1	KENDRA S. CANAPE (SBN: 259641)			
2	kcanape@grsm.com GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI, LLP 5 Park Plaza, Suite 1100 Irvine, CA 92614 Telephone: (949) 290-3253			
3	5 Park Plaza, Suite 1100 Irvine, CA 92614			
4	Telephone: (949) 290-3253 Facsimile: (949) 474-2060			
5	Attorneys for Defendant			
6	IQ DATA INTERNATIONAL, INC.			
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10	CARMEN STARKS, INDIVIDUALLY	Case No.:		
11	CARMEN STARKS, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC,			
12	GENERAL I ODDIO,	DEFENDANT I.Q. DATA INTERNATIONAL, INC.'S NOTICE OF REMOVAL		
	Plaintiff,	NOTICE OF REMOVAL		
13				
14	VS.			
15	I.Q. DATA INTERNATIONAL INC., A WASINGTON CORPORATION; AND	[Removal from Superior Court		
16	DOES 1 THROUGH 100, INCLUSIVE,	[Removal from Superior Court of California, County of Kern, Case No. BCV-23-101559]		
17				
18	Defendants.			
19				
20				
21				
22	TO THE CLERK OF THE UNITED S			
23	THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFOR	NIA AND THE PLAINTIFF AND		
24	HER ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:			
25	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursua	ant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441, and		
26	1446, Defendant IQ Data International, Inc.	("Defendant" or "IQ Data"), hereby		
27	removes the above-referenced case from the	e Superior Court for the State of		
28		•		

Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhami, LLP 5 Park Plaza, Suite 1100 Irvine, CA 92614

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

I.

California for the Cour	nty of Kern, to the United States Distr	ict Court for the Eastern
District of California.	IQ Data pleads as follows regarding t	the grounds for removal

- 1. On May 18, 2023, Plaintiff Carmen Starks ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of the general public, filed suit against IQ Data in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Kern, styled Carmen Starks, Individually And On Behalf Of The General Public v. IQ Data International, Inc., a Washington Corporation; and Does 1 through 100, inclusive (the "State Court Action"). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), copies of all summons, process, pleadings, motions, and orders filed in the State Court Action are attached hereto as "Exhibit A."
- 2. IQ Data first received notice of this lawsuit on May 31, 2023, when it was served with a copy of Plaintiff's summons and Complaint.
- 3. Plaintiff claims that IQ Data violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. (the "FDCPA"), the California Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788, et seq. ("RFDCPA") and the California Unfair Business Practices Act, Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq. ("UPA").

#### II. SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION

THE STATE COURT ACTION

In addition to original jurisdiction over Plaintiff's federal question jurisdiction claims arising under the FDCPA, the Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's RFDCPA and UPA claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367 because those claims are related to federal questions claims within the original

#### 

jurisdiction of this Court and form part of the same case or controversy under Article
III of the United States Constitution.

#### II. THE PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS FOR REMOVAL ARE SATISFIED

- 5. IQ Data first received notice of the Complaint on May 31, 2023, upon service of the summons and Complaint. Therefore, its removal of this action is timely in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b), because IQ Data's Notice of Removal was filed within 30 days. See 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).
- 6. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), copies of all summons, process, pleadings, motions and orders that have been filed in the State Court Action are attached as "Exhibit A."
- 7. This Court embraces the locality in which the State Court Action is now pending, making this Court a proper forum pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a).
  - 8. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein.
- 9. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), a copy of this Notice of Removal is being served upon Plaintiff, and a copy is being filed with the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Kern.
- 10. If any questions arise regarding the propriety of the removal of this action, IQ Data respectfully requests the opportunity to present a brief and/or oral argument in support of its position that this case is removable.

Dated: June 30, 2023 GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI, LLP

By: <u>/s/Kendra S. Canape</u>
Kendra S. Canape
Attorneys for Defendant
IQ DATA INTERNATIONAL, INC.

# **EXHIBIT A**

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar nur	CDB Document 1 Filed 06/3	3 <mark>0/23 Page 5 of 29 CM-010</mark>
JOHN D. GUERRINI (SBN 190972)		FOR COURT USE ONLY
Law Offices of John D. Guerrini, 74-710 Highwi	ay 111, Ste. 102, Palm Desert, CA 92260	
TELEPHONE NO.: 626-485-8660	FAX No. (Optional):	ELECTRONICALLY FILED 5/18/2023 11:59 AM
E-MAIL ADDRESS: john@johnguerrini.com		Kern County Superior Court
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff CARMEN SPARK		By Marina Mercado, Deputy
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF STREET ADDRESS: 1215 Truxtun Avenue	KERN	
MAILING ADDRESS: 12.13 Truxtur Avenue		
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Bakersfield, California 93301		
BRANCH NAME: Metropolitan Division Justice Bi	ıııldıng.	
CASE NAME: STARKS v. I.Q. DATA INTERNATIONAL, INC.		
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER:
■ Unlimited Limited	Counter Joinder	BCV-23-101559
(Amount (Amount	Filed with first appearance by defendant	JUDGE:
demanded demanded is exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	DEPT:
	ow must be completed (see instructions on	
Check one box below for the case type that		
Auto Tort		rovisionally Complex Civil Litigation
Auto (22):	Breach of contract/warranty (06)	Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400–3.403)
Uninsured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10)
Asbestos (04)	Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40) Securities litigation (28)
Product liability (24)	Other contract (37)	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)
Medical malpractice (45)	Real Property	Insurance coverage claims arising from the
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14)	above listed provisionally complex case
Non-Pl/PD/WD (Other) Tort	1 101-2-26 1 2 1-0-2-7000	types (41) Inforcement of Judgment
■ Business tort/unfair business practice (07)		Enforcement of judgment (20)
Civil rights (08)		liscellaneous Civil Complaint
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31).	RICO (27)
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)  Judicial Review	liscellaneous Civil Petition
Professional negligence (25) Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)
Employment	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)
Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)	
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)	
. This case is not comp	blex under rule 3.400 of the California Rule	s of Court. If the case is complex, mark the
factors requiring exceptional judicial manage		
a Large number of separately repres	ented parties d Large number	of witnesses
b. Extensive motion practice raising of		vith related actions pending in one or more
issues that will be time-consuming		counties, states, or countries, or in a federal
c. Substantial amount of documentar	y condende	stjudgment judicial supervision
. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a.	monetary b. nonmonetary; de	claratory or injunctive relief c: * punitive
, Number of causes of action (specify): Three	(3)	a de la companya de La companya de la co
. High and the state of the sta	ss action suit.	
6. If there are any known related cases, file ar	nd serve a notice of related case. (You ma	y use form CM-015.)
ote: May 1, 2023 OHN D. GUERRINI		
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(SIG	NATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)
	NOTICE	
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the fire under the Probate Code. Family Code, or W.		
in sanctions.	eliare and institutions Code). (Cal. Rules o	of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result
<ul> <li>File this cover sheet in addition to any cover</li> </ul>	sheet required by local court rule.	
<ul> <li>If this case is complex under rule 3,400 et se</li> </ul>		ust serve a copy of this cover sheet on all
other parties to the action or proceeding.	3.740 or a compley case, this cover sheet i	

