

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Bell v. Hawx Services, LLC

Bell · No. 2:24-cv-00825-DC-DMC · Decided September 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted in part Hawx Services, LLC’s motion to dismiss Frank Bell’s first amended complaint alleging violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. The court dismissed the TCPA claim for insufficiently detailed allegations that two calls constituted telephone solicitations, but allowed the request for injunctive relief to proceed at this stage. The dismissal was with leave to amend, and the court directed Bell to file a second amended complaint or a notice of intent not to amend within fourteen days.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dena M. Coggins
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	September 3, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-00825-DC-DMC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss Plaintiff's first amended complaint for failure to state a claim and alternatively moved under Rules 12(f) and 23 to strike allegations. The court decided the motion on the papers and granted dismissal in part with leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts material factual allegations as true and construes them in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party, determining whether the complaint states a facially plausible claim. On a facial Rule 12(b)(1) challenge based on standing, the court defers to factual allegations and presumes general allegations embrace the specific facts necessary to support jurisdiction. Leave to amend should be granted unless the pleading could not possibly be cured by additional facts.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district court order; precedential status unknown

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

standing

injunctions

consumer protection

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Telephone Consumer Protection Act

Consumer protection

Article III standing

Pleading standards

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff sufficiently pleaded that the two calls were telephone solicitations actionable under 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5) and 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2).
2. Whether Plaintiff adequately pleaded Article III standing to seek injunctive relief based on the alleged risk of future calls.
3. Whether Plaintiff should be granted leave to amend after dismissal of the first amended complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff failed to state a plausible claim under 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5) because the allegation that Defendant attempted to solicit him to purchase pest-control services was conclusory and did not provide sufficient factual detail to establish that the calls were telephone solicitations within the meaning of the TCPA and implementing regulation.
2. Plaintiff adequately pleaded Article III standing to seek injunctive relief because the alleged continued retention of his telephone number, combined with Defendant's alleged failure to stop the challenged calling practices, supported a sufficient likelihood that Defendant could call him again.
3. Plaintiff was granted leave to amend because the court was not convinced that the deficient TCPA claim could not be cured by pleading additional facts.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“While Plaintiff is not required to provide a line-by-line transcript of the telephone calls in question, he is still required to provide more than a conclusory statement that Defendant attempted to solicit him.” (Analysis § A)

“Because Defendant still purportedly retains Plaintiff’s phone number (Doc. No. 11 at ¶¶ 46, 49), Plaintiff has adequately alleged that there is a sufficient likelihood that Defendant could call him again.” (Analysis § B)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that he registered his residential-use cellphone number on the National Do Not Call Registry in 2014. On December 4, 2023, he received two calls approximately one hour apart from the same number; the callers allegedly identified themselves as associated with Hawx Services and attempted to solicit purchases of pest-control services. Plaintiff told the caller not to call again, and alleges that Hawx uses an automated dialing system and does not scrub its call lists against the Do Not Call Registry.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed his original complaint on March 18, 2024, and filed the first amended complaint as a matter of course under Rule 15. The first amended complaint asserted one putative class claim under 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5), based on two alleged telemarketing calls. Defendant moved to dismiss or strike. The court dismissed the TCPA claim with leave to amend, denied dismissal of the request for injunctive relief, and did not reach the alternative motion to strike.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Navarro v. Block, 250 F.3d 729, 732 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Department, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Robertson v. Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc., 749 F.2d 530, 533–34 (9th Cir. 1984)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 570 (2007)
- Cahill v. Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., 80 F.3d 336, 337–38 (9th Cir. 1996)
- National Wildlife Federation v. Espy, 45 F.3d 1137, 1340 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Knappenberger v. City of Phoenix, 566 F.3d 936, 942 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1127, 1129 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc)
- Safe Air for Everyone v. Meyer, 373 F.3d 1035, 1039 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Costamagna v. McKesson Corp., No. 23-cv-01008-MCE-DB, 2024 WL 871290, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 29, 2024)
- Savage v. Glendale High Union School District No. 205, 343 F.3d 1036, 1039 n.1 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Bates v. United Parcel Service, Inc., 511 F.3d 974, 985 (9th Cir. 2007)
- Lujan v. National Wildlife Federation, 497 U.S. 871, 889 (1990)
- Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560–61 (1992)
- Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Environmental Services (TOC), Inc., 528 U.S. 167, 185 (2000)
- Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins, 578 U.S. 330, 338 (2016), as revised (May 24, 2016)
- Van Patten v. Vertical Fitness Group, LLC, 847 F.3d 1037, 1043 (9th Cir. 2017)
- McLaughlin Chiropractic Associates, Inc. v. McKesson Corp., 606 U.S. 146, 149 (2025)
- Jones v. Royal Administration Services, 887 F.3d 443, 446 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Chennette v. Porch.com, Inc., 50 F.4th 1217, 1224–26 (9th Cir. 2022)
- Gulden v. Consolidated World Travel Inc., No. 16-cv-01113-DJH, 2017 WL 3841491, at *1, *3 (D. Ariz. Feb. 15, 2017)
- Eggleston v. Reward Zone USA LLC, No. 20-cv-01027-SVW-KS, 2022 WL 886094, at *6–7 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2022)

