Peggy Hunt (Utah State Bar No. 6060) Chris Martinez (Utah State Bar No. 11152) Jeffrey M. Armington (Utah State Bar No. 14050)

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

136 South Main Street, Suite 1000 Salt Lake City, UT 84101-1685

Telephone: (801) 933-7360 Facsimile: (801) 933-7373

Email: hunt.peggy@dorsey.com

martinez.chris@dorsey.com armington.jeff@dorsey.com

Attorneys for Court-Appointed Receiver R. Wayne Klein

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH CENTRAL DIVISION

R. WAYNE KLEIN, as Receiver,	
Plaintiff, v.	COMPLAINT
AMIN HAQ, and JOHN DOES NOS. 1-5, Defendants.	(Ancillary to Case No. 2:12-cv-00591) Civil No

R. Wayne Klein, the Court-Appointed Receiver (the "Receiver" or "Plaintiff") of National Note of Utah, LC ("National Note"), its subsidiaries and affiliates (collectively, unless otherwise stated, National Note and all subsidiaries and affiliated entities are referred to herein as "NNU"), and the assets of Wayne LaMar Palmer ("Palmer"), in the case styled as Securities and Exchange Commission v. National Note of Utah, LC et al., Case No. 2:12-cv-00591 (D. Utah) (Jenkins, J.) (the "SEC Civil Enforcement Case"), hereby files this Complaint against Amin Haq ("Haq") and John Does Nos. 1-5 ("Defendant Does") (collectively, "Defendants") and states,

alleges and avers as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. NNU was operated as an enterprise with all of the characteristics of a Ponzi scheme through which money was solicited from investors. Upon information and belief, Haq was paid a commission by NNU for successfully soliciting others to invest in NNU. The Receiver seeks to avoid the commission payments and/or recover the value of the commission payments from Defendants for the benefit of the receivership estate established in the SEC Civil Enforcement Case discussed in greater detail below.

PARTIES

- 2. Pursuant to an Order Appointing Receiver and Staying Litigation entered on June 25, 2012 in the SEC Civil Enforcement Case (the "Receivership Order"),² Plaintiff is the duly-appointed Receiver for National Note and Palmer "together with any and all subsidiaries and affiliated entities of National Note and Palmer. . . ."³
- 3. Upon information and belief, Haq is a resident of or is domiciled in in the State of Washington.
- 4. Upon information and belief, Defendant Does are currently unknown parties who have received commissions or remuneration for bringing investors to NNU, or are persons to whom Haq has transferred monies received from NNU.

¹ See SEC Civil Enforcement Case, Docket No. 1 (Complaint).

² SEC Civil Enforcement Case, Docket No. 9.

³ *Id.* (Receivership Order, pp. 1-2).

JURSIDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. Subject matter jurisdiction is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.
- 6. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants.
- 7. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 754.

FACTS

The Ponzi Scheme

- 8. Since at least 1994 until the commencement of the SEC Civil Enforcement Case, NNU raised capital by soliciting investors to purchase promissory notes, which typically promised to pay interest at a rate of interest above market rates.
- 9. Upon information and belief, investors understood that they were investing in an enterprise that, among other things, bought and sold mortgage notes, underwrote and made loans, or bought and sold real estate assets through National Note, or one of many affiliated entities subject to the Receivership Order, all of which are referred to herein collectively as "NNU."
- 10. Typically, investment funds were deposited in a commingled bank account controlled by NNU. NNU would then transfer such investor funds to another bank account (the "Investor Account").
- 11. Monies on deposit in the Investor Account were commingled, and transfers to investors by NNU were made from the commingled funds on deposit in that Investor Account.
 - 12. NNU paid monies to persons for bringing investors to NNU.
 - 13. At all times relevant hereto, NNU was insolvent.

The Commission Payments to the Defendant

14. NNU transferred a total of \$10,000 to Haq which, upon information and belief, were commissions or remuneration for bringing investors to NNU (the "<u>Commissions</u>").

