1	BILL LOCKYER		
2	Attorney General of the State of California HERSCHEL T. ELKINS		
3	Senior Assistant Attorney General ALBERT NORMAN SHELDEN Supervising Deputy Attorney General		
4	Supervising Deputy Attorney General JUDITH A. FIORENTINI Deputy Attorney General		
5	Deputy Attorney General		
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff People of the State of California		
7	Cumomia		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA		
9	COUNTY OF SAN DIE	GO	
10			
11	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,		
12	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION, CIVIL	
13	v.	PENALTIES AND OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF	
14	ROBERT BARRERE, aka ROBERT BARR, aka ROB BARRERE, aka PAUL BARRERE,		
15	RONALD STEGER, DEBRA MILLWARD, and		
16	DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,		
17	Defendants.		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

1	BILL LOCKYER Attorney General of the State of California		
2	HERSCHEL T. ELKINS Senior Assistant Attorney General		
3	ALBERT NORMAN SHELDEN Supervising Deputy Attorney General		
4	JUDITH A. FIORENTINI Deputy Attorney General		
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff People of the State of		
6	California		
7	SUPERIOR COURT OF CAL	IFORNIA	
8	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO		
9			
10	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,		
11	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR	
12	V.	INJUNCTION, CIVIL PENALTIES AND OTHER	
13	ROBERT BARRERE, aka ROBERT BARR, aka	EQUITABLE RELIEF	
14	ROB BARRERE, aka PAUL BARRERE, RONALD STEGER,		
15	DEBRA MILLWARD, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,		
16	Defendants.		
17			
18			
19	Plaintiff, People of the State of California ("Plaintiff" of the "People"), by and through		
20	Bill Lockyer, Attorney General of the State of California, allege on information and belief:		
21			
22	DEFENDANTS		
23	1. Defendants at all relevant times have transacted business in the City and County of		
24	San Diego, and elsewhere in the State of California. The violations of law alleged herein have been		
25	and are being carried out within the City and County of San Diego, and elsewhere in California and		
26	from California throughout the United States.		
27	2. Defendant ROBERT BARRERE is an individual, aka ROBERT BARR, aka ROB		
28	BARRERE, and aka PAUL BARRERE, who resides in San Diego and does business throughout		
	Complaint For Injunction, Civil Penalties And Other Equitable Relief		

California and the United States under various names which include, but are not limited to, Asset Recovery Group; AMS Financial Services; AMS Members; Advanced Marketing Systems, LLC; Asset Recovery Group; Asset Research Group; Asset Retrieval Service; Claims Department; Claims Retrieval Center; Financial Resource Network; DMS Claims Retrieval; MCD Claims Retrieval; First National Trust Services; MTS Claims Retrieval Center; Funds Recovery Center; Recovery Center; Consumer Rights International, LLC; and Unclaimed Assets (collectively "The Businesses"). Defendant Barrere has at all relevant times managed and controlled the activities of The Businesses.

- 3. Defendant DEBRA MILLWARD is an individual who resides in San Diego and does business in and throughout California and the United States with Defendant Robert Barrere and has at all relevant times managed, controlled, and/or had responsibilities for the activities of some and/or all of The Businesses.
- 4. Defendant RONALD STEGER is an individual, who does business throughout California and the United States with Defendant Robert Barrere and has at all relevant time managed, controlled, and/or had responsibilities for the activities of some and/or all of The Businesses.
- 5. Whenever reference is made in this complaint to any act or transaction of a Defendant such allegation shall be deemed to mean that said Defendant and, if a business, its owners, officers, directors, agents, employees, or representatives, did or authorized such acts while engaged in the management, direction, or control of the affairs of the Defendant and while acting within the scope and course of their duties.
- 6. Whenever in this complaint reference is made to any act of any individual Defendant, such allegation shall be deemed to mean that said Defendant is and was acting (a) as a principal, (b) under express or implied agency, and/or (c) with actual or ostensible authority to perform the acts so alleged on behalf of every other Defendant herein.
- 7. Whenever in this complaint reference is made to any act of Defendants, such allegation shall be deemed to mean the act of each Defendant acting individually and jointly with the other Defendants named in that cause of action.
 - 8. At all times mentioned herein, each Defendant knew or realized that the other

Defendants were engaging in or planned to engage in the violations of law alleged in this Complaint. Knowing or realizing that other Defendants were engaging in such unlawful conduct, each Defendant nevertheless facilitated the commission of those unlawful acts. Each Defendant intended to and did encourage, facilitate, or assist in the commission of the unlawful acts, and thereby aided and abetted the other Defendants in the unlawful conduct.