- Blair v. Assurance IQ LLC, No. 23-cv-00016-KKE, 2023 WL 6622415, at *4–5 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 11, 2023)
- Davidson v. Kimberly-Clark Corp., 889 F.3d 956, 967 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Summers v. Earth Island Institute, 555 U.S. 488, 493 (2009)
- Clapper v. Amnesty International USA, 568 U.S. 389, 409 (2013)
- Whitmore v. Arkansas, 459 U.S. 149, 158 (1980)
- City of Los Angeles v. Lyons, 561 U.S. 95, 111 (1983)
- Campbell v. Facebook, Inc., 951 F.3d 1106, 1119 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Rogers v. Assurance IQ, LLC, No. 21-cv-00823-TL, 2023 WL 2646468, at *8 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 27, 2023)
- Miller v. Time Warner Cable, Inc., No. 16-cv-00329-AS, 2016 WL 7471302, at *4 (9th Cir. Dec. 27, 2016)
- Watison v. Carter, 668 F.3d 1108, 1117 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Rahimian v. Adriano, No. 20-cv-02189-GMN-VCF, 2022 WL 798371, at *6 (D. Nev. Mar. 16, 2022)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 FRANK BELL, No. 2:24-cv-00825-DC-DMC 12 Plaintiff, ORDER
GRANTING IN PART DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO DISMISS 13 v. WITH LEAVE TO
AMEND 14 HAWX SERVICES, LLC (Doc. No. 15) 15 Defendant. 16 17 This matter is before
the court on Defendant Hawx Services, LLC’s motion to dismiss 18 Plaintiff Frank Bell’s first
amended complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) or, 19 alternatively, to strike
certain allegations under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(f) and 23.

20 (Doc. No. 15.) The pending motion was taken under submission to be decided on the papers 21
pursuant to Local Rule 230(g). (Doc. No. 23.) For the reasons discussed below, the court will 22
grant, in part, Defendant’s motion to dismiss with leave to amend. 23 BACKGROUND 24 In his
operative first amended complaint (“FAC”), Plaintiff alleges that on November 7, 25 2014, he
registered his cell phone number on the National Do Not Call (“DNC”) registry.

(Doc. 26 No. 11 at ¶ 26.) According to Plaintiff, his cell phone number is not associated with a
business. 27 (Id. at ¶ 23.) Instead, Plaintiff states his cell phone number is used for residential
purposes, 28 namely, to communicate with friends and family. (Id. at ¶¶ 23–24.) 1 On December 4,
2023, at 8:10 a.m., Plaintiff received a call from the telephone number 2 (801) 689-3100.

