

1 Todd M. Friedman (SBN 216752)  
 2 Meghan E. George (SBN 274525)  
 3 Adrian R. Bacon (SBN 280332)  
 4 LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.  
 5 21031 Ventura Blvd., Suite 340  
 6 Woodland Hills, CA 91364  
 7 Phone: 323-306-4234  
 8 Fax: 866-633-0228  
 9 tfriedman@toddfllaw.com  
 10 mgeorge@toddfllaw.com  
 11 abacon@toddfllaw.com  
 12 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 14 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

15 **MARLON ROMERO**, individually  
 16 and on behalf of all others similarly  
 17 situated,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 **ROCKET MORTGAGE, LLC;**  
 21 **DOES 1-10 Inclusive,**

22 Defendant.

23 **Case No.:** 5:22-cv-1323

24 **CLASS ACTION**

25 **COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**  
 26 **AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**  
 27 **PURSUANT TO THE**  
 28 **TELEPHONE CONSUMER**  
**PROTECTION ACT, 47 U.S.C. §**  
**227, ET SEQ.**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. MARLON ROMERO (“Plaintiff”), brings this Class Action Complaint for damages, injunctive relief, and any other available legal or equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal actions of ROCKET MORTGAGE, LLC (“Defendant”), in negligently 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. Plaintiff alleges as follows upon personal knowledge as to himself and his own acts and experiences, and, as to all other

1 matters, upon information and belief, including investigation conducted by his  
2 attorneys.

3 2. The TCPA was designed to prevent calls and messages like the ones  
4 described within this complaint, and to protect the privacy of citizens like Plaintiff.  
5 “Voluminous consumer complaints about abuses of telephone technology – for  
6 example, computerized calls dispatched to private homes – prompted Congress to  
7 pass the TCPA.” *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740, 744 (2012).

8 3. In enacting the TCPA, Congress intended to give consumers a choice  
9 as to how creditors and telemarketers may call them, and made specific findings  
10 that “[t]echnologies that might allow consumers to avoid receiving such calls and  
11 messages are not universally available, are costly, are unlikely to be enforced, or  
12 place an inordinate burden on the consumer. TCPA, Pub.L. No. 102–243, § 11.  
13 Toward this end, Congress found that

14  
15 [b]anning such automated or prerecorded telephone calls to the home,  
16 except when the receiving party consents to receiving the call or when  
17 such calls are necessary in an emergency situation affecting the health  
18 and safety of the consumer, is the only effective means of protecting  
telephone consumers from this nuisance and privacy invasion.

19 *Id.* at § 12; see also *Martin v. Leading Edge Recovery Solutions, LLC*, 2012 WL  
20 3292838, at\* 4 (N.D.Ill. Aug. 10, 2012) (citing Congressional findings on TCPA’s  
21 purpose).

22 4. Congress also specifically found that “the evidence presented to the  
23 Congress indicates that automated or prerecorded calls are a nuisance and an  
24 invasion of privacy, regardless of the type of call....” *Id.* at §§ 12-13. See also,  
25 *Mims*, 132 S. Ct. at 744.

26 5. In a recent decision, the Supreme Court interpreted the term  
27 “automatic telephone dialing system” and held that “[t]o qualify as an ‘automatic  
28 telephone dialing system,’ a device must have the capacity either to store a

1 telephone number using a random or sequential generator *or* to produce a telephone  
2 number using a random or sequential number generator.” *Facebook, Inc. v. Duguid*,  
3 141 S.Ct. 1163 (2021) (emphasis added).

4 6. In *Duguid*, the Supreme Court provided an example of such systems,  
5 stating: “For instance, an autodialer might use a random number generator to  
6 determine the order in which to pick phone numbers from a preproduced list. It  
7 would then store those numbers to be dialed at a later time.” *Id.* at 1171-72 fn. 7.

8 7. Further, both *Duguid* and the legislative history of the TCPA are clear  
9 that the original focus on prerecorded voice technology prohibition was the fact  
10 that such communications involved agentless calls, not on the question of whether  
11 a literal voice was used during those agentless calls. *See* Hearing Before the  
12 Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Commerce, Science and  
13 Transportation, United States Senate One Hundred Second Congress First Session  
14 July 24, 1992, Testimony of Robert Bulmash and Steve Hamm at pg 11; 7 FCC  
15 Rcd. 8752 (F.C.C. September 17, 1992).

16 8. The Sixth Circuit has also recognized this distinction: “Congress drew  
17 an explicit distinction between ‘automated telephone calls that deliver an artificial  
18 or prerecorded voice message’ on the one hand and ‘calls place by ‘live’ persons’  
19 on the other.” *Ashland Hosp. Corp. v. Serv. Employees Int’l Union, Dist. 1199*  
20 *WV/KY/OH*, 708 F.3d 737,743 (6th Cir. 2013).