- 9. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, or otherwise, of Defendants sued herein under the fictitious names of DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to plaintiff who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to show the true names of each when the same has been ascertained.
- 10. Defendants operate The Businesses from California. They claim The Businesses offer services to consumers that include, but are not limited to, recovery of assets consumers are unaware belong to them, credit card placement, new credit profiling, low cost health care coverage, family trust planning and debt consolidation. Defendants have solicited tens of thousands of consumers in California and elsewhere in the United States to become their customers through the use of automated telephone solicitations with pre-recorded messages, by live telemarketing solicitations made directly by Defendants, their subsidiaries or other entities, and through the Internet and direct mail. Defendants fail to provide the services offered to and paid for by consumers in California and elsewhere in the United States.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS FOR UNTRUE OR MISLEADING STATEMENTS

(Violations of Business And Professions Code Section 17500)

11. The People re-allege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 10 of this

21 | 22 |

complaint.

12. The named Defendants, and each of them, including Does 1-100, (hereafter collectively "Defendants") with the intent to induce California consumers to purchase the products and services Defendants claim to offer, have made or caused to be made, and continue to make, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17500, numerous untrue or misleading statements before the public in the City and County of San Diego, and elsewhere in the State of

7 8

9 10

12

13

11

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

Complaint For Injunction, Civil Penalties And Other Equitable Relief

California, and from California to the public throughout the United States. Such statements include, but are not limited to, the following:

A. Defendants initiate most of their telephone calls to consumers' homes with the assistance of an auto-dialing device which delivers a prerecorded message to the consumer without Defendants having first obtained the prior express consent from the consumer called to receive such pre-recorded call. Defendants use such auto-dial calls to try to sell a number of different "services." For instance, they use auto-dial calls to attempt to sell their asset recovery services to consumers in California and throughout the United States. The prerecorded message disseminated in these automated telephone marketing calls is from a person who does not identify himself or herself by name, but who represents that s/he is calling on behalf of one of Defendant's businesses, including, but not limited to, "Asset Recovery Group" or "Claims Retrieval." In one type of disseminated automated message for this product, the speaker represents that the call is a "confirmation call," that the recipient of the call has over \$500 or \$600 in unclaimed money, property, or other assets. The message provides the consumer with a confirmation number which the consumer is told can be used to determine the amount of unclaimed assets that Defendants have uncovered for that consumer. The automated message then instructs the recipient to contact the "Claims Department" by phone in order to retrieve his/her property. In some instances, the message provides a 900 telephone number for the consumer to call, telling consumers they will be charged \$19.99 for making the call. In other instances, the automated message instructs the consumer to call a California telephone number. When the consumer calls the California number, s/he is greeted by another recorded message, which states that in order to retrieve their property, the consumer must send to Defendants at a California or Arizona address a self addressed stamped envelope, along with a "retrieval fee" ranging from \$25 to \$99, and that without the fee, the consumer's claim will not be processed. The recorded message states that only when the retrieval fee has been processed will the consumer be mailed the proper "claims form." The claim form requires the consumer to provide personal information including the customer's social security number, mother's maiden name, previous addresses and date of birth. When making this return

telephone call the consumer is not able to speak with a live person to inquire about the services promised because there is no option provided which would allow the consumer to speak with a live person. Additionally, the voice-mail box of the California telephone number is always full, or otherwise not available, again preventing the consumer from being able to leave a message with Defendants to inquire about the services offered, complain, or request a refund. The addresses provided during the automated message are addresses of private mailbox rental services. These private mailboxes leased by ROBERT BARRERE and DEBRA MILLWARD. During the presentation for Defendant's asset recovery businesses, various untrue or misleading representations are made in the initial automated telephone solicitations and in the solicitations made to consumers who call the follow-up California telephone number in that:

- i) The initial automated telephone solicitations misleadingly represent or imply at the time of the call being placed Defendants have already uncovered assets or property which belongs to the consumer being called, when in fact at the time the automated telephone call is made;
- ii) Defendants are unaware of the identity of the consumer they are calling and therefore they do not know whether the consumer has any money or property due to him/her;
- iii) No asset or claims search has ever been conducted in order to determine whether there is any property or money due to the consumer being called;
- iv) The confirmation number provided the consumer being called has no relationship to that particular consumer in that the same confirmation number is given to more than one consumer and is not used by Defendants to confirm that any amount of money or property is due to the consumer;
- B. The recorded message the consumer hears when s/he makes the follow-up call to the number provided during the initial automated call misleadingly implies that the consumer who pays the "retrieval fee" and provides the requested information will receive unclaimed money and/or property due to him/her:
 - i) When in fact Defendants have no intention of performing a search to determine

whether the contacted consumer who pays the retrieval fee has any unclaimed assets;

- ii) When in fact after a consumer sends in the retrieval fee, Defendants do not perform a subsequent search to determine whether the consumer has any unclaimed assets;
- iii) When in fact Defendants most often do not provide the consumer with any information regarding any specific unclaimed assets which belongs, or may belong, to the consumer:
- iv) When, in some instances, after a consumer sends in the retrieval fee, Defendants claiming to provide the consumers with his/her missing asset, send the consumer a casino voucher for use in Nevada which Defendants claim has a value of \$500 or \$600, although this voucher is not redeemable for cash;
- v) When, in some instances, after a consumer sends in the retrieval fee, Defendants provide consumers with nothing at all; while other times all Defendants will provide the consumer with is a website address that is free to the public, instructing the consumer to use the website to conduct his/her own asset search for every state in which the consumer has lived; and
- vi) When in fact, Defendants do not use the personal information provided by the consumer in the "claims form" in order to perform any search for any missing assets or property belonging to the consumer.
- C. Defendants also use auto-dial calls to attempt to sell consumers in California and elsewhere in the United States their service which purports to provide a pre-approved credit card with a guaranteed credit line to consumers who pay an up front fee. The pre-recorded message disseminated in these automated telephone marketing calls is from a person who does not identify himself or herself by name, but who represents that s/he is calling on behalf of one of Defendants' businesses, often the "New Accounts Division." In one type of disseminated automated message for this product, the speaker represents that someone at the consumer's telephone number has been pre-approved for a credit card and that Defendants are processing the consumer's credit card application. The unidentified speaker continues by representing that the call is a "confirmation call," that the consumer has been pre-approved for "membership,"

that the membership guarantees approval for a Visa or MasterCard with a credit line of up to \$10,000 regardless of the consumer's past credit experience, and that a pre-approved application is waiting on file for the consumer. The message provides the consumer with a confirmation number which the consumer is told references his/her application. The recorded message then instructs the consumer to contact Defendants by phone at a California telephone number in order to receive the credit card. When the consumer calls the number, one of Defendants' sales representatives reads to the consumer from a script and asks the consumer to provide the following information: the consumer's bank name, bank account number, next check number, and bank routing number. The consumer is advised that a single fee will be deducted from their bank account. During the presentations for Defendants' credit card programs, various untrue or misleading representations are made in the initial automated telephone solicitations and the solicitations made to consumers who call the follow-up California telephone number in that:

- i) Defendants misleadingly represent or imply that at the time of the call being placed Defendants already have on file an approved application for a credit card for the consumer or someone in the home of the consumer being called, when in fact at the time the automated telephone call is made:
 - a) Defendants are unaware of the identity of the consumer they are calling and do not have the consumer's name or other personal information or the name or other personal information of anyone in the home of the consumer they are calling;
 - b) Defendants are not aware of the identity or personal information for the consumer they are calling or the identity of or personal information for anyone in the home of the consumer they are calling until the identity and other information is provided to the Defendants and therefore Defendants do not have the necessary information to process a credit card application for any such persons;
 - c) The same confirmation number is provided to more than one consumer and is not used by Defendants to confirm or locate any pre-approved credit card

applications because Defendants have no such application on file for the consumer or anyone in the home of the consumer they are calling;

- d) Neither the consumer nor anyone else in the home of the consumer that Defendants are calling has completed a credit card application which is being processed by Defendants;
- e) Defendants do not have a pre-approved credit card application on file for the consumer or anyone else in the home of the consumer that Defendants are calling;
- f) Defendants misleadingly represent or imply that they have the ability to authorize or approve a credit card application for the consumer or other individual(s) in the home of the consumer that Defendants are calling, when in fact they do not;
- g) Defendants misleadingly represent or imply that they provide the service of supplying credit cards to consumers, when in fact, the only "service" Defendants provide consumers, if they do anything at all, is to send the consumer's information on to third party credit card issuers who make the final decision as to whether the consumer will receive a credit card;
- h) Defendants misleadingly represent or imply that the consumer's credit experience is not directly related to whether the consumer will be approved for a credit card and, if approved, what the credit line will be, when in fact the consumer's credit experience is directly related to whether the consumer will be approved for a credit card and, if approved, what the credit line will be;

