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. REED LARSEN, SUPERIOR PROPERTIES, INC., TITUS BOATS, LLC, KINJIRUSHI KOKUSAI, INC., and JOHN DOES NOS. 1-5,	(Ancillary to Case No. 2:12-cv-00591) Civil No.
Defendant.	

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 Reed

Larsen ("<u>Larsen</u>"), Superior Properties, Inc. ("<u>Superior</u>"), Titus Boats, LLC ("<u>Titus</u>"), Kinjirushi Kokusai, Inc. ("<u>Kokusai</u>"), and John Does Nos. 1-5 ("<u>Defendant Does</u>") (collectively, with Larsen, Superior, Titus, and Kokusai, "<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, Defendants received 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 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, Defendant Larsen is a resident of or is domiciled in the State of Utah.
 - 4. Upon information and belief, Defendant Superior is a corporation formed under

2

4836-7734-5300\1

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).

the laws of the State of Utah with its principal place of business in Utah.

- 5. Upon information and belief, Defendant Titus is a limited liability company formed under the laws of the State of Utah.
- 6. Upon information and belief, Defendant Kokusai is a corporation formed under the laws of the State of Nevada.
- 7. Upon information and belief, Defendant Does are currently unknown parties who received proceeds from NNU, or are persons to whom Larsen, Superior, Titus, or Kokusai has transferred monies received from NNU.

JURSIDICTION AND VENUE

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

FACTS

The Ponzi Scheme

- 11. 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.
- 12. 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."

- 13. 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").
- 14. 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.
 - 15. NNU paid monies to persons for bringing investors to NNU.
 - 16. At all times relevant hereto, NNU was insolvent.

Reed Larsen's Involvement With NNU

- 17. Upon information and belief, Larsen was knowledgeable about the operations of NNU and was an agent, manager and/or executive of National Note of Utah, LLC and its affiliates.
- 18. Upon information and belief, Larsen knew that NNU was insolvent at the time that all transfers referenced in this Complaint were made.
- 19. Upon information and belief, Larsen knew that NNU was being operated as a Ponzi scheme at the time that all transfers referenced in this Complaint were made.
- 20. Upon information and belief Larsen owned 50% of the equity in Homeland Holdings, LLC, an NNU entity.
- 21. Upon information and belief Larsen controlled Homeland Funding, LLC, through which payroll was paid for NNU.
- Upon information and belief Larsen controlled Old Glory Minting Company,
 LLC, an NNU entity.
 - 23. Larsen is an insider of NNU.

- 24. Larsen is the President of Superior.
- 25. Larsen is a Manager of Titus.
- 26. Larsen is the President, Secretary, Treasurer, and Director of Kokusai.

The Amounts Transferred to Defendant Larsen

- 27. Defendant Larsen received \$214,832.84 from NNU (the "Larsen Transfers").
- 28. On information and belief, Larsen did not take the Larsen Transfers in good faith and/or did not transfer anything of a reasonably equivalent value for the Larsen Transfers.
 - 29. Defendant Larsen has not repaid the Larsen Transfers to NNU.

The Amounts Transferred to Defendant Superior

- 30. Defendant Superior received \$830,206.35 from NNU (the "Superior Transfers").
- 31. On information and belief, Superior did not take the Superior Transfers in good faith and/or did not transfer anything of a reasonably equivalent value for the Superior Transfers.
 - 32. Defendant Superior has not repaid the Superior Transfers to NNU.
- 33. In total, Defendant Superior owes NNU \$830,206.35. On information and belief, all or a portion of the Superior Transfers were subsequently transferred to Larsen.

The Amounts Transferred to Defendant Titus

- 34. Defendant Titus received \$62,921.89 from NNU (the "Titus Transfers").
- 35. On information and belief, Titus did not take the Titus Transfers in good faith and/or did not transfer anything of a reasonably equivalent value for the Titus Transfers.
 - 36. Defendant Titus has not repaid the Titus Transfers to NNU.
- 37. In total, Defendant Titus owes NNU \$62,921.89. On information and belief, all or a portion of the Titus Transfers were subsequently transferred to Larsen.

