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,	COMPLAINT
INNOVATIVE SERVICES, LLC, a Utah limited liability company, and JOHN DOES NOS. 1-5,	(Ancillary to Case No. 2:12-cv-00591) Civil No
Defendants	

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 Innovative

Services, LLC ("<u>Innovative</u>") and John Does Nos. 1-5 ("<u>Defendant Does</u>") (collectively, "<u>Defendants</u>") 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, Innovative obtained funds from NNU, and has not returned those funds to NNU. The Receiver seeks to recover those funds 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, Innovative Services, LLC is a Utah limited liability company with its principal place of business in Utah.
- 4. Upon information and belief, Defendant Does are currently unknown parties who received loan proceeds from NNU, or are persons to whom Innovative 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 Amounts Transferred to Innovative

- 14. Innovative received \$20,000.00 from NNU (the "Transfers").
- 15. On information and belief, NNU received nothing in return for the Transfers.
- 16. Innovative has not repaid the Transfers to NNU.
- 17. In total, Innovative owes NNU \$20,000.00.

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 illgotten gains received by them pursuant to the scheme.
- 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 defendants⁵ and the Receivership Order appointing the Receiver.⁶ Since that time, both National

4

4822-1359-8228\1

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

⁵ *Id.*, Docket No. 7.

⁶ *Id.*, Docket No. 9.

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

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.⁸

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Breach of Contract)

- 21. The Receiver realleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
- 22. On information and belief, NNU and Innovative entered into a legally binding contract, pursuant to which Innovative agreed to repay the amount that NNU loaned to Innovative.
 - 23. Innovative has breached the contract by failing to repay the Transfers.
- 24. Innovative's breach of the contract has damaged NNU. Specifically, Innovative has failed to repay the \$20,000.00, it owes to NNU.
- 25. NNU is entitled to a judgment in the amount of \$20,000.00 caused by Innovative's breach of contract, plus applicable pre-judgment and post-judgment interest.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

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

26. The Receiver realleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding

4822-1359-8228\1

⁷ *Id.*, Docket Nos. 45 and 46.

⁸ *Id.*, Docket No. 315.

allegations as if set forth completely herein.

- 27. NNU was engaged in an enterprise with all of the characteristics of a Ponzi scheme.
 - 28. NNU made the Transfers to Innovative in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
 - 29. At all relevant times hereto, NNU had at least one creditor.
- 30. The Transfers were paid and any obligations to Innovative incurred with actual intent to hinder, delay or defraud a creditor of NNU.
- 31. Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-5(1)(a) and 25-6-8, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Transfers paid to Innovative or, in the event such Transfers were transferred, from the Defendant Does.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

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

- 32. The Receiver realleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
- 33. NNU was engaged in an enterprise that has all of the characteristics of a Ponzi scheme.
 - 34. NNU paid the Transfers to Innovative in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
 - 35. At all relevant times hereto, NNU had at least one creditor.
- 36. The Transfers were paid or the obligations to Innovative were incurred by NNU without receiving a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the Transfers or obligations.
- 37. 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.

38. Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-5(1)(b) and 25-6-8, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Transfers paid to Innovative or, in the event such Transfers were transferred, from the Defendant Does.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

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

- 39. The Receiver realleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
 - 40. NNU was engaged in a Ponzi scheme.
 - 41. NNU paid the Transfers to Innovative in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
- 42. NNU had at least one creditor at the time that the Transfers were made or the obligation to Innovative was incurred.
- 43. The Transfers were paid or the obligation to Innovative was incurred by NNU without NNU receiving a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the Transfers or obligation.
- 44. 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.
- 45. Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-6(1) and 25-6-8, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Transfers to Innovative or, in the event such Transfers were transferred, from the Defendant Does.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Constructive Trust)

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

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Unjust Enrichment)

- 52. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
- 53. The Transfers were comprised of property of NNU and were made by NNU in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
 - 54. The Transfers conferred a benefit upon Defendants.
 - 55. The Defendants knowingly benefitted from the Transfers.
- 56. Allowing Defendants to retain the Transfers would unjustly enrich Defendants and would be inequitable.
 - 57. Absent return of the Transfers, the receivership estate will be damaged by

Defendants' unjust enrichment and may have no adequate remedy at law.