Defendants misleadingly represent or imply that consumers who provide

- Defendants with their personal information and pay the required fee will receive a

 VISA or MasterCard credit card, when in fact, consumers

 will not automatically receive such a card because all consumers will receive by

 providing his/her personal information is a membership in Defendants' program

 which does not automatically provide the consumer or any member of the consumer's

 household with a VISA or MasterCard credit card;
 - j) Defendants misleadingly represent or imply that they will provide

i)

consumers with a credit card if the consumer will provide Defendants with their personal information and pay the required fee, when in fact Defendants do not a credit card, but rather without the consumer being aware Defendants sign the consumer up to their membership program for which Defendants annually and automatically debit funds from the consumer's account;

- Defendants misleadingly represent or imply that consumers being called are being offered approved credit cards, when in fact consumers who provide their personal information and pay the fee are in actuality only enrolled in Defendants' membership services program, but because Defendants fail to adequately disclose to consumers, consumers do not know that they have joined a membership service and so are not able to try to use any of the membership services Defendants' purportedly offer to members;
- Defendants misleadingly represent or imply that in exchange for the "membership fee" the consumer will be provided with a guaranteed and pre-approved VISA or MasterCard credit card, when in fact all Defendants provide the consumer with is the applications for credit cards that the consumer must complete and send in on her/his own to the actual credit card issuers and that approval of these applications is not guaranteed and is not pre-approved; and
- m) Defendants misleadingly represent or imply that if the consumer is denied a credit card, the consumer will not receive a refund of the "membership fee," when in fact Defendants do not return the fee to consumers who are denied a credit card.
- 13. Defendants knew, or should have known, that the statements or omissions set forth in paragraph 12, were untrue or misleading at the time such statements were made.

28

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONIC SELLERS' LAW

(Violations of Business and Professions Code Section 17511.1)

28 ///

14. The People re-allege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 13 of this complaint.

- 15. Defendants are telephonic sellers as defined in Business and Professions Code section 17511.1(a)(9), in that Defendants have made or caused to be made, and continue to make, telephone solicitations or attempted telephone solicitations wherein the telephone seller initiates telephone contact with a prospective purchaser and represents or implies that a prospective purchaser will receive a credit card, if the purchaser pays an up front or pre-application fee for the credit card to the telephonic seller, by committing the practices, inter alia, set forth in paragraph 12 B of the First Cause of Action of this complaint, which paragraph is incorporated herein as though set forth in full.
- 16. Defendants are telephonic sellers as defined in Business and Professions Code section 17511.1(b)(1), in that Defendants have made or caused to be made, and continue to make, a solicitation or attempted solicitation by telephone in response to inquiries generated by unrequested notifications sent by the seller to persons who have not previously purchased goods or services from the seller or who have not previously requested credit from the seller, to a prospective purchaser wherein the seller represents or implies to the recipient of the notification that the recipient has been specifically selected to receive the notification or the offer contained in the notification, by committing the practices, inter alia, set forth in paragraphs 12 A and B of the First Cause of Action of this complaint, which paragraph is incorporated herein as though set forth in full.
- 17. Defendants' activities as set forth in paragraphs 15 and 16 above are violations of Business and Professions Code section 17511.3 in that Defendants have operated as a telephonic seller without first filing with the Attorney General's Office the information required by Business and Professions Code section 17511.4.
- 18. Defendants' activities as set forth in paragraphs 15 and 16 above are violations of Business and Professions Code section 17511.12 in that Defendants have operated as a telephonic seller

without maintaining the bond required by Business and Professions Code section 17511.12 and filing a copy of such bond with the Consumer Law Section of the California Department of Justice.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

FOR UNLAWFUL, UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE BUSINESS PRACTICES

(Violations of California Business and Professions Code 17200)

19. The People re-allege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 18 of this

complaint.

