1	Todd M. Friedman (SBN 216752)		
2	Adrian R. Bacon (SBN 280332) LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, F	P.C.	
3	324 S. Beverly Dr., #725		
	Beverly Hills, CA 90212		
4	Phone: 877-206-4741		
5	Fax: 866-633-0228 tfriedman@attorneysforconsumers.com		
6	abacon@attorneysforconsumers.com		
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
8	UNITED STATES I	DISTRIC	T COURT
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	DONNA RATLIFF, individually and on)	Coso No	
11	behalf of all others similarly situated,	Case INC	J.
12	)	CLASS	ACTION
13	Plaintiff,	)	
		COMP OF:	LAINT FOR VIOLATIONS
14	VS.	) Or.	
15	PROSPECT MEDICAL HOLDINGS,	1.	NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE
16	INC. dba SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	)	CONSUMER PROTECTION
17	HOSPITAL AT CULVER CITY,		ACT [47 U.S.C. §227 ET SEO.]
18	Defendant.	2.	WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE
19		)	CONSUMER PROTECTION
20		)	ACT [47 U.S.C. §227 ET SEQ.]
21		DEMA	ND FOR JURY TRIAL
22		DENT	TOR GORT TRUIL
23			
24			
25	Plaintiff Donna Ratliff ("Plaintiff"	), individu	ally and on behalf of all others
26	similarly situated, alleges the following upon information and belief based upon		
27	personal knowledge:		
28	///		
20			

#### **NATURE OF THE CASE**

1. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated seeking damages and any other available legal or equitable remedies resulting from the illegal actions of Prospect Medical Holdings, Inc. dba Southern California Hospital at Culver City ("Defendant") 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, upon information and belief, will result in at least one class member belonging to a different state than that of Defendant, a company with its principal place of business and State of Incorporation in Delaware. 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 County of Los Angeles and the Central District of California.

## **PARTIES**

- 4. Plaintiff, Donna Ratliff ("Plaintiff"), is a natural person residing in Los Angeles, California and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10).
- 5. Defendant, Prospect Medical Holdings, Inc. dba Southern California Hospital at Culver City ("Defendant"), is a Southern California hospital and care

facility, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10).

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

## **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 6. At various and multiple times prior to the filing of the instant Complaint, including within the one year preceding the filing of this Complaint, Defendant contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect an alleged outstanding debt.
- 7. On or about August 26, 2015, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on her cellular telephone in an attempt to collect an alleged outstanding debt stemming from medical services rendered.
- As an illustrative example (and not one of limitation), Defendant 8. contacted or attempted to contact Plaintiff on or about August 26, 2015 at 12:34 p.m., and on or about August 31, 2015 at 6:11p.m.
- Defendant used an "automatic telephone dialing system", as defined 10. by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1) to place its daily calls to Plaintiff seeking to collect the debt allegedly owed.
- Furthermore, Defendant utilized a prerecorded voice when leaving 11. the message for Plaintiff, as prohibited by 47 U.S.C.  $\S 227(1)(A)(i)$ .
- As an illustrative example (and not one of limitation), Defendant left 12. the following voicemail using a prerecorded voice:

This is Patient Accounting Department of Southern California Hospital at Culver City, calling regrading a personal business matter for Donna Lynn Ratliff. Please contact us at your earliest convenience. You may reach us Monday through Friday 8 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. at 1(800) 404-6627. Please use reference number 5001168850001 when calling. If we have reached this number in error, please contact us 1(800) 404-6627, so we can remove your phone number from our records. We appreciate the opportunity to serve you, and are available to speak with you should any questions arise. Again, this is the Patient Department of Southern California Hospital at Culver City, calling regarding a personal business matter for Donna Lynn Ratliff. Please contact us at your earliest convenience. You may reach us Monday through Friday 8 a.m. to

5:30 p.m. at 1(800) 404-6627. Please use reference number 5001168850001 when calling. If we have reached this number in error, please contact us 1(800) 404-6627, so we can remove your phone number from our records. We appreciate the opportunity to serve you, and are available to speak with you should any questions arise. Thank you and goodbye.

- 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 number assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).
- 15. During all relevant times, Defendant did not possess Plaintiff's "prior express consent" to receive calls using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice on her cellular telephone pursuant to  $47\ U.S.C.$  § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 16. As a result of the above violations of the TCPA, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff's actual damages, statutory damages, and costs and attorney's fees.

## **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

17. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of 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 collection telephone calls from Defendant 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

- 18. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The Class, consisting of all persons within the United States who received any collection telephone calls from Defendant 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 Defendant within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.
- 19. 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.
- 20. 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.
- 21. 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 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 Defendant during those illegal calls, and invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and Class members.
- 22. 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 made any collection 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;
- b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damages thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
- c. Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.
- 23. As a person that received numerous collection calls from Defendant 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.
- 24. 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.
- 25. 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

1011

12

13

1415

1617

18 19

20

2122

23

2425

26

27

28

system, and protects the rights of each Class member.

- 26. 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.
- 27. 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 Class as a whole.

### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

- 28. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-27.
- 29. 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.
- 30. 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).
- 31. 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.

32. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-30.

- 33. 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.
- 34. 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).
- 35. 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 .S.C. §227 et seq.

- 36. 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).
  - 37. 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 .S.C. §227 et seq.

38. As a result of Defendant's 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  $U.S.C. \ \$227(b)(3)(C)$ .

Case 2:16-cv-00253-GW-JEM Document 1 Filed 01/12/16 Page 9 of 9 Page ID #:9