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
DREW BRINAR and JOHN DOES NOS. 1-5,  Defendant.	(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 Drew Brinar ("Brinar") and John Does Nos. 1-5 ("Defendant Does") (collectively, "Defendant") 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, Defendant borrowed money from NNU, without giving any value for the transferred money, and has failed to repay that money. The Receiver seeks to recover the amount owed by the Defendant 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"),<sup>2</sup> 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. . . ."<sup>3</sup>
- 3. Upon information and belief, Defendant Brinar is a resident of or is domiciled in in the State of Arizona.
- 4. Upon information and belief, Defendant Does are currently unknown parties who received loan proceeds from NNU, or are persons to whom Brinar has transferred monies received from NNU.

4825-9139-3556\1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See SEC Civil Enforcement Case, Docket No. 1 (Complaint).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> SEC Civil Enforcement Case, Docket No. 9.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> *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 Defendant.
- 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 Amounts Transferred to Defendant**

- 14. Defendant received \$234,192.60 from NNU (the "Transfers").
- 15. On information and belief, NNU received nothing in return for the Transfers.
- 16. Defendant has not repaid the Transfers to NNU.
- 17. In total, Defendant owes NNU \$234,192.60.

## The SEC Civil Case and the Receiver's Appointment

- 18. 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.<sup>4</sup>
- 19. Also on June 25, 2012, as a result of the filing of the SEC Civil Enforcement Action, the Court entered a Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause against the Defendant<sup>5</sup> and the Receivership Order appointing the Receiver.<sup>6</sup> Since that time, both National Note and Palmer have stipulated to a Preliminary Injunction Order that prohibits National Note

4

4825-9139-3556\1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> SEC Civil Enforcement Case, Docket No. 1 (Complaint).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> *Id.*, Docket No. 7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> *Id.*, Docket No. 9.

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, encumbering, assigning, dissipating, concealing, or otherwise disposing of any of their assets.<sup>7</sup>

20. 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.<sup>8</sup>

## FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

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

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

5

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

4825-9139-3556\1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> *Id.*, Docket Nos. 45 and 46.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> *Id.*, Docket No. 315.

preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.

- 28. NNU was engaged in an enterprise that has all of the characteristics of a Ponzi scheme.
  - 29. NNU paid the Transfers to Defendant in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
  - 30. At all relevant times hereto, NNU had at least one creditor.
- 31. The Transfers were paid or the obligations to Defendant were incurred by NNU without receiving a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the Transfers or obligations.
- 32. At the time the Transfers 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.
- 33. Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-5(1)(b) and 25-6-8, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Transfers paid to Defendant or, in the event such Loan Proceeds 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)

- 34. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
  - 35. NNU was engaged in a Ponzi scheme.
  - 36. NNU paid the Transfers to Defendant in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
  - 37. NNU had at least one creditor at the time that the Transfers were made or the

obligation to Defendant was incurred.

- 38. The Transfers were paid or the obligation to Defendant was incurred by NNU without NNU receiving a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the Transfers or obligation.
- 39. NNU was insolvent at the time the Transfers were paid or the obligation was incurred, or became insolvent as a result of the Transfers or the obligation incurred.
- 40. Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-6(1) and 25-6-8, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Transfers to Defendant or, in the event such Transfers were transferred, from the Defendant Does.

#### **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

(Constructive Trust)

- 41. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
- 42. The Transfers paid were comprised of property of NNU and were made by NNU in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
- 43. Allowing Defendant to retain the Transfers would unjustly enrich Defendant and would be inequitable.
  - 44. The Transfers can be traced to wrongful behavior.
  - 45. An injustice would result if Defendant were allowed to keep the Transfers.
- 46. 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 Transfers paid by NNU to Defendant.

## FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Unjust Enrichment)

- 47. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
- 48. The Transfers were comprised of property of NNU and were made by NNU in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
  - 49. The Transfers conferred a benefit upon Defendant.
  - 50. The Defendant knowingly benefitted from the Transfers.
- 51. Allowing Defendant to retain the Transfers would unjustly enrich Defendant and would be inequitable.
- 52. Absent return of the Transfers, the receivership estate will be damaged by Defendant' unjust enrichment and may have no adequate remedy at law.
  - 53. Defendant must disgorge the amount of the Transfers.

