

1 **Marquis Aurbach Coffing**
 2 Scott A. Marquis, Esq.
 3 Nevada Bar No. 6407
 4 Candice E. Renka, Esq.
 5 Nevada Bar No. 11447
 6 10001 Park Run Drive
 7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
 8 Telephone: (702) 382-0711
 9 Facsimile: (702) 382-5816
 10 smarquis@maclaw.com
 11 crenka@maclaw.com
 12 Attorneys for Plaintiff

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 14 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

15 STEVENSON FISHER, individually and on
 16 behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Case No.: 2:15-cv-00358-RFB-NJK

17 Plaintiff,

18 vs.

19 MJ CHRISTENSEN JEWELERS, LLC, a
 20 Nevada limited liability company; LE VIAN
 21 CORP., a New York business corporation; RSVP
 22 DEVELOPMENT CORP., a Florida profit
 23 corporation dba RSVP PUBLICATIONS and
 24 RSVP PUBLICATIONS, INC.; LX
 25 PUBLICATIONS, LLC, an Illinois limited
 26 liability company dba LX MAGAZINES; DOES
 27 I through X, inclusive; and ROE
 28 CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive,

Defendants.

FILE

STIPULATION AND ORDER TO ~~FILE~~ SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

29 The Parties to the above-entitled action, by and through their respective counsel of record
 30 herein, hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

- 31 1. Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint on March 30, 2015.
- 32 2. The Amended Complaint named LX PUBLICATIONS, LLC, an Illinois limited
 33 liability company dba LX MAGAZINES as a Defendant ("LX IL").
- 34 3. LX IL failed to respond to the Complaint, and Default was entered against LX IL
 35 on July 2, 2015 (#35). Notice of Entry of Default was filed on July 16, 2015 (#36). The Notice

1 of entry of Default was served via regular mail to the same address where LX IL was served with
2 the Summons and Complaint.

3 4. Plaintiff recently learned that LX IL was involuntarily dissolved and that LX
4 Publications, LLC is now a registered Nevada limited liability company ("LX NV") (LX IL and
5 LX NV are collectively referred to as "LX"). Accordingly, Plaintiff wishes to file a Second
6 Amended Complaint to name LX NV as a Defendant.

7 5. Plaintiff filed a Notice of Voluntary Dismissal of RSVP Development Corp.
8 ("RSVP") Without Prejudice on April 21, 2015. Accordingly, Plaintiff wishes to file a Second
9 Amended Complaint to remove RSVP from the caption.

10 6. After conducting some written discovery, Plaintiff has confirmed that this case
11 involves a prerecorded voice message made by Defendant MJ Christensen Jewelers and provided
12 to LX. Therefore, Plaintiff wishes to clarify the use of a prerecorded message throughout the
13 Second Amended Complaint.

14 7. For these reasons, the Parties stipulate to the filing of the Second Amended
15 Complaint, a proposed copy of which is attached hereto as **EXHIBIT A**.

16 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

17 Dated this day of November, 2015

Dated this day of November, 2015

18 **MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING**

FABIAN & CLENDENIN, P.C.

19 By: /s/ Candice E. Renka
20 SCOTT A. MARQUIS, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 6407
21 CANDICE E. RENKA, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 11447
22 10001 Park Run Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89145
23 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Stevenson Fisher*

By: /s/ Ashton J. Hyde
ASHTON J. HYDE, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 12407
601 South 10th Street, Suite 204
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
*Attorney for Defendant MJ Christensen
Jewelers, LLC*

1
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

Dated this day of November, 2015

SNELL & WILMER, LLP

By: /s/ Kelly H. Dove
KELLY H. DOVE, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 10569
3883 Howard Hughes Parkway
Suite 1100
Las Vegas, NV 89169-5958
Attorneys for Defendant Le Vian Corp.

ORDER

Consistent with the above Stipulation, it is hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff may file the Second Amended Complaint, consistent with the copy attached to the above Stipulation as

EXHIBIT A.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
DATED: November 17, 2015

Submitted by:
MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING

By /s/ Candice E. Renka
SCOTT A. MARQUIS, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 6407
CANDICE E. RENKA, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 11447
10001 Park Run Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89145
Attorneys for Plaintiff Stevenson Fisher

Exhibit A

1 **Marquis Aurbach Coffing**
2 Scott A. Marquis, Esq.
3 Nevada Bar No. 6407
4 Candice E. Renka, Esq.
5 Nevada Bar No. 11447
6 10001 Park Run Drive
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
8 Telephone: (702) 382-0711
9 Facsimile: (702) 382-5816
10 smarquis@maclaw.com
11 crenka@maclaw.com
12 Attorneys for Plaintiff

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
14 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

15 STEVENSON FISHER, individually and on
16 behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Case No.: 2:15-cv-00358-RFB-NJK

17 Plaintiff,

18 vs.

