

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

PHILIP MOELLER, *on behalf of himself and all
others similarly situated,*

Plaintiff,

v.

BLOCKRATIZE, INC. d/b/a POLYMARKET,
ADVENTURE ONE QSS, INC. d/b/a
POLYMARKET.com,
QCX LLC d/b/a POLYMARKET US,

Defendants.

Case No.

Hon.

Notice of Removal

DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF REMOVAL

1. Defendants Blockratize, Inc. d/b/a Polymarket, Adventure One QSS, Inc. d/b/a Polymarket.com, and QCX LLC d/b/a Polymarket US (collectively, "Defendants"), without waiving the right to assert any defenses available to them, remove this action from the Superior Court of the District of Columbia to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. This Court has original jurisdiction over this case under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d) and the case is removable under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441, 1446, and 1453.

2. Removal is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 and 1453 because this Court has original jurisdiction under the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA"), 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d). This action is a class action in which the putative class contains more than 100 members, minimal diversity exists between the parties, and the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000. Venue is proper because this Court sits in the federal judicial district embracing the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, the court from which this case is removed.

BACKGROUND

3. Plaintiff Philip Moeller filed this putative class action in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia on July 2, 2026, Case No. 2026-CAB-004615, asserting a single count for violation of the District of Columbia Consumer Protection Procedures Act (“CPPA”), D.C. Code § 28-3901 *et seq.*, against Defendants. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), copies of all process, pleadings, orders, and other papers filed in the Superior Court and served on or obtained by Defendants, including the Complaint, are attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

4. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants operated a prediction-market platform and, while barred from marketing that platform to United States consumers, ran a promotional campaign in which paid social-media creators posted videos depicting themselves making transactions on the Polymarket platform. Plaintiff alleges that the transactions depicted in the videos were staged on counterfeit copies of Defendants’ website, that a portion of the depicted winnings were fabricated through edited footage, and that the creators’ affiliation with Defendants and compensation for the videos were not disclosed to viewers. Compl. ¶¶ 1-6, 20-35.

5. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class defined as all District of Columbia residents who signed up for and funded a Polymarket account during the applicable statute of limitations period through the date of class certification. Compl. ¶ 39. Plaintiff alleges the class likely numbers in the thousands and seeks treble damages, statutory damages, punitive damages, restitution, disgorgement, injunctive relief, attorneys’ fees, and costs on behalf of himself and the putative class. Compl. ¶¶ 41, 61-62.

6. This action is removable to this Court under the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d), because it is a putative class action in which minimal diversity exists between Plaintiff and the putative class, all of whom are alleged to be District of Columbia citizens, and Defendants, none of whom is alleged to be a District of Columbia citizen. The putative class

exceeds 100 members and the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

7. Removal is timely. Defendants executed a waiver of service of the summons and complaint on August 10, 2026. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b), a defendant must file a notice of removal within 30 days of service of the initial pleading. *See Mohammed v. Cooper*, 2023 WL 4547995 (D.D.C. July 14, 2023) (holding removal period “does not run until a defendant is brought under the court's authority by formal service of process (or waiver of such service) ... even if the defendant knows about the suit earlier and has obtained copy of the complaint”). Removal is therefore timely.

GROUND FOR REMOVAL

8. This Court has original jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A) because there is minimal diversity of citizenship between Plaintiff and Defendants, and the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000 exclusive of interest and costs. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a), a civil action filed in state court may be removed to the federal district court if the federal court would have had original jurisdiction over the action. As explained below, this Court has diversity jurisdiction over this action.

A. THIS ACTION IS A COVERED CLASS ACTION

9. CAFA defines “class action” as “any civil action filed under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or similar State statute or rule of judicial procedure authorizing an action to be brought by 1 or more representative persons as a class action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(1)(B). The present action satisfies that definition by its own terms.

10. The caption designates the filing a “CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT,” and Plaintiff states that he brings this action “on behalf of himself and a class of those similarly situated.” Compl. at 1. The Complaint contains a dedicated section titled “Class Action allegations” that

defines the proposed class and pleads numerosity, commonality, predominance, typicality, adequacy, and superiority, tracking the elements required for class certification under Superior Court Rule 23. Compl. ¶¶ 39-46. The Prayer for Relief likewise asks the Court to “[c]ertif[y] the proposed Class,” name Plaintiff “as the representative of the Class,” and appoint Plaintiff’s counsel as “Class Counsel.” This action is therefore a “class action” for purposes of CAFA removal.

