive calls using a telephone facsimile machine pursuant to  $47 \text{ U.S.C.} \ \S 227(b)(1)C$ ).
- 16. Furthermore, the messages that Defendant sent to Plaintiff lacked a valid "opt-out" notice pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(2)(D).

17. Moreover, Defendant refused to disclose their Do-Not-Call policy upon Plaintiff's request as per Defendant's obligation to do so pursuant to 47 CFR § 64.1200.

### **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

18. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, as a member of the proposed class (hereafter "The Class") defined as follows:

All persons within the United States who received any telephone facsimile messages from Defendant to said person's telephone facsimile number made through the use of any telephone facsimile machine and such person had not previously consented to receiving such messages and such messages did not contain any opt-out notice within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint

- 19. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The Class, consisting of All persons within the United States who received any telephone facsimile messages from Defendant to said person's telephone facsimile number made through the use of any telephone facsimile machine and such person had not previously not provided their telephone facsimile number to Defendant within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, nor did the telephone facsimile message contain an opt-out notice.
- 20. Defendant, its employees and agents are excluded from The Class. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in The Class, but believes the Class 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.
- 21. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all of its members is impractical. While the exact number and identities of The Class 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 Class includes thousands of members. Plaintiff alleges that The Class members may be ascertained by the records maintained by Defendant.

- 22. Plaintiff and members of The Class were harmed by the acts of Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant illegally contacted Plaintiff and Class members via their telephone facsimile numbers thereby causing Plaintiff and Class members to incur certain charges or reduced telephone facsimile time for which Plaintiff and Class members had previously paid by having to retrieve or administer messages left by Defendant during those illegal calls, and invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and Class members.
- 23. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of The Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of The Class. These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary between Class members, and which may be determined without reference to the individual circumstances of any Class members, include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, Defendant sent telephone facsimile messages (other than for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party and with an opt-out notice contained in the messages) to a Class member using any telephone facsimile machine to any telephone number assigned to a telephone facsimile service;
  - b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
  - c. Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.
- 24. As a person who received numerous messages from Defendant using a telephone facsimile machine, without Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of The Class.
  - 25. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members

of The Class. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of class actions.

- 26. 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 Class members is impracticable. Even if every Class 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 Class member.
- 27. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class 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 Class 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.
- 28. Defendant has acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable to The Class, thereby making appropriate final and injunctive relief with regard to the members of the California Class as a whole.

### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

# Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.

- 29. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-28.
  - 30. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous

and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

- 31. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., 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).
- 32. Plaintiff and the 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 et seq.

- 33. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-28.
- 34. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.
- 35. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., Plaintiff and the 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).
- 36. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendant for the following:

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

# Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.

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

\$227(b)(1), Plaintiff and the 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); and

• 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 et seq.

- As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of 47 U.S.C.  $\S 227(b)(1)$ , Plaintiff and the 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  $U.S.C. \S 227(b)(3)(C)$ ; and
- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

#### **JURY DEMAND**

Pursuant to the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United 37. States of America, Plaintiff reserves their right to a jury on all issues so triable.

Respectfully Submitted this 2d day of July, 2017.

DIEPPA MARTINEZ PLLC

By: /s/ Raymond R. Dieppa Raymond R. Dieppa DIEPPA MARTINEZ PLLC Attorney for Plaintiff

Raymond R. Dieppa (SBN 27690) DIEPPA MARTINEZ PLLC 14 NE First Ave, Suite 1001 Miami, FL 33132 Phone: (305) 901-2209

Ray.dieppa@floridalegal.law

### SJS 44 (R € 28SE 0:17-cv-61411-KAM DOCU**CTO VILLICIO VERIR** PSHIDDE IT LSD Docket 07/17/2017 Page 1 of 1

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

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

the civil docket sheet. (SEE IN	STRUCTIONS ON THE REVER	SE OF THE FORM.)	NOT.	ICE. Attorneys WIOS	I Indicate An Re-med C	ases Delow.
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS		
NEW CONCEPT DENT similarly situated,	AL, individually and or	n behalf of all other	rs +	DENTAL RESOU	RCE SYSTEMS, INC.	AKA TRUDENTA
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Maricopa County, A  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Broward County, Florida (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Ad					`	E THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT
DIEPPA MARTINEZ PLLC 4 NE First Ave, Suite 1001 Miami, FL 33132 Phone: (305) 901-2209				Attorneys (If Known)		
(d) Check County Where Actio	n Arose:   MIAMI-DADE	□ MONROE 🗹 BROW	/ARD	D PALM BEACH D MAI	RTIN	AN RIVER
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)			RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Particular of the Control of the Con		ot a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Only)  P Citizen of This State		TF DEF  1 √□ 1 Incorporated or Poor Business In The	
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship	of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	<ul> <li>2</li></ul>	=
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	Γ (Place an "X" in One Box Onl	y)	For	reign Country		
CONTRACT	TOR			FEITURE/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 (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise  REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	□ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury  CIVIL RIGHTS □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 444 Welfare □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other	PERSONAL INJURY  362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability  PERSONAL PROPERT  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITION  510 Motions to Vacat Sentence Habeas Corpus:  530 General  535 Death Penalty  540 Mandamus & Oth  550 Civil Rights		10 Agriculture 20 Other Food & Drug 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 30 Liquor Laws 40 R.R. & Truck 50 Airline Regs. 60 Occupational Safety/Health 90 Other  LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 30 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 40 Railway Labor Act 90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security ct  IMMIGRATION 62 Naturalization pplication 63 Habeas Corpus-Alien etatinee 65 Other Immigration ctions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark  SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIW W (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g))  FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and
∡ 1 Original □ 2 R		e-filed-			Terred from ar district	
VI. RELATED/RE-FII	FD	a) Re-filed Case	YES 🗸	NO b) Relat	ed Cases 🗆 YES 💆 NO	
CASE(S).	(See instructions	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
VII. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON VIOLATIONS OF	F THE TELEPHON	NE CO		<u> </u>	
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 2	23		,000,000	JURY DEMAND	: <b>Ø</b> Yes □ No
ABOVE INFORMATION IS THE BEST OF MY KNOWI		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY		July 17,	2017
		FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			FICE USE ONLY	

AMOUNT

RECEIPT #

IFP

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: New Concept Dental Sues Trudenta Over Unsolicited Junk Faxes