The Amounts Transferred to Defendant Kokusai

- 38. Beginning in about 2007, Kokusai began transferring funds to NNU.
- 39. Kokusai transferred funds to NNU in the total amount of \$628,864.02 on or about 2007 through 2011 (the "Kokusai Investment").
- 40. NNU transferred a total of \$1,271,846.00 in cash to Kokusai (the "Kokusai Transfers").
- 41. Of the Kokusai Transfers, \$642,981.98 is an amount that is over and above the amount Kokusai transferred to NNU (the "Kokusai False Profit Transfers")

Defendant Kokusai and Defendant Larsen's Unpaid Promissory Note

- 42. Defendant Kokusai and Defendant Larsen received \$25,000.00 from NNU (the "Kokusai and Larsen Transfer" and together with the Larsen Transfers, the Superior Transfers, the Titus Transfers, and the Kokusai Transfers are referred to as the "<u>Transfers</u>") as evidenced by a promissory note dated June 9, 1999 (the "<u>Promissory Note</u>").
- 43. On information and belief, Larsen and Kokusai did not repay the Promissory Note.
 - 44. Accordingly, Kokusai and Larsen owe NNU \$25,000.00.

The SEC Civil Case and the Receiver's Appointment

45. 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

6

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 Defendant⁵ 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, encumbering, assigning, dissipating, concealing, or otherwise disposing of any of their assets.⁷
- 47. 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)

48. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.

4836-7734-5300\1

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

⁵ *Id.*, Docket No. 7.

⁶ *Id.*. Docket No. 9.

⁷ *Id.*, Docket Nos. 45 and 46.

⁸ *Id.*, Docket No. 315.

- 49. NNU was engaged in an enterprise with all of the characteristics of a Ponzi scheme.
 - 50. NNU made the Transfers to Defendants in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
 - 51. At all relevant times hereto, NNU had at least one creditor.
- 52. The Transfers were paid and any obligations to Defendants incurred with actual intent to hinder, delay or defraud a creditor of NNU.
- 53. Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-5(1)(a) and 25-6-8, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Transfers paid to Defendants or, in the event such Transfers were transferred, from the Defendant Does.
- 54. Alternatively, to the extent that Kokusai took in good faith and for a reasonably equivalent value, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Kokusai False Profit Transfers from Kokusai, or in the event such Kokusai False Profit Transfers were transferred, from the Defendants.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

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

- 55. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
- 56. NNU was engaged in an enterprise that has all of the characteristics of a Ponzi scheme.
 - 57. NNU paid the Transfers to Defendants in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
 - 58. At all relevant times hereto, NNU had at least one creditor.
 - 59. The Transfers were paid or the obligations to Defendants were incurred by NNU

without receiving a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the Transfers or obligations.

- 60. 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.
- 61. Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-5(1)(b) and 25-6-8, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Transfers paid to Defendants or, in the event such Transfers were transferred, from the Defendant Does.
- 62. Alternatively, to the extent that Kokusai took in good faith and for a reasonably equivalent value, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Kokusai False Profit Transfers from Kokusai, or in the event such Kokusai False Profit Transfers were transferred, from the Defendants.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

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

- 63. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
 - 64. NNU was engaged in a Ponzi scheme.
 - 65. NNU paid the Transfers to Defendants in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
- 66. NNU had at least one creditor at the time that the Transfers were made or the obligation to Defendants was incurred.
 - 67. The Transfers were paid or the obligation to Defendants was incurred by NNU