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the Civil Case Cover Sheet contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the Civil Case Cover Sheet to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES
Contract the case is complex.

#### **Auto Tort**

Auto (22)-Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to arbitration, check this item instead of Auto)

#### Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/ Property Damage/Wrongful Death)

Asbestos (04)

Asbestos Property Damage Asbestos Personal Injury/ Wrongful Death

Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) (24)

Medical Malpractice (45)

Medical Malpractice-

Physicians & Surgeons

Other Professional Health Care

Malpractice

Other PI/PD/WD (23)

Premises Liability (e.g., slip

and fall)

Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD

(e.g., assault, vandalism)

Intentional Infliction of

**Emotional Distress** 

Negligent Infliction of

**Emotional Distress** Other PI/PD/WD

Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

Business Tort/Unfair Business

Practice (07)

Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination,

false arrest) (not civil

harassment) (08)

Defamation (e.g., slander, libel)

(13)

Fraud (16)

Intellectual Property (19)

Professional Negligence (25)

Legal Malpractice

Other Professional Malpractice

(not medical or legal)

Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)

#### Employment

Wrongful Termination (36) Other Employment (15)

Breach of Contract/Warranty (06)

Breach of Rental/Lease

Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction)

Contract/Warranty Breach-Seller

Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence)

Negligent Breach of Contract/

Warranty

Other Breach of Contract/Warranty

Collections (e.g., money owed, open

book accounts) (09)

Collection Case-Seller Plaintiff

Other Promissory Note/Collections

Case

Insurance Coverage (not provisionally

complex) (18)

Auto Subrogation Other Coverage

Other Contract (37)

Contractual Fraud

Other Contract Dispute

#### **Real Property**

Eminent Domain/Inverse

Condemnation (14)

Wrongful Eviction (33)

Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26)

Writ of Possession of Real Property

Mortgage Foreclosure

Quiet Title

Other Real Property (not eminent

domain, landlord/tenant, or

foreclosure)

#### **Unlawful Detainer**

Commercial (31)

Residential (32)

Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal

drugs, check this item; otherwise, report as Commercial or Residential)

Judicial Review

Asset Forfeiture (05)

Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)

Writ of Mandate (02)

Writ-Administrative Mandamus

Writ-Mandamus on Limited Court

Case Matter

Writ-Other Limited Court Case

Review

Other Judicial Review (39)

Review of Health Officer Order Notice of Appeal-Labor Commissioner Appeals

Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rules 3.400-3.403)

Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)

Construction Defect (10)

Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)

Securities Litigation (28)

Environmental/Toxic Tort (30)

Insurance Coverage Claims

(arising from provisionally complex

case type listed above) (41)

#### **Enforcement of Judgment**

Enforcement of Judgment (20)

Abstract of Judgment (Out of County)

Confession of Judgment (non-

domestic relations)

Sister State Judgment

Administrative Agency Award

(not unpaid taxes)

Petition/Certification of Entry of

Judgment on Unpaid Taxes

Other Enforcement of Judgment

Case

#### Miscellaneous Civil Complaint

**RICO (27)** 

Other Complaint (not specified

above) (42)

Declaratory Relief Only

Injunctive Relief Only (non-

harassment)

Mechanics Lien

Other Commercial Complaint

Case (non-tort/non-complex)

Other Civil Complaint

(non-tort/non-complex)

#### Miscellaneous Civil Petition

Partnership and Corporate

Governance (21) Other Petition (not specified

above) (43)

