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
v. RICHARD MADSEN, a Utah resident, 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 Richard Madsen ("Madsen") 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, Madsen 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, Richard Madsen is a resident of or is domiciled in in the State of Utah.
- 4. Upon information and belief, Defendant Does are currently unknown parties who received loan proceeds from NNU, or are persons to whom Madsen 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 Madsen

- 14. Madsen received \$15,850.00 from NNU (the "Transfers").
- 15. On information and belief, NNU received nothing in return for the Transfers.
- 16. Madsen has not repaid the Transfers to NNU.
- 17. In total, Madsen owes NNU \$15,850.00.

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 ill-gotten gains received by them pursuant to the scheme.⁴
- 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 Note and Palmer have stipulated to a Preliminary Injunction Order that prohibits National Note

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

⁵ *Id.*, Docket No. 7.

⁶ *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.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

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

- 21. The Receiver realleges 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 Madsen 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 Madsen 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 Madsen 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 realleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding

⁷ *Id.*, Docket Nos. 45 and 46.

⁸ *Id.*, Docket No. 315.

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 Madsen 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 Madsen 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 Madsen or, in the event such Transfers were transferred, from the Defendant Does.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

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

- 34. The Receiver realleges 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 Madsen 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 Madsen was incurred.

- 38. The Transfers were paid or the obligation to Madsen 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 Madsen 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 Defendants to retain the Transfers would unjustly enrich Defendants and would be inequitable.
 - 44. The Transfers can be traced to wrongful behavior.
 - 45. An injustice would result if Defendants 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 Defendants.

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 Defendants.
 - 50. The Defendants knowingly benefitted from the Transfers.
- 51. Allowing Defendants to retain the Transfers would unjustly enrich Defendants and would be inequitable.
- 52. Absent return of the Transfers, the receivership estate will be damaged by Defendants' unjust enrichment and may have no adequate remedy at law.
 - 53. Defendants 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 Defendants.
- 57. Defendants have 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 Defendants as follows:

- B. Pursuant to the Receiver's First 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 \$15,850.00.
- C. Pursuant to the Receiver's Second 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 \$15,850.00.
- D. Pursuant to the Receiver's Third 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 \$15,850.00.
- E. 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 Transfers.
- F. Pursuant to the Receiver's Fifth Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendants for unjust enrichment, and requiring Defendants to disgorge the Transfers in the total amount of \$15,850.00.
- G. Pursuant to the Receiver's Sixth Claim for Relief, entry of an Order requiring Defendants to disgorge the Transfers in the total amount of \$15,850.00.

9

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.

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 initiating the civil c	OCKET SHEET. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON	NEXT PAGE OF THIS FO	JRMI.)			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS R. Wayne Klein, as Receiver			DEFENDANTS RICHARD MADSEN, a Utah resident, and JOHN DOES NOS. 1-5,			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Salt Lake (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Peggy Hunt Dorsey & Whitney, LLP			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. Attorneys (If Known)			
136 South Main Street #	1000, SLC, UT 84101; 801-933					
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant)			
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	★ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		PT	FF DEF 1 □ 1 Incorporated or Proof Business In 1	PTF DEF	
2 U.S. Government Defendant			en of Another State	2		
			en or Subject of a preign Country	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	0 6 0 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT				DANZDUDTOV		
CONTRACT ☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY PERSO 310 Airplane 365 Per 315 Airplane 365 Per 315 Airplane 367 Per 320 Assault, Libel & Slander Per 330 Federal Employers' Liability 368 Asi Jay 340 Marine Jay 345 Marine Jay 345 Marine Jay 355 Motor Vehicle 371 Tr. PERSON 350 Other Personal Jay 360 Other Personal Product Liability PERSON 360 Other Personal Injury 385 Per 380 Other 362 Personal Injury 385 Per 362 Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 385 Per 362 Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 363 Personal Injury 364 Personal Injury 365	DNAL INJURY sonal Injury - oduct Liability alth Care/ sonal Injury - oduct Liability alth Care/ sonal Injury duct Liability oestos Personal ury Product sibility NAL PROPERTY or Fraud thin Lending perty Damage perty Damage duct Liability Corpus: en Detainee tions to Vacate tence seral th Penalty or 46 46 46 46	DREETURE/PENALTY 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 20 Other LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 10 Railway Labor Act 15 Family and Medical Leave Act 10 Other Labor Litigation 11 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 35 Other Immigration Actions	BANKRUPTCY	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 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	
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under 28 U.S.C. § 754	Court Reor	pened Another (specify)	r District Litigation		
J.	Brief description of cause: Recovery of the value of tr	ansfers from Defe	ndant for the benefit	of the receivership esta	ite.	
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.		SS ACTION D	CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: 5,850.00 JURY DEMAND: Yes No			
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE	Jenkins		DOCKET NUMBER 2:1	12-cv-00591	
DATE		TURE OF ATTORNEY	OF-RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		TI	}			
RECEIPT# AN	4OUNT APF	LYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	DGE	