FILED No Fee ALDEN F. ABBOTT 1 2019 NOV -4 AM 9: 30 General Counsel 2 CLERK U.S. DESTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST, OF CALIF. STEPHEN T. FAIRCHILD WA Bar No. 41214; sfairchild@ftc.gov 3 RICHARD MCKEWEN 4 WA Bar No. 45041; rmckewen@ftc.gov FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION 5 915 Second Avenue, Suite 2896 6 Seattle, WA 98174 7 Tel.: (206) 220-6350; Fax: (206) 220-6366 8 ROBERT J. QUIGLEY, Local Counsel 9 CA Bar No. 302879; rquigley@ftc.gov FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION 10 10990 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 400 11 Los Angeles, CA 90024 Tel.: (310) 824-4300; Fax: (310) 824-4380 12 13 Attorneys for Plaintiff 14 15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 16 17 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, SACV 19 - 02109 JVS (ADSk) Civ. No. 18 Plaintiff, COMPLAINT FOR PERMANENT 19 INJUNCTION AND OTHER 20 **EQUITABLE RELIEF** v. 21 AMERICAN FINANCIAL SUPPORT FILED UNDER SEAL 22 SERVICES INC., 23 ARETE FINANCIAL GROUP, a 24 corporation, also d/b/a Arete Financial Freedom, 25 26 ARETE FINANCIAL GROUP LLC, 27 CBC CONGLOMERATE LLC, also 28

Qase 8:19-cv-02109-JVS-ADS Document 1 Filed 11/04/19 Page 1 of 24 Page ID # 1

1	d/b/a 1file.org,
2	DIAMOND CHOICE INC., also d/b/a
3	Interest Rate Solutions,
4	J&L ENTERPRISE LLC, also d/b/a
5	Premier Solutions Servicing,
6	LA CASA BONITA INVESTMENTS,
7	INC., f/k/a La Casa Bonita Investments
8	LLC, also d/b/a Education Loan
9	Network, also d/b/a Edunet,
10	US FINANCIAL FREEDOM CENTER,
11	INC., a corporation,
12	CAREY G. HOWE, individually and as
13	an officer or manager of Arete Financial
14	Group; Arete Financial Group LLC; CBC Conglomerate LLC; and La Casa
15	Bonita Investments, Inc.,
16	ANNA C. HOWE, individually and as
17	an officer of CBC Conglomerate LLC,
18	SHUNMIN "MIKE" HSU, individually
19	and as an officer or manager of Arete
20	Financial Group; Arete Financial Group LLC; CBC Conglomerate LLC; and La
21	Casa Bonita Investment, Inc.,
22	RUDDY PALACIOS a/k/a RUDDY
23	BARAHONA, individually and as an
24	officer of Arete Financial Group; Arete
25	Financial Group LLC; and Diamond Choice Inc.,
26	
27	OLIVER POMAZI, individually and as an officer or director of Arete Financial
28	Group; Arete Financial Group LLC; and
ĺ	

J&L Enterprise LLC, and

JAY SINGH, individually and as an officer of American Financial Support Services Inc. and US Financial Freedom Center Inc.,

Defendants,

MJ WEALTH SOLUTIONS, LLC,

Relief Defendant.

Plaintiff, the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC" or "Commission"), for its Complaint alleges:

- 1. The FTC brings this action under Sections 13(b) and 19 of the Federal Trade Commission Act ("FTC Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 53(b) and 57b, and the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act ("Telemarketing Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 6101–6108, to obtain temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief, rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, disgorgement of ill-gotten monies, and other equitable relief for Defendants' acts or practices in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), and the FTC's Telemarketing Sales Rule ("TSR"), 16 C.F.R. pt. 310, in connection with Defendants' ongoing deceptive marketing and sale of student loan debt relief services.
- 2. Since at least April 2014, Defendants have operated an unlawful debt relief scheme that preys on consumers with student loan debt. Defendants promise consumers that, in exchange for the payment of an upfront fee and subsequent monthly fees, Defendants will reduce consumers' monthly student loan payments or eliminate all, or a substantial portion of, their federal student loan debt by enrolling consumers in student loan forgiveness, consolidation, or repayment programs. In numerous instances, however, Defendants fail to reduce or eliminate

consumers' loan balances or monthly loan payments. Defendants also break their promises that they will apply consumers' monthly fee payments to Defendants toward the consumers' loans and assume responsibility for servicing those loans, leaving consumers on the hook for adverse consequences like increased interest and delinquency. As a result, consumers who already struggle to pay their student loans lose even more money to Defendants. Since the beginning of their scheme, Defendants have pocketed at least \$43 million in revenues from consumers.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1337(a), and 1345.
- 4. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1), (b)(2), (c)(1), (c)(2), and (d), and 15 U.S.C. § 53(b).

PLAINTIFF

- 5. The FTC is an independent agency of the United States government created by statute. 15 U.S.C. §§ 41–58. The FTC enforces Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), which prohibits unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce. The FTC also enforces the Telemarketing Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 6101–6108. Pursuant to the Telemarketing Act, the FTC promulgated and enforces the TSR, 16 C.F.R. pt. 310, which prohibits deceptive or abusive telemarketing acts or practices.
- 6. The FTC is authorized to initiate federal district court proceedings, by its own attorneys, to enjoin violations of the FTC Act and the TSR, and to secure such equitable relief as may be appropriate in each case, including rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, and the disgorgement of ill-gotten monies. 15 U.S.C. §§ 53(b), 57b, and 6102(c).