The SEC Civil Case and the Receiver's Appointment

- 15. On June 25, 2012, the SEC Civil Enforcement Case was filed, alleging that NNU is a Ponzi scheme, and seeking, among other things, orders (a) restraining and enjoining NNU and Palmer from continuing to violate federal securities laws, (b) freezing assets and prohibiting NNU from transferring, changing, wasting, dissipating, converting, concealing, or otherwise disposing of assets, (c) prohibiting NNU from destroying, mutilating, concealing, transferring, altering, or otherwise disposing of NNU's books and records, (d) imposing civil money penalties against NNU and Palmer, and (e) requiring the disgorgement by NNU and Palmer of all ill-gotten gains received by them pursuant to the scheme.⁴
- Action, the Court entered a Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause against the defendants⁵ and the Receivership Order appointing the Receiver.⁶ Since that time, both National Note and Palmer have stipulated to a Preliminary Injunction Order that prohibits National Note and Palmer from committing any further acts in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme and that prohibits National Note and Palmer from withdrawing, transferring, selling, buying, pledging,

4844-3295-4644\1

⁴ SEC Civil Enforcement Case, Docket No. 1 (Complaint).

⁵ *Id.*, Docket No. 7.

⁶ *Id.*, Docket No. 9.

encumbering, assigning, dissipating, concealing, or otherwise disposing of any of their assets.⁷

17. On or about May 21, 2013, the Court entered an Order authorizing the Receiver to commence legal proceedings for the benefit of and on behalf of the receivership estate.⁸

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Avoidance of Fraudulent Transfers Under Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-5(1)(a) and 25-6-8)

- 18. The Receiver realleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
- 19. NNU was engaged in an enterprise with all of the characteristics of a Ponzi scheme.
 - 20. NNU paid the Commissions to Haq in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
 - 21. At all relevant times hereto, NNU had at least one creditor.
- 22. The Commissions were made and any obligations to Haq incurred with actual intent to hinder, delay or defraud a creditor of NNU.
- 23. Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-5(1)(a) and 25-6-8, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Commissions paid to Haq or, in the event such Commissions were transferred, from the Defendant Does.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Avoidance of Fraudulent Transfers Under Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-5(1)(b) and 25-6-8)

- 24. The Receiver realleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
 - 25. NNU was engaged in an enterprise that has all of the characteristics of a Ponzi

⁷ *Id.*, Docket Nos. 45 and 46.

⁸ *Id.*, Docket No. 315.

scheme.

- 26. NNU paid the Commissions to Defendant in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
- 27. At all relevant times hereto, NNU had at least one creditor.
- 28. The Commissions were paid or the obligations to Haq were incurred by NNU without receiving a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the Commissions or obligations.
- 29. At the time the Commissions were paid, NNU (a) was engaged or was about to be engaged in a business or transaction for which the remaining assets of NNU were unreasonably small in relation to the business or transaction; or (b) intended to incur, or believed or reasonably should have believed that it would incur, debts beyond its ability to pay as such debts became due.
- 30. Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-5(1)(b) and 25-6-8, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Commissions paid to Haq or, in the event such Commissions were transferred, from the Defendant Does.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Avoidance of Fraudulent Transfers Under Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-6(1) and 25-6-8)

- 31. The Receiver realleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
 - 32. NNU was engaged in a Ponzi scheme.
 - 33. NNU paid the Commissions to the Haq in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
- 34. NNU had at least one creditor at the time that the Commissions were made or the obligations to Haq were incurred.
 - 35. The Commissions were paid or the obligation to Haq was incurred by NNU

without NNU receiving a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the Commissions or obligation.

- 36. NNU was insolvent at the time the Commissions were paid or the obligation was incurred, or became insolvent as a result of the Commissions or the obligation incurred.
- 37. Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-6(1) and 25-6-8, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Transfers to Haq or, in the event such Commissions were transferred, from the Defendant Does.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Constructive Trust)

- 38. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
- 39. The Commissions paid were comprised of property of NNU and were made by NNU in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
- 40. Allowing Defendants to retain the Commissions would unjustly enrich Defendants and would be inequitable.
 - 41. The Commissions can be traced to wrongful behavior.
 - 42. An injustice would result if Defendants were allowed to keep the Commissions.
- 43. A constructive trust for the benefit of the receivership estate must be imposed for the benefit of the receivership estate in the amount of the Commissions paid by NNU to Defendants.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Unjust Enrichment)

44. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the

preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.

