

The Honorable Thomas S. Zilly

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

9125-8954 QUEBEC INC., D.B.A. GLOBAL
MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS, a Canadian
corporation;
9125-8947 QUEBEC INC., D.B.A.
COMMUTEL MARKETING, and D.B.A.
MARKETING US*ti*

ons and
Commutel Marketing/Marketing USA;
CORY KORNELSON, individually and as a
director or officer of Global Management
Solutions;
BYRON STECZKO, individually and as a
director or officer of Commutel
Marketing/Marketing USA;
PHONG ANH VO, individually and as a
director or officer of Commutel
Marketing/Marketing USA;
y and as a
director or officer of American Business
Solutions; and
MINH TAM VO, individually and as a director
or officer of American Business Solutions,

Defen

(“FTC Act”), 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), filed its Complaint for

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
915 Second Ave., Su. 2896
Seattle, Washington 98174
(206) 220-6350

1 Injunctive and Other Equitable Relief, including consumer redress, alleging that defendants 9125-
2 8954 Quebec Inc., d.b.a. Global Management Solutions; 9125-8947 Quebec Inc., d.b.a.
3 Commutel Marketing and Marketing USA; 6050808 Canada Inc., d.b.a. American Business
4 Solutions; Ty Nguyen, a.k.a. Hiep Manh Nguyen; Cory Kornelson; Byron Steczko; Kelly Nguyen,
5 a.k.a. Phu Minh Huy Nguyen, and Minh Tam Vo engaged in deceptive acts and practices in
6 connection with telemarketing business directories and/or listings in business directories to U.S.
7 consumers, in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a). The Commission later
8 filed an Amended Complaint adding Phong Anh Vo as a defendant.

9 The Co
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 *amended by Pub. L. 104-121, 110 Stat. 847, 863-64 (1996), and all rights to seek judicial review*
2 *or otherwise to challenge the validity of this Order. r2*

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 for goods or services offered for sale or sold by the corporate defendants.

2 E. “Defendant” means Byron Steczko.

3 F. “Document” is synonymous in meaning and equal in scope to the usage of the
4 term in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34(a), and includes writings, drawings, graphs, charts,
5 photographs, audio and video recordings, computer records, and other data compilations from
6 which information can be obtained and translated, if necessary, through detection devices into
7 reasonably usable form. A draft or non-identical copy is a separate document within the meaning
8 of the term.

9 G. “Material” means likely to affect a person’s choice of, or conduct regarding, goods
10 or services.

11 H. “Person” means any natural person and any organization or other legal entity,
12 including a corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship, limited liability company, association,
13 cooperative, government agency, or any other group or combination acting as an entity.

14 I.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1

2

3

1 judgment shall be deemed a payment of any fine, penalty or punitive assessment. Defendant
2 agrees that the facts as alleged in the Complaint filed in this action shall be taken as true for
3 purposes of any subsequent proceedings to enforce payment required by this Section.
4

5 that, by agreeing to this Order, defendant reaffirms and
6 attests to the truthfulness, accuracy, and completeness of the financial disclosure form (“financial
7 statement”), executed on March 8, 2005, provided to the Commission. Plaintiff’s agreement to
8 this Order is expressed

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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
27
28