DEFENDANTS

Defendant American Financial Support Services Inc. ("AFSS") is a

2

3

Corporate Defendants

4 5

7.

6

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

Delaware corporation with its current principal place of business at 500 Ygnacio Valley Road, Suite 430, Walnut Creek, CA 94596. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, or as part of the common enterprise described in Paragraph 22, AFSS has advertised, marketed, offered to provide, sold, or provided student loan debt relief services to consumers in this District and throughout the United States.

- 8. Defendant Arete Financial Group, also doing business as Arete Financial Freedom ("Arete Financial Freedom"), is a California corporation with its current principal place of business at 1261 East Dyer Road, Suite 100, Santa Ana, CA 92705. From approximately June to August 2017, Arete Financial Freedom also listed its principal place of business in California Secretary of State filings as 5772 Bolsa Avenue, Suite 220, Huntington Beach, CA 92649. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, or as part of the common enterprise described in Paragraph 22, Arete Financial Freedom has advertised, marketed, offered to provide, sold, or provided student loan debt relief services to consumers in this District and throughout the United States.
- 9. Defendant Arete Financial Group LLC is a California limited liability company with its principal place of business listed in California Secretary of State filings as 1261 East Dyer Road, Suite 100, Santa Ana, CA 92705. Arete Financial Group LLC sometimes also does business as Arete Financial Freedom. Arete Financial Group LLC has also operated under the name Arete Finacial [sic] Group LLC, a California limited liability company that was registered with the California Secretary of State on or about February 15, 2017, and dissolved on or about March 26, 2018. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, or as part of the common enterprise described in Paragraph 22,

4 5

6 7

8

9 10

11 12

13 14

15 16

18

17

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27 28 Arete Financial Group LLC has advertised, marketed, offered to provide, sold, or provided student loan debt relief services to consumers in this District and throughout the United States.

- Defendant CBC Conglomerate LLC, also doing business as **1 file.org** ("1 file.org"), is or was a California limited liability company with its principal place of business at 1261 East Dyer Road, Suite 100, Santa Ana, CA 92705. Ifile.org has also represented, in documents filed with the California Secretary of State, that its principal place of business is or was 5862 Bolsa Avenue, Suite 102, Huntington Beach, CA 92649. Ifile.org's corporate status is currently listed as "FTB [Franchise Tax Board] Suspended" on the California Secretary of State's website. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, or as part of the common enterprise described in Paragraph 22, 1 file.org has advertised, marketed, offered to provide, sold, or provided student loan debt relief services to consumers in this District and throughout the United States.
- 11. Defendant Diamond Choice Inc., also doing business as Interest **Rate Solutions** ("Diamond Choice"), is a California corporation with its principal place of business at 1261 East Dyer Road, Suite 250, Santa Ana, CA 92705. Individual Defendant Palacios is the owner, and serves as chief executive officer, chief financial officer, and director, of Diamond Choice. Diamond Choice has held an ownership interest in Arete Finacial [sic] Group, LLC. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, or as part of the common enterprise described in Paragraph 22, Diamond Choice has advertised, marketed, offered to provide, sold, or provided student loan debt relief services to consumers in this District and throughout the United States.
- 12. Defendant J&L Enterprise LLC, also doing business as Premier Solutions Servicing ("PSS"), is a Delaware limited liability company with its registered address and principal place of business at 18001 Sky Park Circle, Suites

- Casa Bonita Investments LLC, also doing business as Education Loan Network, also doing business as Edunet (collectively, "La Casa Bonita"), is a California corporation with its current principal place of business at 5772 Bolsa Avenue, Suite 220, Huntington Beach, CA 92649. La Casa Bonita Investments, Inc. is the corporate successor to La Casa Bonita Investments LLC, which was a California limited liability company that conducted business at 5862 Bolsa Avenue, Suite 102, Huntington Beach, CA 92649. On or about August 1, 2016, La Casa Bonita Investments LLC filed an Articles of Incorporation with Statement of Conversion with the California Secretary of State and thereby converted into Defendant La Casa Bonita Investments, Inc. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, or as part of the common enterprise described in Paragraph 22, La Casa Bonita has advertised, marketed, offered to provide, sold, or provided student loan debt relief services to consumers in this District and throughout the United States.
- 14. Defendant **US Financial Freedom Center, Inc.** ("USFFC") is a Delaware corporation with its current principal place of business at 500 Ygnacio Valley Road, Suite 430, Walnut Creek, CA 94596. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, or as part of the common enterprise described in Paragraph 22, USFFC has advertised, marketed, offered to provide, sold, or provided student loan debt relief services to consumers in this District and throughout the United States.