Civil Harassment

Workplace Violence

Elder/Dependent Adult

Abuse

**Election Contest** 

Petition for Name Change

Petition for Relief From Late

Claim

Other Civil Petition

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED** 5/18/2023 11:59 AM Kern County Superior Court LAW OFFICES OF JOHN D. GUERRINI By Marina Mercado, Deputy John D. Guerrini (State Bar No. 190972) 74-710 Highway 111 · Suite 102 Palm Desert, CA 92260 626-485-8660 john@johnguerrini.com 5 ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF, CARMEN STARKS 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 FOR THE COUNTY OF KERN 9 **UNLIMITED JURISDICTION** BCV-23-101559 10 CARMEN STARKS, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON) Case No.: BEHALF OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC. 11 COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND DAMAGES FOR VIOLATIONS OF Plaintiff. 12 THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT, THE ROSENTHAL VS. 13 ACT, AND BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS **CODE SECTION 17200** I.Q. DATA INTERNATIONAL, INC., A 14 WASHINGTON CORPORATION; AND DEMAND: EXCEEDS \$25,000.00 15 DOES 1 THROUGH 100, INCLUSIVE, JURY TRIAL DEMANDED 16 Defendants. 17 18 TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD: 19 Plaintiff CARMEN STARKS ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of herself and all 20 others similarly situated, as well as on behalf of the general public, hereby complains against 21 defendants I.Q. DATA INTERNATIONAL, INC. ("Defendant") and DOES 1 through 100, 22 inclusive, and on information and belief, alleges as follows: 23 **OPERATIVE FACTS** This action concerns Defendants' violations of the federal Fair Debt Collection 24 1. 25 Practices Act (the "FDCPA"), the California Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (the 26 "Rosenthal Act"), and the California Unfair Business Practices Act also known as Business 27 & Professions Code section 17200 et seg. (the "UBP Act"). 28 2. Plaintiff is a 67-year-old retiree living in Bakersfield.

- 3. Defendant is a Washington Corporation which regularly engages in debtcollection activity in this Judicial District in Kern County, State of California.
- 4. Defendant planned and carried out a despicable campaign of false, deceptive, misleading, unfair, and unconscionable conduct directed at Plaintiff, a literal "bait and switch," whereby Defendant lied to Plaintiff about the terms of a settlement proposed by the Defendant. It was only after Plaintiff complied with the terms of the settlement exactly as presented that Defendant then showed its true colors and reneged on the terms, refusing to honor the settlement. This despicable conduct crosses the boundaries of civilized behavior and violates a host of consumer protection statutes. One can only wonder how many times Defendant has engaged in the same pattern of conduct with other similarly situated consumers.
- 5. Plaintiff brings this action as a private attorney general and seeks injunctive relief to end this corporate lawbreaking for the benefit of all affected Californians.
- 6. In summer 2022, Plaintiff and her daughter, Lorene Miller, co-signed a lease for an apartment located in Moreno Valley in an apartment building known as Ardella on Chagall (the "Apartment"). Plaintiff and her daughter then occupied the property.
- 7. At the time Plaintiff vacated the Apartment, there remained a balance due to the owner of the Apartment. The owner then hired Defendant to attempt to collect the balance from Plaintiff and her daughter.
- 8. In early January 2023, Defendant made demand upon both Plaintiff and her daughter for the balance due on the Apartment. The demand was made upon Plaintiff and her daughter in the city of Bakersfield. Each demand was nearly identical, and critically, each demand bore the same account number: 0008880875.
- 9. On or about January 20, 2023, Plaintiff spoke by telephone with Tyler Tabarejo-Ishikuro, an employee of Defendant. In this telephone call, Plaintiff told Tyler that she did not have enough money to pay the entire balance. At that time, Tyler refused to discount the balance.

10. Subsequently, on January 31, 2023, Tyler made an oral offer via telephone to Plaintiff to settle the entire balance on the account 0008880875 if Plaintiff were to immediately pay 50% of the then-outstanding balance of \$6238.90. Plaintiff asked Tyler to confirm the settlement offer in writing, and that same day, Tyler sent by email written confirmation of the offer to settle in full the entire account 0008880875 in exchange for 50% of the then-outstanding balance of \$6238.90. In other words, in exchange for Plaintiff paying \$3119.45, the account would be settled in full with no further liability to either Plaintiff or her daughter. A true copy of said written offer is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by this reference as though set out in full.

- 11. Specifically, Defendant stated in writing: "We at I.Q. Data International have reviewed your file and agree to accept \$3119.45 as settlement in full regarding the above-mentioned account. Payment must be received in our office not later than 01/31/23."
- 12. Defendant also stated in writing: "I.Q. Data International, Inc., further agrees to request deletion of any negative information supplied to any credit bureaus regarding this account."
- 13. Plaintiff complied the very same day with the terms of the offer by Plaintiff promptly paying \$3119.45 by credit card over the phone to Defendant, based upon Defendant's telephone and emailed offer.
- 14. Later the same day, January 31, 2023, Defendant stated in writing: "We at I.Q. Data International, Inc., acknowledge receipt of your payment in the amount of \$3119.45 on the date of 01/31/23 and hereby release you, and you alone, from any further liability related to the above mentioned debt to the original creditor and I.Q. International, Inc. [sic]." A true copy of this written statement is attached hereto as Exhibit 2 and incorporated herein by this reference as though set out in full.
- 15. In other words, Defendant was now attempting to change the terms of the settlement offer that it had made to Plaintiff. Defendant now took the position that only Plaintiff and not her daughter was released by the settlement, and not the entire account. This position directly contradicts the terms of the proposal made by the Defendant's agent

on the telephone as well as the express terms of the Exhibit 1 written offer. Plaintiff demanded that Defendant comply with the terms of the offer that Plaintiff had accepted; however, Defendant refused, insisting that there remained a balance due on the account in the sum of \$3119.45.

16. Despite Plaintiff's reminder to the Defendant that by her payment, the entire debt was settled, the Defendant ignored its agreement and continued its attempts to collect the debt. Plaintiff's and her daughter's credit reports by the three major credit reporting agencies thus contained derogatory information because of Defendant's refusal to correct the reporting to credit bureaus, even though Plaintiff fully satisfied the terms of the settlement offer made by Defendant.