- 45. The Commissions were comprised of property of NNU and were made by NNU in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
 - 46. The Commissions conferred a benefit upon Defendants.
 - 47. The Defendants knowingly benefitted from the Commissions.
- 48. Allowing Defendants to retain the Commissions would unjustly enrich Defendants and would be inequitable.
- 49. Absent return of the Commissions, the receivership estate will be damaged by Defendants' unjust enrichment and may have no adequate remedy at law.
 - 50. Defendants must disgorge the amount of the Commissions.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Disgorgement)

- 51. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
 - 52. The Commissions were paid as part of and in furtherance of a Ponzi scheme.
 - 53. The Commissions were ill-gotten by Defendants.
- 54. Defendants have no claim to the Commission paid by NNU, or derivatively, from NNU's investors.
- 55. All Commissions should be disgorged to the Receiver for the benefit of the receivership estate.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Receiver prays for Judgment against Defendants as follows:

- A. Pursuant to the Receiver's First Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendants avoiding the Commissions under Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-5(a)(1) and 25-6-8, and permitting Plaintiff's recovery of the value of the Commissions in the total amount of \$10,000.00.
- B. Pursuant to the Receiver's Second Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendants avoiding the Commissions under Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-5(a)(2) and 25-6-8, and permitting Plaintiff's recovery of the value of the Commissions in the total amount of \$10,000.00.
- C. Pursuant to the Receiver's Third Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendants avoiding the Commissions under Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-6(1) and 25-6-8, and permitting Plaintiff's recovery of the value of the Commissions in the total amount of \$10,000.00.
- D. Pursuant to the Receiver's Fourth Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendants imposing a constructive trust for the benefit of the receivership estate on any and all Commissions.
- E. Pursuant to the Receiver's Fifth Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendants for unjust enrichment, and requiring Defendant to disgorge the Commissions in the total amount of \$10,000.00.
- F. Pursuant to the Receiver's Sixth Claim for Relief, entry of an Order requiring Defendants to disgorge the Commissions in the total amount of \$10,000.00.
- G. Judgment for pre-judgment interest, costs, and fees, including reasonable attorney's fees, as may be allowed by law.

/

/

For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. H.

DATED this 7th day of June, 2013.

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

/s/ Peggy Hunt
Peggy Hunt Chris Martinez Jeffrey M. Armington Attorneys for Receiver

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS R. Wayne Klein, as Rece		DEFENDANTS Amin Haq and John Does 1-5,						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Salt Lake (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
Peggy Hunt Dorsey & Whitney, LLP	Address, and Telephone Number) 1000, SLC, UT 84101; 801-933-7360		Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		IZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in	One Box f	or Plaintij
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☑ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			TF DEF	Incorporated or Pri		r Defenda PTF 4	nt) DEF
2 U.S. Government Defendant			of Another State	1 2 🗇 2	Incorporated and F of Business In A		□ 5	□ 5
			or Subject of a gn Country	3 🗆 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		FOR	EFITTIDE/DENALTV	I PAN	IKBIIDTOV	l OTHER	STATION	pe 1
GONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	330 Federal Employers' Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 370 Other Fraud 380 Other Personal Injury Medical Malpractice 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Injury Medical Malpractice 370 Truth in Lending 385 Property Damage 700 Product Liability 700 Property Damage 385 Property Damage 700 Product Liability 700 Property Damage 700 Property Damage 700 Product Liability 700 Property Damage 700 Property Damage 700 Property Damage 700 Product Liability 700 Property Damage 700 Pro	RY	TABOR TABOR Fair Labor Standards Act abor/Management Relations Railway Labor Act ramily and Medical Leave Act Dither Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Paramone Security Act Act Act Act Act Act Act Act	422 Appe	SC 157 RTY RIGHTS rights tt emark SECURITY (1395ff) t Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g)) KL TAX SUITS s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	OTHER STATUTES 375 False Claims Act 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 770 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION VII. REQUESTED IN	moved from the Court	om Defend	ed Anothe (specify) not cite jurisdictional state	er District) tutes unless di t of the rec	eivership estat	te. if demanded in		nt:
COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S)	10	,000.00	J	URY DEMAND:	☐ Yes	X No	
IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE Jenkins	3		DOCKE	T NUMBER 2:1	2-cv-00591		
DATE 6-7-	SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY OF		1		-1		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	(ALINE	1	1000			AGD.	-	
RECEIPT # AN	MOUNT APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG.IUT)GE		