- 20. Defendants have engaged in the following acts, among others, of unfair competition as defined in Business and Professions Code section 17200:
 - A. Defendants have violated and continue to violate Business and Professions Code section 17500 as alleged in paragraphs 12 and 13 of the above First Cause of Action, which paragraphs are incorporated herein as though set forth in full.
 - B. Defendants have violated and continue to violate Business and Professions Code section 17511.1 as alleged in paragraphs 17 and 18 of the above Second Cause of Action, which paragraphs are incorporated herein as though set forth in full.
 - C. Defendants have violated and continue to violate 47 U.S.C.A. § 227 which prohibits the initiation of a telephone call to any residential telephone line using an artificial or prerecorded voice to deliver a message without the prior express consent of the called party by committing the practices, inter alia, set forth in paragraph 12 of the First Cause of Action of this complaint, which paragraph is incorporated herein as though set forth in full.
 - D. Defendants have violated and continue to violate Civil Code section 1770(a)(22), which prohibits disseminating an unsolicited prerecorded message by telephone: (a) without an unrecorded, natural voice first informing the person answering the telephone of the name of the caller or the organization being represented, and either the address or telephone number of the caller, and (b) without obtaining the consent of that person to listen to the prerecorded message, in that Defendants use an auto dialer to disseminate unsolicited pre-recorded phone calls as set forth in Paragraph 12 of the First Cause of Action, which paragraph is incorporated

herein as though set forth in full.

- E. Defendants have violated and continue to violate Civil Code section 1770(a)(5), which prohibits representing that services have characteristics or benefits that they do not have, in that Defendants represent:
 - i) That consumers who respond to the asset recovery recorded telephone solicitation and provide the retrieval fee will receive over a specific dollar amount in unclaimed assets or property if the consumer's confirmation number starts with the certain letters and/or numbers, when in fact Defendants do not know of any unclaimed assets due to any consumer at the time they call a consumer; and
 - ii) That Defendants will provide consumers with a credit card, when defendants not have the ability to authorize or approve a credit card application for the consumer, Defendants do not issue any credit card, and receipt of any credit card is not guaranteed.
- F. Defendants have violated and continue to violate Civil Code section 1770(a)(9), which prohibits advertising services with the intent not to sell them as advertised, in that Defendants have advertised:
 - i) That MCD Claims Retrieval Center, DMS Claims Retrieval Center, AMS Asset Recovery Group, Recovery Center, Funds Recovery Center, and Asset Recovery Group are asset retrieval services whose "primary purpose is to locate the rightful owners who have cash or property due to them," when Defendants know that, because no asset or claims search has ever been conducted, or will be conducted, consumers who pay the "retrieval fee" will not receive any unclaimed money and property due to them as advertised;
 - ii) That AMS Financial Services and First Nation Credit are credit card placement services offering a "pre-approved credit card" with a guaranteed credit line of up to \$10,000 for an up front fee, regardless of the consumer's credit experience, when
 - iii) Defendants know that they do not have the ability to authorize or approve a credit card application for the consumer, that the consumer's credit experience is directly related to whether or not the consumer can obtain a credit card, what the credit line will

be, and that the consumer will not obtain a credit card as part of the membership as advertised.

- F. Defendants in offering their credit card service business to consumers operate as a credit services organization as defined in Civil Code section 1789.12(a). In so operating, Defendants have violated and continue to violate:
 - i) Civil Code section 1789.25 which prohibits Defendants from operating as a credit services organization without first filing the registration application with and receiving from the Department of Justice a certificate of registration, in that Defendants have not filed a registration application, have not posted a bond as required by Civil Code section 1789.18, have not paid the registration required and have not obtained a certificate of registration from the Department of Justice;
 - ii) Civil Code section 1789.13 subdivision (a) which prohibits a credit services organization, from charging or receiving money or other valuable consideration prior to the full and complete performance of the services the credit services organization has agreed to perform on behalf of the buyer, in that Defendants charge consumers a fee prior to performing any service on behalf on consumers;
 - iii) Civil Code section 1789.13 subdivision (c) which prohibits a credit services organization, from charging or receiving money or other valuable consideration for referral of the buyer to a retail seller or other credit grantor who will or may extend credit to the buyer, if the credit which is or will be extended to the buyer is upon substantially the same terms as those available to the general public, or is upon substantially the same terms that would have been extended to the buyer without the assistance of the credit services organization, in that the credit grantors to whom Defendants refer consumers, grant such consumers credit, if they grant credit at all, on the same terms as they grant it to the general public;
 - iv) Civil Code section 1789.13 subdivision (f) which prohibits a credit services organization, from creating, or assisting or advising the buyer to create a new credit record by using a different name, address, social security number, or employee identification