#### **PARTIES**

- 17. Plaintiff is an individual over the age of 18 years, who resides in the city of Bakersfield, California.
- 18. Defendant is a Washington corporation which, at all times relevant herein, was licensed to do business and was conducting business in the State of California and in Kern County. Defendant is a debt collector and engaged in the business of attempting to collect consumer debt.
- 19. Defendants Does 1 through 100 are persons or entities whose true names and capacities are presently unknown to Plaintiff, and who therefore are sued by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants perpetrated some or all of the wrongful acts alleged herein, is responsible in some manner for the matters alleged herein and is jointly and severally liable to plaintiff. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this complaint to state the true names and capacities of such fictitiously named defendants when ascertained.
- 20. At all times mentioned herein, each defendant was the agent or employee of each of the other defendants and was acting within the course and scope of such agency or employment. The defendants are jointly and severally liable to plaintiff.

#### **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

- 21. This action is brought as a class action. Plaintiff tentatively defines the class as all California consumers to whom, during the one year prior to the filing of this Complaint, Defendants sent letters similar to Exhibit 1, i.e., letters to a co-debtor on one single account, purporting to accept payment as settlement in full of the account. Plaintiff may subsequently refine the class definition in light of discovery.
- 22. The class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impractical. On information and belief, letters similar to Exhibit 1 have been sent to hundreds of consumers who were jointly liable with one or more co-debtors on a single account.
- 23. There are questions of law and fact common to the class, which predominate over any questions affecting only individual class members. The principal question is whether Defendants' conduct in connection with the mailing of Exhibit 1 and similar letters to consumers, and subsequently accepting money from consumers in response to said letters without honoring the terms of the letter, violates the FDCPA and the Rosenthal Act.
- 24. There are no individual questions, other than whether a class member received one of the offending letters, which can be determined by ministerial inspection of defendants' records.
- 25. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class. She is committed to vigorously litigating this matter. She is greatly annoyed at being the victim of Defendants' illegal practices and wishes to see that the wrong is remedied for her and others similarly situated. To that end, she has retained counsel to represent her and the class claims, and neither Plaintiff nor her counsel have any interests which might cause them not to vigorously pursue this claim.
- 26. Plaintiff's claim is typical of the claims of the class, which all arise from the same operative facts and are based on the same legal theories.
- 27. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Most of the consumers who receive a letter identical or similar to Exhibit 1 undoubtedly believe that they and their co-debtor(s) will be released upon payment of the

 monies pursuant to the settlement terms in the letter. They would have no way to know that illegal collection practices are violating their rights. The interest of class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendants is small because the maximum damages allowable under the FDCPA in an individual action are \$1,000 per violation. Management of this class claim is likely to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class claims.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 28. The Superior Court has jurisdiction over this matter since Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and the amount in controversy exceeds \$25,000.
- 29. Venue is proper in Kern County pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17203, which allows any person who has engaged in unfair competition to be enjoined in "any court of competent jurisdiction." Defendants do not maintain their residence in any particular county in the State of California. Plaintiff resides in this Judicial District.
- 30. Venue is also proper in Kern County pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 395.

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

## VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 ET SEQ.

(By Plaintiff as to All Defendants)

- 31. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 30, inclusive, as though set forth in full herein.
- 32. The Federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA") became effective in March 1978 and was and is designed to eliminate abuse, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices. It also protects reputable debt collectors from unfair competition and encourages consistent state action to protect consumers from abuses in debt collection.
- 33. The FDCPA applies only to the collection of debt incurred by a consumer primarily for personal, family, or household purposes. It does not apply to the collection of

 corporate debt or debt owed for business or agricultural purposes. The debt herein is for outstanding rent due from a tenant to a landlord – a consumer debt – and is thus covered under the FDCPA.

- 34. The FDCPA defines a debt collector as any person who regularly collects, or attempts to collect, consumer debts for another person or institution or uses some name other than its own when collecting its own consumer debts. The definition includes businesses that regularly collect debts for an unrelated institution. Defendant is a business that is regularly hired to collect debts for others and as such, is subject to the FDCPA.
- 35. The FDCPA at 15 U.S.C. section 1692e provides, among other things, that "[a] debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." By lying to Plaintiff to convince her to pay money to Defendant purportedly to settle the debt owed by both Plaintiff and her daughter, Defendants used a false representation or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect any debt and thus violated the FDCPA.
- 36. The FDCPA at 15 U.S.C. section 1692f provides, among other things, that "[a] debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." By lying to Plaintiff to convince her to pay money to Defendant purportedly to settle the debt owed by both Plaintiff and her daughter, Defendants engaged in an unfair practice to collect or attempt to collect any debt and thus violated the FDCPA.
- 37. As a result of the foregoing violations of the FDCPA, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for a declaratory judgment that the Defendants' conduct violated the FDCPA, and for actual damages, statutory damages, costs, and attorney's fees.

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

# VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT, CIVIL CODE § 1788 et seq.

(By Plaintiff as to All Defendants)

38. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 30 inclusive, as though set forth in full herein.

 39. The Rosenthal Act at California Civil Code § 1788 et seq. was enacted in 1976 to protect consumers from the oppressive and overreaching debt collection practices of creditors and professional debt collectors. The State Legislature found that unfair or deceptive debt collection practices undermine the public confidence that is essential to the continued functioning of the banking and credit system and sound extensions of credit to consumers. As originally passed, The Rosenthal Act set forth a list of proscribed collection practices. It was amended with Civil Code § 1788.17, which incorporates many provisions of the FDCPA into the law.