21 9. Similarly, the FTC has observed that “prerecorded calls are by their  
22 very nature one-sided conversations, and if there is no opportunity for consumers  
23 to ask questions, offers may not be sufficiently clear for consumers to make  
24 informed choices before pressing a button or saying yes to make a purchase.” 73  
25 FR 51164-01, 51167 (Aug. 29, 2008).

26  
27 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

28 10. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this action

1 arises under a federal statute, namely the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47  
2 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.*

3 11. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Central  
4 District of California pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and 1441(a) because  
5 Defendant does business within the state of California and Plaintiff resides within  
6 this district.

7 **PARTIES**

8 12. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein, was a citizen and  
9 resident of the State of California. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein  
10 was, a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39). Plaintiff was physically in  
11 California at the time he received the alleged text messages from Defendant.

12 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant  
13 is a mortgage loan provider incorporated in the state of Michigan. Defendant, and  
14 all of its agents, are and at all times mentioned herein were “persons,” as defined  
15 by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39). Plaintiff alleges that at all times relevant herein Defendant  
16 conducted business in the State of California and in the County of Riverside, and  
17 within this judicial district.

18 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

19 14. At all times relevant, Plaintiff was a citizen of Riverside County, and  
20 a citizen of the State of California. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein  
21 was a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

22 15. Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a “person,” as  
23 defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

24 16. At all times relevant Defendant conducted business in the State of  
25 California and in the County of Riverside, within this judicial district.

26 17. On or about July 11, 2022, Plaintiff received a text message from  
27 Defendant on his cellular telephone number ending in -3890.

28 18. Specifically, the text message read:

1 Hello! This is Eric Decuyper, from Rocket Mortgage. As  
2 the #1 lender in America, we are running a special for the  
3 lowest rate and fee combination the market has to offer.  
4 When do you have 5 minutes to chat?

5 19. Defendant did not have Plaintiff's prior express consent to contact him  
6 on his cellular phone.

7 20. Based on the content and format of these text messages, Plaintiff  
8 alleges that they were sent via Defendant's SMS Blasting Platform, i.e., an  
9 "automatic telephone dialing system," ("ATDS") as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227  
10 (a)(1) as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).

11 21. The text message sent to Plaintiff's cellular telephone was not sent by  
12 a live agent and thus created a one-sided conversation in which Plaintiff could not  
13 receive a response to his questions and/or concerns. The text message also was sent  
14 in an automated fashion as a result of computerized campaigns that were pre-  
15 programmed in advance to send messages out to large groups of consumers all at  
16 once, either sequentially or via algorithmic dialing, i.e. in an automated fashion by  
17 a computer.

18 22. In Merriam Webster's Dictionary, "voice" is defined as "an  
19 instrument or medium of expression." It defines "artificial" as "humanly  
20 contrived...often on a natural model : MAN-MADE" and "lacking in natural or  
21 spontaneous quality."

22 23. The messages sent to Plaintiff by Defendant using the SMS blasting  
23 platform employed a text message as an instrument or medium of expression to  
24 deliver an automatic message drafted in advance of being sent, i.e. that of an SMS  
25 message, to convey a telemarketing communication to Plaintiff. SMS blasting  
26 platforms are man-made humanly contrived programs which allow companies to  
27 blast out such messages via non-spontaneous methods, i.e. automated methods  
28

1 similar to that of an assembly line in a factory. Such SMS blasting devices are  
2 incapable of spontaneity, as they must be programmed by the operator to  
3 automatically send messages out, *en masse*, pursuant to preprogrammed  
4 parameters.

5 24. Accordingly, Defendant's messages utilized an "artificial voice" as  
6 prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

7 25. In Merriam Webster's Dictionary, "prerecorded" is defined as  
8 "recorded in advance." "Recorded" is defined as "to set down in writing." The  
9 text message sent to Plaintiff's cellular telephone via an SMS blasting platform was  
10 set down in writing in advance by Defendant, whose employees wrote out the  
11 standard automated messages that were to be sent to Plaintiff and other class  
12 members, and by way of preprogrammed SMS blasting, entered the prerecorded  
13 message into the SMS Blasting platform, and thereafter sent these messages  
14 pursuant to scheduled blasts that were programmed by Defendant. Thus, Defendant  
15 employed a text message as an instrument or medium of expression to deliver a  
16 prerecorded message drafted in advance of being sent.  
17

18 26. Thus, Defendant's messages utilized a "prerecorded voice" as  
19 prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

20 27. Additionally, Defendant placed numerous telephone calls to Plaintiffs  
21 cellular phone using an ATDS as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1), including but  
22 not limited to phone calls placed on December 9, 2021, and December 10, 2021.