11. CAFA also requires that the aggregate number of proposed class members be at least 100. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(5)(B). The Complaint alleges that Defendants’ marketing campaign “reached more than 140 million views across social-media platforms” directed at United States users, including District of Columbia residents. Compl. ¶ 41. Plaintiff further alleges that “[t]here are likely thousands of Class members.” *Id.* These allegations, offered by Plaintiff himself, establish that the putative class comfortably exceeds CAFA’s 100-member threshold.

B. MINIMAL DIVERSITY IS SATISFIED

12. CAFA requires only minimal diversity—that is, that any member of the plaintiff class be a citizen of a state different from any defendant. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A).

13. Plaintiff is a natural person and a resident and citizen of Washington, D.C. Defendants are Blockratize, Inc. (“Blockratize”), Adventure One QSS (“Adventure One”), and QCX LLC (“QCX”).

14. Blockratize is a Delaware corporation headquartered in New York. It is a citizen of Delaware and New York for purposes of diversity jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1) (stating that a corporation is “a citizen of every State and foreign state by which it has been incorporated and of the State or foreign state where it has its principal place of business”).

15. Adventure One is a Panamanian corporation alleged to be headquartered in New York. It is a citizen of Panama and New York for purposes of diversity jurisdiction. *See id.*

16. QCX is a Delaware-registered limited liability company. As an LLC, QCX takes the citizenship of its members. *Lopes v. JetsetDC, LLC*, 994 F. Supp. 2d 135, 143 (D.D.C. 2014) (“As an LLC, diversity jurisdiction in a suit by or against the entity depends on the citizenship of all the members.”) (citation omitted). The sole member of QCX is QCL Quad Code USA Corporation, which is a citizen of Delaware and New York, and the ultimate parent of QCX is Blockratize, which is also a citizen of Delaware and New York. Accordingly, Defendant QCX LLC is a citizen of Delaware and New York for purposes of diversity jurisdiction.

17. At minimum, at least one putative class member—Moeller, a citizen of Washington, D.C.—is a citizen of a different state from at least one Defendant, satisfying 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A).

C. THE AMOUNT IN CONTROVERSY EXCEEDS \$5,000,000

18. The aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2). If plaintiff pleads the amount-in-controversy in good faith, it controls. *Info. Strategies, Inc. v. Dumosch*, 13 F. Supp. 3d 135, 140 (D.D.C. 2014). For a court to reject the amount-in-controversy claimed by the plaintiff, “it must appear to a legal certainty that the claim is really for less than the jurisdictional amount.” *Id.* (“Even a ‘cursory’ allegation of the amount in controversy, if it exceeds the jurisdictional requirement, is sufficient to evade dismissal.”); *see also Dart Cherokee Basin Operating Co., LLC v. Owens*, 574 U.S. 81, 89 (2014) (“[A] defendant’s notice of removal need include only a plausible allegation that the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional threshold.”). Defendants easily meet that burden here.

19. To determine whether the matter in controversy exceeds CAFA’s \$5 million jurisdictional threshold, the claims of the individual class members, both named or unnamed, who

fall within the definition of the proposed or certified class, must be aggregated. *Standard Fire Ins. Co. v. Knowles*, 568 U.S. 588, 592 (2013).

20. Plaintiff seeks treble damages, statutory damages, and punitive damages under D.C. Code 28-3905(k) on behalf of a class Plaintiff alleges is in the “thousands.” Compl. ¶ 41. Plaintiff further alleges that the class consists of “[a]ll District of Columbia residents who signed up for and funded an account on Polymarket” during the relevant period. *Id.* ¶ 39.

21. The CPPA, through D.C. Code 28-3905(k), permits statutory damages independent of any showing of actual loss. Under the CPPA, Plaintiff is entitled to recover treble damages or \$1,500 per violation, whichever is greater. D.C. Code § 28-3905(k)(2); *see also McMullen v. Synchrony Bank*, 82 F. Supp. 3d 133, 139 (D.D.C. 2015) (determining amount in controversy for CPPA violations under CAFA). Plaintiff seeks such damages on behalf of the class. Compl. at ¶ 62.