(Id. at ¶ 28.) When Plaintiff answered, the caller stated that he was with 3 Defendant and
attempted to solicit Plaintiff “to purchase Hawx’s pest control services.” (Id. at 4 ¶¶ 30, 32.)
Plaintiff advised the caller that he was not interested in Defendant’s services and not 5 to call
again. (Id. at ¶ 34.) 6 Approximately one hour later, on December 4, 2023, at 9:11 a.m., Defendant
called 7 Plaintiff from the same telephone number.

(Id. at ¶ 35.) When Plaintiff answered, the caller again 8 attempted to solicit Plaintiff “to purchase
pest control services.” (Id. at ¶ 36.) Plaintiff again 9 advised the caller that he was not interested

and asked why Defendant had called him after he had 10 requested not to be contacted. (Id. at ¶ 37.)

In response, the caller advised Plaintiff that he could 11 not control the calling because he was using an autodialer. (Id. at ¶ 38.) Plaintiff alleges he is at 12 risk of receiving future calls from Defendant because Defendant uses an automated dialing 13 system, and it does not “scrub” its call/lead lists against the DNC registry before making calls. 14 (Id. at ¶¶ 46, 49.)

15 Based on these allegations, on June 19, 2024, Plaintiff filed the FAC bringing a single 16 claim on behalf of himself and a putative class against Defendant for violating 47 U.S.C. 17 § 227(c)(5) of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”).¹ (Doc. No. 11.)

In his FAC, 18 Plaintiff asks, among other things, for injunctive relief to enjoin Defendant from causing “any 19 continued and future harm” to him and the putative class. (Id. at 9, 11, 13.) On July 17, 2024, 20 Defendant filed the pending motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, to strike Plaintiff’s FAC. 21 (Doc. No. 15.)

On July 31, 2024, Plaintiff filed an opposition to that motion. (Doc. No. 17.) On 22 August 12, 2024, Defendants filed a reply to Plaintiff’s opposition. (Doc. No. 18.) 23 // 24 1 Plaintiff filed his original complaint on March 18, 2024. (Doc. No. 1.)

On June 10, 2024, 25 Defendant filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff’s original complaint. (Doc. No. 9.) The court did not substantively address Defendant’s motion, however, because Plaintiff timely filed his first 26 amended class action complaint as a matter of course pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 27 15. (Doc. No. 11.)

Thus, on June 24, 2024, the court denied Plaintiff’s motion to dismiss as having been rendered moot by Plaintiff’s filing of the operative first amended complaint. (Doc. 28 No. 12.) 1 LEGAL STANDARDS 2 A. Rule 12(b)(6) Standard 3 A motion to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) asks a court to 4 dismiss a plaintiff’s complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

5 *Navarro v. Block*, 250 F.3d 729, 732 (9th Cir. 2001). A claim may be dismissed for lack of a 6 cognizable legal theory or the absence of sufficient facts to support a cognizable legal theory. 7 *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep’t*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990) (citing *Robertson v. Dean 8 Witter Reynolds, Inc.*, 749 F.2d 530, 533–34 (9th Cir. 1984)). 9 “To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, 10 accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 11 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl.*

Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)); see also 12 Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2) (a complaint must contain a short and plain statement of the claim showing 13 that the pleader is entitled to relief). A complaint satisfies the plausibility requirement if it 14 contains sufficient facts for the court to

“draw [a] reasonable inference that the defendant is liable 15 for the misconduct alleged.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555).

For 16 purposes of a motion to dismiss, “[a]ll allegations of material fact are taken as [*338] true and 17 construed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party.” *Cahill v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co.*, 80 F.3d 336, 337–38 (9th Cir. 1996) (citing *Nat’l Wildlife Fed’n v. Espy*, 45 F.3d 1137, 1340 (9th Cir. 1995)). If a court dismisses certain claims, “[l]eave to amend should be granted unless the 20 district court ‘determines that the pleading could not possibly be cured by the allegation of other 21 facts.’” *Knappenberger v. City of Phx.*, 566 F.3d 936, 942 (9th Cir.