Individual Defendants

- 15. Defendant Carey G. Howe ("Mr. Howe") holds himself out as the president and an owner of Arete Financial Freedom and Arete Financial Group LLC, as a manager of 1 file.org, and as the chief executive officer and sole director of La Casa Bonita. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, Mr. Howe has formulated, directed, controlled, had the authority to control, or participated in the acts and practices of the Corporate Defendants, including the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. For example, Mr. Howe has responded to consumer complaints about 1 file.org lodged with the Better Business Bureau ("BBB"), and has signatory authority on Corporate Defendants' bank accounts. Mr. Howe resides in this District and, in connection with the matters alleged herein, transacts or has transacted business in this District and throughout the United States.
- 16. Defendant **Anna C. Howe** ("Ms. Howe") holds herself out as the chief operating officer and a manager of 1 file.org. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, Ms. Howe has formulated, directed, controlled, had the authority to control, or participated in the acts and practices of the Corporate Defendants, including the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. For example, Ms. Howe has responded to consumer complaints about 1 file.org lodged with the BBB and has represented that she handles refunds, chargebacks, and sales-related issues for Defendants. Ms. Howe resides in this District and, in connection with the matters alleged herein, transacts or has transacted business in this District and throughout the United States.
- 17. Defendant **Shunmin Hsu, also known as Mike Hsu**, holds himself out as the secretary, chief financial officer, and a director of Arete Financial Freedom, as a manager of Arete Financial Group LLC and 1 file.org, and as the chief financial officer of La Casa Bonita. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, Mr. Hsu has formulated, directed,

- ("Palacios"), holds himself out as the chief operating officer, an owner, and a director of Arete Financial Freedom; as the chief executive officer of Arete Financial Group LLC; and as chief executive officer, chief financial officer, and director of Diamond Choice. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, Mr. Palacios has formulated, directed, controlled, had the authority to control, or participated in the acts and practices of the Corporate Defendants, including the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. For example, Mr. Palacios has signatory authority on Corporate Defendants' bank accounts, has opened a payment account using a Corporate Defendant's email address, and has registered at least one web domain associated with Corporate Defendants. Mr. Palacios resides within this District and, in connection with the matters alleged herein, transacts or has transacted business in this District and throughout the United States.
- 19. Defendant **Oliver Pomazi** holds himself out as the sole owner of PSS, the chief executive officer of Arete Financial Freedom, and has held himself out as a director of Arete Finacial [sic] Group, LLC. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, Mr. Pomazi has formulated, directed, controlled, had the authority to control, or participated in the acts and practices of the Corporate Defendants, including the acts and practices set forth in

- this Complaint. For example, Mr. Pomazi has signatory authority on Corporate Defendants' bank accounts, has opened a payment account using a Corporate Defendant's email address, and has responded to consumer complaints lodged with the BBB. Mr. Pomazi resides within this District and in connection with the matters alleged herein, transacts or has transacted business in this District and throughout the United States.
- 20. Defendant **Jay Singh** holds himself out as the president, chief executive officer, and director of AFSS and USFFC. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, Mr. Singh has formulated, directed, controlled, had the authority to control, or participated in the acts and practices of AFSS and USFFC, including the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. For example, Mr. Singh has opened a payment account using a Corporate Defendant's email address, is the point of contact for USFFC's website registration, and has responded to consumer complaints lodged with the BBB. Mr. Singh resides in California and, in connection with the matters alleged herein, transacts or has transacted business in this District and throughout the United States.

Relief Defendant

21. Relief Defendant **MJ Wealth Solutions, LLC** ("MJ Wealth Solutions") is a California limited liability company with its principal place of business listed in California Secretary of State filings as 5917 Oak Avenue #314, Temple City, CA 91780. Individual Defendant Hsu serves as the chief executive officer of MJ Wealth Solutions. MJ Wealth Solutions has received assets that can be traced directly to Defendants' deceptive acts or practices alleged below, and it has no legitimate claim to those assets. MJ Wealth Solutions transacts or has transacted business in this District.

COMMON ENTERPRISE

22. Defendants AFSS, Arete Financial Freedom, Arete Financial Group LLC, 1file.org, Diamond Choice, PSS, La Casa Bonita, and USFFC (collectively, "Corporate Defendants") operate as a common enterprise while engaging in the deceptive acts and practices alleged below. Corporate Defendants conduct the business practices described below through an interrelated network of companies that have common ownership, identities, officers, managers, business functions, employees, and office locations, that commingle funds, and that use common contracts. Because these Corporate Defendants operate as a common enterprise, each of them is jointly and severally liable for the acts and practices alleged below. Furthermore, Defendants Carey G. Howe, Anna C. Howe, Shunmin Hsu, Ruddy Palacios, Oliver Pomazi, and Jay Singh (collectively, "Individual Defendants") formulate, direct, control, have the authority to control, or participate in the acts and practices of the Corporate Defendants that constitute the common enterprise.

COMMERCE

23. At all times material to this Complaint, Defendants have maintained a substantial course of trade in or affecting commerce, as "commerce" is defined in Section 4 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 44.

DEFENDANTS' DECEPTIVE STUDENT LOAN DEBT RELIEF SCHEME Background on Student Loan Forgiveness and Repayment Programs

- 24. Student loan debt is the second largest class of consumer debt in the United States; more than 42 million Americans collectively owe nearly \$1.5 trillion in student loan debt. The student loan market shows elevated levels of distress, such as delinquency and default, relative to other types of consumer debt.
- 25. To address this mounting level of distressed debt, the Department of Education ("ED") and state government agencies administer a limited number of student loan forgiveness and discharge programs. Most consumers, however, are not eligible for these programs because of strict eligibility requirements. For

example, one program requires the consumer to demonstrate a total and permanent disability; another applies only to consumers whose school closed while the consumer was still enrolled. A third program, the Borrower Defense to Repayment ("BDR"), may provide a loan discharge if the school, through an act or omission, violated state law directly related to the borrower's federal student loan or to the educational services for which the loan was provided.