22. The Complaint alleges at least six separate violations of the CPPA. *See* ¶ 53 (alleged violation of § 28-3904(a)); ¶ 54 (alleged violation of § 28-3904(e)); ¶ 55 (alleged violation of § 28-3904(b)); ¶ 56 (alleged violation of § 28-3904(f)); ¶ 57 (alleged violation of § 28-3904(f-1)); ¶ 58 (alleged violation of § 28-3904(h)).

23. As a result, for each class member, the alleged claim is whichever is greater of either (i) \$9,000 (*i.e.*, the statutory minimum of \$1,500 per violation for six alleged violations) or (ii) treble damages. *See Cannon v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 908 F. Supp. 2d 110, 114 (D.D.C. 2012) (“[The Complaint] lists ten separate violations of the CPPA. Am. Compl. ¶ 75 (alleging violations of D.C.Code § 28–3904(e), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (q), (r), (t), and (u)). Ten violations of the statute with damages of \$1,500 per violation for each of the 738 members of the class amounts to a total of \$11,070,000—more than double the amount in controversy necessary under the

CAFA.”); *McMullen*, 82 F. Supp. 3d at 139-40 (finding that “the twenty-four CPPA violations alleged by McMullen multiplied by \$1,500 results in statutory damages of \$36,000.00” and that the \$5 million threshold was satisfied given there were “at least 367 class members”).

24. To determine the amount in controversy, the average class member’s claim is multiplied by the number of class members. *See McMullen*, 82 F. Supp. 3d at 139-140. Plaintiff alleges there are “thousands” of class members. ¶ 41. Even if the Court, “to be safe,” were to “round down” to just one thousand class members—rather than thousands, plural, as Plaintiff alleges—that would result in an amount in controversy of \$9,000,000 (*i.e.*, \$9,000 per class member, based on six alleged CPPA violations). *Pleznac v. Equity Residential Mgmt., L.L.C.*, 2018 WL 10196622, at *3 (D.D.C. May 8, 2018) (rounding down from 4,962 to 4,000 members and finding amount-in-controversy requirement still satisfied). The jurisdictional threshold of \$5 million in controversy is clearly satisfied based solely on minimum statutory damages, and without even considering other relief sought which further confirms the threshold is satisfied.

25. Plaintiff separately seeks punitive damages on behalf of the class. Punitive damages sought in a complaint are properly included in the amount in controversy calculation for removal purposes, regardless of the ultimate merit of the claim for such damages. *Bronner on Behalf of Am. Studies Assoc. v. Duggan*, 962 F.3d 596, 611 (D.C. Cir. 2020) (“[P]unitive damages should be considered in determining the jurisdictional amount in controversy.”) (citation omitted).

26. Courts applying due process principles to punitive damages recognize a single-digit ratio as the benchmark for what a punitive award may bear to the underlying compensatory or statutory damages figure. *See State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co. v. Campbell*, 538 U.S. 408, 425 (2003); *Thomas v. Nat. Legal Pro. Assoc.*, 594 F. Supp. 2d 31, 33 (D.D.C. 2009) (applying 6.5:1 ratio between punitive and compensatory damages). Even applying a conservative 1:1 ratio to the

statutory damages figure would make the amount-in-controversy at least \$18 million for a class of just one thousand members (*i.e.*, \$9 million in statutory damages and \$9 million in punitive damages)—let alone a class of “thousands,” as Plaintiff alleges (¶ 41). Indeed, solely considering minimum statutory damages and punitive damages at a 1:1 ratio, a class of just 278 members would still result in an amount in controversy of \$5,004,000, exceeding the \$5 million threshold.

27. Plaintiff further seeks a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to alter their marketing practices. Compl. ¶ 62. The value of injunctive relief for amount in controversy purposes may be measured by the cost of compliance to the defendant, which, given the scope of the marketing practices at issue as alleged in the Complaint, would further support the amount in controversy here. *See GEO Specialty Chemicals, Inc. v. Husisian*, 951 F. Supp. 2d 32, 39-40 (D.D.C. 2013) (“The value of injunctive relief for determining the amount in controversy can be calculated as the cost to the defendant.”).