2009) (quoting *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1127 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc)). 23 B. Rule 12(b)(1) Standard 24 Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1), a party may move to dismiss a claim 25 based on a lack of subject matter jurisdiction. There are two types of motions to dismiss for lack 26 of subject matter jurisdiction: a factual attack and a facial attack.

Safe Air for Everyone v. Meyer, 373 F.3d 1035, 1039 (9th Cir. 2004). A factual attack challenges “the truth of the allegations that, 28 by themselves, would otherwise invoke federal jurisdiction.” *Id.* Where, as here, when a motion 1 to dismiss constitutes a facial attack, “the motion to dismiss is granted only if the nonmoving 2 party fails to allege an element necessary for subject matter jurisdiction.” *Costamagna v. McKesson Corp.*, No. 23-cv-01008-MCE-DB, 2024 WL 871290, at *2 (E.D.

Cal. Feb. 29, 2024) 4 (citing *Savage v. Glendale High Union Sch. Dist.* No. 205, 343 F.3d 1036, 1039 n.1 (9th Cir. 5 2003)). 6 “Standing is a threshold matter central to [the court’s] subject matter jurisdiction.” *Bates v. United Parcel Servs. Inc.*, 511 F.3d 974, 985 (9th Cir. 2007). When a 12(b) (1) motion to 8 dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction is based on a lack of standing, the court must defer 9 to the plaintiff’s factual allegations and must “presume[] that general allegations embrace those 10 specific facts that are necessary to support the claim.” *Lujan v. Nat’l Wildlife Fed’n*, 497 U.S. 11 871, 889 (1990).

To show standing at the pleading stage, general factual allegations as they exist 12 at the time the complaint was filed may suffice. *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 13 560–61 (1992). Further, “a plaintiff must demonstrate standing separately for each form of relief 14 sought.” *Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Env’t Servs. (TOC), Inc.*, 528 U.S. 167, 185 (2000) 15 (citations omitted).

The party invoking federal subject matter jurisdiction has the burden of 16 establishing standing. *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, 578 U.S. 330, 338 (2016), as revised (May 24, 17 2016). 18 ANALYSIS 19 In its motion, Defendant contends Plaintiff’s FAC should be dismissed because he fails to 20 state a cognizable TCPA claim and fails to plead standing for injunctive relief.

(Doc. No. 15 at 9– 21 10, 13–15.) The court addresses each contention in turn.² 22 A. Plaintiff’s TCPA Claim 23 In 1991, Congress enacted the TCPA “to protect consumers from the unwanted intrusion 24 and nuisance of unsolicited telemarketing phone calls and fax advertisements.” *Van Patten v. 25 Vertical Fitness Grp., LLC*, 847 F.3d 1037, 1043 (9th Cir. 2017) (citing the Telephone Consumer 26 27 2 Because the court concludes dismissal of Plaintiff’s FAC with leave to amend is appropriate, the court will not address Defendant’s alternative request to strike certain allegations contained in the 28 FAC.

1 Protection Act of 1991, Pub. L. 102–243, § 2, ¶ 12, 105 Stat. 2394 (1991)); see also *McLaughlin 2 Chiropractic Assocs. Inc. v. McKesson Corp.*, 606 U.S. 146, 149 (2025) (“The TCPA protects 3 businesses and consumers from intrusive telemarketing communications.”). “Section 227(c) of 4 the TCPA directs the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to promulgate regulations ‘to 5 implement methods and procedures for protecting the privacy rights’ of ‘residential telephone 6 subscribers.’”³ *Lyman v. Quinstreet, Inc.*, No. 23-cv-05056-PCP, 2024 WL 3406992, at *2 (N.D.