- 40. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were "debt collectors" within the meaning of Civil Code § 1788.2(d), in that they regularly and in the ordinary course of business, on behalf of themselves or others, engaged in acts and practices in connection with the collection of consumer debt. Plaintiff is a "debtor" within the meaning of Civil Code § 1788.2(h) in that she is a natural person from whom Defendants sought to collect a consumer debt alleged to be due and owing.
- 41. The purported debt that Defendants attempted to collect from Plaintiff was a "consumer debt" within the meaning of Civil Code § 1788.2(f).
  - 42. Defendants violated the provisions of Civil Code § 1788.17 by:
  - a. engaging in conduct the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse Plaintiff and other parties in connection with collection of a debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d;
  - b. using false, deceptive, or misleading misrepresentations or means in connection with the collection of a debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e; and
  - c. using unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect a debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692f.
- 43. Defendants violated the provisions of Civil Code § 1788.10 by threatening to take action in violation of other provisions of the Rosenthal Act.
- 44. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' violations enumerated above, Plaintiff has been damaged in amounts that are subject to proof.

- 45. Defendants' violations of the Rosenthal Act were willful and knowing, thereby entitling Plaintiff to statutory damages pursuant to Civil Code § 1788.30(b). Plaintiff is also entitled to the remedies set forth at 15 U.S.C. § 1692k., pursuant to Civil Code § 1788.17.
- 46. Plaintiff is entitled to recover her reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Civil Code §1788.30(c) and 15 U.S.C. § 1692k.
- 47. Any communications or communicative acts by Defendants herein in connection with their attempts to collect on alleged debts were not made to achieve the objects of, and had no connection or logical relation to, any judicial proceeding or anticipated judicial proceeding. At the time of making any such communications or performing any such communicative acts, a lawsuit was not imminent, and Defendants did not seriously contemplate a lawsuit in good faith as a means of resolving any dispute.
- 48. At all times herein, Defendants acted with malice, and with a state of mind arising from hatred or ill will, evidencing a willingness to vex, annoy and/or injure Plaintiff and members of the general public.

#### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California's Unfair Business Practices Act also known as Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq.

(By Plaintiff as to All Defendants)

- 49. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 30 and 39 through 48 inclusive, as though set forth in full herein.
- 50. Plaintiff brings this action as a private attorney general acting on behalf of the general public, pursuant to the California Unfair Business Practices Act, Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq. (the "UBP Act"). Plaintiff is acting in a representative capacity to remedy the ongoing unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices alleged herein, and to seek injunctive relief and restitution on behalf of all those persons who have been and are being affected thereby. The UBP Act is often referred to as the "Unfair Competition Law" and it defines unfair competition to include any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice. The UBP Act provides that a court may order injunctive

relief and restitution to affected members of the general public as remedies for any violations of the UBP Act.

- 51. Beginning on an exact date unknown to Plaintiff, but at all times relevant herein, Defendant and the DOE defendants have committed acts of unfair competition proscribed by the UBP Act., including the practices alleged herein. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that numerous California consumers are debtors being chased by Defendant and the DOE defendants who have been subject to these unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent practices. Defendants committed each of the violations enumerated above against members of the general public in addition to Plaintiff.
- 52. Beginning on or about four years prior to the filing of the Complaint in this action, and continuing thereafter, Defendants have been systematically violating the provisions of the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Civil Code § 1788 et seq. These violations are and were a matter of corporate policy, and they constitute a consistent pattern and practice of unlawful corporate behavior.
- 53. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that, since four years prior to the filing of the complaint, Defendants have been and are violating the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, and therefore the UBP Act, through the following unlawful practices:
  - a. Violating the provisions of Civil Code § 1788.17 by: (i) using false, deceptive, or misleading misrepresentations or means in connection with the collection of a debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d; and (ii) using unfair or unconscionable methods in collecting debts, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692f.
- 54. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and on that basis alleges that, since four years prior to the filing of the Complaint, Defendants have been and are violating the Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act, Civil Code § 1785.1 et seq., and therefore the UBP Act, through the following unlawful practices:
  - a. Violating the provisions of Civil Code § 1785.25(a) by furnishing incomplete and inaccurate information to consumer credit reporting agencies on the specific

 transactions or experiences of consumers' disputed debts, to wit, by failing to note those debts as "disputed";

- b. Defendants have violated the provisions of Civil Code § 1785.25(c) by furnishing information to consumer credit reporting agencies about consumer debts that were subject to a continuing dispute, without also including a notice that the consumer disputed the information.
- 55. The business acts and practices of Defendants, as hereinabove alleged, constitute "unlawful" business practices under the UBP Act in that, for the reasons set forth above, said acts and practices violate the provisions of the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Civil Code § 1788 et seq. and the Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act, Civil Code § 1785.1 et seq.
- 56. The business acts and practices of Defendants, as hereinabove alleged, constitute "unfair" business practices under the UBP Act in that said acts and practices offend public policy and are substantially injurious to consumers. Said acts and practices have no utility that outweighs their substantial harm to consumers.
- 57. The business acts and practices of Defendants, as hereinabove alleged, constitute "fraudulent" business practices under the UBP Act in that said acts and practices are likely to deceive the public and affected consumers as to their legal rights and obligations, and by use of such deception, may preclude consumers from exercising legal rights to which they are entitled.
- 58. The unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business acts and practices of Defendants described herein present a continuing threat to members of the general public in that Defendants are currently engaging in such acts and practices, and will persist and continue to do so unless and until this Court issues an injunction.
- 59. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiff seeks an order enjoining Defendants from engaging in the acts and practices as hereinabove alleged, and ordering that Defendants disgorge all ill-gotten gains and provide appropriate restitution to all affected consumers.