19 MJ CHRISTENSEN JEWELERS, LLC, a
20 Nevada limited liability company; LE VIAN
21 CORP., a New York business corporation;; LX
22 PUBLICATIONS, LLC, an Illinois limited
23 liability company dba LX MAGAZINES; LX
24 PUBLICATIONS, LLC, a Nevada limited
25 liability company dba LX Magazines; DOES I
26 through X, inclusive; and ROE
27 CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive,

[PROPOSED] SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT

28 Defendants.

Plaintiff STEVENSON FISHER (hereinafter "Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all persons similarly situated, by and through his attorneys of record, the law firm of Marquis Aurbach Coffing, alleges and complains as follows:

PARTIES

1. Stevenson Fisher ("Plaintiff") is and was at all times relevant herein, an individual and a citizen residing in Clark County, Nevada.

2. MJ Christensen Jewelers, LLC is and was at all times relevant herein, a Nevada limited liability company ("MJC").

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1
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

13. This is a proposed class action brought on behalf of consumers that received telemarketing calls to their cell phones made using a prerecorded voice or automated telephone dialing system (“ATDS”) by or on behalf of Defendants, for which calls the Defendants never obtained express, written consent from the consumers.

14. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants’ use of a prerecorded voice or ATDS to make telemarketing phone calls to consumers’ cell phones without prior express, written consent violates the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227, and the Nevada Deceptive Trade Practices Act, (“NVDTPA”), NRS Chapter 598. Moreover, a violation of the TCPA is a *per se* violation of the NVDTPA. NRS 598.023(3).

15. The TCPA, as interpreted by Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) prohibits the use of an ATDS to make telemarketing calls to consumers’ cell phones unless the consumer has provided express, written consent.

16. Plaintiff brings this action in his individual capacity and on behalf of the classes of persons similarly situated, as defined below.

THE RELATIONSHIP AMONGST THE DEFENDANTS

17. MJC is a retailer that sells jewelry manufactured and provided by other companies, such as Le Vian.

18. Le Vian is a company that designs and sells jewelry and watches internationally.

19. Le Vian has several brands of jewelry.

20. Le Vian sells its product through retailers, including MJC.

21. Le Vian has input and control over certain aspects of how MJC markets Le Vian products.

22. Le Vian sometimes sends representatives to MJC to instruct MJC how to display, advertise, and market its jewelry.

23. Le Vian instructs MJC use its displays and advertisements, and requires that MJC market its materials with Le Vian’s third-party marketing company, LX.

1 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

2 **NATIONAL CLASS**

3 36. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to FRCP 23 as a class action on behalf of
4 himself and on behalf of a National Class defined as:

5 ALL PERSONS RESIDING IN THE UNITED STATES WHO RECEIVED A
6 TELEMARKETING CALL ON THEIR CELL PHONE, MADE USING A
7 PRERECORDED VOICE OR AUTOMATED TELEPHONE DIALING
8 SYSTEM BY OR ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANTS, WHO HAD NOT
9 PROVIDED DEFENDANTS EXPRESS, WRITTEN CONSENT TO RECEIVE
10 SUCH CALLS, ON OR AFTER JANUARY 20, 2011.

11 37. Plaintiff and members of the National Class received telemarketing calls to their
12 cell phones, made by using a prerecorded voice or ATDS by or on behalf of Defendants and had
13 not provided Defendants express, written consent to receive such calls, on or after January 20,
14 2011, in violation of the TCPA.

15 **NEVADA CLASS**

16 38. Plaintiff also brings this action on behalf of a Class comprised of Nevada
17 residents (“Nevada Class”) defined as:

18 ALL PERSONS RESIDING IN NEVADA WHO RECEIVED A
19 TELEMARKETING CALL ON THEIR CELL PHONE, MADE USING A
20 PRERECORDED VOICE ORAUTOMATED TELEPHONE DIALING
21 SYSTEM BY OR ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANTS, WHO HAD NOT
22 PROVIDED DEFENDANTS EXPRESS, WRITTEN CONSENT TO RECEIVE
23 SUCH CALLS, ON OR AFTER JANUARY 20, 2011.