7 Cal. Jul. 12, 2024) (quoting 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(1)–(2)). Further, “[t]he TCPA gives consumers 8 who ha[ve] received more than one telephone call within any 12-month period by or on behalf of 9 the same entity in violation of the[se] regulations a private right of action.” *Jones v. Royal Admin. 10 Servs.*, 887 F.3d 443, 446 (9th Cir. 2018) (citing 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)).

11 In 2003, in response to § 227(c)’s directive, the FCC created the DNC registry, which 12 allows a consumer to opt out of receiving marketing calls by prohibiting “a person or entity” from 13 “initiat[ing] any telephone solicitation to... [a] residential telephone subscriber who has 14 registered his or her telephone number on the national do-not-call registry.” 47 C.F.R. 15 § 64.1200(c)(2).

A solicitation is defined as “the initiation of a telephone call or message for the 16 purpose of encouraging the purchase or rental of, or investment in, property, goods, or services, 17 which is transmitted to any person.” 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(f)(15).

Thus, to state a claim under 47 18 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5) and 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2), a plaintiff must allege: (1) he is a residential 19 telephone subscriber with a number that is registered on the DNC registry, (2) that he received 20 more than one telephonic solicitation, (3) on or behalf of the same entity, (4) during a twelve- 21 month period. *Greene v. Select Funding, LLC*, No. 20-cv-07333-RGK-KS, 2021 WL 4926495, at 22 *5 (C.D.

Cal. Feb. 5, 2021); *Andersen v. Nexa Mortg., LLC.*, No. 24-cv-00619-DOC-ASD, 2024 23 WL 3762098, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2024). 24 In its motion, Defendant argues Plaintiff’s allegations that a caller attempted to solicit him 25 “to purchase Hawx’s pest control services” (Doc. No. 11 at ¶ 32), is insufficient because he 26 3 In *Chennette v. Porch.com, Inc.*, 50 F.4th 1217 (9th Cir.

2022), the Ninth Circuit held that 27 cellular phones used for both personal and business purposes were presumptively residential for the purposes of § 227(c). *Id.* at 1224–26. Thus, Plaintiff’s cellphone constitutes a residential 28 telephone. 1 “alleges virtually no content of the alleged violative calls in his FAC, such that this [c]ourt could 2 reasonably determine whether they were actually ‘telephone solicitations’ as required by the 3 TCPA.” (Doc.

No. 15 at 14.) To support its argument, Defendant relies on the decision in *Gulden 4 v. Consol. World Travel Inc.*, No. 16-cv-01113-DJH, 2017 WL 3841491 (D. Ariz. Feb. 15, 2017). 5 (*Id.* at 14.) There, the plaintiff alleged that from approximately December 4, 2015, to January 31, 6 2016, the defendant called his residential phone four times “for the purpose of soliciting for its 7 products and services,” even though the plaintiff’s telephone number was registered on the DNC 8 registry.

Gulden, 2017 WL 3841491, at *1. The court found the plaintiff’s allegations insufficient 9 to state a cognizable TCPA claim because he did “not describe the calls” and his allegation was 10 “nothing more than a conclusion, which *Twombly* specifically prohibits.” *Id.* at *3 (citing 11 *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555).

The court concluded that without further factual enhancement, the 12 plaintiff’s allegation that the calls were unsolicited advertisements was insufficient for his TCPA 13 claim to survive a motion to dismiss. *Id.* 14 Like *Gulden*, the court finds Plaintiff has not sufficiently pled that he received a telephone 15 solicitation within the meaning of the TCPA.

Although Plaintiff argues in his opposition that he 16 has sufficiently pled facts to allege that telephone solicitations in violation of the TCPA occurred 17 (Doc. No. 17 at 12, 15), Plaintiff provides no details in his FAC regarding the content of the two 18 calls he received on December 4, 2023. Instead, Plaintiff simply alleges that Defendant 19 “attempted to solicit [Plaintiff] to purchase Hawx’s pest control services.” (Doc.