# Case 1:23-cv-00996-CDB Document 1 Filed 06/30/23 Page 18 of 29

	1	ł			
1	60.	Plaintiff seeks recovery of attorneys' fees, costs and expenses incurred in the			
2	filing and prosecution of this action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and any				
3	other applica	other applicable law.			
4	61.	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as set forth below.			
5		PRAYER FOR RELIEF			
6	1.	For a declaratory judgment that Defendants' conduct violated the FDCPA, the			
7	Rosenthal A	ct, and the UBP Act;			
8	2.	For the maximum amount of statutory damages pursuant to the FDCPA, the			
9	Rosenthal A	ct, and the UBP Act;			
10	3.	For actual damages;			
11	4.	For punitive damages;			
12	5.	For injunctive relief, restitution, and disgorgement of ill-gotten gains;			
13	6.	For prejudgment interest to the extent permitted by law;			
14	7. For an award of costs, expenses, and reasonable attorney fees incurred in the				
15	5 investigation, filing, and prosecution of this lawsuit, pursuant to the FDCPA, the Rosenthal				
16	Act, and the UBP Act; and				
17	8.	For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.			
18					
19	Dated: May	1, 2023 LAW OFFICES OF JOHN D. GUERRINI			
20		•			
21					
22		By:			
23		ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF CARMEN STARKS			
24					
25	111				
26	111				
27	111				
28	111				
		- 12 -			

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

Dated: May 9, 2023

LAW OFFICES OF JOHN D. GUERRINI

Ву:\_

JOHN D. GUERRINI ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF CARMEN STARKS

ij

- 13 -

COMPLAINT

# EXHIBIT 1

I.Q. DATA INTERNATIONAL, INC.
21222 30TH DRIVE SE #120 BOTHELL, WA 98021,
PO BOX 340, BOTHELL, WA 98041

HOURS: MONDAY-FRIDAY 8AM TO 5PM PST

TOLL FREE: 888-248-2509 OR (425)-609-2150 FAX: (425)-609-2104

JANUARY 31, 2023

SOD CARMEN STARKS 408 TAYLOR ST APT 24 BAKERSFIELD CA 93309-3051 Account# 0008880875

Creditor: ARDELLA ON CHAGALL (CA)

Principal Due: \$6146.95 Interest Due: \$91.95 Total Due: \$6238.90

Dear CARMEN STARKS

We at I.Q. Data International have reviewed your file and agree to accept \$3119.45 as settlement in full regarding the above-mentioned account. Payment must be received in our office not later than \$01/31/23. If you need additional time to respond to this offer, please contact us. This agreement depends on funds clearing your account. I.Q. Data International, Inc., further agrees to request deletion of any negative information supplied to any credit bureaus regarding this account. We are not obligated to renew this offer. Please contact our office if you have any questions regarding your file.

Sincerely,

Account Répresentative 888-248-2509

This communication is from a debt collector and is an attempt to collect a debt and any information obtained will be used for that purpose. Your outstanding principal balance will accrue interest at a rate of 007.00 percent per annum. As of the date of this letter, you owe \$6238.90 Because of interest, late charges and other charges that may vary from day to day, the amount due on the day you pay may be greater. Hence, if you pay the amount shown above, an adjustment may be necessary after we receive your payment, in which event we will inform you before depositing the payment for collection. For further information, write the undersigned or call 1-888-248-2509.

# EXHIBIT 2

I.Q. DATA INTERNATIONAL, INC. 21222 30TH DRIVE SE #120 BOTHELL, WA 98021 PO BOX 340, BOTHELL, WA 98041

HOURS: MONDAY-FRIDAY 8AM TO 5PM PST TOLL FREE: 888-248-2509 OR (425)-609-2104

JANUARY 31, 2023

RDR CARMEN STARKS 408 TAYLOR ST APT 24 BAKERSFIELD CA 93309-3051 Account#: 0008880875

Creditor: ARDELLA ON CHAGALL (CA)

Principal Due: \$3027.50 Interest Due: \$91.95 Total Due: \$3119.45

Dear CARMEN STARKS

We at I.O. Data International, Inc., acknowledge receipt of your payment in the amount of \$3119.45 on the date of 01/31/23 and hereby release you, and you alone, from any further liability related to the above mentioned debt to the original creditor and I.O. International, Inc. I.O. Data International, Inc. further agrees to request deletion of any negative information supplied to the credit bureaus regarding the above debt. Please contact the below account representative question regarding your file.

Sincerely,

TYLER TABAREJO-ISHIKURO Account Representative 888-248-2509

This communication is from a debt collector.