28. Plaintiff also seeks an award of reasonable attorneys’ fees under D.C. Code 28-3905(k)(2), which authorizes fee-shifting to a prevailing CPPA plaintiff. Compl. ¶ 62. Where, as here, a governing statute provides for an award of attorneys’ fees, a reasonable estimate of the fees likely to be incurred over the life of the litigation is properly included in the amount in controversy calculation for purposes of removal. *See Info. Strategies, Inc. v. Dumosch*, 13 F. Supp. 3d 135, 144 (D.D.C. 2014) (“Attorney fees are part of the amount in controversy if they are provided for by statute.”). This court has looked to the *Laffey* rates as evidence of appropriate rates for attorneys in complex civil litigation. *See D.L. v. District of Columbia*, 924 F.3d 585, 589-90 (D.C. Cir. 2019). The lowest of the rates in the Laffey Matrix¹ is currently \$508. The D.C. Court of Appeals previously approved an attorney fee award of \$425,916.25 for a case taken through trial at a time

¹ Laffey Matrix, www.laffeymatrix.com/see.html

Laffey rates were less than half what they are at present. *See Dist. Cablevision L.P. v. Bassin*, 828 A.2d 714, 718, 733 (D.C. 2003) (affirming \$425,916.25 attorney fee award in CPPA action filed in 1994); *Laffey Matrix* (reflecting lowest rates of \$185-\$227 from 1994 through 2002, as opposed to lowest rate of \$508 as of June 2025 to May 2026). As such, \$1 million is a conservative and reasonable estimation of the attorneys’ fees that should be included in the amount in controversy. Courts routinely employ much higher estimates. *E.g., Lopez v. First Student, Inc.*, 427 F. Supp. 3d 1230, 1238 (C.D. Cal. 2019) (denying motion to remand and rejecting arguments that 25% of aggregate damages estimate of attorneys fees was excessive, and noting the 25% as a “benchmark”).

29. Given the scope of the putative class, which Plaintiff alleges numbers in the thousands, Compl. ¶ 41, and the multi-year litigation likely required to resolve a certified consumer class action, a reasonable estimate of attorney’s fees would further support the amount in controversy already established.

30. Based solely on the allegations in the Complaint, and without any concession as to liability or damages, the aggregate amount in controversy, comprising statutory damages, treble damages, punitive damages, and injunctive relief sought on behalf of a class Plaintiff alleges to be in the thousands, plausibly and in good faith exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, satisfying 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2).

D. NO CAFA EXCEPTION APPLIES

31. The burden of establishing any exception rests with the party seeking remand. *See McMullen v. Synchrony Bank*, 82 F. Supp. 3d 133, 138 (D.D.C. 2015) (“Once a party establishes that CAFA’s basic jurisdictional requirements are satisfied, the burden shifts to the party seeking remand to establish that a CAFA exception applies.”).

32. Neither the home-state exception nor the local-controversy exception, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(4), divests this Court of jurisdiction.

33. *Home-State Exception.* The home-state exception requires remand if two-thirds or more of the putative class members and the primary defendants are citizens of the state in which the action was filed. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(4)(B); *Demetro v. Vaughan McLean, LLC*, 2024 WL 6988711, at *1 (D.D.C. Dec. 2, 2024). No Defendant is alleged to be a citizen of Washington, D.C., Compl. ¶¶ 11-13, so the Home-State Exception does not apply.

34. *Local Controversy Exception.* The local controversy exception requires, among other things, that at least one Defendant be a “citizen of the State in which the action was originally filed.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(4)(A) & (B); *McMullen*, 82 F. Supp. 3d at 140-141. Because no Defendant is a citizen of the District of Columbia, the exception does not apply.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

35. Nothing in this Notice of Removal shall be interpreted as a waiver or relinquishment of Defendants’ right to assert any defense or affirmative matter, including any defense available under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12, or any other procedural or substantive defense available under State or Federal Law. Likewise, Defendants’ statements about the amount in controversy are not an admission about Plaintiff’s damages. *See, e.g., Raskas v. Johnson & Johnson*, 719 F.3d 884, 888 (8th Cir. 2013) (collecting cases). Defendant reserves the right to amend or supplement this Notice of Removal.

