AT CHARLOTTESVILE, VA FILED Juy 10, 2017

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

BY: OFFITY OLERK

Charlottesville Division

CHRISTOPHER MORGAN, individually and on behalf of a class of all persons and entities similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00045

ON DECK CAPITAL, INC.

Defendant.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Preliminary Statement

1. Plaintiff Christopher Morgan brings this action under the Telephone Consumer

Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. § 227, a federal statute enacted in response to widespread public outrage about the proliferation of intrusive, nuisance telemarketing practices. *See Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs.*, *LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740, 745 (2012).

2. Defendant On Deck Capital, Inc. ("On Deck") sent Mr. Morgan and other putative class members automated telemarketing calls without prior express written consent.

3. Because the call to Mr. Morgan was transmitted using technology capable of generating thousands of similar calls per day, Mr. Morgan sues on behalf of a proposed nationwide class of persons who also received illegal telephone calls from On Deck.

4. A class action is the best means of obtaining redress for the Defendant's illegal telemarketing, and is consistent both with the private right of action afforded by the TCPA and the fairness and efficiency goals of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Parties

5. Plaintiff Christopher Morgan resides in Charlottesville, Virginia. He is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).

6. Defendant On Deck Capital, Inc., is a Delaware Corporation with a New York headquarters that transacts business throughout the United States, including in this District.

Jurisdiction & Venue

This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

8. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim – in particular, Mr. Morgan's receipt of the calls – occurred in this District.

Statutory Background

9. In 1991, Congress enacted the TCPA in response to a growing number of consumer complaints regarding certain telemarketing practices.

10. The TCPA regulates the use of automated telephone equipment, or "autodialers." Section 227(b)(1)(A)(iii) of the TCPA prohibits the use of autodialers to make any call to a wireless number absent an emergency or the prior express consent of the called party.

11. According to the FCC, the agency vested with authority to issue regulations implementing the TCPA, such calls are prohibited because, as Congress found, automated or prerecorded telephone calls are a greater nuisance and invasion of privacy than live solicitation calls.

12. The FCC also recognized that wireless customers are charged for incoming calls whether they pay in advance or after the minutes are used.

Factual Allegations

Calls from On Deck Capital

13. On June 19, 2017, the Plaintiff received an automated call from On Deck Capital at (XXX) XXX-8433, a cellular telephone number.

14. The following facts indicate the calls were placed through an "automatic telephone dialing system" as defined in 47 U.S.C. 227(a)(1):

a. On Deck manipulated the Caller ID number to make it appear as a local number, which is typically done in an automated telemarketing campaign;

b. Paul Rosen, Chief Sales Officer for On Deck Capital acknowledged in an online interview on June 22, 2015, that the company had recently improved its sales by using an autodialer which allows sales people to make more than 100 calls per day. *See* Sales Benchmark Index Interview of Paul Rosen, available at <u>https://salesbenchmarkindex.com/insights/case-study-scaling-from-13-million-to-160-million-in-3-years/</u>. In that interview Mr. Rosen stated: "One of the things that we work real hard as a management team on and this isn't just sales, we're very collaborative with marketing, and with product, with finance, and with credit to find little wins that we can have. A couple of examples is, we added a 59 auto dialer so our outbound sales people can make 100 more calls per day."

c. The geographic distance between the Plaintiff and the Defendant indicates that the calling was done through a nationwide *en masse* telemarketing campaign;

15. Through both the scripted telephone pitch and follow up e-mail communications,On Deck attempted to sell its small business loans.

16. Plaintiff and the other call recipients were harmed by these calls. They were temporarily deprived of legitimate use of their phones because the phone line was tied up during

3

the telemarketing calls and their privacy was invaded. Moreover, these calls injured Plaintiff and the other call recipients because they were frustrating, obnoxious, annoying, were a nuisance and disturbed the solitude of plaintiff and the class.

Class Action Allegations

17. As authorized by Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff sues

on behalf of all other persons or entities similarly situated throughout the United States.

18. The class of persons Plaintiff proposes to represent include:

All persons within the United States (a) to whom On Deck initiated a telephone call promoting its services, (b) to a cellular telephone number, (c) using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, (d) at any time four years before the date this action was commenced through the date of class certification.

19. Excluded from the class is the Defendant, any entities in which the Defendant has

a controlling interest, the Defendant's agents and employees, any Judge to whom this action is

assigned, and any member of the Judge's staff and immediate family.

20. The proposed class members are identifiable through phone records and phone

number databases.

21. The potential class members number in the thousands, at least. Individual joinder

of these persons is impracticable.

22. Plaintiff is a member of the class.

23. There are questions of law and fact common to Plaintiff and to the proposed class,

including but not limited to:

- a. Whether the Defendant used an ATDS to send telemarketing calls;
- b. Whether the Defendant placed automated telemarketing calls without obtaining the recipients' valid prior express written consent;

- c. Whether the Defendant's violations of the TCPA were negligent, willful, or knowing; and
- d. Whether the Plaintiff and the class members are entitled to statutory damages because of the Defendant's actions.

24. Plaintiff's claims are based on the same facts and legal theories, and therefore are typical of the claims of class members.

25. Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the class because his interests do not conflict with the interests of the class, he will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class, and he is represented by counsel skilled and experienced in class actions, including TCPA class actions.

