

1 Sean C. Wagner (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
2 [Sean.Wagner@wagnerhicks.law](mailto:Sean.Wagner@wagnerhicks.law)  
3 Meagan L. Allen (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
4 [Meagan.Allen@wagnerhicks.law](mailto:Meagan.Allen@wagnerhicks.law)  
5 Adam L. Wilson, (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
6 [Adam.Wilson@wagnerhicks.law](mailto:Adam.Wilson@wagnerhicks.law)

7 **WAGNER HICKS PLLC**

8 831 East Morehead Street, Suite 860  
9 Charlotte NC 28202  
10 Telephone: (704) 705-7538  
11 Facsimile: (704) 705-7787

12 John Forest Hilbert, Esq. (SBN 105827)  
13 [jhilbert@hscallaw.com](mailto:jhilbert@hscallaw.com)  
14 Joseph A. LeVota, Esq. (SBN 226760)  
15 [jlavota@hscallaw.com](mailto:jlavota@hscallaw.com)

16 **HILBERT & SATTERLY LLP**

17 409 Camino del Rio S. #104  
18 San Diego, California 92108  
19 Telephone: (619) 795-0300  
20 Facsimile: (619) 501-6855

21 Attorneys for Defendant  
22 **Goldwater Bank, N.A.**

23 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
24 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

25 MARK AUSSIEKER, individually and on  
26 behalf of all others similarly situated,

27 *Plaintiffs,*

28 vs.

GOLDWATER BANK, N.A., Does 1-10  
inclusive

*Defendant.*

**Case No. 2:22-CV-00851-MCE-DB**

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT  
GOLDWATER BANK, N.A.'S  
RENEWED MOTION TO DISMISS  
PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED  
COMPLAINT [ECF No 36]**

1                                   **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
2                                   **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

3                   MARK AUSSIEKER, individually and on  
4                   behalf of all others similarly situated,

5                                   *Plaintiffs,*

6                                   vs.

7                   GOLDWATER BANK, N.A., Does 1-10  
8                   inclusive

9                                   *Defendant.*

**Case No. 2:22-CV-00851-MCE-DB**

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT  
GOLDWATER BANK, N.A.'S  
RENEWED MOTION TO DISMISS  
PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED  
COMPLAINT [ECF No. 36]**

10  
11           The Court having reviewed the submissions of the parties regarding Defendant  
12   Goldwater Bank, N.A.'s ("Goldwater") Renewed Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's  
13   Amended Complaint pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) (ECF No. 36) finds that  
14   Plaintiff's Amended Complaint (ECF No. 4) fails to state a claim upon which relief  
15   may be granted. For the reasons set forth below, Plaintiff's Amended Complaint is  
16   DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE and without leave to amend.<sup>1</sup>

17           Plaintiff's Amended Complaint seeks relief under the Telephone Consumer  
18   Protection Act ("TCPA"), specifically 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A) and § 227(b)(1)(B).  
19   In his Opposition, Plaintiff admits that his Amended Complaint does not plausibly  
20   allege that the single, text message alleged was sent using an automatic telephone  
21   dialing system ("ATDS") as that term has been interpreted by the Ninth Circuit  
22   following the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Facebook, Inc. v. Duguid*,  
23   141 S. Ct. 1163, 1167 (2021). That is, Plaintiff concedes (and his allegations  
24   demonstrate) that Goldwater's dialing equipment did not generate telephone numbers  
25   using a random or sequential number generator, as is required to state a claim under  
26   47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A). *See Borden v. eFinancial, LLC*, 53 F.4th 1230, 1234 (9th


27                                   <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff's Request for Judicial Notice ("RJN") is DENIED. ECF No. 40 (RJN).  
28

1 Cir. 2022); *Trim v. Reward Zone USA LLC*, No. 22-55517, 2023 WL 5043724, at \*1  
2 (9th Cir. Aug. 8, 2023).

3 Further, Plaintiff's contention that the alleged text message utilized "an  
4 artificial or prerecorded voice" under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A) or § 227(b)(1)(B) is  
5 unsupported by law or any reasonable reading of the TCPA. *See, e.g., Trim v. Reward*  
6 *Zone USA LLC*, 76 F.4th 1157 (9th Cir. 2023). As both causes of action alleged in  
7 Plaintiff's Amended Complaint are legally insufficient, Plaintiff's Amended  
8 Complaint must be dismissed for failure to assert a plausible claim for relief pursuant  
9 to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). Plaintiff concedes he cannot amend in order to state a  
10 valid claim. Accordingly, Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 36) is  
11 GRANTED without leave to amend. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this  
12 case.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: May 13, 2024

15   
16 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.  
17 SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28