24 39. Plaintiff and members of the Nevada Class received telemarketing calls to their
25 cell phones, made by using a prerecorded voice or ATDS by or on behalf of Defendants and had
26 not provided Defendants express, written consent to receive such calls, on or after January 20,
27 2011, in violation of the NVDTPA.

28 40. The requirements for maintaining this action as a class action under Rule 23 of the
Federal Rules of Civil procedure are satisfied:

41. **NUMEROSITY:** It is impracticable to bring all members of the National Class
and the Nevada Class (collectively, “Class Members”) before the Court. Plaintiff estimates that
there are thousands of Class Members, geographically spread throughout the United States, and

1 that their identities can be ascertained from Defendants' books and records. Attempting to join
2 and name each Class member as a Co-Plaintiff would be unreasonable and impracticable.

3 42. **COMMONALITY:** There is a well-defined commonality of interest in the
4 questions of law and fact involving Class Members in that all Class Members received
5 telemarketing calls, made using a prerecorded voice or ATDS, to their cell phones, from
6 Defendants in violation of the TCPA and NVDTPA.

7 43. **PREDOMINANCE:** There are questions of law and fact common to the Class
8 Members, which are identical for each Class Member and which predominate over the questions
9 affecting the individual Class Members, if any, which include:

10 a. Whether Defendants violated the TCPA and the NVDTPA when using a
11 prerecorded voice or ATDS to make telemarketing calls to Class Members' cell phones without
12 express, written consent;

13 b. Whether Defendants used a prerecorded voice to make the calls;

14 c. Whether Defendants used an ATDS to make the calls;

15 d. Whether the calls were telemarketing calls;

16 e. Whether the calls were made to Class Members' cell phones;

17 f. Whether the Class Members provided express, written consent to receive
18 the calls;

19 g. Whether Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to damages under the
20 TCPA;

21 h. Whether Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to damages under the
22 NVDTPA;

23 i. Whether Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to treble damages under
24 the TCPA; and

25 j. Whether Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to injunctive relief under
26 the TCPA;

27 44. **TYPICALITY:** The claims of the Plaintiff are typical of the Class Members in
28 that Plaintiff is informed and believes that each Class Member received a telemarketing call from

1 Defendants, made using a prerecorded voice or ATDS to their cell phone without having
2 provided express, written consent to Defendants. Also, there is uniformity in the federal and
3 state legislation prohibiting the practice complained of and providing statutory damages that may
4 be pursued in state court. In this action, Plaintiff and the Class Members seek an injunction
5 prohibiting Defendants' using a prerecorded voice or ATDS to make telemarketing calls to
6 consumers' cell phones without express, written consent; damages; attorney fees; and costs
7 incurred in the prosecution of this action.

8 45. **ADEQUACY:** Plaintiff is willing to devote the time necessary to serve as
9 representative of the National Class and the Nevada Class and work with class counsel.
10 Plaintiff's attorneys are experienced and knowledgeable in class action litigation in Nevada, and
11 they will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the National Class and the Nevada Class
12 and have no interests antagonistic to the class.

13 46. **SUPERIORITY:** There is no plain, speedy or adequate remedy other than
14 maintenance of this class action since Plaintiff is informed and believes that a class action is
15 superior to any other available means for the adjudication of this controversy.

16 47. This action will cause an orderly and expeditious administration of the Class
17 Members' claims. A class action will save time, effort and expense, and will ensure uniformity
18 of decisions at the lowest cost and with the least toll on judicial resources.

19 48. Because the loss suffered by individual Class Members may be relatively small,
20 the expense and burden of individual litigation makes it impracticable for the Class Members to
21 individually seek redress. Plaintiff believes that Class Members, to the extent they are aware of
22 their rights against Defendants, would be unable to secure counsel to litigate their claims on an
23 individual basis because of the relatively small nature of the individual damages warranted
24 and/or the value of individual injunctive relief.

25 49. Hence, a class action is the only feasible means of recovery for the Class
26 Members. Furthermore, without a class action, Class Members will continue to suffer damages
27 and Defendants will continue to violate federal and state law, retaining and reaping the proceeds
28 of their wrongful marketing practices.

