

FILED

2006 SEP 19 PM 3:28

CLERK US DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BY RM DEPUTY

1 WILLIAM BLUMENTHAL
General Counsel

2

3 DEBORAH MATTIES
PATRICIA POSS
Federal Trade Commission
4 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, H-286
Washington, DC 20580
5 (202) 326-2047, 2413
(202) 326-3395 (fax)

6

7 JOHN D. JACOBS
Cal. Bar No. 134154
Federal Trade Commission
8 10877 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 700
9 Los Angeles, CA 90024
(310) 824-4360
10 (310) 824-4380 (fax)

11 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ORIGINAL

14 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Plaintiff,
15
16 v.
17 NEOVI, INC., d/b/a NEOVI DATA
CORPORATION and QCHEX.COM, et al.,
18 Defendants.

CIVIL NO. ~~06CV 1952~~ R JMA

MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR
TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER
WITH OTHER EQUITABLE
RELIEF AND ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE

RM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1

2 **I. INTRODUCTION** 1

3 **II. PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE** 2

4 A. Parties 2

5 1. Plaintiff 2

6 2. Defendants 3

7 B. Jurisdiction and Venue 4

8 **III. STATEMENT OF FACTS** 5

9 A. Defendants’ Unfair Business Practices 5

10 1. How the Qchex Website Works 5

11 2. Defendants Create and Deliver Unauthorized Checks 7

12 a. *Defendants Initially Created and Delivered Checks*

13 *Without Any Pretense of Verification* 7

14 b. *Complaints about Qchex’s Unverified Check Creation*

15 *and Delivery Service and Defendants’ Response* 9

16 c. *Qchex’s Purported “Micro-Deposit Validation”*

17 *Procedure* 11

18 d. *Qchex’s Purported Voided Check Validation*

19 *Procedure* 13

20 e. *Qchex’s Most Recent Purported Validation*

21 *Procedures* 15

22 B. Defendants’ Unfair Practices Cause Consumer Harm 17

23 1. Individuals and Businesses on Whose Bank Accounts Qchex

24 Created and Delivered Unauthorized Checks 17

25 2. Individuals and Businesses Who Received Bogus Checks

26 Created by Qchex 19

 C. The Corporate Defendants Are Engaged In Common Enterprise 22

 D. The Individual Defendants are Personally Involved 23

 1. Danforth is Personally Involved 23

 2. Villwock is Personally Involved 24

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
26

IV. LEGAL ARGUMENT 24

 A. The Court is Authorized to Grant the Requested Relief 25

 B. The Court Should Issue The Requested TRO 26

 1. Plaintiff Must Demonstrate Some Chance of Success on the
 Merits and that the Balance of Equities Tips in Their Favor 26

 2. Plaintiff Has Demonstrated A Likelihood of Success
 on the Merits 27

 3. The Corporate Defendants are Liable for Violating Section 5
 as a Common Enterprise 31

 4. The Individual Defendants are Liable for Violating Section 5 32

 5. The Balance of Equities Warrants Entry of the Proposed Order 33

V. CONCLUSION 35

