1	FAYE CHEN BARNOUW (Calif. Bar No. 1686)	31)
2	RAYMOND E. McKOWN (Calif. Bar No. 1509) MARICELA SEGURA (Calif. Bar No. 225999)	<i>(</i> 5)
3	Federal Trade Commission 10877 Wilshire Bl <b>W</b> lelsh@usdoj.gov	
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12	Resident Counsel	
13		DICEDICE COURT
14		DISTRICT COURT OF NEVADA
15		
16	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,	
17	Plaintiff,	Case no. 2:08-cv-00620-PMP-PAL
18	v.	FTC'S OPENING BRIEF ON THE ISSUE OF DAMAGES
19	PUBLISHERS BUSINESS SERVICES, INC.,	
20	a corporation; ED DANTUMA ENTERPRISES, INC., a corporation, also dba	Evidentiary hearing Date: May 18, 2010
21	PUBLISHERS DIRECT SERVICES and PUBLISHERS BUSINESS SERVICES;	Time: 9:30 a.m. Place: Courtroom 7C
22	PERSIS DANTUMA; EDWARD DANTUMA; BRENDA DANTUMA	333 S. Las Vegas Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89101
23	SCHANG; DRIES DANTUMA; DIRK DANTUMA; AND JEFFREY DANTUMA,	
24	individually and as officers or managers of Publishers Business Services, Inc., or Ed	
25	Dantuma Enterprises, Inc.,	
26	Defendants.	
27		
28		

2 I. Section 13(b) of the FTC Act authorizes the Court to order full restitution against Defendants for their violations of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act	
3	restricted
II. equitable monetary relief awarded pursuant to Section 13(b) of the FTC Act is not represented the section of the FTC Act is not represented by the section of the FTC Act is not represented by the section of the FTC Act is not represented by the section of the FTC Act is not represented by the section of the FTC Act is not represented by the section of the FTC Act is not represented by the section of the FTC Act is not represented by the section of the FTC Act is not represented by the section of the FTC Act is not represented by the section of the FTC Act is not represented by the section of the FTC Act is not represented by the section of the FTC Act is not represented by the section of the FTC Act is not represented by the section of the FTC Act is not represented by the section of th	1
The FTC has met its burden of proof for showing that Defendants' net revenues "reasonably approximate" the amount of consumers' net losses	2
7 IV. The Court should reject Defendants' evidence as to "satisfied customers 32006 48290"	9600 TDt10S0.0000 T
8	
9   10	
13   14	
15	
16	
17	
18   19	
20	
21	
22   23	
24	
25	
26   27   27   27   27   27   27   27	
27   28	

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES FEDERAL CASES

CFTC v. Amer

	Case 2:08-cv-00620-PMP -GWF Document 154 Filed 04/20/10 Page 4 of 14
1	15 U.S.C. § 57b(e)
2	15 U.S.C. § 6102(c)
3	FEDERAL RULES
4	FRCP 26(a)(1)(A)(ii)
5	FRCP 37(c)(1)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li></ul>	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

in lieu of, any other remedy or right of action provided by State or Fede

<sup>3</sup> PBS does not consider consumers who complain by telephone to be "complaints":

Q: ... What about people who call in asking for[,] say John Marley, general manager[,] saying, ["]I don't know what this agreement form is. It's saying I owe \$717.60, but I never agree to that. Somebody lied to me.["] Do you consider a complaint like that, a call like that[,] a complaint?

A: I consider that a ["]problem.["] In other words, [what] a customer service rep needs to do is find out what the problem is with the accounts and solve that problem.

their defense that customers who paid for magazines were satisfied were documents entitled "First Payment Coupons" and their lists of new customer for a four-month period.<sup>5</sup>

The First Payment Coupon does not in fact attempt to elicit consumers' opinions on whether they are in fact satisfied customers. The first question, "1. How do you rate the way our representative presented your order?", is ambiguous since consumers have spoken to more than one representative by the time they receives the First Payment Coupon, and the question does not allow for a negative response (the only answers allowed are "Excellent," "Good," or "Fair"). The second question, "2. Were your magazines lists correctly on your order?", does not have even colorable relevance to the issue of whether consumers were satisfied customers. Moreover, as the Court noted in its Order, some of the First Payment Coupons included written complaints which show or suggest customer dissatisfaction. Doc. #151 at p.12, lns.18-25. Thus, the Court should conclude as a matter of law that Defendants' First Payment Coupons are insufficient to support Defendants' claim that they had satisfied customers.

The Court should likewise find that Defendants' "new customer" lists are insufficient as a matter of law to establish that Defendants had any satisfied customers. The Court found that Defendants' abusive collection tactics included threatening legal action or negative credit repercussions if the consumer failed to pay. In addition, consumer declarations show that at least some of the consumers who are on Defendants' "new customer" lists were extremely dissatisfied with Defendants' sales and collections tactics, and that these consumers paid money to PBS because they were either afraid that PBS would damage their credit if they didn't pay, or felt as though they had been tricked into a binding contract. *See* doc. #90 (FTC's undisputed fact #151); doc. #96 at p.410 (Campbell declaration ¶ 11); doc. #135-16 (Shepard declaration ¶ 2, 5). Thus, the Court should reject Defendants' proposed inference that the fact that a consumer paid money to PBS and is a current "customer" should somehow lead to the conclusion that the consumer is a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Defendants initially refused to produce this evidence to the FTC, and ultimately produced new customer lists covering a four-month period, only after the Court compelled their production. Pursuant to FRCP 37(c)(1), the Court should exclude any new evidence that Defendants attempt to introduce on this issue at the evidentiary hearing. If the Court allows Defendants to present new evidence, it should also allow the FTC to present new evidence, including on consumer injury for the period September 1, 2008 to date.

satisfied customer. To the contrary, given the Court's findings and the FTC's uncontroverted evidence which shows that consumers who paid money to PBS did so because PBS's collections tactics made them feel coerced to pay, the Court should infer that the typical paying consumer felt coerced into paying because of Defendants' deceptive and abusive collections tactics.