NOTICE TO SUPERIOR COURT AND PLAINTIFF

36. Counsel for Defendants certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d) that copies of this Notice of Removal will be promptly filed with the Clerk of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia and promptly served on counsel for Plaintiff.

CONCLUSION

37. For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully remove this action from the Superior Court of the District of Columbia to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

38. Should Plaintiff move to remand this case, Defendants respectfully request an opportunity to respond more fully in writing, including submitting additional declarations and authority, or conducting jurisdictional discovery as necessary.

Dated: September 2, 2026

/s/ Avi Perry

Avi Perry (DC Bar No. 90023480)
QUINN EMANUEL
URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
555 13th Street NW, Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 538-8000
aviperry@quinnemanuel.com

Nicolas G. Keller (DC Bar No. 90024950)
QUINN EMANUEL
URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
295 5th Avenue, 9th Floor
New York, New York 10016
Telephone: (212) 849-7000
nicolaskeller@quinnemanuel.com

Attorneys for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that on September 2, 2026, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served on the counsel of record for Plaintiff listed below, via email:

Edward W. Ciolko (Bar No. 985110)
Julian Jiggetts (Bar No. 1739066)
Jennifer S. Czeisler
STERLINGTON, PLLC
228 Park Avenue South, Suite 97956,
New York, New York 10003
Tel.: (212) 433-2993
edward.ciolko@sterlingtonlaw.com
julian.jiggetts@sterlingtonlaw.com
jen.czeisler@sterlingtonlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

/s/ Avi Perry
Avi Perry

CIVIL COVER SHEET

JS-44 (Rev. 8/2026 DC)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Philip Moeller, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated (b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF _____ (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	DEFENDANTS Blockratize, Inc. d/b/a Polymarket, Adventure One QSS, Inc. d/b/a Polymarket.com, QCX LLC d/b/a Polymarket US 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) Edward Ciolko Sterlington, PLLC 228 Park Avenue South, Suite 97956, New York, New York 10003 (212) 433-2993	ATTORNEYS (IF KNOWN) Avi Perry Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP 555 13th Street NW, Suite 600 Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 538-8000

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (PLACE AN x IN ONE BOX ONLY) ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☒ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in item III)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN x IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT) FOR DIVERSITY CASES ONLY! <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">PTF</th> <th style="text-align: center;">DFT</th> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">PTF</th> <th style="text-align: center;">DFT</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Citizen of this State</td> <td style="text-align: center;">☒ 1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">☐ 1</td> <td>Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in This State</td> <td style="text-align: center;">☐ 4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">☐ 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Citizen of Another State</td> <td style="text-align: center;">☐ 2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">☐ 2</td> <td>Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State</td> <td style="text-align: center;">☐ 5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">☒ 5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country</td> <td style="text-align: center;">☐ 3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">☐ 3</td> <td>Foreign Nation</td> <td style="text-align: center;">☐ 6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">☐ 6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		PTF	DFT		PTF	DFT	Citizen of this State	☒ 1	☐ 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in This State	☐ 4	☐ 4	Citizen of Another State	☐ 2	☐ 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State	☐ 5	☒ 5	Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	☐ 3	☐ 3	Foreign Nation	☐ 6	☐ 6
	PTF	DFT		PTF	DFT																				
Citizen of this State	☒ 1	☐ 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in This State	☐ 4	☐ 4																				
Citizen of Another State	☐ 2	☐ 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State	☐ 5	☒ 5																				
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	☐ 3	☐ 3	Foreign Nation	☐ 6	☐ 6																				

IV. CASE ASSIGNMENT AND NATURE OF SUIT

(Place an X in one Nature of Suit that best represents your Cause of Action. For Nature of Suit descriptions see [here](#).)