1 50. **MANAGEABILITY:** There are no manageability problems due to variations in
2 state laws or choice of law provisions, because the TCPA applies to the claims of all the Class
3 Members asserted herein, and Nevada law applies to the Nevada Class. Further, the evidence
4 proving Defendants’ violation of the statutes is ascertainable through discovery. The identities
5 of the Class Members are known by Defendants, and damages can be calculated from
6 Defendants’ records. Thus, this action poses no unusual difficulties that would impede its
7 management by the Court as a class action.

8 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

9 **(Violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 USC § 227 et seq.)**

10 51. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the paragraphs above as though fully stated herein.

11 52. Defendants used a prerecorded voice or ATDS to make telemarketing calls to the
12 Class Members’ cell phones without express, written consent from the Class Members.

13 53. By using an ATDS, Defendants were able to effectively send thousands of
14 telemarketing calls to thousands of consumers’ cell phone numbers.

15 54. Defendants’ calls were made using an artificial prerecorded voice. By using an
16 ATDS and a prerecorded message, Defendants are able to simultaneously call thousands of
17 wireless customers without any human intervention and at very little cost to Defendants.

18 55. Upon information and belief, Defendants used a prerecorded voice or ATDS to
19 make the calls or had a high degree of involvement in the making of the calls. For example,
20 Defendants:

- 21 a. Knew that the calls were being made with a prerecorded voice;
- 22 b. Knew that the calls were being made with an ATDS;
- 23 c. Knew that the calls were telemarketing calls;
- 24 d. Knew that the calls were being made to Class Members’ cell phones;
- 25 e. Knew that the Class Members had not provided express, written consent to
26 receive such calls;
- 27 f. Participated in preparing the content of the calls or messages;
- 28 g. Provided or obtained the cell numbers of the Class Members; and

1 h. Received compensation for or a benefit from making such calls.

2 56. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff and the Class Members have suffered
3 damages by being charged by their cell phone carriers for the minutes, time, or usage for the
4 calls made by Defendants.

5 57. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Class Members have suffered a violation of
6 their right to privacy.

7 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

8 **(Violation of the Nevada Deceptive Trade Practices Act NRS Chapter 598)**

9 58. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the paragraphs above as though fully stated herein.

10 59. Defendants willfully and knowingly violated the TCPA, which is a statute relating
11 to the sale or lease of goods or services. NRS 41.600; NRS 598.0923(3).

12 60. Defendants engaged in a deceptive trade practice.

13 61. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' deceptive trade practice, Plaintiff
14 and Nevada Class Members have suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

15 62. Plaintiff and Nevada Class Members are victims of consumer fraud and are
16 therefore entitled to damages as well as attorney fees and costs. NRS 41.600.

17 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

18 **(Declaratory Relief)**

19 63. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the paragraphs above as though fully stated herein.

20 64. A genuine dispute exists between the parties regarding the Defendants' illegal
21 calls to Plaintiff and Class Members.

22 65. The interests of the parties are adverse.

23 66. This Court should declare that based upon the Defendants' violation of federal
24 and Nevada law, that Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to \$500 damages per call, treble
25 damages for each call, injunctive relief, attorney fees, and costs.

26 67. It has become necessary for Plaintiff and Class Members to engage the services of
27 an attorney to prosecute this action; therefore, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to costs
28 and attorney fees as special damages.

1
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

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Attorney Fees as Special Damages)

68. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the paragraphs above as though fully stated herein.

69. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s conduct, it has been necessary for Plaintiff and Class Members to retain the services of an attorney in order to prosecute this action and, therefore, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to an award of reasonable attorney fees and costs incurred herein as special damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief against Defendants:

1. Certification of the National Class and Nevada Class;
2. A Declaration that Defendants have violated the TCPA because it failed to obtain express, written consent to make the calls to Plaintiff or the Class Members;
3. Judgment in the amount of \$500 for Plaintiff and each member of the National Class and the Nevada Class for statutory damages for each call received by them from Defendants;
4. Judgment in the amount equal to three times the damages to Plaintiff and the Class Members under the TCPA;
5. Extraordinary, equitable, and/or injunctive relief as permitted by law to ensure that Defendants will stop making the illegal calls;
6. For an award of reasonable attorney fees and costs of suit; and
7. For any further relief as the Court deems to be just and proper.

Dated this ____ day of November, 2015.

MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING

By _____
Scott A. Marquis, Esq., Nevada Bar No. 6407
Candice E. Renka, Esq., Nevada Bar No. 11447
10001 Park Run Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
Attorneys for Plaintiff