Case 1:23-cv-00996-CDB Document 1 Filed 06/30/23 Page 24 of 29 CM-010 ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bai number, and address), JOHN D. -GUERRINI (SBN 190972). FOR COURT USE ONLY Law Offices of John D. Guerrini, 74-710 Highway 111, Ste. 102, Palm Desert, CA 92260 **ELECTRONICALLY FILED** TELEPHONE NO. 626-485-8660 FAX NO (Optional): 5/18/2023 11:59 AM E-MAIL ADDRESS: john@johnguemni.com Kern County Superior Court ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff CARMEN SPARKS By Marina Mercado, Deputy SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF KERN STREET ADDRESS: 1215 Truxtun Avenue MAILING ADDRESS CITY AND ZIP CODE: Bakersfield, California 93301 BRANCH NAME Metropolitan Division Justice Building CASE NAME: STARKS V. I.Q. DATA INTERNATIONAL, INC. CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET CASE NUMBER **Complex Case Designation** BCV-23-101559 × Unlimited Limited Counter Jöinder (Amount (Amount Filed with first appearance by defendant demanded demanded is (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3,402) exceeds \$25,000). DEPT.: \$25,000 or less) Items 1–6 below must be completed (see instructions on page 2). Check one box below for the case type that best describes this case. Auto Tort Contract. Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3 400-3 403) Auto (22): Breach of contract/warranty (06) : Antitrust/Trade regulation (03). Uninsured motorist (46) Rule 3.740 collections (09) Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Construction defect (10) Other collections (09) Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort Mass tort (40) Insurance coverage (18) Asbestos (04) Securities litigation (28) Other contract (37): Product liability (24) Environmental/Toxic tort (30) Real Property Medical malpractice (45) Insurance coverage claims arising from the Eminent domain/inverse above listed provisionally complex case Other PI/PD/WD (23) condemnation (14) types (41) Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort Wrongful eviction (33) Enforcement of Judgment Business tort/unfair business practice (07) Other real property (26) Enforcement of judgment (20) Unlawful Detainer Civil rights (08) Miscellaneous Civil Complaint Commercial (31) Defamation (13) ] RICO (27) Residential (32) Fraud (16) Other complaint (not specified above) (42) Drugs (38) Intellectual property (19) Miscellaneous Civil Petition Judicial Review Professional negligence (25) Partnership and corporate governance (21). Asset forfeiture (05) Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35) Other petition (not specified above) (43) Petition resarbitration award (11) Employment: Writ of mandate (02) Wrongful termination (36): Olher judicial review (39) Other employment (15) This case is is not complex under rule 3:400 of the California Rules of Court. If the case is complex mark the factors requiring exceptional judicial managements Large number of separately represented parties d. Large number of witnesses Extensive motion practice raising difficult of novel Coordination with related actions pending in one or more issues that will be time-consuming to resolve courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal Substantial amount of documentary evidence Substantial postjudgment judicial supervision 3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a. 💌 monetary b. 💌 nonmonetary, declaratory or injunctive relief c: 💌 punitive Number of causes of action (specify): Three (3) This case x is is not a class action suit. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may use for Date: May 1, 2023 JOHN D. GUERRINI (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY) NOTICE Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except small claims cases or cases filed under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result

File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.

It this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq; of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all other parties to the action or proceeding.

. Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only.

Page 1 of 2

#### INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

CM-010 To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers:, If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the Civil Case Cover Sheet contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the Civil Case Cover Sheet to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiffs designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES
Contract

the case is complex.

**Auto Tort** Auto (22)-Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to arbitration, check this item instead of Auto)

Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/ Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort

Asbestos (04)

Asbestos Property Damage Asbestos Personal Injury/ Wrongful Death

Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) (24)

Medical Malpractice (45)

Medical Malpractice-

Physicians & Surgeons

Other Professional Health Care Malpractice

Other PI/PD/WD (23)

Premises Liability (e.g., slip

and fall)

Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD

(e.g., assault, vandalism)

Intentional Infliction of

**Emotional Distress** 

Negligent Infliction of

**Emotional Distress** 

Other PI/PD/WD

Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

Business Tort/Unfair Business

Practice (07)

Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination,

false arrest) (not civil

harassment) (08)

Defamation (e.g., slander, libel)

(13)Fraud (16)

Intellectual Property (19)

Professional Negligence (25)

Legal Malpractice

Other Professional Malpractice

(not medical or legal) Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)

**Employment** 

Wrongful Termination (36) Other Employment (15)

Breach of Contract/Warranty (06)

Breach of Rental/Lease

Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction)

Contract/Warranty Breach-Seller

Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence)

Negligent Breach of Contract/

Warranty

Other Breach of Contract/Warranty

Collections (e.g., money owed, open

book accounts) (09)

Collection Case-Seller Plaintiff

Other Promissory Note/Collections

Insurance Coverage (not provisionally

complex) (18)

Auto Subrogation

Other Coverage

Other Contract (37)

Contractual Fraud

Other Contract Dispute

Real Property

Eminent Domain/Inverse

Condemnation (14)

Wrongful Eviction (33)

Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26)

Writ of Possession of Real Property

Mortgage Foreclosure

Quiet Title

Other Real Property (not eminent

domain, landlord/tenant, or

foreclosure)

Unlawful Detainer

Commercial (31)

Residential (32)

Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal drugs, check this item; otherwise,

report as Commercial or Residential)

Judicial Review

Asset Forfeiture (05)

Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)

Writ of Mandate (02)

Writ-Administrative Mandamus

Writ-Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter

Writ-Other Limited Court Case

Review

Other Judicial Review (39)

Review of Health Officer Order

Notice of Appeal-Labor Commissioner Appeals Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rules 3.400-3.403)

Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)

Construction Defect (10)

Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)

Securities Litigation (28)

Environmental/Toxic Tort (30)

Insurance Coverage Claims

(arising from provisionally complex

case type listed above) (41)

**Enforcement of Judgment** 

Enforcement of Judgment (20)

Abstract of Judgment (Out of

County)

Confession of Judgment (non-

domestic relations)

Sister State Judgment Administrative Agency Award

(not unpaid taxes)

Petition/Certification of Entry of

Judgment on Unpaid Taxes

Other Enforcement of Judgment

Case

Miscellaneous Civil Complaint

**RICO (27)** 

Other Complaint (not specified

above) (42)

Declaratory Relief Only

Injunctive Relief Only (non-

harassment)

Mechanics Lien

Other Commercial Complaint

Case (non-tort/non-complex)

Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)

Miscellaneous Civil Petition

Partnership and Corporate Governance (21)

Other Petition (not specified

above) (43)

Civil Harassment

Workplace Violence

Elder/Dependent Adult

Abuse

**Election Contest** 

Petition for Name Change Petition for Relief From Late

Claim

Other Civil Petition

CM-010 [Rev. September 1, 2021] CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET

For your protection and privacy, please press the Clear This Form button after you have printed the form