#### **SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

(Disgorgement)

- 54. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
  - 55. The Transfers were paid as part of and in furtherance of a Ponzi scheme.
  - 56. The Transfers were ill-gotten by Defendant.
- 57. Defendant has no claim to the Transfers paid by NNU, or derivatively, from NNU's investors.
- 58. The Transfers should be disgorged to the Receiver for the benefit of the receivership estate.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

- A. Pursuant to the Receiver's First Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendant avoiding the Transfers under Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-5(a)(1) and 25-6-8, and permitting Plaintiff's recovery of the value of the Transfers in the total amount of \$234,192.60.
- B. Pursuant to the Receiver's Second Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendant avoiding the Transfers under Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-5(a)(2) and 25-6-8, and permitting Plaintiff's recovery of the value of the Transfers in the total amount of \$234,192.60.
- C. Pursuant to the Receiver's Third Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendant avoiding the Transfers under Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-6(1) and 25-6-8, and permitting Plaintiff's recovery of the value of the Transfers in the total amount of \$234,192.60.
- D. Pursuant to the Receiver's Fourth Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendant imposing a constructive trust for the benefit of the receivership estate on any and all Transfers.
- E. Pursuant to the Receiver's Fifth Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendant for unjust enrichment, and requiring Defendant to disgorge the Transfers in the total amount of \$234,192.60.
- F. Pursuant to the Receiver's Sixth Claim for Relief, entry of an Order requiring Defendant to disgorge the Transfers in the total amount of \$234,192.60.
- G. Judgment for pre-judgment interest, costs, and fees, including reasonable attorney's fees, as may be allowed by law.
  - H. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED this 21st 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.)

Finition	Control (DDD III DIN CONT								
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS R. Wayne Klein, as Receiver				DEFENDANTS DREW BRINAR and JOHN DOES NOS. 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 Arizona  (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 136 South Main Street #	Address, and Telephone Number) 1000, SLC, UT 84101; 80	01-933-7360		Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One	Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCI	PAL PARTIES			
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☑ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not	a Party)			TF DE			PTF  4	DEF  d
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of	of Parties in Item III)	Citize	n of Another State	2 🗇	2 Incorporated and P of Business In A		<b>5</b>	<b></b> 5
				n or Subject of a 💢 eign Country	3 🗇	3 Foreign Nation	···	D 6	<b>1</b> 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only)		FO	REETTURE/PENALTY		BANKRUPTCY	OTHERS	STATUT	ES
CONTRACT  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	TOR'    PERSONAL INJURY   310 Airplane   315 Airplane   70		71 62	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other	422 A   423 V   2   2   423 V   2   423 V   2   424 V   425	ppeal 28 USC 158 Vithdrawal 18 USC 157  PERTY RIGHTS Copyrights atent rademark  IAL SECURITY IIA (1395ff) Glack Lung (923) DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) SID Title XVI SI (405(g))  ERAL TAX SUITS axes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) RS—Third Party 16 USC 7609	375 False Cl 400 State Re 410 Antitrus 430 Banks an 450 Commel 470 Rackete Corrupt 480 Consum 490 Cable/S: 850 Securitic Exchan 890 Other St 891 Agricult 895 Freedon Act 895 Arbitrati 899 Adminis Act/Rev	aims Act apportion t nd Bankir rce tion er Influen Organizat er Credit at TV es/Comme ge tatutory Acts mental M n of Inforn ion strative Pr iew or Ap Decision attionality of	nument  ng  need and tions  odities/ actions  atters mation
X 1 Original □ 2 Rea	moved from	pellate Court	Reop	(specify)	r District	Litigation	ict		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON Cite the U.S. Civil Statut 28 U.S.C. § 754  Brief description of cause Recovery of the value	÷:					e.	<del></del>	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	<del></del>	A CLASS ACTION	DI	EMAND \$ 234,192.60		CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:		complair	nt;
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(Can innterpretation).	JDGE Jenkins	/	1	DOC	KET NUMBER 2:1	2-cv-00591		
DATE (20/13		SIGNATURE OF ATTOR	RVEY	FRECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY  RECEIPT # AM	OUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	OGE		