26. The actions of the Defendant are applicable to the class and to Plaintiff.

27. Common questions of law and fact predominate over questions affecting only individual class members, and a class action is the superior method for fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

28. The likelihood that individual class members will prosecute separate actions is remote due to the time and expense necessary to prosecute an individual case, and given the small recoveries available through individual actions.

29. Plaintiff is not aware of any litigation concerning this controversy already commenced by others who meet the criteria for class membership described above.

5

Legal Claims

Violation of the TCPA's provisions prohibiting autodialed calls to cell phones.

30. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations from all previous paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

31. The Defendant violated the TCPA by (a) initiating a telephone call using an automated dialing system or prerecorded voice to Plaintiff's and class members' telephone numbers assigned to a cellular telephone service, or (b) by the fact that others caused the initiation of those calls on its behalf. *See* 47 C.F.R. 64.1200(a)(1)(iii); 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

32. The Defendant's violations were willful and/or knowing.

Relief Sought

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on his own behalf and on behalf of the class members, requests judgment against Defendant as follows:

A. That the Court certify the proposed Class;

B. That the Court appoint Plaintiff Class representative;

C. That the Court appoint the undersigned counsel as counsel for the Class;

D. That the Court enter a judgment permanently enjoining the Defendant from engaging in or relying upon telemarketing, or, alternatively, from engaging in or relying upon telemarketing that violates the TCPA;

E. That, should the Court permit Defendant to engage in or rely on telemarketing, it enter a judgment requiring it to adopt measures to ensure TCPA compliance, and that the Court retain jurisdiction for a period of six months to ensure that the Defendant complies with those measures; F. That the Court enter a judgment awarding any other injunctive relief necessary to ensure the Defendant's compliance with the TCPA;

H. That Defendant and its agents, or anyone acting on its behalf, be immediately restrained from altering, deleting or destroying any documents or records that could be used to identify class members;

I. That the Plaintiff and all class members be awarded statutory damages of \$500 for each negligent violation of the TCPA, and \$1,500 for each knowing violation;

J. That the Court enter an order awarding the Plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; and

K. That the Plaintiff and all class members be granted other relief as is just and equitable under the circumstances.

Plaintiff requests a jury trial as to all claims of the complaint so triable.

Plaintiff, By Counsel,

<u>/s/ Michael B. Hissam</u> Michael B. Hissam Bailey & Glasser LLP 209 Capitol Street Charleston, WV 25301 (304) 345-6555 mhissam@baileyglasser.com

CIVIL COVER SHEET

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

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS					
CHRISTOPHER MORGAN				ON DECK CAPITAL, INC.					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff <u>Albemarle</u> (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)				Attorneys (If Known)					
Michael B. Hissam, Baile Charleston, WV 25301; 7									
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				TIZENSHIP OF I (For Diversity Cases Only)	PRINCIPA	AL PARTIES			
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	□ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			(For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF PTF DEF itizen of This State X 1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4 4 of Business In This State					
2 U.S. Government Defendant	★ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)			of Business In Another State				X 5	
				en or Subject of a reign Country		Foreign Nation		1 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		aly) DRTS		Click here for: <u>Nature of Suit Code Descriptions</u> . FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES					
 CONTINCET 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR DERSONAL INJUR PERSONAL INJUR Product Liability Dafo Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEL 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIO Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacator Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	X 0 62 1 69 1 71 0 72 0 72 0 72 0 75 0 79 0 79	DRFEITURE/PENALTY 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 20 Other LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 20 Other Labor Litigation 21 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application 55 Other Immigration Actions	 422 App 423 Witi 28 U PROPE 820 Cop; 830 Pate 835 Pate New, 840 Trad 861 HIA 862 Blac 863 DIW 864 SSII 865 RSI FEDER 870 Taxa or L 871 IRS-26 U 	JSC 157 RTY RIGHTS yrights nt nt - Abbreviated 'Drug Application lemark _SECURITY (1395ff) k Lung (923) /C/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	 375 False C 376 Qui Tai 3729(a 400 State R 410 Antitru 430 Banks a 450 Comme 460 Deporta 470 Racketa Corrupt 480 Consut 490 Cable/S 850 Securit Exchar 893 Environ 895 Freedon 895 Actitra 899 Admini Act/Rev 	laims Act m (31 USC))) eapportionn st and Banking erce ation eer Influence to Organization ner Credit 3at TV ies/Commod nge itatutory Act ltural Acts mmental Matt m of Inform tion istrative Pro view or App v Decision utionality of	nent g ced and ons dities/ ctions ters nation ocedure peeal of
		Remanded from Appellate Court	□ 4 Reir Reo		er District	□ 6 Multidistr Litigation		Multidist Litigation	n -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	DN 42 USC 227 Brief description of ca Violation of TCPA	use: A including calls to IS A CLASS ACTION	phone n	(specif Do not cite jurisdictional sta umbers through the EMAND \$	e use of au	todialers. CHECK YES only		-	
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY		JUDGE				IURY DEMAND: ET NUMBER	🕱 Yes	□No	
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	OF RECORD					
07/10/2017 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		/s/Michael B. ⊦	lissam						
RECEIPT # 042 Case 3	<u>^11747_v\$00045-Nk</u>	<u>(M</u> Documen	<u>t 1-1</u>	<u>Filed</u> 07/10何17	No mane Moon	<u>1 o</u> f 2 ^{MAC} P8	g€ <u>id#: 8</u>		

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)

- **III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: <u>Nature of Suit Code Descriptions</u>.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.

Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. **PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P. Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction. Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.