1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	BILL LOCKYER Attorney General HERSCHEL T. ELKINS Senior Assistant Attorney General MARGARET REITER Supervising Deputy Attorney General SETH MERMIN Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 189194 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004 Attorneys for Plaintiff, The People of the State of California SUPERIOR COURT OF CALI COUNTY OF SAN FRANC THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, Plaintiff, v. JUDITH LUGO, JORGE LUGO, J. J. & J. LUGO SERVICES, J. & J. LUGO SERVICES; and DOES 1 THROUGH 10, inclusive, Defendants.	
26		
27		
	PEOPLE v. LUGO Complaint for	Injunction, Civil Penalties and Other

Plaintiff, the People of the State of California, by Bill Lockyer, Attorney General of the State of California, alleges the following on information and belief:

PARTIES

- 1. Defendants Judith Lugo and Jorge Lugo are individuals. They engage in business under the names J.J. & J. Lugo Services and J. & J. Lugo Services.
- 2. Defendants J.J. & J. Lugo Services and J. & J. Lugo Services are businesses of unknown form
- 3. Defendant Judith Lugo is not currently nor was she at any time referred to in this Complaint licensed to practice law in the State of California or authorized by federal law to represent persons before the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the Immigration Courts and Board of Immigration Appeals.
- 4. Defendant Jorge Lugo is not currently nor was he at any time referred to in this Complaint licensed to practice law in the State of California or authorized by federal law to represent persons before the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the Immigration Courts and Board of Immigration Appeals.
- 5. The true names and capacities of defendants sued herein under the fictitious names Does 1 through 10 are unknown to plaintiff. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to allege such names and capacities as soon as they are ascertained.
- 6. All references in this Complaint to any of the defendants shall also include all of them, unless otherwise specified. Whenever reference is made in this Complaint to any act of Defendants, such allegation shall mean that each defendant acted individually and jointly with the other defendants.
- 7. At all relevant times, each defendant has committed the acts, caused others to commit the acts, or permitted others to commit the acts alleged in this Complaint.
- 8. Any allegation about any acts of any corporate or other business defendant shall mean that the corporation or other business did the acts alleged through its officers, directors, employees, agents and/or representatives while they were acting within the actual or ostensible scope of their authority.
- 9. The named defendants' principal place of business is located at 2489 Mission Street #37, San Francisco, California.

10. The violations of law alleged in this Complaint occurred in the City and County of San Francisco and may also have occurred elsewhere in California.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATIONS OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200 (UNLAWFUL BUSINESS ACTS OR PRACTICES)

(Against all Defendants)

- 11. The People reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 10 of this Complaint.
- 12. Defendants have engaged and are engaging in unfair competition as defined by California Business and Professions Code section 17200 by engaging in acts or practices including, but not necessarily limited to, violation of Business and Professions Code section 22443.3.
- 13. Business and Professions Code section 22443.3 provides that any person making a statement indicating directly or by implication that the person serves as an immigration consultant must have on file with the Secretary of State a bond of \$50,000. The measure, which is contained in the Immigration Consultants Act (Bus. & Prof. Code § 22440 et seq.), provides:

It is unlawful for any person to disseminate by any means any statement indicating directly or by implication that the person engages in the business or acts in the capacity of an immigration consultant, unless the person has on file with the Secretary of State a bond, in the amount and subject to the terms described in Section 22443.1, that is maintained throughout the period covered by the statement, such as, but not limited to the period of a yellow pages listing.

- 14. Section 22443.1 of the Business and Professions Code, describing the amount and terms of the required bond, provides in relevant part:
 - (a) . . . [E]ach person shall file with the Secretary of State a bond of fifty thousand (\$50,000) executed by a corporate surety admitted to do business in this state and conditioned upon compliance with this chapter. The total aggregate liability on the bond shall be limited to fifty thousand dollars

(\$50,000)....

- (b) The bond required by this section shall be in favor of, and payable to, the people of the State of California and shall be for the benefit of any person damaged by any fraud, misstatement, misrepresentation, unlawful act or omission, or failure to provide the services of the immigration consultant or the agents, representatives, or employees of the immigration consultant while acting within the scope of that employment or agency.
- 15. Section 22441(a) of the Business and Professions Code provides:
 A person engages in the business of or acts in the capacity of an immigration consultant when that person gives nonlegal assistance or advice on an immigration matter.
- 16. From a point on or after January 1, 2002, and continuing to the present, Defendants have disseminated and continue to disseminate statements indicating directly or by implication that they engage or propose to engage in the business, or act in the capacity or propose to act in the capacity, of an immigration consultant.
- 17. Defendants do not currently have on file with the Secretary of State, nor have they at any time referred to in this Complaint had on file with the Secretary of State, the requisite \$50,000 bond.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATIONS OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 22443.3 (FAILURE TO OBTAIN AND FILE SURETY BOND)

(Against all Defendants)

- 18. The People reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 17 of this Complaint.
- 19. By disseminating statements indicating directly or by implication that they engage in the business or act in the capacity of an immigration consultant, without having on file with the Secretary of State the bond described in Business and Professions Code Section 22443.1,
- Defendants have violated Business and Professions Code section 22443.3.

1		
2	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:	
3	1. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 22446.5, that all	
4	Defendants, their agents, employees, officers, representatives, successors, partners, assigns, and	
5	all persons acting in concert or participating with them, be permanently enjoined from violating	
6	Business and Professions Code sections 17200 and 22443.3, including but not limited to the	
7	violations alleged in this Complaint;	
8	2. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17206, 22445 and 22446.5, that	
9	the Court assess a civil penalty against each Defendant for each violation of Business and	
10	Professions Code sections 17200 and 22443.3 alleged in the Complaint, as proved at trial, in the	
11	total amount of at least \$25,000.00;	
12	3. That the People recover their costs of suit; and	
13	4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as it may deem just and proper.	
14		
15	Dated: January, 2003	
16	BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General	
17	HERSCHEL T. ELKINS, Senior Assistant Attorney General	
18	MARGARET REITER, Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
19	SETH E. MERMIN, Deputy Attorney General	
20	Ву	
21	SETH E. MERMIN Attorneys for the Plaintiff,	
22	the People of the State of California	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	PEOPLE v. LUGO Complaint for Injunction, Civil Penalties and Other	