IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

REUBEN DRAKE

V.

Civil No. CCB-19-2134

SYNCHRONY BANK

MEMORANDUM

Pro se plaintiff Reuben Drake has filed a complaint against Synchrony Bank alleging violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. (TCPA) and the Maryland Telephone Consumer Protection Act, Md. Code Ann., Com. Law § 14-3201, et seq. (MTCPA) and a state commonlaw claim for invasion of privacy. The Bank has filed a motion to dismiss, which has been fully briefed.

An essential element of a TCPA and an MTCPA claim is that the defendant has used an automatic telephone dialing system ("ATDS"). Sprye v. Ace Motor Acceptance Corp., 2017 WL 1684619, at *4 (D. Md. 2019). Under 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1) an ATDS is defined as "equipment which has the capacity (A) to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator." See Snow v. General Electric Co., 2019 WL 2500407, at *5 (E.D.N.C. 2019).

Drake alleges the use of an ATDS (Cplt ¶ 13) but proffers no factual allegations that plausibly support such a claim. Further, while Drake seeks leave to amend, nothing in the proffered affidavit indicates that he could plausibly allege that a "random or sequential number generator" was involved.¹ On the other hand, the calls may well be computerized, pre-recorded, and dialed repeatedly based on stored telephone numbers.

This case appears to hinge on the definition of an ATDS, as discussed at length in *Snow*. *Snow* is currently on appeal to the Fourth Circuit. *Snow*, 2019 WL 2500407, *appeal docketed*, No. 19-1724 (July

¹ Rather it appears the Bank may have been trying to reach an account holder by the name of Amanda Socks. (Cplt ¶ 15)

11, 2019). Because the appeal in Snow may result in definitive guidance from the Fourth Circuit, the court
intends to stay ruling on the motion to dismiss pending the ruling in Snow. A separate Order follows.

/0/17/19 Date

Catherine C. Blake

United States District Judge