- 26. Other forgiveness programs require working in certain professions for a period of years. Teacher Loan Forgiveness applies to teachers who have worked full-time for five years in a low-income elementary or secondary school or educational service agency. Public Service Loan Forgiveness ("PSLF") applies to employees of governmental units or non-profit organizations who make timely monthly payments for a period of ten years while employed in the public sector.
- 27. The federal government also offers loan forgiveness through incomedriven repayment ("IDR") programs that enable borrowers to reduce their monthly payments and have portions of their loans forgiven. IDR programs allow eligible borrowers to limit their monthly payments based on a percentage of their discretionary monthly income. To remain in an IDR program, borrowers must recertify their income and family size annually. Obtaining forgiveness through IDR programs requires a minimum of 20 or 25 years of qualifying payments.
- 28. Because a borrower's income is likely to fluctuate over the life of the loan, monthly payments under the IDR programs can vary considerably from year to year. If a borrower's income were to increase over the repayment period, for example, the monthly payment amount could correspondingly increase to the point where those payments would pay off the loan before any amount could be forgiven at the end of the repayment term.
- 29. Consumers can apply for BDR, PSLF, IDR, and other loan repayment and forgiveness or discharge programs through ED or their student loan servicers

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13 14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

27 28 at no cost; these programs do not require the assistance of a third-party company or payment of application fees.

30. ED will grant forbearance or deferment while processing applications for an alternative repayment plan, and in some cases of hardship. During forbearance, and, under some circumstances, during deferment, unpaid interest is added to the principal balance.

Defendants' Deceptive Marketing of Student Loan Debt Relief Services

- Defendants promise to enroll consumers in student loan forgiveness, consolidation, and repayment programs to reduce or eliminate their monthly payments and principal balances. Defendants make these claims in radio and television advertisements, on the Internet, and in telemarketing calls. In some instances, in response to the Defendants' marketing materials, consumers call Defendants for more information. In other instances, Defendants' telemarketers, or third-party telemarketers working on Defendants' behalf, make unsolicited outbound calls to consumers to offer Defendants' services and convince consumers to sign up with Defendants.
- 32. In both inbound and outbound telemarketing calls, and in publicfacing statements, Defendants make at least four types of deceptive claims: (1) consumers who purchase Defendants' services will have their monthly student loan payments reduced to a lower, specific amount or have their loan balances forgiven in whole or in part; (2) most or all of consumers' monthly fee payments to Defendants will be applied toward consumers' student loans; (3) Defendants will assume responsibility for servicing consumers' student loans; and (4) Defendants are affiliated or work directly with ED or one of ED's authorized loan servicers.

Defendants' Deceptive Payment Reduction Representations

Defendants' telemarketers inform consumers that Defendants can enroll them in programs such as BDR, PSLF, or IDR to lower their monthly payments or loan balances. Defendants' representatives further tell consumers that Defendants will obtain a reduction in the consumer's monthly loan payment, or save the consumer a specific amount of money, if the consumer purchases Defendants' services. In some instances, Defendants promise consumers that their entire loan balances will be forgiven after the consumer makes lower monthly

payments for a specified period of time, anywhere from three to ten years.

5 6

7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

16

15

18

17

19 20

21 22 23

24 25

26 27

28

In fact, Defendants fail to deliver the benefits they promise. 34. Consumers consistently report that Defendants do not reduce consumers' monthly loan payments or cause loan balances to be forgiven. Instead, Defendants often merely contact a consumer's loan servicer to place the consumer's loans into temporary forbearance or deferment status, without the consumer's authorization or knowledge.

- 35. During forbearance, borrowers are temporarily relieved of the obligation to make monthly payments, but interest continues to accrue on their loans and is added to the principal balance. During deferment, borrowers are relieved of making monthly payments and of paying interest on some federal loans, but must pay interest on others. Thus, if a consumer's loan is placed into forbearance or deferment status, the consumer's loan balance increases while Defendants continue to collect the consumer's monthly fees. In numerous instances, consumers end up owing substantially more on their student loans after signing up and paying for Defendants' services.
- Even when Defendants enroll consumers in programs such as BDR, 36. PSLF, or IDR, or consolidate consumers' loans, such consumers do not realize the savings or reduction in payments that Defendants promise. Furthermore, on IDR applications, Defendants frequently misstate borrowers' family sizes or indicate that borrowers do not have access to their spouses' income, even though they share bank accounts and file taxes jointly. Defendants do so in an effort to obtain for borrowers a larger reduction in payments than the borrowers would otherwise qualify for under ED regulations.

Defendants' Payment and Servicing Misrepresentations

- 37. Defendants frequently represent that they will apply the monthly fees that consumers pay Defendants towards consumers' student loan debt. In numerous instances, however, Defendants do not send such payments to consumers' student loan servicers. Instead, Defendants collect and retain consumers' payments to enrich themselves.
- 38. Furthermore, Defendants frequently represent that they will assume responsibility for servicing consumers' student loans, and that consumers should stop paying their loan servicers and instead make their loan payments to Defendants. Defendants, however, are not federal loan servicers and, despite their representations to consumers, have not taken over or purchased consumers' student loans. Defendants do not, in fact, service consumers' student loans or make payments on their behalves. As a result, consumers' loan balances increase with accumulated interest. In addition, many consumers' loans become delinquent, and some consumers have been placed in default status and their income tax refunds have been garnished.