58. Defendants must disgorge the amount of the Transfers.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Disgorgement)

- 59. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
 - 60. The Transfers were paid as part of and in furtherance of a Ponzi scheme.
 - 61. The Transfers were ill-gotten by Defendants.
- 62. Defendants have no claim to the Transfers paid by NNU, or derivatively, from NNU's investors.
- 63. 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 Defendants as follows:

- A. Pursuant to the Receiver's First Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendants and in favor of Plaintiff in the total amount of \$20,000.00.
- B. Pursuant to the Receiver's Second Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendants 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 \$20,000.00.
- C. Pursuant to the Receiver's Third Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendants 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 \$20,000.00.

Case 2:13-cv-00566-PMW Document 2 Filed 06/21/13 Page 10 of 10

D. Pursuant to the Receiver's Fourth Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendants

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 \$20,000.00.

E. Pursuant to the Receiver's Fifth Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendants

imposing a constructive trust for the benefit of the receivership estate on any and all Transfers.

F. Pursuant to the Receiver's Sixth Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendants

for unjust enrichment, and requiring Defendants to disgorge the Transfers in the total amount of

\$20,000.00.

G. Pursuant to the Receiver's Seventh Claim for Relief, entry of an Order requiring

Defendants to disgorge the Transfers in the total amount of \$20,000.00.

H. Judgment for pre-judgment interest, costs, and fees, including reasonable

attorney's fees, as may be allowed by law.

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

10

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.)

purpose of miniating the civil of	OCHOC SHOCK. DEEL INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT 1 NOE	or imaronus,						
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS R. Wayne Klein, as Receiver			DEFENDANTS INNOVATIVE SERVICES, LLC, a Utah limited liability company, and JOHN DOES NOS. 1-5,					
(b) County of Residence o	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Salt Lake (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)							
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Peggy Hunt Dorsey & Whitney, LLP								
	1000, SLC, UT 84101; 801-933-7360 ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZE	NSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES,	(Place an "X" in	One Box for Pla	
☐ 1 U.S. Government 🔀 3 Federal Question		(For Div	ersity Cases Only) P1	F DEF		and One Box fo	or Defendant) PTF DEI	 R
Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)		Citizen of Thi			Incorporated or Pri of Business In T		O 4 O 4	
☐ 2 U.S. Government ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citizen of And	Citizen of Another State					
		Citizen or Sub Foreign Co		3 🗖 3	Foreign Nation		0606	i
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		FORFEIT	IDE/PENALTY	I BAN	KRI PTOV	ОТНЕР	STATISTICS	Salat I
□ 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 □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury - Product Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 348 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 355 Motor Vehicle 370 Other Personal Injury Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage 361 Product Liability 362 Personal Injury 363 Alien Detainee 363 General 3643 Alien Detainee 364 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of	625 Drug F of Pro 690 Other 740 Railwa 751 Family Leave 790 Other 791 Employ Income 791 Employ 791 Employ 791 Employ 791 Other 791 Employ 791 Other 791 Employ 791 Other 791 Other	Management ons by Labor Act and Medical Act abor Litigation wee Retirement Security Act GRATION ization Application mmigration	422 Appe	SC 157 RTY RIGHTS rights t emark SECURITY (1395ff) : Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g)) ALTAX SUITS (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	375 False C 400 State Re 410 Antitrus 430 Banks a 450 Comme 460 Deporta 470 Rackete Corrupt 480 Consum 490 Cable/S 850 Securiti Exchan 890 Other S 891 Agricult 893 Environ 895 Freedom 895 Freedom 895 Freedom 896 Arbitrat 899 Adminis Act/Rev	eapportionment st and Banking orce tation eer Influenced an Organizations eer Credit iat TV es/Commodities. age tatutory Actions tunental Matters of Information cion strative Procedur view or Appeal o Decision utionality of	ad /
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a Brief description of cause:		Another (specify) e jurisdictional state	r District utes unless div				-
VII. REQUESTED IN	Recovery of the value of transfers from CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION	N DEMANI) \$		eivership estat HECK YES only i		-	_
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.	20,000	.00	JU	JRY DEMAND:	☐ Yes	⋈ No	_
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE Jenkins			DOCKE	r NUMBER 2:1	2-cv-00591		_
S 120/13	SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY OF RECO	KD.					_
RECEIPT # AM	IOUNT APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	GE		