1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Senior Assistant Attorney General MARGARET REITER Supervising Deputy Attorney General	ORNIA
11	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCIS	SCO
12		
13	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,	CASE NO.:
14		COMPLAINT FOR
15	V.	INJUNCTION, CIVIL PENALTIES, AND OTHER
16	TONY MOSCOSO, ALVARO BRAVO, TONY'S	RELIEF
17	SERVICES, TONY MOSCOSO SERVICES, and DOES 1 THROUGH 10, inclusive,	
18	Defendants.	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	PEOPLE v. MOSCOSO     Complaint for In       Relief     1	njunction, 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

Defendants Tony Moscoso (aka Antonio Moscoso, aka Anthony Moscoso) and Alvaro
 Bravo (aka Bravo Alvaro) are individuals. They engage in business under the names Tony's Services
 and Tony Moscoso Services.

Defendants Tony's Services and Tony Moscoso Services are businesses of unknown form.
Defendant Tony Moscoso 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.

4. Defendant Alvaro Bravo 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.

16 5. The true names and capacities of defendants sued herein under the fictitious names Does
17 1 through 10 are unknown to plaintiff. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to
18 allege such names and capacities as soon as they are ascertained.

- 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.
   At all relevant times, each defendant has committed the acts, caused others to commit the
- 23 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 1370 Valencia Street, San

28 Francisco, California.

3

1	10. The violations of law alleged in this Complaint occurred in the City and County of San		
2	Francisco and may also have occurred elsewhere in California.		
3	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION		
4	VIOLATIONS OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200		
5	(UNLAWFUL BUSINESS ACTS OR PRACTICES)		
6	(Against all Defendants)		
7	11. The People reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 10 of this		
8	Complaint.		
9	12. Defendants have engaged and are engaging in unfair competition as defined by		
10	California Business and Professions Code section 17200 by engaging in acts or practices		
11	including, but not necessarily limited to, violation of Business and Professions Code section		
12	22443.3.		
13	13. Business and Professions Code section 22443.3 provides that any person making a		
14	statement indicating directly or by implication that the person serves as an immigration consultant		
15	must have on file with the Secretary of State a bond of \$50,000. The measure, which is contained		
16	in the Immigration Consultants Act (Bus. & Prof. Code § 22440 et seq.), provides:		
17	It is unlawful for any person to disseminate by any means any statement		
18	indicating directly or by implication that the person engages in the business or acts		
19	in the capacity of an immigration consultant, unless the person has on file with the		
20	Secretary of State a bond, in the amount and subject to the terms described in		
21	Section 22443.1, that is maintained throughout the period covered by the		
22	statement, such as, but not limited to the period of a yellow pages listing.		
23	14. Section 22443.1 of the Business and Professions Code, describing the amount and		
24	terms of the required bond, provides in relevant part:		
25	(a) [E]ach person shall file with the Secretary of State a bond of fifty		
26	thousand (\$50,000) executed by a corporate surety admitted to do business in		
27	this state and conditioned upon compliance with this chapter. The total		
28	aggregate liability on the bond shall be limited to fifty thousand dollars		
	PEOPLE v. MOSCOSO       Complaint for Injunction, Civil Penalties and Other         Relief       Complaint for Injunction, Civil Penalties and Other		
	3		

1	(\$50,000)	
2	(b) The bond required by this section shall be in favor of, and payable to, the	
3	people of the State of California and shall be for the benefit of any person	
4	damaged by any fraud, misstatement, misrepresentation, unlawful act or	
5	omission, or failure to provide the services of the immigration consultant or	
6	the agents, representatives, or employees of the immigration consultant while	
7	acting within the scope of that employment or agency.	
8	15. Section 22441(a) of the Business and Professions Code provides:	
9	A person engages in the business of or acts in the capacity of an immigration	
10	consultant when that person gives nonlegal assistance or advice on an	
11	immigration matter.	
12	16. From a point on or after January 1, 2002, and continuing to the present, Defendants	
13	have disseminated and continue to disseminate statements indicating directly or by implication that	
14	they engage or propose to engage in the business, or act in the capacity or propose to act in the	
15	capacity, of an immigration consultant.	
16	17. Defendants do not currently have on file with the Secretary of State, nor have they at	
17	any time referred to in this Complaint had on file with the Secretary of State, the requisite	
18	\$50,000 bond.	
19	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION	
20	VIOLATIONS OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 22443.3	
21	(FAILURE TO OBTAIN AND FILE SURETY BOND)	
22	(Against all Defendants)	
23	18. The People reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 17 of this	
24	Complaint.	
25	19. By disseminating statements indicating directly or by implication that they engage in	
26	the business or act in the capacity of an immigration consultant, without having on file with the	
27	Secretary of State the bond described in Business and Professions Code Section 22443.1,	
28	Defendants have violated Business and Professions Code section 22443.3.	
	PEOPLE v. MOSCOSO Complaint for Injunction, Civil Penalties and Other Relief	
	4	

1	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:		
2	1. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 22446.5, that all		
3	Defendants, their agents, employees, officers, representatives, successors, partners, assigns, and		
4	all persons acting in concert or participating with them, be permanently enjoined from violating		
5	Business and Professions Code sections 17200 and 22443.3, including but not limited to the		
6	violations alleged in this Complaint;		
7	2. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17206, 22445 and 22446.5, that		
8	the Court assess a civil penalty against each Defendant for each violation of Business and		
9	Professions Code sections 17200 and 22443.3 alleged in the Complaint, as proved at trial, in the		
10	total amount of at least \$25,000.00;		
11	3. That the People recover their costs of suit; and		
12	4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as it may deem just and proper.		
13			
14	Dated: January, 2003		
15	BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General		
16	HERSCHEL T. ELKINS, Senior Assistant Attorney General		
17	MARGARET REITER, Supervising Deputy Attorney General		
18	SETH E. MERMIN, Deputy Attorney General		
19	By		
20	SETH E. MERMIN Attorneys for the Plaintiff,		
21	the People of the State of California		
22			
23 24			
24 25			
23 26			
20			
27			
_0	PEOPLE v. MOSCOSO Complaint for Injunction, Civil Penalties and Other		
	Relief 5		