Defendants' Government Affiliation Misrepresentations

- 39. On their telemarketing calls with consumers, Defendants state or imply that they are affiliated, or work directly, with ED or its authorized servicers. For example, Defendants have stated that because they have a "better, more direct relationship" with ED than do its servicers, they can secure better repayment terms than consumers could obtain through their servicers. Defendants have also directly confirmed, in response to consumers' questions, that they work directly with ED.
- 40. In fact, Defendants' representations in Paragraph 39 are false. Defendants are not affiliated with, and do not work directly with, ED or one of ED's authorized loan servicers. Defendants themselves are not authorized loan servicers or affiliated with or approved by ED in any manner.

Materiality

41. Based on Defendants' representations, consumers believe that Defendants will enroll them in programs that will reduce their monthly loan payments or loan balances; that Defendants will take responsibility for servicing the consumers' student loans and obtain for the consumers reductions in loan payments or balances; that Defendants will apply consumers' monthly fee payments to Defendants toward the consumers' loan balances; and that Defendants are affiliated, or work directly, with ED or its authorized loan servicers. Relying on these representations, consumers purchase the services that Defendants offer.

Defendants' Upfront and Monthly Fees

- 42. Defendants charge an upfront fee when consumers agree to their services. These upfront fees range from approximately \$500 to as high as \$1,800.
- 43. Defendants require that consumers pay at least part of the upfront fee before they perform any work on consumers' behalf. As Ms. Howe admitted in answering a complaint about 1 file.org submitted to the BBB, "We do NOT start any work on a file until the first payment is made by the client." Similarly, Defendants' standard-form contract states: "Following receipt of all necessary information from Client and the first payment has been made, [Defendants'] Services will commence." Sometimes, when consumers are unable to pay the full upfront fee, Defendants offer to break it into monthly installments or to allow a postdated payment. In at least one instance, Defendants have also worked with a third-party company to offer a separate loan to cover the upfront fee—thereby piling another loan onto a consumer's existing student loans.
- 44. In addition to the upfront fee, Defendants charge a monthly fee for their purported services, typically ranging from \$19 to \$49.

Defendants' Tactics to Perpetuate Their Unlawful Scheme

45. Defendants employ additional deceptive tactics to string consumers along and prevent consumers from learning of Defendants' deception. For

- 46. Defendants also require consumers to sign "service agreements" that are substantially identical in content and format. These standard-form contracts contain terms that were not discussed with consumers during the Defendants' sales pitches, or that directly contradict Defendants' marketing materials or statements made to consumers during their calls with Defendants' representatives. For example, although Defendants represent in telemarketing calls that they are affiliated with ED, the form contract states, in the middle of dense text, that Defendants are not affiliated with a government agency.
- 47. Consumers are often unable to spot these contradictions because Defendants rush consumers through the process of signing up by creating a sense of urgency. Defendants often require consumers to electronically sign forms during their phone call with Defendants, without affording consumers adequate time to consider the forms' language. In some cases, Defendants require consumers to review and sign Defendants' multi-page service agreement on consumers' mobile phones. The electronic forms use a hard-to-read font and jump from one signature line to another without a meaningful opportunity for review.

1 2 48. 3 4 5 49. 6 7 8 50. 9 10 11 12 13 51. 14 15 16 a. 17 whole or in part; 18 19 b. 20 21 c. 22 d. 23 24 25 26

27

28

Ongoing Unlawful Conduct

48. Based on the facts and violations of law alleged in this Complaint, the FTC has reason to believe that Defendants are violating or are about to violate laws enforced by the Commission.

THE FTC ACT

- 49. Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), prohibits "unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce."
- 50. Misrepresentations or deceptive omissions of material fact constitute deceptive acts or practices prohibited by Section 5(a) of the FTC Act.

VIOLATIONS OF THE FTC ACT

Count I

Deceptive Student Loan Debt Relief Representations

- 51. In numerous instances in connection with the advertising, marketing, promotion, offering for sale, or sale of student loan debt relief services, Defendants represent, directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, that:
 - a. consumers who purchase Defendants' services generally will have their monthly payments reduced or their loan balances forgiven in whole or in part;
 - b. most or all of consumers' monthly fee payments to Defendants will be applied toward consumers' student loans;
 - c. Defendants will assume responsibility for servicing consumers' student loans; and
 - d. Defendants are affiliated or work directly with ED or one of ED's authorized loan servicers.
- 52. In truth and in fact, in numerous instances in which Defendants make the representations set forth in paragraph 51 of this Complaint, such representations are false or not substantiated at the time Defendants make them.

53. Therefore, Defendants' representations as set forth in paragraph 51 of this Complaint are false or misleading and constitute deceptive acts or practices in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

