1		
2		OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT PROCEEDING
3		
4		FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
5		
6	MATTER NO.	R511003
7		
8	TITLE	FRANCHISE RULE ANPR MEETING
9		
10	DATE	RECORDED: JULY 29, 1997
11		TRANSCRIBED: AUGUST 11, 1997
12		
13	PAGES	1 THROUGH 32
14		
15		
16		FRANCHISE RULE ANPR MEETING
17		OPEN PUBLIC FORUM
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
		For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301) 870-8025

1	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION	
2	<u>index</u>	
3		
4	STATEMENT OF : PAGE :	
5	Dianne Mousley 3	
6	David W. Raymond, Esq. 18	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
	For The Record, Inc.	

Waldorf, Maryland (301) 870-8025

1	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
2	
3	In the Matter of:)
4	Franchise Rule ANPR) Matter No. R511003
5)
6)
7	
8	
9	The following transcript was produced from a live
10	tape provided to For The Record, Inc. on July 31, 1997.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	APPEARANCES:
17	
18	ON BEHALF OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION :
19	STEVEN TOPOROFF, ESQUIRE
20	Federal Trade Commission
21	Division of Marketing Practices
22	6th & Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
23	Washington, D.C.
24	(202)326-3135
	For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301) 870-8025

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	
3	MR. TOPOROFF: My name is Steve Toporoff. I'm
4	an attorney in the Division of Marketing Practices at the
5	Federal Trade Commission. It is July 29, 1997, and we're
б	meeting today in a open public forum to allow all
7	interested parties the opportunity to meet and discuss
8	issues involving the Commission's Franchise Rule, as well
9	as the Commission's Advance Notice of Proposed Rule
10	making that was published in the Federal Register this
11	past Friday this past February.
12	Today, we have one member of the public who
13	wishes to make a statement on the record, and I'd ask her
14	to introduce herself and to state her name for the record
15	and also to begin her statement, please.
16	MS. MOUSLEY: My name is Dianne Mousley and I
17	am a former franchisee with the Mike Schmidt's
18	Philadelphia Hoagies franchise, and they were a franchise
19	that was based in Treehouse (phonetic), Pennsylvania,
20	with about eight stores in the Philadelphia area.
21	Our my store was in Lancaster, Pennsylvania,
22	and we entered into an agreement with them three years
23	ago. So that would have been 1994, we signed an
24	agreement in March and opened our store in August of 1994
	For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301) 870-8025

and have had a series of setbacks with them right from
 the beginning.

3 The construction was done by a company that 4 they recommended. And they came in, helped us choose the 5 site where we were to be, and they came in, started 6 construction, were three-quarters of the way through the 7 construction -- now, this is with their company that had built all their other stores -- three-quarters of the way 8 through the construction, the building inspector came in 9 10 from the township and said, where's your building 11 permits. And they had not obtained any building permits 12 at all.

13 So there was a stop-work warrant until they could secure the proper permits. Then, the township made 14 15 them get a demolition permit, so they had to demolish 16 everything that they had built and start over again. So, 17 this put us behind in our schedule of about six weeks to two months. However, I had already signed a lease and 18 19 was paying for rent on this building or on this space and 20 was not able to open for business and was behind in two 21 months.

Therefore, the training that we were to receive was also pushed back, and we got maybe two weeks -- two to three weeks' worth of training which was done at my

> For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301) 870-8025

own home, very little training done at our site, because
 it was still under construction.

So when we opened -- now, this is a cheese 3 4 steak and hoagie franchise, a sandwich shop -- we did not 5 really have the proper training that we were told that we were going to have. And they -- they did supply us with 6 7 two people that came and worked with us. However -- and 8 they stayed for several weeks. However, they were going 9 to charge us their hourly rate, and we were to pay for 10 them to be there.

We disputed that, we had a dispute with our lawyer and their lawyer, and they finally agreed that they would pay for that cost since it -- the construction was delayed and we didn't get the proper training. Then

first time, they saw to it that he got there. They then began letting people go in their organization and hired one person who was to be in charge of training and running the franchise. He did come out and he seemed to know what he was doing.

6 He came out to see us maybe once a week or once 7 every other week and would sit down with our numbers, 8 help us figure out our profit and loss, show us all the 9 business aspect of the franchise, which we really had not 10 been trained in at all. We basically knew how to order 11 food, how to prepare the food and that was it.