In short, Defendants' First Payment Coupons and new customer lists are not reliable and are insufficient to support Defendants' argument that consumers paid money to PBS because they were satisfied with Defendants' sales and collections tactics.

e they

Defendants' consumer victims should not be monetarily penalized for expenses incurred by 1 Defendants and over which the consumers had no control. 2 VI. 3 THE COURT SHOULD HOLD EACH OF THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS JOINTLY AND SEVERALLY LIABLE FOR THE FULL AMOUNT OF RESTITUTION 4 In ordering equitable monetary relief under Section 13(b), the Court may hold individual 5 corporate officers and owners personally liable for the monetary relief if the individuals: 6 had knowledge that the corporation or one of its agents engaged in dishonest or fraudulent conduct, that the misrepresentations were the type upon which a 7 reasonable and prudent person would rely, and that consumer injury resulted. 8 FTC v. Affordable Media, LLC, 179 F.3d 1228, 1234 (9th Cir. 1999) (citing FTC v. Publishing 9 Clearing House, Inc., 104 F.3d 1168, 1171 (9th Cir. 1997)). The knowledge requirement can be 10 satisfied if: 11 the individuals had actual knowledge of material misrepresentations, [were] recklessly indifferent to the truth or falsity of a misrepresentation, or had awareness 12 of a high probability of fraud along with an intentional avoidance of the truth. 13 *Id.* Accordingly, an individual may be held personally liable for restitution without a showing of 14 an actual intent to defraud consumers. Id. 15 Among the factors that courts have considered in determining whether an individual 16 defendant had knowledge of the underlying corporate fraud are the individual's active role in 17 developing deceptive materials used to market to consumers, such as telemarketing scripts, and 18 responsibility for corporate financial matters. See, e.g., FTC v. Cyberspace.com, LLC, 2002 U.S. 19 Dist LEXIS 25565 at \*17-19, 2003-1 Trade Cas. (CCH) ¶ 73,960 (W.D. Wash. 2002), aff'd, 453 20 F.3d 1196 (@m87@it72;006); FTC v. Amy Travel, 875 F.2d 564, 574 (8th Cir. 1989) (telemarketing 21 scripts); FTC v. Am. Standard Credit Sys., 874 F. Supp. 1080, 1089 (C.D. Cal. 1994) (developing 22 deltal F.3dvHalfaCredit 23 24 25 26 27 28

should make the additional findings that: (1) consumer injury has resulted; and (2) each individual Defendant (Edward Dantuma, Persis Dantuma, Brenda Dantuma Schang, Dirk Dantuma, Jeffrey Dantuma, and Dries Dantuma) had actual knowledge of material misrepresentations, was recklessly indifferent to the truth or falsity of a misrepresentation, or had awareness of a high probability of fraud along with an intentional avoidance of the truth. Based on these findings and the Court's previous findings that (1) PBS's sales and collections tactics violated Section 5 of the FTC Act and four provisions of the FTC's TSR; and (2) the misrepresentations are the type upon which a reasonable and prudent person would rely, the Court should hold each of the individual Defendants personally liable for monetary relief.

Further, the Court should find that the Defendants acted as a "common enterprise." *See* discussion at Sections II.H. and III.D of doc. #88. Based on the Court's findings that Defendants acted as a common enterprise in engaging in the acts and practices that violate Section 5(a) of the FTC Act and the TSR, the Court should hold each of the defendants jointly and severally liable with the Corporate Defendants for the monetary judgment.

VII. THE FTC REQUESTS THAT THE COURT ORDER ANCILLARY RELIEF TO FACILITATE ADMINISTRATION BY THE FTC OF ANY MONETARY RELIEF AWARDED

Section VIII of the proposed final judgment lodged by the FTC in connection with its summary judgment motion set forth various ancillary equitable provisions designed to assist and provide guidance to the FTC in administering the requested monetary relief. *See* doc. #109. The FTC respectfully requests that the Court include the following sections of doc. #109 with any monetary relief it awards: Sections VIII.B. (allowing for creation of restitution fund), VIII.C. (requiring Defendants to produce customer information to FTC, to facilitate administration of a restitution program), VIII.D. (providing for accrual of interest on unpaid balance of monetary award), and VIII.E (disclosing Defendants' taxpayer identifying numbers to FTC to facilitate collecting and reporting on delinquent amounts).

Dated: April 20, 2010

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Faye Chen Barnouw
FAYE CHEN BARNOUW
RAYMOND E. MCKOWN
MARICELA SEGURA
Attorneys for Plaintiff FTC