THE TELEMARKETING SALES RULE

- 54. In 1994, Congress directed the FTC to prescribe rules prohibiting abusive and deceptive telemarketing acts or practices pursuant to the Telemarketing Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 6101–6108. The FTC adopted the original TSR in 1995, extensively amended it in 2003, and amended certain provisions thereafter. 16 C.F.R. pt. 310.
- 55. Defendants are "seller[s]" or "telemarketer[s]" engaged in "telemarketing" as defined by the TSR, 16 C.F.R. § 310.2(dd), (ff), and (gg). A "seller" means any person who, in connection with a telemarketing transaction, provides, offers to provide, or arranges for others to provide goods or services to the customer in exchange for consideration. 16 C.F.R. § 310.2(dd). A "telemarketer" means any person who, in connection with telemarketing, initiates or receives telephone calls to or from a customer or donor. 16 C.F.R. § 310.2(ff). "Telemarketing" means a plan, program, or campaign which is conducted to induce the purchase of goods or services or a charitable contribution, by use of one or more telephones and which involves more than one interstate telephone call. 16 C.F.R. § 310.2(gg).
- 56. Defendants are sellers or telemarketers of "debt relief services" as defined by the TSR, 16 C.F.R. § 310.2(o). Under the TSR, a "debt relief service" means any program or service represented, directly or by implication, to renegotiate, settle, or in any way alter the terms of payment or other terms of the debt between a person and one or more unsecured creditors or debt collectors, including, but not limited to, a reduction in the balance, interest rate, or fees owed by a person to an unsecured creditor or debt collector. 16 C.F.R. § 310.2(o).

14 15

13

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

27 28

- 57. The TSR prohibits sellers and telemarketers from requesting or receiving payment of any fees or consideration for any debt relief service until and unless:
 - (A) The seller or telemarketer has renegotiated, settled, reduced, or otherwise altered the terms of at least one debt pursuant to a settlement agreement, debt management plan, or other such valid contractual agreement executed by the customer;
 - (B) The customer has made at least one payment pursuant to that settlement agreement, debt management plan, or other valid contractual agreement between the customer and the creditor or debt collector; and
 - (C) To the extent that debts enrolled in a service are renegotiated, settled, reduced, or otherwise altered individually, the fee or consideration either:
 - (1) Bears the same proportional relationship to the total fee for renegotiating, settling, reducing, or altering the terms of the entire debt balance as the individual debt amount bears to the entire debt amount. The individual debt amount and the entire debt amount are those owed at the time the debt was enrolled in the service; or (2) Is a percentage of the amount saved as a result of the renegotiation, settlement, reduction, or alteration. The percentage charged cannot change from one individual debt to another. The amount saved is the difference between the amount owed at the time the debt was enrolled in the service and the amount actually paid to satisfy the debt.
- 16 C.F.R. § 310.4(a)(5)(i).
- 58. The TSR prohibits sellers and telemarketers from misrepresenting, directly or by implication, a seller's or telemarketer's affiliation with, or endorsement or sponsorship by, any person or government entity. 16 C.F.R. § 310.3(a)(2)(vii).

- 59. The TSR prohibits sellers and telemarketers from misrepresenting, directly or by implication, any material aspect of any debt relief service, including, but not limited to, the amount of money or the percentage of the debt amount that a customer may save by using the service. 16 C.F.R. § 310.3(a)(2)(x).
- 60. Pursuant to Section 3(c) of the Telemarketing Act, 15 U.S.C. § 6102(c), and Section 18(d)(3) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 57a(d)(3), a violation of the TSR constitutes an unfair or deceptive act or practice in or affecting commerce, in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEMARKETING SALES RULE Count II

Advance Fee for Debt Relief Services

- 61. In numerous instances, in connection with the telemarketing of student loan debt relief services, Defendants request or receive payment of a fee or consideration for debt relief services before:
 - a. Defendants have renegotiated, settled, reduced, or otherwise altered the terms of at least one debt pursuant to a settlement agreement, debt management plan, or other such valid contractual agreement executed by the customer; and
 - b. The customer has made at least one payment pursuant to that settlement agreement, debt management plan, or other valid contractual agreement between the customer and the creditor.
- 62. Defendants' acts or practices, as described in paragraph 61 of this Complaint, violate Section 310.4(a)(5)(i) of the TSR, 16 C.F.R. § 310.4(a)(5)(i).

Count III

Misrepresentation of Affiliation

63. In numerous instances, in connection with the telemarketing of student loan debt relief services, Defendants misrepresent, directly or indirectly,

expressly or by implication, that Defendants are affiliated with, or endorsed or sponsored by, the government or the U.S. Department of Education.

64. Defendants' acts and practices, as described in paragraph 63 of this Complaint, violate Section 310.3(a)(2)(vii) of the TSR, 16 C.F.R. § 310.3(a)(2)(vii).

Count IV

Material Debt Relief Misrepresentations

- 65. In numerous instances, in connection with the telemarketing of student loan debt relief services, Defendants misrepresent, directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, material aspects of their debt relief services, including that:
 - a. consumers who purchase Defendants' services generally will have their monthly payments reduced or their loan balances forgiven in whole or in part;
 - b. most or all of consumers' monthly fee payments to Defendants will be applied toward consumers' student loans; and
 - c. Defendants will assume responsibility for servicing consumers' student loans.
- 66. Defendants' acts and practices, as described in paragraph 65 of this Complaint, violate Section 310.3(a)(2)(x) of the TSR, 16 C.F.R. § 310.3(a)(2)(x).

Count V

Relief Defendant

- 67. Relief Defendant MJ Wealth Solutions has received, directly or indirectly, funds and other assets from Defendants that are traceable to funds obtained from Defendants' customers through the deceptive acts or practices described herein.
- 68. Relief Defendant is not a bona fide purchaser with legal and equitable title to Defendants' customers' funds and other assets, and Relief Defendant will be

4 5

7 8

6

9 10

11 12

13 14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

23 24

22

25

26

27 28 unjustly enriched if it is not required to disgorge the funds or the value of the benefit it received as a result of Defendants' deceptive acts or practices.