But this person did seem to know what he was doing, and we were quite shocked when -- he was hired in February, and in August we got a notice out of the clear blue that said he had been let go, no reason why, no explanation as to what was going to happen next, he was gone. And then, right after that, the rest of their staff was gone. So, we had no support staff.

We had one memo that came out and said we've moved our offices. This is the new address, new phone number. We would call the phone number and we would get an answering machine. Then, several weeks later, it was now a new address and now we had a pager number, and we would try to page and no one would return the page.

> For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301) 870-8025

The only time we ever heard from them was when they wanted their royalty, which was six percent a month. And, we began withholding our royalty payments because we said, where are you? You know, what are you doing for us? There's no marketing. There's no contact with you. There's not even a phone number.

7 Well, that's not your concern. You signed an 8 agreement. You're to pay six percent royalty. We never 9 really promised you anything. And when you look at the 10 agreement, it is very nebulous as to what the franchisor 11 is responsible for.

So, we began withholding royalty, and, at that point, I started contacting the other franchisees just saying, you know, how are you guys doing? Because, whenever we did hear from the franchisor, where's your royalty, and we would say, where are you? Well all the other stores are doing great, what's your problem?

18 So, then I started calling the other stores, 19 and they weren't doing great. They were also withholding 20 royalty. They were on the verge of collapse. They were 21 in worse shape than I was. So we, the franchisees, got 22 together. I would say three or four of us became very 23 close. They came to Lancaster and met with me and my

> For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301) 870-8025

So he came into this meeting as well, and we confronted him at this point. Where is your support? Where are all the promises? When we bought this franchise from a salesman, they gave us a very nice, glossy, glitzy pamphlet of how this was going to be a great franchise opportunity.

7 It was not to be missed. It was different from 8 any other franchise because Mike Schmidt's name was 9 attached to it. And it was going to be kept, you know, 10 manageable and small enough that help was only going to 11 be a phone call away. And we said, where is -- where 12 are -- where's the follow up to all these promises?

And we were told that the President of the 13 franchise was running his own store, as well as trying to 14 15 be the franchisor because all the other people had been 16 let go. He told us he was now going to sell his store --17 or not even really sell it. He told us that the shopping center that his store was in wanted his space to expand 18 19 the grocery store. So he was getting out of his lease 20 and this was going to allow him time now to go out and 21 really be a franchisor and give us the support that we 2.2 needed.

23 So we basically said okay, that's what we're 24 going to expect. As soon as we start getting that help,

> For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301) 870-8025

them, present a plan as to how to pay these off and how we can turn things around, which we did. We contacted their lawyer. Well, their lawyer, every time we tried to contact them, you would get an answering machine and he does not return the calls, even to my lawyer. He does not return the calls. It goes for weeks and weeks before he returns the calls.

My lawyer left messages for him, sent a letter. 8 The day before our termination notice -- we were to be 9 10 terminated, we still had not heard from them. I called 11 my lawyer and I said, what -- what's going to happen 12 now? He said, I don't know what to tell you. I have 13 never seen anything like this, where a lawyer does not respond. 14

He said, tomorrow's the date that they gave you. He said, I guess you can expect to have a sheriff come in and padlock your door. And he said, certainly don't do anything. They don't really have the right to padlock your store, but I don't know what to tell you. Well then the next day, the lawyer did call and said, okay, we're now going to have someone else come in.

22 The President of the franchise was a young kid, 23 30 years old. At this point, he said, he will no longer 24 be involved. His father is now taking over and you will

> For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301) 870-8025

communicate only with the father. So the father then -it was decided the father would come out and sit down at our store with my husband and try and work out an equitable plan that we would pay part of the royalties until we saw that they were going to get their act together and give us the support that we needed.

7 So that happened. We started paying partially for the back royalties, but we still did not hear from 8 9 them, nothing. We would call. We would get -- a 10 secretary from the father's main business would answer 11 the phone. And we would call with questions about the 12 business, about preparing the food or ordering, and the 13 secretary would say, he doesn't know the answer to that. He knows nothing about the food business. 14

We could -- really couldn't get through to him and when we did finally get through to him, he would say, I don't know what to tell you. I know nothing about the food business, but they still wanted to collect their royalties. So again, we stopped paying. I'm still now in contact with the other franchisees, several others.