Print this form

Save this form

Clear this form

Page 2 of 2

## Case 1:23-cv-00996-CDB Document 1 Filed 06/30/23 Page 76 Ni CALLY FILED

5/18/2023 11:59 AM

Kern County Superior Court

By Marina Mercado, Deputy

# SUPERIOR COURT - COUNTY OF KERN STATE OF CALIFORNIA

BCV-23-101559

#### STATEMENT OF CLASSIFICATION AND LOCATION

CASE N	AME: Starks v. I.Q. Data International, et al.		
CLASSII	General Civil Civil Collections Unlawful Detainer		
	check <u>ONE</u> of the following statements to indicate the basis fand fill in the address:	for your filing of the Comp	plaint in this Judicial
<b>1</b> .	Cause of action arose in this Judicial District. Address of	cause of action:	
	480 Taylor Street, Apt. 24	Bakersfield	93309-3051 ZIP CODE
<b>2</b> .	Property located in this Judicial District. Address of the pro-	operty is:	
	STREET	CITY	ZIP CODE
<b></b> 3.	Tort occurred in this Judicial District, Address of tort is:		*
	STREET (or nearest major intersection)	CITY	ZIP CODE
4.	Contract entered into or to be performed in this Judicial Di into or to be performed:	istrict. Address where cor	ntract entered
	STREET	CITY	ZIP CODE
<b>5</b> .	Defendant resides in this Judicial District. Address of defe	ndant is:	
	STREET	CITY	ZIP CODE
<b>6</b> .	This action falls within the provisions of local case manage		
	date May 9, 2023	SIGNATURE	OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY

KERN-0007 (Rev. 11/01/2003) (Optional Form)

STATEMENT OF CLASSIFICATION AND LOCATION

CEB Essential Forms

Kern County Superior Court

By Marina Mercado, Deputy

#### **SUPERIOR COURT - COUNTY OF KERN** STATE OF CALIFORNIA

BCV-23-101559

#### STATEMENT OF CLASSIFICATION AND LOCATION

CASE NA	ME: Starks v. I.Q. Data International,	et al.	
CLASSIF	General Civil Civil Collections Unlawful Detainer		
	neck <u>ONE</u> of the following statements to indicat nd fill in the address:	te the basis for your filing of the Complair	nt in this Judicial
<b>1</b> .	Cause of action arose in this Judicial District.	Address of cause of action:	
	480 Taylor Street, Apt. 24	Bakersfield	93309-3051 zip code
<b>2</b> .	Property located in this Judicial District. Addre	ess of the property is:	
3.	STREET  Tort occurred in this Judicial District. Address	CITY	ZIP CODE
	STREET (or nearest major intersection)	СІТУ	ZIP CODE
4.	Contract entered into or to be performed in this into or to be performed:	s Judicial District. Address where contrac	ct entered
	STREET	CITY	ZIP CODE
<b>5</b> .	Defendant resides in this Judicial District. Add	lress of defendant is:	
	STREET	CITY	ZIP CODE
<b>—</b> 6.	This action falls within the provisions of local	case management rule found in the Local	Rules of Court.
			•
	рате Мау 9, 2023	SIGNATURE OF P.	ARTY OR ATTORNEY

#### SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: I.O. DATA INTERNATIONAL, INC., A (AVISO AL DEMANDADO): WASHINGTON CORPORATION; AND DOES 1 THROUGH 100, INCLUSIVE,

**SUM-100** 

FOR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED** 

5/22/2023

Kern County Superior Court

By Marina Mercado, Deputy

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: CARMEN STARKS, *(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):* INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le

podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y dirección de la corte es):

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF KERN

CASE NUMBER: (Número del Caso):	BCV-23-101559
ĺ	

Bakersfield, California 93301				
(El nombre, la dirección y el n JOHN D. GUERRINI (SBI LAW OFFICES OF JOHN 74-710 Highway 111 · Suit	D. GUEŔRINI	demandante, o del demai		s) <i>:</i>
Palm Desert, CA 92260 DATE: 5/22/2023	TAMARAH HARBER-PICKENS	Clerk, by		, Deputy
(Fecha)		(Secretario)	7	(Adjunto)
(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)				
(Para prueba de entrega de esta citatión use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).				
	NOTICE TO THE PERSON SER	VED: You are served		
[SEAL]	1 as an individual defend	ant.		
0.001	2. as the person sued und	ler the fictitious name of (s	specify):	
2	3. on behalf of (specify):			
	under: CCP 416.10 (c	orporation)	CCP 416.60 (minor)	
15 5 100 A	CCP 416.20 (d	efunct corporation)	CCP 416.70 (conservate	e)
		ssociation or partnership)	CCP 416.90 (authorized	•
Total Property of the Party of	other (specify):	, , , ,		,
	4 by personal delivery on			Page 1 of 1

# Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP 5 Park Plaza, Suite 1100 Irvine, CA 92614

#### 

#### **PROOF OF SERVICE**

I am a resident of the State of California, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My business address is: Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP, 5 Park Plaza, Suite 1100, Irvine, CA 92614. On June 30, 2023, I served the within document(s) as follows:

#### DEFENDANT I.Q. DATA INTERNATIONAL, INC.'S NOTICE OF REMOVAL

- **By U.S. Mail.** By placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in United States mail in the State of California at Irvine, addressed as set forth below.
- BY OVERNIGHT SERVICE. By placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope, at a station designated for collection and processing of envelopes and packages for overnight delivery by FedEx as part of the ordinary business practices of Gordon & Rees LLP described below, addressed as follows:
- **BY ELECTRONIC.** By transmitting via **ELECTRONIC MAIL** the document(s) listed above to the electronic mail (e-mail) addresses as follows:

John D. Guerrini, Esq.	Attorneys for plaintiff
LAW OFFICES OF JOHN D. GUERRINI	Carmen Starks
74-710 Highway 111, Suite 102	
Palm Desert, CA 92260	
Tel.: 626-485-8660	
john@johnguerrini.com	

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on June 30, 2023 at Chino Hills, California.

Evangelina Andrews

-1-