No. at 11 ¶¶ 32, 20 36.) While Plaintiff is not required to provide a line-by-line transcript of the telephone calls in 21 question, he is still required to provide more than a conclusory statement that Defendant 22 attempted to solicit him. See *Eggleston v. Reward Zone USA LLC*, No. 20-cv-01027-SVW-KS, 23 2022 WL 886094, at *6–7 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2022) (finding plaintiff’s reliance on conclusory 24 labels such as advertisement and promotion, without any supporting factual detail, was 25 insufficient to state a plausible claim that defendant’s messages constituted telephone solicitations 26 under *Iqbal*.)

27 Accordingly, because Plaintiff has not sufficiently alleged that the two calls he received 28 were telephone solicitations under TCPA, the court will grant Defendant’s motion to dismiss 1 Plaintiff’s TCPA claim. 2 B. Injunctive Relief 3 The court next turns to Plaintiff’s request for

injunctive relief. “The TCPA permits a plaintiff to bring ‘an action based on a violation of [§ 227] or the regulations prescribed under 5 th[e statute] to enjoin such violation[.]’” *Blair v. Assur.*

IQ LLC, No. 23-cv-00016-KKE, 2023 6 WL 6622415, at *4 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 11, 2023) (quoting 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A)). Injunctive relief requires that the threat of injury be “actual and imminent,” or “certainly impending,” and “not conjectural or hypothetical.” *Davidson v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 889 F.3d 956, 967 (9th Cir. 9 2018) (citing *Summers v. Earth Island Inst.*, 555 U.S. 488, 493 (2009); *Clapper v. Amnesty Int’l USA*, 568 U.S. 389, 409 (2013)). “Allegations of possible future injury do not satisfy the requirements of [Article] III.” *Whitmore v. Arkansas*, 459 U.S. 149, 158 (1990).

When standing is “premised entirely on the threat of repeated injury, a plaintiff must show ‘a sufficient likelihood that he will again be wronged in a similar way.’” *Davidson*, 889 F.3d at 967 (citing *City of Los Angeles v. Lyons*, 561 U.S. 95, 111 (1983)). In its motion, Defendant contends Plaintiff lacks Article III standing to seek injunctive relief because he has not pled plausible facts suggesting an imminent possible future injury to himself.

(Doc. No. 15 at 9, 15.) Specifically, Defendant contends Plaintiff’s request for injunctive relief must be dismissed because he has “not allege[d] receiving a single additional call from [Defendant] since December 4, 2023.” (Doc. No. 18 at 12.) Defendant is correct that “[t]he timing and number of calls” on December 4, 2023, alone, do not show a “sufficient likelihood that [Plaintiff] will again be wronged in a similar way.” *Brown v. Nano Hearing Tech Opco, LLC*, No. 24-cv-00221-BTM-JLB, 2024 WL 3367536, at *8 23 (S.D.

Cal. Jul. 9, 2024) (quoting *Lyons*, 461 U.S. at 111). However, Plaintiff does not solely rely 24 on the December 4, 2023 calls to allege standing. Cf. *Brown*, 2024 WL 3367536, at *8 (“The 25 Complaint does not allege any facts regarding potential future calls.”); *Blair*, 2023 WL 6622415, 26 at *5 (dismissing plaintiff’s claim for injunctive relief because “he [did] not even mention the 27 possibility of future calls”).

Instead, Plaintiff contends he has sufficiently alleged a risk of future harm that Defendant may call him again, “due to Defendant’s scrubbing policies (which appear nonexistent) and usage of automated dialing systems it cannot control.” (Doc. No. 17 at 20.) In support of his contention, Plaintiff relies on the decision in *Campbell v. Facebook, Inc.*, 951 F.3d 1106 (9th Cir.

2020), which the court finds persuasive. (Id. at 20–21.) In *Campbell*, the Ninth Circuit upheld a settlement agreement in a class action alleging that Facebook had captured, read, and used website links in its users’ private messages without their consent where a “combination of continuing harm plus likelihood of future harm was sufficient for Plaintiffs to have standing to seek injunctive relief.” 951 F.3d at 1119.