They are now -- it's now winter time, which is a very slow time to begin with. They're sliding deeper and deeper into debt. They're barely holding on. They're not meet -- able to meet their payroll. None of

them, at this point, were able to pay their rent. 1 Their 2 electric bills were in arrears. They were getting termination notices for phone bills and all kinds of 3 things, and they were still trying to hang on. 4 5 Yet, they were still being harassed for their 6 royalties. They were getting no contact, no help at all 7 with the franchisor. Finally, we just kept withholding royalties, as did the other ones, and finally, we said, 8 9 this is it. We're just not -- we're just not going to 10 pay anymore, and we then started the proceedings of 11 breaking off of the franchise agreement, which is --12 MR. RAYMOND: Somewhere in there you have a --13 you talk about the consultant they brought in. MS. MOUSLEY: Oh, right. 14 15 They did bring in a consultant. MR. RAYMOND: 16 MS. MOUSLEY: They did -- they did -- when we 17 had the first meeting with them, he said, okay, we're going to hire a food consultant to get us back on track 18 19 since he knew nothing about the food industry. And they 20 had someone come out and talk to us from the May

21 (phonetic) Association in Chicago. And, they were 22 thinking of hiring this firm to come in and help my store 23 and one other store. Those were the two that they 24 selected.

> For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301) 870-8025

1 The other stores that were failing, they 2 weren't even going to try and help. And this company was 3 going to charge an outrageous amount of money. I forget 4 what it was -- something -- several hundred dollars an 5 hour -- and, of course, they were going to charge us for 6 that.

7 When my husband sat down and met with the 8 father of this franchisor, my husband said to him, did 9 you get other estimates, other bids for any other 10 companies to come in, because it does seem like an 11 outrageous amount of money. And he said, no, that's a 12 good idea, maybe we should do that.

He said, do you have anyone in mind? And my husband had just been reading the <u>Philadelphia Magazine</u>, and there had been an article in there about a restaurant doctor. He said, I just read this article, maybe you should call him. And he says, oh, that's great. That's a great idea. Do you have a copy of that article?

19 So my husband went home, got the article, 20 brought it back, the franchisor called and did engage 21 this other organization. So that was through us. I 22 mean, we arranged all that for him. They came in. They 23 did -- they spent one full day with us. They went over 24 all of our numbers, everything. Basically told us, you

> For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland (301) 870-8025

1 know, what we needed to do to turn the business around,
2 how we were to get profitable, because we were -- we were
3 losing money. We were having to put money in of our own
4 to meet payroll, to pay the rent.

5 It was just every month, we were not even б breaking even, and we had no clue why, because no one had 7 taught us how to figure out the profit and loss and how to turn this around. So the restaurant consultant did 8 9 come out. Like I said, they spent one full day. They 10 gave us some basic ideas to raise prices, which we 11 thought all along, you know, we need to raise prices. 12 That's the key issue.

We've been in business two years and the prices

them to teach you how to reprogram your cash register,
 which is basically what we did.

We incurred that expense ourselves to learn how to reprogram it, to put the new prices in, which did help us then to start to turn things around. So, the food consultant then completed their contracted time, which was really a day, and that was it. Then the franchisor, of course, tried to collect the payment from us to pay for that food consultant who came in.

We did pay a little bit more of the royalties. We never did pay the full six percent after that because we didn't feel we were getting everything that we had been promised. So, at one point, we -- my brother even did come to the Federal Trade Commission and filed a complaint with the Federal Trade Commission as to their disclosure document.

And the FTC cited them, sent their lawyer a letter citing the different violations, and, of course, their lawyer then sent back a letter saying this is not true. And that's -- as far as I know, that's where it stands right now. The FTC has not really followed up again to pursue it any further.

23 We did come to an agreement then to end our 24 franchise agreement. We decided that we would -- with

the franchisor, decided that we would pay them \$5,000 and 1 2 that would -- that would end our relationship with them. 3 A termination document was written up. We signed the 4 document. The document was sent back to them the 5 beginning of June for them to sign. We still have not 6 received it. My lawyer has not received it. We still 7 don't know whether they've signed it. We've tried to call the franchisor's lawyer, no return phone calls. 8 9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: He did return the call. 10 MS. MOUSLEY: To you. 11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, to David. 12 MS. MOUSLEY: Oh, to -- finally, yeah --13 finally he did return -- two weeks ago, the lawyer returned my lawyer's phone call finally and said, oh 14 yeah, they did sign it, but I haven't had a secretary so 15 16 we haven't been able to get it sent out in the mail. As 17 of yesterday, we still have not received it. And I said to my lawyer, now what do we do? 18 19 I have to change my name. I have to 20 redecorate. I, you know -- I have to get on with my life 21 here, and they did cash the certified check because I 22 went to the bank and said, has the check been cashed? They said, yeah, the check was cashed several days after 23 24 it was drawn. So my lawyer's advice was, well, if they

cashed the check, then they've terminated the agreement.

