```
Todd M. Friedman (SBN 216752)
1
    Meghan E. George (SBN 274525)
2
    Adrian R. Bacon (SBN 280332)
   LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.
3
    21550 Oxnard St., Suite 780
4
    Woodland Hills, CA 91367
    Phone: 877-206-4741
5
   Fax: 866-633-0228
6
   tfriedman@toddflaw.com
7
   mgeorge@toddflaw.com
   abacon@toddflaw.com
8
    Attorneys for Plaintiffs,
9
                    UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10
                   CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11
12
    STEVE GALLION, individually and ) Case No.
   on behalf of all others similarly
13
    situated.
                                       CLASS ACTION
14
    Plaintiff,
                                       COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS
15
                                       OF:
16
         VS.
                                                NEGLIGENT
17
                                          VIOLATIONS OF THE
                                          TELEPHONE CONSUMER
18
    CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS,
                                          PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C.
19
                                          §227 ET SEO.1
    INC., and SPECTRUM
                                                WILLFÚL VIOLATIONS
    MANAGEMENT HOLDING
20
                                          OF THE TELEPHONE
   COMPANY, LLC; DOES 1 through
                                          CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT
21
                                          [47 U.S.C. §227 ET SEQ.]
    10, inclusive,
22
                                       DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
    Defendants.
23
         Plaintiff, STEVE GALLION ("Plaintiff"), individually and all others
24
   similarly situated, alleges the following upon information and belief based upon
25
    personal knowledge:
26
                          NATURE OF THE CASE
27
              Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others
         1.
28
```

sim
 ren
 INO
 CO
 neg
 tele

similarly situated seeking damages and any other available legal or equitable remedies resulting from the illegal actions of CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS, INC. ("CHARTER") and SPECTRUM MANAGEMENT HOLDING COMPANY, LLC ("SPECTRUM"), collectively referred to as "Defendants", in negligently, knowingly, and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff on Plaintiff's cellular telephone in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47. U.S.C. § 227 et seq. ("TCPA"), thereby invading Plaintiff's privacy.

JURISDICTION & VENUE

- 2. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) because Plaintiff, a resident of California, seeks relief on behalf of a Class, which will result in at least one class member belonging to a different state than that of Defendants. Defendant CHARTER is headquartered in Connecticut, and Defendant SPECTRUM is headquartered in New York. 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 Central District of California pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1391(b) and 18 U.S.C. § 1441(a) because Defendant does business within the state of California and Plaintiff resides within this District.

PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff, STEVE GALLION ("Plaintiff"), is a natural person residing in San Bernardino County of the state of California and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10).
- 5. Defendant CHARTER is a telecommunications company and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10).

- 6. Defendant SPECTRUM is a telecommunications company and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10).
- 7. The above named Defendants, and its subsidiaries and agents, are collectively referred to as "Defendants." The true names and capacities of the Defendants sued herein as DOE DEFENDANTS 1 through 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues such Defendants by fictitious names. Each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible for the unlawful acts alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend the Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when such identities become known.
- 8. 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

- 9. On July 6, 2017, Defendants contacted Plaintiff on his cellular telephone, (310) 916-6963, in an effort to sell or solicit its services.
- 10. Defendants used an "automatic telephone dialing system", as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1) to place its daily calls to Plaintiff seeking to sell or solicit its business services.
- 11. During this call, Defendant utilized an "artificial or prerecorded voice" as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 12. When Plaintiff answered the call, he heard a pre-recorded voice say "Hi, my name is Kimberly Greene with Spectrum Communications. Please hold while I connect you to a specialist for custom pricing promotions." Plaintiff was

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 then transferred to a live representative of Defendants.

- Defendants' calls constituted calls that were not for emergency 13. purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 14. Plaintiff is not a customer of Defendants' services and has never provided any personal information, including his cellular telephone number, to Defendants for any purpose whatsoever. Accordingly, Defendants never received Plaintiff's "prior express consent" to receive calls using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice on his cellular telephone pursuant to 47 *U.S.C.* § 227(b)(1)(A).

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others 15. 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 calls from Defendants to said person's cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such person had not previously consented to receiving such calls within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint

- 16. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The Class, consisting of All persons within the United States who received any telephone calls from Defendants to said person's cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such person had not previously not provided their cellular telephone number to Defendants within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.
- Defendants, their employees and agents are excluded from The 17. Class. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in The Class, but believes

1

4 5 6

8 9

7

11 12

10

14 15

13

16

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

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.

- 18. 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 Defendants.
- Plaintiff and members of The Class were harmed by the acts of Defendants in at least the following ways: Defendants illegally contacted Plaintiff and Class members via their cellular telephones thereby causing Plaintiff and Class members to incur certain charges or reduced telephone time for which Plaintiff and Class members had previously paid by having to retrieve or administer messages left by Defendants during those illegal calls, and invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and Class members.
- 20. 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:
 - Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, a. Defendants made any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) to a Class member using any automatic telephone dialing system or any artificial or prerecorded voice to any telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service;
 - Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damages thereby, and b. the extent of damages for such violation; and

- c. Whether Defendants should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.
- 21. As a person that received numerous calls from Defendants using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, without Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of The Class.
- 22. 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.
- 23. 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.
- 24. 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.
- 25. Defendants have 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.

- 26. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-23.
- 27. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants constitute numerous and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.
- 28. As a result of Defendants' 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).
- 29. 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.

- 30. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-23.
- 31. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.
- 32. As a result of Defendants' 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

 $U.S.C. \S 227(b)(3)(B) \text{ and } 47 \ U.S.C. \S 227(b)(3)(C).$

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

Respectfully Submitted this 6th day of July, 2017.

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

By: /s Todd M. Friedman

1	Todd M. Friedman
2	Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman Attorney for Plaintiff
3	7 Recorney for 1 lument
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	