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

1. The FTC brings this action under Sections 13(b) and 9 of the Federal Trade Commission Act ("FTC Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 536) 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, e c Tolon, (teo)ant tr nota to 2000 in 6000

4.j 6.36 -rj 6.(T)' 08.52400D0000 TD (she 0200 0 TD (t)T

reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, and the disgorgement of ill-gotten monies. 15 U.S.C. §§ 53(b), 56(a)(2)(A)-(B), 57b, 6102(c), and 6105(b). **DEFENDANTS** 6. Defendant U.S. Homeowners Relief, Inc., having also done business as Greenle of Modify and Greenle of ("U.S. Homeowners"), is a California ("O.S. Homeo corporatio

controlled, had the authority to control, or participated in the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. DefendantSarpas esides in and transacts or hastransacted business in this District and throughout the United States.

15. Defendant Damon Grant Carriger ("Carriger") is an officer, owner and/or principal of Defendants DGC and DLD. At times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, he has formulated, directed, controlled, had he authority to control, or participated in the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. DefendantCarriger resides in andtransacts or has transacted business in this District and throughout the United States.

COMMON ENTERPRISE

16. Defendants U.S. Homeowners Waypoint, American Lending, New Life, DGC, and DLD (collectively, "Corporate Defendants") have operated as a common enterprise while engaging in the deceptve acts and practices alleged below. They have conduted these practices through a network of interrelated companies that have common ownership, officers, business functions, and office locations and have commingled their funds. Because the Corporate Defendants have operated as a common enterprise, each of them is jointly and severally liable for the acts and practices alleged below. Defendants Paul Bain, Macie Bain, Sarpas, and Carriger (collectively, "Individual Defendants") have formulated, directed, controlled, had the authority to control, or participated in, the acts and practices of the Corporate Defendants that constitute the common enterprise. The Individual Defendants also engaged the common enterprise by doing businessas Liberty Lending Review and US Financial Solutions (Paul Bain), New Life (Sarpas, prior to incorporation of New Life), and US Mortgage Solutions and Home Relief Center (Macie Bain).

26

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

COMM ERCE

2 17.

behind in their mortgage payments or in danger of losing their homes to foreclosure.

21. Defendants have ergaged in telemarketing by participating in plans, programs, or campaigns conducted to induce the purchase of goodsor services by use of one or more telephones and which involve more than one interstate telephone call. Defendants' telemarketing activities include initiating calls to customers, or having others initiate calls to customers, to induce the purchase of mortgage loan modification and foreclosure relef services. Defendants also engage in telemarketing by mailing, or causing others to mail, flyers delivered by U.S. mail that invite consumers to contact the Defendants by telephone or via Defendants' websites. The flyers that invite consumers to contact the Defendants by telephone do not disclose the total costs to purchase, receive, or use Defendants' services.

Purported Loan Modification and Foredosure Relief Services

- 22. Defendants deceive consumers into spending hundreds or thousands of dollars on their purported loan modification services.
- 23. Defendants' advertising promotes their ability to modify mortgage loans and help consumers avoid foreclosure. For example, Defendants' radio advertisements represented that Defendants could provide "a very attractive mortgage modification that will keepyou in your home that you have worked so hard for." Defendants' websites represent that the companies' loan modification services can reduce monthly payments, interest, and principal, and prevent foreclosure. These websites also promise to "work with your lender, exploring options that will provide a satisfactory conclusion for all parties involved." Defendants represent that their expertise and esablished reationships with I

1	example, under the heading, "2009-A SPECIAL RELIEF ADVISORY," about standers	(1737) (1737) (1737) (1 737)
2	Defendants' mailers asked consumers, "Are you in a seed of lower a house pain ments	
3	and a beter interest rate?' The mailer claim et and a beter interest rate?' The mailer claim et and a beter interest rate?')k
4	"designed to keeloitehe mai6.ess2000(00000000000000000000000000000000	0 5(a).TG 0 6(p)
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

- iv. Defendants' relationships with "all major lending institutions" have 'saved our clients millions of dolars in successful loan modifications."
- b. Telemarketers have stated that Defendants' success rate for providing desired loan modifications is 90% or higher.
- c. Defendants use testimonials on their websites and in documents they provide to consumers in which purported customers claim that Defendants reduced their monthly payments by bwering their loan interest rates, their loan principals, or both.
- 27. Before Defendants render any service, they charge consumers fees ranging from \$835 to \$4,250 for their purported loan modification and forecobsure rightness rs its infinite or their purported loan modification and forecobsure rs its infinite or their purported loan modification and forecobsure rs its infinite or their purported loan modification and forecobsure rs its infinite or their purported loan modification and forecobsure rs its infinite purported loan modification and forecobsure results in the purported loan modification and forecobsure r

respond to calls or emails from the consumers who paid their fees. In some instances, Defendants have disconnected the telephone numbers they had proided to these consumers. On several occasions, Defendants changed the name of their businessand continued the same businessunder adifferent name.