1

2 The lawyer -- their lawyer claims that they've 3 signed the papers, but they're -- we still don't have 4 them. My lawyer doesn't have them and I don't have them. 5 So, that's where we stand at this point. All the other 6 stores are gone. Two of them went bankrupt. Several of 7 them just closed their doors and walked out. Their 8 things are still in there. They're in the process of 9 trying to sell off their equipment because they just couldn't make it. 10

11 There is one store in Emmaus right now that is 12 still operating as a Mike Schmidt's Philadelphia Hoagies. 13 No one knows what their relationship is or what's going 14 on. Are they paying royalties? Are they getting away 15 with not paying royalties? No one knows, but there is 16 one store that is still a Mike Schmidt's Philadelphia 17 Hoagies. The rest of us are gone.

And, to me, I mean, that's -- it's outrageous. It is absolutely outrageous and are they -- are they collecting royalties from this one store? The one store really has been ostracized by the rest of us. We sort of decided not to include her because she was at the

said, yeah, we're going to withhold our royalties along with everyone else, and then we found out that she went back and began paying them. So, I don't -- like I say, I don't know what's happening with her, but she's still trading with the Mike Schmidt's and she's the only one. So that's basically the story.

7 MR. TOPOROFF: If I might, this is Steve 8 Toporoff, just to make the record clear. I'm going to 9 ask you a question if I can. Based upon your experience, 10 is there any advice that you could give the Federal Trade 11 Commission as we look at our disclosure log?

12 MS. MOUSLEY: Mm-hmm.

MR. TOPOROFF: Which is basically thedisclosure document that you got.

15 MS. MOUSLEY: Mm-hmm.

16 MR. TOPOROFF: Is there any information that 17 the franchisor could have given you early on that would 18 have been helpful to you or would have put you in a 19 better position in terms of your experience in operating 20 the franchise?

21 MS. MOUSLEY: As far as the disclosure 22 document, they -- they basically were a young company and 23 they had, I would say, grandiose ideas as to what they 24 were going to do, and we sort of believed them. I don't

1 know how, in the disclosure document, they can, as an -2 as a young franchise, they can justify what they've done
3 or are going to do. I think it's difficult with a young
4 franchise as to what they can disclose.

5 MR. RAYMOND: They -- could you -- for the 6 record, I'm David Raymond. I'm a lawyer with Winston & 7 Strawn, but I'm also appearing here in a different 8 capacity. Dianne is not my client but my sister and I 9 was a minority investor in her franchise. So I have 10 lived through this experience as well.

11 In my review of the documents, it appeared to 12 me that this franchisor did comply with all the disclosure requirements. They were also careful to make 13 the statement that they were not making any earnings 14 15 representations, and that no one had any authority on 16 their behalf to make any earnings representations. So they -- they complied with the script letter of the FTC 17 franchise disclosure rule. 18

19

One problem, and the problem that we discussed

1 and the month after that.

24

And so the disclosure document represents the facts at a particular point in time and any franchisee who's looking at making a major investment will be considering that over some longer period of time. Now, Dianne did go out and talk to other franchisees before she signed her agreement. The other franchisees did the same thing.

9 But, because everybody had such a short period of experience, nobody was speaking from any significant 10 11 amount of experience. They could only talk about what 12 was happening for that short period of time, and so an awful lot of them had to make their decisions based on 13 these rosy projections of what the future was going to be 14 15 like, and the big part of that was the promises that they 16 were going to get support.

At the time Dianne signed her agreement, there was somewhat of an organization behind this franchisor. They had a small staff. They had enough people to send out to train Dianne's staff. And so there was a reason to believe that this was a start-up organization that had a good concept, and they also had a major sports celebrity behind them.

Now, we knew that he wasn't actively

participating, but you would expect anybody in that kind of stature and public image that have done some kind of due diligence before he allowed somebody to use his name. So you at least thought that the people that were behind the franchise were at least experienced businessmen, even if they weren't experienced franchisors.

And there were disclosures about everybody that was involved in the organization, but again, within the next several months, most of those people were no longer associated there. And so the snapshot in time the disclosure document represented when Dianne got the disclosure documents changed dramatically in a year and two months later.