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

Civil Code section 1789.13 subdivision (g) which prohibits a credit services

number, in that Defendants advise consumers to create new credit records;

organization, from making, or using untrue or misleading representations in the offer or sale of the services of a credit services organization including guaranteeing or otherwise

stating that Defendants are able to obtain an extension of credit, regardless of the buyer's

previous credit problems or credit history, without clearly disclosing, in a manner equally

as conspicuous as the guarantee, the eligibility requirements for obtaining an extension

of credit, in that Defendants have guaranteed, in return for payment of an up front

"membership fee" a pre-approved credit card for the consumer regardless of the

consumer's credit problems or credit history without making the required disclosures; and

vi) Civil Code section 1789.13 subdivision (h) which prohibits a credit services

organization, from engaging, directly or indirectly, in any act, practice, or course of

business which operates or would operate as a fraud or deception upon any person in

connection with the offer or sale of the services of a credit services organization, in that

Defendants advise consumers to create new credit records to avoid the consumer's credit

problems or credit history.

M. Defendants have violated California Civil Code section 1572 subsection (1) which

prohibits a party to a contract, with the intent to deceive or to induce the other party to enter

into the contract, from suggesting as a fact that which is not true, by one who does not believe

it to be true, in that Defendants represent to consumers during the automated telephone

solicitations:

i) that the consumer has unclaimed assets in California of a particular value when

Defendants know that, because they have not conducted any asset or claims search, they

are not aware of any unclaimed assets belonging to the consumer, and the consumer who

pays the "retrieval fee" will not receive any unclaimed money and/or property due to

him/her because of Defendants' actions; and

that the consumer has been pre-approved for a credit card with a guaranteed

credit line of up to \$10,000 regardless of the consumer's credit experience, when

Defendants know that they do not have the ability to authorize or approve a credit card application for the consumer, that the consumer's credit experience is directly related to whether or not the consumer will obtain a credit card and, if so, what the credit line will be, and that the consumer who pays Defendants' "membership fee" will not obtain a credit card as part of the membership.

- N. Defendants have violated California Civil Code section 1572 subsection (3), which prohibits a party to a contract, with the intent to deceive or to induce the other party to enter into the contract, from suppressing that which is true, by one having knowledge or belief of the fact, by withholding from consumers:
 - i) that Defendants have not conducted any asset or claims search in order to locate property or money due to the consumer;
- ii) that Defendants are not aware of any unclaimed assets belonging to the consumer contacted;
 - iii) that the same confirmation number is provided to more than one consumer and is not used by Defendants to confirm that any amount of money or property is due to the consumer;
 - iv) that the consumer who pays the "retrieval fee" will not receive any unclaimed money and/or property due to him/her;
 - v) that at the time of the automated telephone solicitation, Defendants are unaware of the identity of the consumer they are calling and therefore unable to determine whether the consumer has any money or property due to him/her;
 - vi) that the consumer has not been pre-approved for a credit card with a guaranteed credit line of up to \$10,000 regardless of the consumer's credit experience;
 - vii) that the consumer has not completed a credit card application which is being processed by Defendants;
 - viii) that Defendants do not have the ability to authorize or approve a credit card application for the consumer;
 - ix) that Defendants do not have a pre-approved credit card application on file for

the consumer;

- x) that the consumer's credit experience is directly related to whether or not the consumer will obtain a credit card and, if so, what the credit line will be;
- xi) that at the time of the initial automated telephone solicitation, Defendants are not aware of the identity of the consumer they are calling and therefore do not have the necessary information to process a credit card application;
- xii) that Defendants do not have any of the consumer's personal information until the consumer provides such information to the Defendants;
- xiii) that the same confirmation number is provided to more than one consumer and is not used by Defendants to confirm or locate any pre-approved credit card application because Defendants have no such application on file for the consumer; and
- xiv) that the consumer who pays Defendants' "membership fee" will not obtain a credit card as part of the membership.
- O. Defendants have violated California Civil Code section 1572 subsection (4), which prohibits a party to a contract, with the intent to deceive or to induce the other party to enter into the contract, from making a promise without any intention of performing it by representing to the consumer:
 - i) that the consumer has unclaimed assets in California of a particular value when Defendants know that, because they have not, nor do they intend to, conduct any asset or claims search, they are not aware of any unclaimed assets belonging to the consumer, and the consumer who pays the "retrieval fee" will not receive any unclaimed money and property due to him/her; and
 - ii) that the consumer has been pre-approved for a credit card with a guaranteed credit line of up to \$10,000 regardless of the consumer's credit experience when Defendants know that they do not have the ability to authorize or approve a credit card application for the consumer, that the consumer's credit experience is directly related to whether or not the consumer will obtain a credit card and, if so, what the credit line will