By reason of the foregoing, Relief Defendant holds funds and assets in 69. constructive trust for the benefit of Defendants' customers.

CONSUMER INJURY

70. Consumers are suffering, have suffered, and will continue to suffer substantial injury as a result of Defendants' violations of the FTC Act and the TSR. In addition, Defendants have been unjustly enriched as a result of their unlawful acts or practices. Absent injunctive relief by this Court, Defendants are likely to continue to injure consumers, reap unjust enrichment, and harm the public interest.

THIS COURT'S POWER TO GRANT RELIEF

- 71. Section 13(b) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), empowers this Court to grant injunctive and such other relief as the Court may deem appropriate to halt and redress violations of any provision of law enforced by the FTC. This Court, in the exercise of its equitable jurisdiction, may award ancillary relief, including rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, and the disgorgement of ill-gotten monies, to prevent and remedy any violation of any provision of law enforced by the FTC.
- Section 19 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 57b, and Section 6(b) of the 72. Telemarketing Act, 15 U.S.C. § 6105(b), authorize this Court to grant such relief as the Court finds necessary to redress injury to consumers resulting from Defendants' violations of the TSR, including the rescission or reformation of contracts, and the refund of money.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff FTC, pursuant to Sections 13(b) and 19 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 53(b) and 57b, Section 6(b) of the Telemarketing Act, 15 U.S.C. § 6105(b), and the Court's own equitable powers, requests that the Court:

1 Award Plaintiff such preliminary injunctive and ancillary relief as A. 2 may be necessary to avert the likelihood of consumer injury during the pendency 3 of this action and to preserve the possibility of effective final relief, including a 4 temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction, an order freezing assets, 5 appointment of a receiver, immediate access to premises, an evidence preservation 6 order, and expedited discovery; 7 Enter a permanent injunction to prevent future violations of the FTC B. Act and the TSR; 8 9 C. Award such relief as the Court finds necessary to redress injury to consumers resulting from Defendants' violations of the FTC Act and the TSR, 10 11 including rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies 12 paid, and the disgorgement of ill-gotten monies; 13 Enter an order requiring Relief Defendant to disgorge all funds and D. assets, or the value of the benefit it received from the funds and assets, which are 14 15 traceable to Defendants' deceptive acts or practices; and E. Award Plaintiff the costs of bringing this action, as well as such other 16 and additional relief as the Court may determine to be just and proper. 17 18 Respectfully submitted, 19 20 ALDEN F. ABBOTT Dated: November 4, 2019 21 General Counsel 22 23 24 Stephen T. Fairchild Richard McKewen 25 Attorneys for Plaintiff 26 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION 27

ORIGINA UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself)				DEFENDANTS (Check box if you are representing yourself)				
Federal Trade Commission			American Financial	American Financial Support Services Inc., et al.				
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plain	tiff	County of Resid	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Contra Costa				
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CAS		*****		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number) If you are representing yourself, provide the same information. Stephen T. Fairchild, Richard McKewen, Robert J. Quigley (local counsel) Federal Trade Commission 915 Second Avenue, Suite 2896 Seattle, WA 98174; (206) 220-4476 (Fairchild)			, ,	Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number) If you are representing yourself, provide the same information. Unknown				
II. BASIS OF JURISDIC		ne box only.)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES-For D	Diversity Cases Only			
1. U.S. Government Plaintiff 2. U.S. Government Defendant	4. Diversity (I	uestion (U.S. Not a Party) ndicate Citizenship	(Place an X in one bo Citizen of This State [Citizen of Another State [Citizen or Subject of a	ox for plaintiff and one for d PTF DEF	lefendánt) r Principal Place			
Defendant of Parties in Item III) Foreign Country State Court of Parties in Item III) Foreign Country State Court of Parties in Item III) Foreign Country State Country St								
V. REQUESTED IN COM	IPLAINT: JURY DE	MAND: 🗌 Yes 🗵	No (Check "Yes" o	only if demanded in com	plaint.)			
CLASS ACTION under	F.R.Cv.P. 23:	res ⊠No	MONEY DEMA	ANDED IN COMPLAINT:	s 0			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.) 15 U.S.C. § 53(b): Unfair or deceptive acts or practices in violation of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45, and the Telemarketing Sales Rule, 16 C.F.R. pt. 310.								
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one bo	ox only).						
OTHER STATUTES	CONTRACT	REAL PROPERTY CONT	. IMMIGRATION	PRISONER PETITIONS	PROPERTY RIGHTS			
375 False Claims Act	110 Insurance	240 Torts to Land	462 Naturalization Application	Habeas Corpus:	820 Copyrights			
376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) 400 State Reapportionment	☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property TORTS	465 Other Immigration Actions TORTS PERSONAL PROPERTY	463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty	830 Patent 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application 840 Trademark			
410 Antitrust	150 Recovery of Overpayment &	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	370 Other Fraud	Other:	SOCIAL SECURITY			
430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/Etc. 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced & Corrupt Org. 480 Consumer Credit	Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Vet.)	315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander	371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damag Product Liability BANKRUPTCY	550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405 (g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405 (g))			
490 Cable/Sat TV	153 Recovery of	345 Marine Product	422 Appeal 28 USC 158	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	FEDERAL TAX SUITS			
850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts Matters 895 Freedom of Info.	Overpayment of Vet. Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Med Malpratice	423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Right 441 Voting 442 Employment	625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609			
Act	196 Franchise	365 Personal Injury- Product Liability	Accommodations	740 Railway Labor Act				
■ 896 Arbitration 899 Admin. Procedures Act/Review of Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	445 American with Disabilities- Employment 446 American with Disabilities-Other 448 Education	751 Family and Medical Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Employee Ret. Inc. Security Act				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Numbe SACV 19 - 02109 JVS (ADSx)								

CV-71 (05/17)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII. VENUE: Your answers to the questions below will determine the division of the Court to which this case will be initially assigned. This initial assignment is subject to change, in accordance with the Court's General Orders, upon review by the Court of your Complaint or Notice of Removal.