23 28. The telephone number that Defendant, or their agent texted and called  
24 was assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs charges for  
25 incoming texts and calls pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1).

26 29. These calls and text messages constituted calls that were not for  
27 emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A)(i).  
28

1 30. Plaintiff was never a customer of Defendant and never provided his  
2 cellular telephone number to Defendant for any reason whatsoever. Accordingly,  
3 Defendant and their agents never received Plaintiff's prior express consent to  
4 receive unsolicited calls and text messages, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).

5 31. Such calls and text messages constitute solicitation calls pursuant to  
6 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2) as they were attempts to promote or sell Defendant's  
7 services.

8 32. These calls and text messages by Defendant, or its agents, violated 47  
9 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

10 33. Plaintiff is not a customer of Defendant's services and has never  
11 provided any personal information, including his cellular telephone numbers, to  
12 Defendant for any purpose whatsoever. In addition, Plaintiff told Defendant at  
13 least once to stop contacting them and Plaintiff has been registered on the Do-  
14 Not-Call Registry for at least thirty (30) days prior to Defendant contacting him.  
15 Accordingly, Defendant never received Plaintiff "prior express consent" to  
16 receive calls using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or  
17 prerecorded voice on their cellular telephone pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §  
18 227(b)(1)(A).

19 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

20 34. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and on behalf of and  
21 all others similarly situated, as a member of the two proposed Classes (together,  
22 "the Classes").

23 35. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, the ATDS Class, defined as  
24 follows: all persons within the United States who received any unsolicited calls or  
25 text messages sent using an ATDS or an artificial or prerecorded voice from  
26 Defendant, which text message was not made for emergency purposes or with the  
27 recipient's prior express consent within the four years prior to the filing of the  
28 Complaint through the date of class certification.

1           36. Plaintiff also represents, and is a member of, the DNC Class, defined  
2 as follows: all persons within the United States registered on the National Do-Not-  
3 Call Registry for at least 30 days, who had not granted Defendant prior express  
4 consent not had a prior established business relationship, who received more than  
5 one phone call or text message from or on behalf of Defendant that promoted  
6 Defendant's products or services, within any twelve-month period, within four  
7 years prior to the filing of the Complaint through the date of class certification.

8           37. Defendant and its employees or agents are excluded from the Classes.  
9 Plaintiff does not know the number of members in the Classes, but believes the  
10 Classes' members number in the thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should  
11 be certified as a Class action to assist in the expeditious litigation of this matter.

12           38. This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of  
13 economic injury on behalf of the Classes, and it expressly is not intended to request  
14 any recovery for personal injury and claims related thereto. Plaintiff reserves the  
15 right to expand the Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional persons  
16 as warranted as facts are learned in further investigation and discovery.

17           39. The joinder of the members of the Classes is impractical and the  
18 disposition of their claims in the Class action will provide substantial benefits both  
19 to the parties and to the court. The Classes can be identified through Defendant's  
20 records or Defendant's agents' records.

21           40. Plaintiff and members of the ATDS Class were harmed by the acts of  
22 Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant, either directly or through their  
23 agents, illegally contacted Plaintiff and the Class members via their cellular  
24 telephones by using marketing calls and text messages, thereby causing Plaintiff  
25 and the Class members to incur certain cellular telephone charges or reduce cellular  
26 telephone time for which Plaintiff and the Class members previously paid, and  
27 invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and the Class members. Plaintiff and the  
28 Class members were damaged thereby.



1           41. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law  
2 and fact involved affecting the ATDS Class members. The questions of law and  
3 fact common to the ATDS Class predominate over questions which may affect  
4 individual Class members, including the following:

- 5
- 6           a) Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint  
7 through the date of class certification, Defendant or their agents made  
8 any calls or text messages (other than those made for emergency  
9 purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party)  
10 to an ATDS Class member using any automatic dialing system or  
11 artificial or prerecorded voice to any telephone number assigned to a  
12 cellular phone service;
  - 13           b) Whether Plaintiff and the ATDS Class members were damaged  
14 thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
  - 15           c) Whether Defendant and their agents should be enjoined from  
16 engaging in such conduct in the future.

17           42. As a person that received at least one solicitation call and text message  
18 without Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are  
19 typical of the ATDS Class. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect  
20 the interests of the ATDS Class in that Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to any  
21 member of the ATDS Class.

22           43. Plaintiff and members of the DNC Class were harmed by the acts of  
23 Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant illegally contacted Plaintiff  
24 and the DNC Class members via their cellular telephones for solicitation purposes,  
25 thereby invading the privacy of Plaintiff and the DNC Class members whose  
26 telephone numbers were on the National Do-Not-Call Registry. Plaintiff and the  
27 DNC Class members were damaged thereby.