And I can't say that they intended that to 14 15 I assume that they wanted this to be a success, happen. 16 too. But at some point in time, somebody decided not to 17 support it any longer when they started eliminating employees, closing down offices, moving offices and phone 18 19 numbers. At some point in time, somebody decided to no 20 longer support this, but they still kept calling the 21 franchisees every month asking for royalties.

And so it really became a contract dispute, which the FTC's Rule really doesn't address what happens after the relationship is entered into. And so that's

Because franchisees are, in some -- there are 1 2 some cases where you got major corporations that are 3 franchisees of big franchisors, but an awful lot of them 4 happen to be people like Dianne and her colleagues in 5 this franchise that are taking out loans on their homes, 6 home equity loans, that are taking out major loans maybe 7 from the SBA or from the bank, that represent a significant portion of their net worth. 8

And for those people, they're putting much more 9 10 of their own assets on the line and their financial 11 future on the line than somebody investing in a mutual 12 fund. And it seems to me that these kind of people ought to have as much protection in terms of disclosures as the 13 investor does. And, in that regard, by allowing 14 15 franchisors to say, we're not going to make any earnings 16 claims and nobody has any authority to make any earnings claims, I think is a disturbance to franchisees. 17

A mutual fund investor makes more disclosures than that. Now, true, they say past performance is not an indication of future performance, but you don't even get that with a franchisor. Most of them will say nothing about earnings. They say, it's up to you to check it out. Now if -- in a normal business relationship, that's true.

A major business making an investment decision 1 2 or a decision to make an acquisition or a decision to 3 enter into a joint venture, will do a lot of due 4 diligence. But you're talking about major corporations that have those kinds of resources available. You're 5 talking about people who have never run a business before б 7 who are putting their own net worth on the line and, 8 in many cases, making lifestyle changes as a result of

their contract or an amendment or at least bring the 1 2 prospective franchisee up to date about any changes that 3 may have occurred since they first received the 4 disclosure document? 5 MR. RAYMOND: Yes, it would. 6 MR. TOPOROFF: Um. 7 MS. MOUSLEY: Yeah, I agree with that. This is Dianne Mousley speaking again. I agree with that and I 8 9 agree that, even up to the day of signing, that you 10 should be given a statement as to what's happening and be 11 able, at that point, to walk away from the table and say 12 we're not going through with this. At several times I did threaten to not go 13 14 through with the franchise agreement when we began 15 having -- of course, I did sign in March and, during that 16 summer when they started doing construction and then 17 didn't have the building permits and we were way behind 18 schedule, at that point, I threatened to not go through 19 with opening the store, and was actually harassed by the 20 franchise salesman who sold us the franchise to begin 21 with.

He called me, I would say for one solid week, several times a day telling me it would be a big mistake for me not to go forward, that I was really going to

regret it. Someone else would come in here and open the hoagie shop, and they would be very successful, and would just be kicking myself the rest of my life that didn't take -- take advantage of this golden opportunity.

And it was -- it got to the point where it was harassment, and I finally said to him, do not call me anymore. And he just basically wouldn't let go, and I think that franchise salesmen is also a very integral part of the whole picture. They need to be governed in

1 basic disclosure document is met.

2 MR. RAYMOND: You know, big deal if you look at 3 their investment comparisons. People that sell securities have to be licensed and registered. To find 4 that these franchisors -- any businessman that decides he 5 6 wants to put together a franchise plan can put together 7 something, hire a broker to sell it, put out some ads and start selling with these kind of representations of a 8 9 rosy future. So I don't -- I don't know if there's any 10 11 possibility kind of looking at the securities regulations 12 as a model, but I think we got to look at this as a very 13 serious investment for a lot of people. It's not just a straight business transaction which is what -- the way 14 I think franchisors have been treated. These are 15 16 business --17 MR. TOPOROFF: Well, businesses --MR. RAYMOND: -- relationships between --18 19 MR. TOPOROFF: Sure. 20 MR. RAYMOND: -- two parties. But you got one 21 party, in many cases, that has many more resources and 2.2 knowledge, much more knowledge and sophistication than 23 the other party. 24 MR. TOPOROFF: This is Steve Toporoff again.

1 On the issue of a comparison between franchises and 2 securities, that's one that is brought to our attention a 3 number of times. And a key distinction is that 4 securities are regulated by statute, that there are any

To be honest with you, it is focused on disclosure issues because that's our primary concern, but that's not to say that we wouldn't entertain other ideas. And one of the proposals that has come back to us is by the Franchise Mediation Group, and I can provide you a copy of that if you're interested.

