

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,  
STATES OF ILLINOIS, KANSAS,  
MINNESOTA, and NORTH CAROLINA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AFFILIATE STRATEGIES, INC., *et al.*

Defendants.

**Case No. 5:09-CV-04104-JAR-KGS**

**FINAL JUDGMENT ORDER AS TO  
DEFENDANT MEGGIE CHAPMAN**

Following a bench trial on the merits on August 22-23, 2011, the Court issued Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in favor of Plaintiffs Federal Trade Commission and the States of Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, and North Carolina (collectively, "Plaintiffs") and against Meggie Chapman on September 16, 2011 (Docket No. 422). Based upon the Court's Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED** as follows:

**FINDINGS**

1. Entry of this Final Judgment Order is in the public interest. It is also appropriate in light of Defendant Chapman's violation of the Telemarketing Sales Rule, 16 C.F.R. Part 310.
2. This Final Judgment Order is remedial in nature and shall not be construed as payment of a fine, penalty, punitive assessment or forfeiture.

**ORDER**

**I.**

**CONSUMER REDRESS**

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant Chapman is liable for One Million Six Hundred Eighty-Two Thousand Nine Hundred Fifty Dollars (\$1,682,950) in consumer redress, and Plaintiffs are awarded monetary judgments as follows:

- A. Three Hundred Thirty-Six Thousand Five Hundred Ninety Dollars (\$336,590) to the Federal Trade Commission;
- B. Three Hundred Thirty-Six Thousand Five Hundred Ninety Dollars (\$336,590) to the State of Illinois;
- C. Three Hundred Thirty-Six Thousand Five Hundred Ninety Dollars (\$336,590) to the State of Kansas;
- D. Three Hundred Thirty-Six Thousand Five Hundred Ninety Dollars (\$336,590) to the State of Minnesota; and
- E. Three Hundred Thirty-Six Thousand Five Hundred Ninety Dollars (\$336,590) to the State of North Carolina.

Funds paid to the Plaintiffs pursuant to this Section shall be deposited into a fund or funds administered by the Plaintiffs or their designees to be used for consumer redress and any attendant expenses for the administration any redress fund. Defendant will cooperate fully to assist the Plaintiffs in identifying consumers who may be entitled to redress from the funds paid to the Plaintiffs pursuant to this Section.

In the event that direct redress to consumers is wholly or partially impracticable or funds remain after redress is completed, the Plaintiffs may apply any remaining funds for any other

equitable relief (including consumer information remedies) that they determine to be reasonably related to Defendant's practices alleged in the Second Amended Complaint. Any funds paid to the Commission not used for equitable relief shall be deposited into the U.S. Treasury as disgorgement. Any funds paid to any State Plaintiff not used for equitable relief may be used by that State Plaintiff to the full extent authorized by that State's laws, including, but not limited to, as payment for that State's costs of investigating and litigating the instant case. Defendant shall have no right to challenge Plaintiffs' choice of remedies under this Section or any other aspect of the redress program.

**II.**

**ENTRY OF ORDER**

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that there is no just reason for delay, and the Clerk of Court is hereby directed to enter this Final Judgment Order immediately.

**III.**

**RETENTION OF JURISDICTION**

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter for purposes of construction, modification, and enforcement of this Final Judgment Order.

Dated: September 26, 2011

S/ Julie A. Robinson  
JULIE A. ROBINSON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE