THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Plaintiff

CIVIL ACTION NO. MJG - 11- 1483 VS.

LOMA INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS GROUP INC., et al.

Defendants

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

RI 3ODLQWLII¶V FODLPV The Court has conducted a bench trial ODQXHO \$OEDQ 30U \$OEDIQAIbaDQG /R against Defendants 3 0 U V \$OEDQ′ FROOHFWLYHO\ 3WK3H/R\$PODE'D ODVQ'G 6HUYLFLRV /DWLQR\$PHULFDQRV 'H 0DU\ODQG .1,QThe 36HUYL Court has heard the evidence presented , reviewed the exhibits, considered the materials submitted by the parties, and had th е benefit of the arguments of counsel. The Court now issues this Memorandum of Decision as its findings of fact and conclusions of law in compliance with Rule 52(a) of the Fe deral Rules of Civil Procedure

Defendant Marco Alban, having filed a Motion for Summary

Judgment resolved herewith, did not participate in the trial.

² ³In an action tried on the facts without a jury the court must find the facts specially and state its conclusions of law separ ately. The findings and conclusions may be stated on the record after the close of the evidence or may appear in an opinion or a memorandum of decision filed by the court. Judgment must be entered under Rule 58. Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(a) (1) .

The Court finds the facts stated herein based upon its evaluation of the evidence, includi ng the credibility of witnesses, and the inferences that the Court has found reasonable to draw from the evidence.

I. INTRODUCTION

knowingly violated Section 5

For some ten years, from 2001 to 2011 , Defendants Manuel

\$OEDQ 30U \$OEDQ DQG /ROD \$OEDQ 30UV \$OEDQ

3WKH \$OEDQbeing neither qualified nor accredited to do so,
operated an immigration business serving ± or in all too many
cases disserving ± Spanish - speaking customers. Furthermore, Mr.

Alban, on occasion, engaged in the unauthorized practice ± or
malpractice ± of law.

(a) of the Federal Trade Commission

FRO

On June 1, 2011, the United States Federal Trade Commission
3) 7 & '3 filed the instant suit alleging that the Defendants

\$FW 3)7& \$FW' 8 6 & † D E\ H[SUHVVO\ DQG LPSOLH misrepresenting to consumers that they were authorized immigration service providers, although they were not.

The FTC is a n independent agency of the United States

The FTC seeks to have the Court permanently e njoin the Defendants from violating § 5(a) of the FTC Act by engaging in unauthorized immigration services or any similar deceptive practice and seeks restitution in the amount of \$750,000. As discussed the Court finds that the FTC has established herein. the need for injunctive relief against the Albans However, the Court finds it necessary to conduct further proceedings to resolve remaining issue s relating to the equitable relief to be provided.

II. STATUTORYFRAMEWORK

Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade

&RPPLVVLRQ She WFTC3

\$FW' VWDWHV LQ SHUWLQHQW SDUW

- (a) Declaration of unlawfulness; power to prohibit unfair practices; inapplicability to foreign trade
 - (1) Unfair methods of competition in or affecting commerce, and unfair or deceptive acts or pra ctices in or affecting commerce, are hereby declared unlawful.
 - (2) The Commission is hereby empowered and directed to prevent persons, partnerships, or corporations, [with stated exceptions] from using unfair methods of competition in or affecting commerce and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce.

. . . .

DUP RI (O + HUDOGR ³/R P although the entity was not a corporation . The newspaper ceased operations in 2004.

n

Mr. Alban testified that in or about 2000, he attended a immigration semi nar and was told that he did not need to be an attorney to assist with filling out immigration forms but that he needed to apply to the Executive Office for Immigration Review to be an accredited representative.

In or about 2002 , Mr. Alban attended a tax preparation seminar and obtained authorization to prepare income tax returns. He provided the income tax preparation and filing VHUYLFHV XQGHU WKH ³/RPD ,QF ´QDPH

At about the same time, Mr. Alban began to provide drug and

alcohol counseling to members of the Hispanic community.

This
business was operated under the name

Servicios LatinoAmericanos

'H 0 D U \ O D Q G , Q F ´ D O W K R X J K D V Z L W K / R P D , Q F W K H Q I not then refer to an existing corporation.

In 2005, Mr. Alban prepared and signed incorporation papers

IRU FRUSRUDWLRQV WR EH QDPHG 3/RPD ,QWHUQDWLRQDO ,QF 8′ DQG 36HUYLFLRV /DWLQR\$PHULFDQRV 'H (InDU\ODQG ,Q 2007, the papers were filed and the corporations were formed.

Mr. Alban was identified as the sole director of both

FRUSRUDWLRQV 30¶V ([

B. The Immigration Service s Operation

The Albans testified that when they first began offering assistance with completing immigration forms, most of their

Regular cl asses were conducted by certified counselors, and a fee was charged per class. Mr. Alban took the courses for certification in drug and alcohol abuse counseling. M. Alban

Dep. 15:18 ± 3 O ¶ V ([

8 \$SSDUHQWO\ WKH QDPH 3/RPD , QF ´ZIĐ.V QRW DYDLODE

customers brought in their own forms

⁹ and they, purportedly,

customers, deposited the funds into a Servicios checking account, and then made payment to the Government by a Servicios The canceled check served as proof of receipt. The check. Albans stoppe d using the Servicios bank a ccount for this purpose in 2007.

The Albans did not operate their immigration business competently. While some customers fortunately obtained what they sought, many did not . Data from USCIS shows that of more than 600 immigrat ion applications capable of associat ion with Defendants, over 60 percent were denied or rejected. Strong

Some customers suffered severely for their reliance upon the Albans. Several of the Alban s ¶ customers were deported. One c ustomer who relied upon the Al bans ¶ advice was arrested and 12 Albans 13 jailed for almost 11 months. In 2007 and 2008, the settled two separate lawsuits brought by customers by signing finding s of fact acknowledging ineffective assistance with immigration applications. Nevertheless, the Albans continued to operate their immigration business, as before, until June 1, 2011.

¹² See *XHYHUD 5LYHUD 'HFO ^ 30 ¶ V ([

¹³ And Loma.

See 3 O ¶ V ([- Miguel Zelaya, et.al. v. Manuel Alban, et. -0012695 - 2007; 3 O ¶ V ([il Case No. 0101 - Santos Bacilia Guevara Rivers v. Manuel Alban, etc. al., Civil Case No. 0101 - 0004723 - 2008.

On June 1, 2011, the FTC filed the instant lawsuit, obtained an ex par te Temporary Restraining Order, appointment of a mo nitor , and permission to enter the Alban s¶ EXVLQHVV SUHPLVHV The Alban s¶ UHFRUGV ZHUH LQFRPSOHWH DQG and seize records. . Nevertheless, poorly organized t he monitor was able to some of the estimated 1,000 immigration identif y and contact customers 15 to provide assistance with any outstanding immigration requirements. By virtue of the lack of reliable and adequate financial records , the monitor retained a forensic

- (2) that was likely to mislead customers acting reasonably under the circumstances; and
- (3) the representation, omission, or practice was material.

FTC v. Tashman , 318 F.3d 1273, 1277 (11th Cir. 2003);

v. Gill , 265 F.3d 944, 950 (9th Cir. 2001) .

If the se three elements are proven, the FTC need not pro ve any intent to deceive , and were the Defendants able to prove good faith , 18 it would not provide a defense. FTC v. Patriot

Alcohol Testers, Inc. , 798 F. Supp. 851, 855 (D. Mass. 1992) ;

<u>) 7 & Y 9 H U L W \ , Q W ¶ Q443/ ₹V36</u> 48, 63 (2d Cir. 2006); <u>FTC v. Wor ld Travel Vacation Brokers, Inc.</u> , 861 F.2 d 1020, 1029 (7th Cir. 1988) .

To hold an individual liable for the deceptive acts or practices of a corporate entity, the FTC must establish that the individual had some knowledge of the unlawful conduct, and the individual participated in the acts or had a uthority to control the conduct . FTC v. Ross , 897 F. Supp. 2d 369, 384 (D. Md. FTC v. Amy Travel Serv., Inc. , 875 F.2d 564, 57 2012) (citing 3-74 (7th Cir. 1989)). The knowledge requirement may be fulfilled by showing actual knowledge of material misrepresentations or reckless indifference to the truth or fall sity of such

The Albans have not, however, proven good faith. Indeed the Court finds that Mr. Alban intentionally sought to mislead his customers as to his competence and authority and Mrs. Alban was, DW EHVW D ZLOOIXOO\ EOLQG HQDEOHU RI 0U \$OEDQ¶V G

misrepresentations . Id.

authorization to provide such a service, hence is suffic ient to support the finding that there was a represe ntation, omission, or practice.

The evidence includes many

Guevera Rivera Decl. 8 ^ 3O ¶V ([3, ZRXOG QHYHU KDYH XVHG 0U \$OEDQ¶V VHUYLFHV LI, KDG NQRZQ KH ZDV DWWRUQ.H\One customer testified

responding, 3+RZ FDQ, KHOS\RX"´WR WKH TXHVWLRQ 3,V WKDWRUQH\0DQXHO\$OED'Q¶3\\OR¶\\VL\F[H Nordid Mr.

Alban choose to inform a telephone caller stating, 3, DP interested in getting att RUQH\0DQXHO\$OEDQ¶V th\ath\Uh\ELFHV´ was not an attorney.

3O¶V ([6.4.

Mislead ing

The Court must consider whether a representation is likely to mislead a reasonable consumer by viewing the representation as a whole and focusing on the impression created, not its literal truth or falsity.

Patriot, 798 F. Supp. at 855.

3In evaluating a t endency or capacity to deceive, it is appropriate to look not at the most sophisticated, but the least sophisticated consumer.

FTC v. Five - Star Auto Club, Inc., 97

F. Supp. 2d 502, 532 (S.D.N.Y. 2000).

customer

UHOLHG RQ WKH 'HIHQGDQWV¶ PLVUHSUHVHQWDWLRQV RU representative sample of in jured consumers is sufficient.

Figgie _, 994 F.2d at 605. The FTC has provided adequate sampling evidence. For example, Ms. Guevara Rivera, Ms. Lovo, Mr.

Maddox, and Mr. Vasquez Montoya testified that they hired and paid Defendant Manuel Alban to help them with their immigration needs because Defendants represented that Mr. Alban was

The FTC did not have to prove that each individual

qualified to provide immigration services. See, e.g. 3 O \P V ([V 1, 3, 4, 50.

Even without this s ampling testimony, the Court finds that the Albans ¶ DQG /RPD¶V UHSUHVHQWDWLRQV ZHUH OLNHO\ WF reasonable consumer of the services provided to believe that the Albans and Loma were competent, qualified , and legal ly

The fact that some of the Alban s¶DQG/RPD¶V FXVWeRePHUV satisfied with the services they received does not provide a defense. Amy, 875 F.2d at 572. Indeed, there is no reason to doubt that these customers relied upon the Al bans¶ representations of competence, qualification and legal authority. Fortunately, they were not among the customers who suffer ed for their reliance.

3. Material ity

o provide such services.

authorized t

A material representation is one that involves information
that is important to consumers such that it is likely to affect
their decisions or actions.

Patriot, 798 F. Supp. at 855;

Cyberspace.Com LLC, 453 F.3d 1196, 1201 (9th Cir. 2006). Express
representations that are shown to be false are presumptively
material.

Patriot, 798 F. Supp. at 855.

The FTC has proven that the representations that the Albans and Loma were competent, qualified and legally authorized to provide the services at issue 3involves information that is important to consumers and , hence, likely to affect their cho ice of, or conduct regarding [the services] 'Kraft, Inc. v. F TC, 970 F.2d 311, 322 (7th Cir. 1992).

Although such evidence is not necessary , the FTC provided testimony of some customers that the 'HIHQGDQnWookes Tentations were material to their decidi ng to use WKH 'HIHQG Ds@rwleds.¶ Mr. Maddox, Ms. Guevara Rivera , Mr. Vasquez Montoya, and Ms. Lovo each testified that had they known that Manuel Alban was not authorized to provide immigration services, they would neither have sought nor paid for the services. 3 O ¶ V s(.[1, 3, 4,50 .

The Court finds that the FTC has proven the materiality element of the FTC Act § 5 violation.

4. Liability Conclusion

The Court finds that the FTC has prov en each of the elements necessary to hold the Albans and Loma liable under § 5 of the FTC Act.

The Albans personally violated the statu t e by their own individual actions. Loma, Inc. , acting through the Albans, also

1. Permanent Injunction

Permanent injunctive relief is appropriate when there is

3 some cognizable danger of recurring violation.

Calcalate and a series are positioned to commit future violations;

Ress, 897 F.

Ross, 897 F.

Ross, 897 F.

Supp. 2d at 387 (citing FTC v. Med. Billers Network, Inc. _____, 543

F. Supp. 2d 283, 323 (S.D.N.Y. 2008)(internal quotations

RPLWWHG 6RPHIDFWRUV WR FRQVLGHU LQFOXGH GH scienter; (2) whether the conduct was isolated or recurrent; (3)

whether defendants are positioned to commit future violations;

(4) GHJUHH RI FRQVXPHU KDUP GHIHQGDQWV¶ UHFRJQLV
FXOSDELOLW\ DQG VLQFHULW\ RI GHIHQGDQWV¶ DVVXUI
future violations. Id. The injunction must not unduly harm the

The Court finds that absent an injunction, the re is a realistic danger that the Albans will find and take a nother opportunity to mislead consumers , particularly those who speak Spanish and not English , in violation of § 5 of the FTC Act.

The FT C seeks, and may well be entitled to obtain, broad injunctive relief. However, the Court finds a need to hear further evidence and argument regarding the terms of the injunction to be issu ed. In particular, the Court wishes to consider providing injunctive relief regarding violations of § 5 of the FTC Act in addition to those only r elat ed to immigration services . 21

Restitution

Since the Court holds that a permanent injunction is warranted, restitution may be provided. To obtain restitution under Section 13(b) of the FTC Act, the FTC must prove consumer reliance.

Consumer reliance can be established by a representative sample of injured consumers or by a VKRZLQJWKDW ³ WKH bus iness entity made material misrepresentations likely to

For example, income tax preparation services. Indeed, the evidence at trial indicates that, while providing income tax return preparing services to the public, Mr. Alba n prepared and filed unreliable ± if not outright fraudulent ± income tax returns on behalf of himself and his corporations.

The FTC has the initial burden to show the amount of assets

subject to disgorgement. <u>FTC v. Washington</u> Data Res. , 856 F.

Supp. 2d 1247, 1279 (M.D. Fla. 2012) DII¶G VXE QFRE v.

Washington Data Res., Inc. , 704 F.3d 1323 (11th Cir. 2013). All

WKDW LV UHTXLUHG LV 3D UHDVRQDEOH DSSUR[LPDWLRQ R

ill - JRWWHQ JDLIQ.V The burden then shifts t o the

defendants to show WKDW WKH) 7 & ¶ V ILJXUHV DUH <u>LLQ</u>DFFXUDWH at 1281.

TKH 'HIHQGD Quadwind poorly organized files and

lack of adequate and reliable financial records ²² made it

impossible for the FTC to pr esent definitive evidence

establish ing precisely the ir revenue deri ved from the services

at issue. The FTC presented the testimony of Mr. Joseph

Dengler, a f ormer Internal Revenue Service Agent experienced in

the reconstruction of income from incomplete records. Mr.

Dengler u sed alternative methods ²³ WR HVWLPDWH WKH 'HIHQGDQWV

revenue received from the services at issue. He testified that

The Defendants had no internal accounting program or method for recording the amount of money received from ind ividual customers. Further, it appears that a substantial amount of the money received was in cash. Although the Albans report that Loma had its own bank account that should have been used to analyze bank deposits made during the period, there were no rec ords available for that bank account prior to 2008.

See 3 O ¶ V ([7 Z R G L I I H U H Q W P H W K R G R O R J L H V Z H U H estimate net revenues, each with two variables based on the bank account records found, the receipts that were found, a subset of 110 custo mer files from 2010, and information regarding fees charged as supplied by the Albans.

WKH 'HIHQGDQWV¶ UHYHQXH DWWULEXWHG WR WKH VHUYLF within a range from \$479,000
²⁴ to \$753,406 . ²⁵

The Court finds 0 U 'HQJOHU¶ttvmovtvyHtoVbe reliable and DGHTXDWH WR SURYLGH D 3 UHDVRQDEOH DSSUR[LPDWLRQ′ revenue and, therefore, shift s the burden to the Defendants to show that the estimated range is too high.

Washington Data Res.

Washington Data Res.

Defendants contend that the estimated range is too high
be cause the estimated fee per transaction was excessive, and
some clients did not pay the total fee charged.

26 Mr. Alban
testified that they charged \$25 per client in 2001, and they
increased the fee to \$50 in 2 004 and then to \$100 sometime

This figure

is derived from

estimation method #1, which is

based on deriving an average number of transactions per client of 4.79 based on the detailed review of 11 0 client files. i.e., \$100.00 constant fee per transaction x 4.79 transactions x 1000 clients = \$479,000.00. Using this same method with an average fee per transaction of \$129.67, calculated from evidence of fees charged over the years ranging from \$80.00 to \$200.00, results in an estimation of \$621,119.30, i.e., \$129.67 per transaction x 4.79 transactions x 1000 clients = $$621,119.\overline{30}$. This figure is derived from estimation method #2 ± using the actual Servicios checks written to USCIS between April 2001 and July 2007 to derive a number of transactions per year, and extrapolating that average forward to 2011 after the Albans stopped using Servicios to write checks to USCIS, and using an average per transaction fee of \$129.67 as in method #1. Mr. Alban testified that some clients also did not pay the due and that Loma would advance the fee on an entire USCIS fee understanding that it would be repaid. Not all clients repaid these advances.

around 200 7. ²⁷ Additional fees were also charged, but they were for other services such as translation or photographs and not for filling out the immigration forms. The Defendants estimate ± without support from any reliable documentation - that they received from the services at issue only about \$200,000 in total.

The reasonableness of an approximation varies depending on WKH LQIRUPDWLRQ DYDLODEOH EXW ³WKH ULVN RI XQFHUWIDOO RQ WKH ZURQJGRHUMed. Biller's Network , 543 F.

Supp. 2d at 324. As stated by other courts:

>: @ KHUH GHIHQGDQWV¶ UHFRUG NHHSLQJ KDV ³VR obscured matters that lawful gains cannot be distinguished from the unlawful without incurring inordinate expense, it is well within the distric WFRXUW¶V SRZHU WR UXOH

'HIHQGDQWV¶ UHFHLSWV IURP WKH VHUYLFHV DW LVVXH DU range of \$479,000 to \$75 3,406 . However, the amount of disgorgement to be ordered does not necessarily equate to the revenue derived from the services.

The Court, considering an equitable remedy, finds it

DSSURSULDWH WR WDNH LQWR DFFRXQW WKH 'HIHQGDQWV¶ financial circumstance s because disgorgement is designed to be remedial and not punitive.

See Febre, 128 F.3d at 537.

Moreover, it may be appropriate to consider the ultimate disposition

29 of any amount of disgorgement paid.

Therefore, the Court finds a need to he ar further evidence and argument regarding the amount of disgorgement to be required.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons , as stated more fully herein:

1. The Court finds Defendant Manuel E. Alban, Lola

- 2. The Court finds that a permanent injunction pursuant to § 13(b) of the FTC Act, 5 U.S.C. § 53(b), is appropriate.
- 3. The Court finds that the injunctive relief should include a restitution requirement .
- 4. The Court finds it necessary to conduct further proceedings related to the terms of the aforesaid permanent injunction and the amount of the aforesaid restitution requirement.

SO DECIDED on Wednesday, June 5, 201 3.

/s/____ Marvin J. Garbis United States District Judge