28           44. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law  
and fact involved affecting the DNC Class members. The questions of law and fact  
common to the DNC Class predominate over questions which may affect individual  
DNC Class members, including the following:

- a. Whether, within four years prior to the filing of the complaint through the date of class certification, Defendant or its agents made more than one solicitation call to the members of the DNC Class whose telephone numbers were on the National Do-Not-Call Registry for over thirty days and who had not granted prior express consent to Defendant and did not have an established business relationship with Defendant;
- b. Whether Defendant obtained prior express written consent to place solicitation calls to Plaintiff's or the DNC Class members' telephones;
- c. Whether Plaintiff and the DNC Class members were damaged by Defendant's conduct, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
- d. Whether Defendant and its agents should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.

45. As a person whose phone number was registered on the National Do-Not-Call Registry for at least thirty days, did not give Defendant express prior consent and did not have a prior business relationship with Defendant, but received more than one call or text message on behalf of Defendant during the applicable period, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of the DNC Class. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the DNC Class in that Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to any member of the DNC Class.

46. Plaintiff and the members of the Classes have suffered irreparable harm as a result of the Defendant's unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class action, the Classes will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy and Defendant will likely continue such illegal conduct. Because of the size of the individual member's claims, few, if any, members of the Classes could afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.

47. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in handling class action claims and claims involving violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

48. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce

1 Defendant to comply with federal and California law. The interest of the Classes'  
2 members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against  
3 Defendant are small because the maximum statutory damages in an individual  
4 action for violation of privacy are minimal. Management of these claims is likely  
5 to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class claims.

6 49. Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to the Classes,  
7 thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory  
8 relief with respect to the Classes as a whole.

9  
10 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
11 **NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT**  
12 **47 U.S.C. § 227(B)**  
13 **ON BEHALF OF THE ATDS CLASS**

14 50. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this  
15 Complaint as though fully stated herein.

16 51. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous  
17 and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each  
18 and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b).

19 52. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b),  
20 Plaintiff and ATDS Class members are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory  
21 damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

22 53. Plaintiff and ATDS Class members are also entitled to and seek  
23 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

24 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
25 **KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE**  
26 **TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT**  
27 **47 U.S.C. § 227(B)**  
28 **ON BEHALF OF THE ATDS CLASS**

54. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this  
Complaint as though fully stated herein.

1 55. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous  
2 and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not  
3 limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b).

4 56. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47  
5 U.S.C. § 227(b), Plaintiff and ATDS Class members are entitled to an award of  
6 \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C.  
7 § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

8 57. Plaintiff and ATDS Class members are also entitled to and seek  
9 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

10  
11 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**  
12 **NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT**  
13 **47 U.S.C. § 227(c)**  
14 **ON BEHALF OF THE DNC CLASS**

15 59. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this  
16 Complaint as though fully stated herein.

17 60. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous  
18 and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each  
19 and every one of the above cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c), and in particular  
20 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

21 61. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c),  
22 Plaintiff and the DNC Class members are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in  
23 statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §  
24 227(c)(5)(B).

25 62. Plaintiff and the DNC Class members are also entitled to and seek  
26 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.  
27  
28

1                                   **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
2                   **KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER**  
3                                   **PROTECTION ACT**  
4                                   **47 U.S.C. § 227(C)**  
5                                   **ON BEHALF OF THE DNC CLASS**

6           63. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this  
7           Complaint as though fully stated herein.

8           64. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous  
9           and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not  
10           limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c),  
11           and in particular 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

12           65. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47  
13           U.S.C. § 227(c), Plaintiff and the DNC Class members are entitled to an award of  
14           \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C.  
15           § 227(c)(5)(B).

16           Plaintiff and the DNC Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief  
17           prohibiting such conduct in the future.

18                                   **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

19           Wherefore, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court grant Plaintiff, and  
20           members of the Classes, the following relief against Defendant:

21                                   **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENT VIOLATION OF**  
22                                   **THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(B)**

- 23           • As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1),  
24           Plaintiff seeks for himself and each ATDS Class member \$500.00 in  
25           statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §  
26           227(b)(3)(B).  
27           • Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such  
28           conduct in the future.

- Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATION OF  
THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(B)**

- As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for himself and each ATDS Class member \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.
- Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENT VIOLATION OF  
THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(C)**

- As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5), Plaintiff seeks for himself and each DNC Class member \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).
- Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.
- Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATION OF  
THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(C)**

- As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5), Plaintiff seeks for himself and each DNC Class member \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(B).
- Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.
- Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**TRIAL BY JURY**

66. Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demands, a trial by jury.

Dated: July 28, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

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

By: s/ Todd M. Friedman  
TODD M. FRIEDMAN, ESQ.  
ADRIAN R. BACON, ESQ.  
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

# ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Rocket Mortgage Hit with Lawsuit Over Alleged Robocalls, Texts](#)

---