False Government Affiliation Claims

31. Some of Defendants' advertising bolsters their credibility by claiming affiliation with a government entity. These claims are nade in Defendants' telemarketing, in television ads, and the mitter as

35. Along with Defendants U.S. Homeowners and Sarpas, Paul Bain is a co-owner of the fictitious businessnames Greenleaf and Greenleaf Modify, which were used by U.S. Homeowners. Paul Bain is also (i)Tj2s00 0.00 TD a

- 42. She is the domain name registrant and/or payor for website services used by Defendants Waypoint and New Life.
- 43. Macie M. Bain owns the assumed business names US Mortgage Solutions, which has been used as a d/b/a of Defendant DGC Consulting, and Home Relief Center.
- 44. Macie M. Bain is jointly and severally liable for the conduct of the corporate defendants because she has the authority to control and direct the companies' activities; has participated in those activities; and has knowledge of the companies' misrepresentations and other misconduct.

Sarpas's Role

45. Sarpas is Chief Financial Noel Schrite a aerterao eciac aancia'a Faine acceient era teroo e (netha)

Carriger's Role

- 49. Carriger is the President and/or Member of Defendants DGC and DLD. He has acted as a sales representative for U.S. Homeowners and Waypoint. Through DLD, Carriger has received consumer payments solicited by Defendant American Lending d/b/a American Law Center and Defendant DGC d/b/a US Mortgage Solutions.
- 50. Carriger is jointly and severally liable for the conduct of the corporate defendants because he has the authority to control and direct the companies' activities; has participated in those activities; and has knowledge of the companies' misrepresentations and other misconduct.

VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 5 OF THE FTC ACT

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

COUNT I

Falseor Misleading Claims Regarding Loan Modification Services

53. In numerous instances, in connection with the advertising, marketing, promotion, offering for sale, or sale of mortgage loan modification services, Defendants have represente

61. Therefore, Defendants' representation as set forth in Paragraph 59 is false and misleading and constitutes a deceptive act or practice in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

THE TELEM ARKETING SALES RULE

- 62. Congress directed the FTC to prescribe rules prohibiting abusive and deceptive telemarketing acts or practices pursuant to the Telemarketing Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 61016108,in 1994. The FTC adopted the original Telemarketing Sales Rule in 1995, extensively amended it in 2003, and amended certain sections thereafter.
- 63. Defendants are "seller[s]" or "telemarketer[s]" engaged in "telemarketing" as those terms are defined in the TSR, 16 C.F.R. § 310.2(z), (bb), and (cc)
- 64. The TSR prohibits sellers and telemarketers from misrepresenting, directly or by implication, in the sale of goodsor services, any of the following material information:
- a. Any material aspect of the performance, efficacy, nature, or central characteristics of goods or services that are the subject of a sales offer, 16 C.F.R. § 310.3(a)(2)(iii);
- b. A seller's or telemarketer's affiliation with, or endorsement or sponsorship by, any person or government entity, 16 C.F.R. § 3103(a)(2)(vii); and
- c. Any material aspect of the nature or terms of the seller's refund, cancellation, exchangeor repurchase policies, 16 C.F.R. § 310.3(a)(2)(iv).
- 65. 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).

CONSUMER INJURY

72. Consumers have affered andwill confinue 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

- 73. 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. The 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.
- 74. Section 19 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 57b, and Section 6(b) of the 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 rescission and reformation of contracts, and the refund of money.

1	b.	. Enter a permanent injunction to prevent future violations of the					
2	FTC Act and the TSR by Defendants;						
3	C.	Award such reilef asth	e Court finds necessary to redres injury				
4	to consumers resulting from Defendants' violations of the FTC Act and the TSR,						
5	including butnot limited to rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the						
6	refund of monies paid, and the disgorgement of ill-gotten monies; and						
7	d.	Award Plaintiff the costs of bringing this ætion, aswell assuch					
8	other and additional relief as the Court may determine to be just and proper.						
9							
10	Dated this 27 th da	y of September, 2010.	Respectfully submitted,				
11			WILLARD K. TOM				
12			Geneal Counsel ROBERT J. SCHROEDER Regional Director				
13			Regiona Director				
14			MAXINE R. STANSELL				
15			JENNIFER LARABEE				
16			Attorneysfor Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission				
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
	i						