A. Antitrust ☐ 410 Antitrust	B. Personal Injury/Malpractice ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers Liability ☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury ☐ 362 Medical Malpractice ☐ 365 Product Liability ☐ 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability ☐ 368 Asbestos Product Liability	C. Administrative Agency Review ☐ 151 Medicare Act <u>Social Security</u> ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g)) <u>Other Statutes</u> ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision	D. Temporary Restraining Order/Preliminary Injunction ☐ This category must be selected if the action is accompanied by a Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and/or Preliminary Injunction. **A corresponding nature of suit from any other category must also be selected for this category of case assignment.** (If Antitrust, then A governs)		
E. General Civil (Other)		OR		F. Pro Se General Civil	
<u>Real Property</u> ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent, Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property <u>Personal Property</u> ☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<u>Bankruptcy</u> ☐ 422 Appeal 27 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 <u>Prisoner Petitions</u> ☐ 535 Death Penalty ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Conditions ☐ 560 Civil Detainee – Conditions of Confinement <u>Property Rights</u> ☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent ☐ 835 Patent – Abbreviated New Drug Application ☐ 840 Trademark ☐ 880 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016 (DTSA)	<u>Federal Tax Suits</u> ☐ 870 Taxes (US plaintiff or defendant) ☐ 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609 <u>Forfeiture/Penalty</u> ☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other <u>Other Statutes</u> ☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 430 Banks & Banking ☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. ☐ 460 Deportation	☐ 462 Naturalization Application ☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced & Corrupt Organization ☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) ☐ 490 Cable/Satellite TV ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange ☐ 896 Arbitration ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes ☒ 890 Other Statutory Actions (if not Privacy Act)		

G. Habeas Corpus/2255 ☐ 530 Habeas Corpus – General ☐ 510 Motion/Vacate Sentence ☐ 463 Habeas Corpus – Alien Detainee	H. Employment Discrimination ☐ 442 Civil Rights – Employment (criteria: race, gender/sex, national origin, discrimination, disability, age, religion, retaliation) *(If pro se, select this deck)*	I. FOIA/Privacy Act ☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions (if Privacy Act) *(If pro se, select this deck)*	J. Student Loan ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (excluding veterans)
K. Labor/ERISA (non-employment) ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act ☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations ☐ 740 Labor Railway Act ☐ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	L. Other Civil Rights (non-employment) ☐ 441 Voting (if not Voting Rights Act) ☐ 443 Housing/Accommodations ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 445 Americans w/Disabilities – Employment ☐ 446 Americans w/Disabilities – Other ☐ 448 Education	M. Contract ☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholder's Suits ☐ 190 Other Contracts ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	N. Three-Judge Court ☐ 441 Civil Rights – Voting (if Voting Rights Act)

V. ORIGIN
☐ 1 Original Proceeding
 ☒ 2 Removed from State Court
 ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court
 ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened
 ☐ 5 Transferred from another district (specify)
 ☐ 6 Multi-district Litigation
 ☐ 7 Appeal to District Judge from Mag. Judge
 ☐ 8 Multi-district Litigation – Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (CITE THE U.S. CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE A BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE.)
 28 U.S.C. §1332(d) removal of action asserting violations of D.C. Code § 28-3901 (Consumer Protection Procedures Act)

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT	☒ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	DEMAND \$ JURY DEMAND:	Check YES only if demanded in complaint YES ☒ NO ☐
------------------------------------	---	---	--

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY	(See instruction)	YES ☐ NO ☒	If yes, please complete related case form
-------------------------------------	-------------------	---	---

DATE: 09/02/2026	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Avi Perry
-------------------------	--

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET 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 services 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. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. Listed below are tips for completing the civil cover sheet. These tips coincide with the Roman Numerals on the cover sheet.

- I.** COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF/DEFENDANT (b) County of residence: Use 11001 to indicate plaintiff if resident of Washington, DC, 88888 if plaintiff is resident of United States but not Washington, DC, and 99999 if plaintiff is outside the United States.
- III.** CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES: This section is completed only if diversity of citizenship was selected as the Basis of Jurisdiction under Section II.
- IV.** CASE ASSIGNMENT AND NATURE OF SUIT: The assignment of a judge to your case will depend on the category you select that best represents the primary cause of action found in your complaint. **You may select only one nature of suit.** For nature of suit descriptions, see [here](#).
- VI.** CAUSE OF ACTION: Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of the primary cause.
- VIII.** RELATED CASE(S), IF ANY: If you indicated that there is a related case, you must complete a related case form, which may be obtained from the Clerk's Office.

Because of the need for accurate and complete information, you should ensure the accuracy of the information provided prior to signing the form.