be, and that the consumer who pays the "membership fee" will not obtain a credit card as part of the membership.

- P. Defendants have violated 18 U.S.C. § 1341, which prohibits anyone who has devised any scheme or artifice to defraud, or to obtain money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, from placing in any post office or authorized depository for mail any matter or thing whatever to be sent or delivered by the Postal Service, for the purpose of executing or attempting such scheme or artifice, by sending to consumers, mail as described, inter alia, in paragraphs 12 and 13 of the First Cause of Action of this complaint, which paragraphs are incorporated herein as though set forth in full.
- Q. Defendants have illegally withdrawn funds from consumers' bank accounts without their authorization by:
 - i) deducting an annual membership fee for a membership the consumer is not aware of;
 - ii) deducting funds from the consumer's bank account in an amount other than that which the consumer authorized;
 - iii) deducting funds from the consumer's bank account without the consumer's knowledge; and
 - iv) deducting funds from the consumer's bank account for services Defendants promise, but do not deliver.
- R. In order to hide from consumers, Defendants have engaged in the business practice of concealing their identities by changing with great frequency the names Defendants use in their Businesses, the telephone numbers of the Businesses, the addresses of the private mailbox rental units used by Defendants' Businesses, and the names used to register for the private mailbox rental units.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

1. That pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 17535, Defendants, and each of them, their successors, agents, representatives, employees, and all other persons who act under, by, through, or on behalf of any of them, or any of them, be permanently restrained and

enjoined from doing any of the following:

- (A) Making or disseminating any of the untrue or misleading statements alleged in paragraph 12 of this complaint or any other untrue or misleading statement in violation of Business and Professions Code sections 17500 et seq., in connection with any telemarketing, direct mail or Internet business;
- (B) Violating the California Telephonic Seller Law, Business and Professions Code section 17511.1 et seq. by conducting any business as a telephonic seller unless such business is conducted in compliance with Business and Professions Code section 17511.1 et seq.;
- (C) Violating the Credit Services Act, Civil Code section 1789.10 et seq., by conducting any business as a credit services organization unless such business is conducted in compliance with Civil Code section 1789.10 et seq.; and
- (D) Engaging in any of the acts of unfair competition set forth in paragraph 27 of this complaint or any other act of unfair competition in violation of Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq., in connection with any telemarketing or Internet business.
- 3. That pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17206, each defendant be assessed a civil penalty of \$2,500.00 for each violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200, as proven at trial, but in an amount of not less than \$500,000.00.
- 4. That pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17206.1, each defendant be assessed an additional civil penalty of \$2,500.00 for each violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200 et seq., perpetrated against one or more senior citizens or disabled persons, as proven at trial, but in an amount of not less than \$500,000.00.
- 5. That pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17536, each defendant be assessed a civil penalty of \$2,500.00 for each violation of Business and Professions Code section 17500, as proven at trial, but in an amount of not less than \$500,000.00.
- 6. That pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17536, each defendant be assessed a civil penalty of \$2,500.00 for each violation of Business and Professions Code section 17511.1, et seq. as proven at trial, but in an amount of not less than \$500,000.00.

1	///	
2	///	
3		
4	7. That plaintiff have such other and further relief as the nature of the case may require an	
5	as the court deems appropriate and necessary.	
6	8. That plaintiff recover its costs.	
7		
8	Dated: May 20, 2003	
9	Respectfully submitted,	
10	BILL LOCKYER Attorney General of the State of California	
11	HERSCHEL T. ELKINS	
12	Senior Assistant Attorney General ALBERT NORMAN SHELDEN	
13	Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
14		
15	JUDITH A. FIORENTINI	
16	Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Plaintiff People of the State of	
17	Attorneys for Plaintiff People of the State of California	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	19	