QUESTION A: Was this case removed from state court?	STATE CASE WAS PENDING IN	THE COUN	πyoe:	INMAL DI	/ISION IN CACD IS:	
Yes X No	Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, or S	A the second of the second	Western			
If "no, " skip to Question B. If "yes," check the box to the right that applies, enter the	☐ Orange	S	Southern			
corresponding division in response to Question E, below, and continue from there.	Riverside or San Bernardino	•			Eastern	
	I	划法 注				
QUESTION B: Is the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, a	B.1. Do 50% or more of the defendants who the district reside in Orange Co.?	YES. Your case will initially be assigned to the Southern Division. Enter "Southern" in response to Question E, below, and continue				
PLAINTIFF in this action?	check one of the boxes to the right		from there. NO. Continue to Question B.2.			
If "no, " skip to Question C. If "yes," answer Question B.1, at right.	B.2. Do 50% or more of the defendants who reside in the district reside in Riverside and/or San Bernardino Counties? (Consider the two counties together.)		YES. Your case will initially be assigned to the Eastern Division. Enter "Eastern" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there.			
	check one of the boxes to the right	NO. Your case will initially be assigned to the Western Division. Enter "Western" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there.				
QUESTION C: Is the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, a DEFENDANT in this action?	C.1. Do 50% or more of the plaintiffs who reside in the district reside in Orange Co.? check one of the boxes to the right		YES. Your case will initially be assigned to the Southern Division. Enter "Southern" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there.			
Yes No			NO. Continue to Question C.2.			
If "no, " skip to Question D. If "yes," answer Question C.1, at right.	Counties? (Consider the two counties together.) check one of the boxes to the right Counties? (Consider the two counties together.) Check one of the boxes to the right		YES. Your case will initially be assigned to the Eastern Division. Enter "Eastern" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there.			
			will initially be assigned to the Western Division. in response to Question E, below, and continue			
QUESTION D: Location of plaintiff	s and defendants?	Orar	tradition of the region to the first first the second	B. Riverside or San ernardino County	C. Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo County	
Indicate the location(s) in which 50% or reside. (Check up to two boxes, or leave	more of <i>plaintiffs who reside in this district</i> blank if none of these choices apply.)					
Indicate the location(s) in which 50% or district reside. (Check up to two boxes, c apply.)	more of defendants who reside in this or leave blank if none of these choices					
D.1. Is there at least one	answer in Column A?	D.2. Is there at least one answer in Column B?				
If "yes," your case will initially be assigned to the SOUTHERN DIVISION. Enter "Southern" in response to Question E, below, and continue from there.			If "yes," your case will initially be assigned to the EASTERN DIVISION. Enter "Eastern" in response to Question E, below.			
QUESTION E: Initial Division?			INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD			
Enter the initial division determined by 0	Question A, B, C, or D above:	SOUTHERN				
QUESTION F: Northern Counties?						
Do 50% or more of plaintiffs or defendar	nts in this district reside in Ventura, Santa	Barbara,	or San Luis Obispo o	ounties?	Yes 🗵 No	

CV-71 (05/17) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 3

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

IX(a). IDENTICAL CAS	SES: Has this act	ion been previously filed in this court?	⊠ NO	☐ YES			
If yes, list case num!	ber(s):						
IX(b). RELATED CASE	S: Is this case re	ated (as defined below) to any civil or criminal case(s) previously filed in th	is court?	☐ YES			
If yes, list case numb	ber(s):						
Civil cases are rel	lated when they	(check all that apply):					
A. Arise	from the same o	or a closely related transaction, happening, or event;					
B. Call f	or determination	of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or					
C. For a	other reasons wo	uld entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.					
Note: That cases	may involve the	same patent, trademark, or copyright is not, in itself, sufficient to deem case	es related.				
A civil forfeiture	case and a crim	inal case are related when they (check all that apply):					
A. Arise	from the same o	or a closely related transaction, happening, or event;					
☐ B. Call f	or determination	of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or					
	lve one or more heard by differe	defendants from the criminal case in common and would entail substantial nt judges.	duplication of				
neither replaces nor supp	(ies: The submiss plements the filing)	ion of this Civil Cover Sheet is required by Local Rule 3-1. This Form CV-71 and and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as pronstruction sheet (CV-071A).	and the informatio	n contained herein es of court. For			
Key to Statistical codes relat	ting to Social Secur	ity Cases:					
Nature of Suit Code	-	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action					
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Socinclude claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as provide (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))	ial Security Act, as a ers of services under	mended. Also, the program.			
862	BL All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)						
863	DIWC All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))						
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability undo amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))	er Title 2 of the Socia	l Security Act, as			
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed amended.	under Title 16 of the	Social Security Act, as			
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))	Security Act, as ame	ended.			

CV-71 (05/17)