The court found that the plaintiffs had shown there was a risk of future harm because the defendant never claimed to have ceased the challenged conduct, and the defendant's "ongoing retention of the data collected from private messages meant that there was a risk that it would resume using the [plaintiffs'] data." *Id.* Like *Campbell*, there is no indication that Defendant has ceased the challenged conduct, and Defendant 12 has made no representation that they have taken any action to prevent that challenged conduct, 13 such as deleting Plaintiff's phone number from its records.

See *Rogers v. Assur. IQ, LLC*, No. 21- 14 cv-00823-TL, 2023 WL 2646468, at *8 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 27, 2023) (denying defendants' 15 motion to dismiss plaintiffs' request for injunctive relief because defendants' retention of the 16 plaintiffs' phone numbers could cause future harm); Cf. *Miller v. Time Warner Cable, Inc.*, No. 17 16-cv-00329-AS, 2016 WL 7471302, at *4 (9th Cir.

Dec. 27, 2016) (finding the plaintiff lacked 18 standing to request injunctive relief under the TCPA where the defendant presented evidence it 19 had received and respected plaintiff's DNC request).⁴ Because Defendant still purportedly retains 20 Plaintiff's phone number (Doc. No. 11 at ¶¶ 46, 49), Plaintiff has adequately alleged that there is 21 a sufficient likelihood that Defendant could call him again.

22 Accordingly, the court will deny Defendant's motion to dismiss Plaintiff's request for 23 injunctive relief as a remedy for his TCPA claim. 24 C. Leave to Amend 25 Defendant contends that Plaintiff's FAC should be dismissed without leave to amend 26 because he already had an opportunity to amend his original complaint, and his FAC still contains 27 4 Citation to this unpublished Ninth Circuit opinion is appropriate pursuant to Ninth Circuit Rule 28 36-3(b).

1 the same fatal defects as the original complaint. (Doc. No. 15 at 16.) Defendant asserts 2 amendment is futile because "[i]f Plaintiff had any more actual facts he could allege to bring his 3 pleading into compliance with federal pleadings standards... he could (and indeed should) have 4 pled them by now." (*Id.*) 5 Rule 15(a)(2) of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure provides that "leave [to amend] shall 6 be freely given when justice so requires." Fed.

R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). However, district courts are 7 only required to grant leave to amend if a complaint can be saved. *Lopez v.*, 203 F.3d at 1129. 8 Here, although Plaintiff has already amended his complaint, the court is not convinced that his 9 TCPA claim cannot possibly be cured by pleading additional facts. *Watson v. Carter*, 668 F.3d 10 1108, 1117 (9th Cir.

2012); see *Rahimian v. Adriano*, No. 20-cv-02189-GMN-VCF, 2022 WL 11 798371, at *6 (D. Nev. Mar. 16, 2022) (granting plaintiff leave to amend his TCPA claims 12 because plaintiff may be able to plead additional facts to cure those claims).

Therefore, the court 13 will grant Plaintiff leave to amend his complaint. 14 CONCLUSION 15 For the reasons explained above: 16 1. Defendant's motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 15) is

GRANTED, in part, as stated 17 herein; 18 2. Plaintiff’s first amended complaint (Doc. No. 11) is
DISMISSED with leave to 19 amend; 20 3. Within fourteen (14) days from the date of entry of
this order, Plaintiff shall file a 21 second amended complaint, or alternatively, a notice of his intent
to not file a 22 second amended complaint; and 23 //// 24 //// 25 //// 26 //// 27 //// 28 //// 1 4.

Plaintiff is cautioned that his failure to comply with this order may result in 2 dismissal of this
action due to Plaintiff's failure to prosecute and comply with a 3 court order. 4 5 IT IS SO
ORDERED.: 6 | Dated: _ September 2, 2025 EIU cs Dena Coggins 7 United States District Judge
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 10