We are going to have two additional public -well, all told, we're going to have six workshop conferences. This is the first in the series. There is going to be one in New York City on September, I think it's the 17th and the 18th. And one of the issues that we'll be discussing there is that specific issue of --I -- of alternative law enforcement approach.

And in the proposal that was submitted, there are ideas for putting together some kind of alternative program and that's very much in its infancy. And I would suggest that if you have an interest in this subject matter, we're going to be discussing that issue in New York and then in November in Seattle.

I would encourage you to get involved and, you know, as, having gone through your experience, either directly as a franchisee or as somebody who's been involved a little bit on the side, but nonetheless, you might have very valuable information to offer. So I

1 would encourage you.

2 The only -- the only prerequisite for 3 participating in our public workshop conferences as a 4 participant at a round table discussion is that you 5 submit a comment and that you let us know. I think by 6 appearing today and giving your statement on the record, 7 you certainly have offered a comment. So you qualify as far as that is concerned. 8 9 MS. MOUSLEY: Mm-hmm. MR. TOPOROFF: So really, the only thing 10 11 that -- if you were interested in participating in that 12 event we would love to have you, I think you could make a valuable contribution. It's just a question of letting 13 us know, and I could provide you with that information 14 15 after we meet. 16 MS. MOUSLEY: Mm-hmm. 17 MR. TOPOROFF: I'm going to ask my colleague, 18 Carolyn Cox, if she had any questions at this point. 19 MS. COX: One thing that we were talking -interested in is how franchisees use their disclosure 20 21 documents and whether or not they consult outside parties 2.2 in their evaluation of the document in trying to determine if it's a feasible franchise system. So I was 23 24 just curious as to whether you had hired an attorney or

an accountant or anyone to kind of sit down with you, the
 disclosure document and evaluate the feasibility of a
 franchise system.

MS. MOUSLEY: Yes, we did do that. My brother took a look at it. We hired -- well, we did not hire, we had a financial analyst come in and look at it, and my lawyer also looked at it. And all of them I think basically felt that, well, this is a very young operation, their figures did not look real good.

10 But it was because they were several years old 11 and, you know, it takes a while to get rosy-looking 12 figures that -- and, like they kept saying when they were 13 giving us the sales pitch, this is a young company and, you know, we have a lot of expenses to get the business 14 up and running, so therefore, that's why the figures were 15 16 not great looking because they were still paying off the 17 initial debt of starting it.

And basically, that's what everyone came up with, that yes, you know, it's a young company so therefore, I guess, you're taking a risk as to getting involved in a young company, as any investment you're taking a risk. But when you're presented with a glitzy sales package and a very high-pressured, aggressive sales person that's harassing you on the phone saying, you

know, you're going to be very sorry if you don't do this, 1 2 you know, you start to -- like, when you look any 3 figures, they can -- thinking you can get the figures to 4 go on either side, you know. 5 MS. COX: Okay. That's helpful to know. 6 MR. TOPOROFF: Okay. Is there anything -- this 7 is Steve Toporoff. Is there anything that anybody else would like to say for the record? 8 9 MS. MOUSLEY: I think part of my concern is 10 that we did go through this process, and we did file a 11 complaint with the FTC, and the FTC responded. And I 12 just feel like -- at this point, their lawyer came back 13 and disputed it, which obviously is what you would expect, but I don't really know, is that as far as the 14 15 FTC is going to go with it? 16 MR. TOPOROFF: Could you -- okay. Just --17 (inaudible). MS. MOUSLEY: Okay. Is the FTC going to follow 18 19 up and check their lawyer's response and, you know, 20 respond to that? That's my concern at this point. I 21 just feel like we're more or less in a state of limbo 2.2 with the FTC. 23 MR. TOPOROFF: Well then that concludes this 24 meeting.

1	(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded.)
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	CERTIFICATION OF TYPIST
8	
9	MATTER NUMBER: <u>R511003</u>
10	CASE TITLE: FRANCHISE RULE ANPR MEETING
11	TAPING DATE: <u>7/29/97</u>
12	TRANSCRIPTION DATE: <u>8/6/97</u>
13	
14	I HEREBY CERTIFY that the transcript contained
15	herein is a full and accurate transcript of the tapes
16	transcribed by me on the above cause before the FEDERAL
17	TRADE COMMISSION to the best of my knowledge and belief.
18	
19	DATED: AUGUST 11, 1997
20	
21	
22	RUTH KERKER BLAIR
23	
24	CERTIFICATION OF PROOFREADER
	For The Record, Inc. Waldorf, Maryland

(301) 870-8025