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

- 68. 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.
- 69. Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-6(1) and 25-6-8, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Transfers to Defendants or, in the event such Transfers were transferred, from the Defendant Does.
- 70. Alternatively, to the extent that Kokusai took in good faith and for a reasonably equivalent value, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Kokusai False Profit Transfers from Kokusai, or in the event such Kokusai False Profit Transfers were transferred, from the Defendants.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Avoidance of Fraudulent Transfers Under Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-6(2) and 25-6-8)

- 71. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
 - 72. NNU was engaged in a Ponzi scheme.
 - 73. The Transfers were made as part of and in furtherance of a Ponzi scheme.
 - 74. NNU had at least one creditor at the time that the Transfers were made.
 - 75. Defendants were insiders of NNU.
 - 76. The Transfers were made to the Defendants for an antecedent debt.
- 77. NNU was insolvent at the time the Transfers were made and, on information and belief, the Defendants had reasonable cause to believe that NNU was insolvent.

78. Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-6(2) and 25-6-8, the Receiver may avoid and recover the Transfers made to the Defendants or, in the event such Transfers were transferred, from the Defendant Does.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Constructive Trust)

- 79. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
- 80. The Transfers paid were comprised of property of NNU and were made by NNU in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
- 81. Allowing Defendants to retain the Transfers would unjustly enrich Defendant and would be inequitable.
 - 82. The Transfers can be traced to wrongful behavior.
 - 83. An injustice would result if Defendants were allowed to keep the Transfers.
- 84. 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)

- 85. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
- 86. The Transfers were comprised of property of NNU and were made by NNU in furtherance of the Ponzi scheme.
 - 87. The Transfers conferred a benefit upon Defendants.
 - 88. The Defendants knowingly benefitted from the Transfers.

- 89. Allowing Defendants to retain the Transfers would unjustly enrich Defendants and would be inequitable.
- 90. Absent return of the Transfers, the receivership estate will be damaged by Defendants' unjust enrichment and may have no adequate remedy at law.
 - 91. Defendants must disgorge the amount of the Transfers.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Disgorgement)

- 92. The Receiver re-alleges and incorporates herein by reference each of the preceding allegations as if set forth completely herein.
 - 93. The Transfers were paid as part of and in furtherance of a Ponzi scheme.
 - 94. The Transfers were ill-gotten by Defendants.
- 95. Defendants have no claim to the Transfers paid by NNU, or derivatively, from NNU's investors.
- 96. 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 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: (1) Larsen Transfers in the total amount of \$214,832.84; (2) Superior Transfers in the total amount of \$830,206.35; (3) Titus Transfers in the total amount of \$62,921.89; (4) Kokusai Transfers in the total amount of \$1,271,846.00, or alternatively, the

Kokusai False Profit Transfers, in the total amount of \$642,981.98; and (5) Kokusai and Larsen Transfer in the total amount of \$25,000.00.

- 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: (1) Larsen Transfers in the total amount of \$214,832.84; (2) Superior Transfers in the total amount of \$830,206.35; (3) Titus Transfers in the total amount of \$62,921.89; (4) Kokusai Transfers in the total amount of \$1,271,846.00, or alternatively, the Kokusai False Profit Transfers, in the total amount of \$642,981.98; and (5) Kokusai and Larsen Transfer in the total amount of \$25,000.00.
- 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: (1) Larsen Transfers in the total amount of \$214,832.84; (2) Superior Transfers in the total amount of \$830,206.35; (3) Titus Transfers in the total amount of \$62,921.89; (4) Kokusai Transfers in the total amount of \$1,271,846.00, or alternatively, the Kokusai False Profit Transfers, in the total amount of \$642,981.98; and (5) Kokusai and Larsen Transfer in the total amount of \$25,000.00.
- D. Pursuant to the Receiver's Fourth Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendant avoiding the Transfers under Utah Code Ann. §§ 25-6-6(2) and 25-6-8, and permitting Plaintiff's recovery of the value of the: (1) Larsen Transfers in the total amount of \$214,832.84; (2) Superior Transfers in the total amount of \$830,206.35; (3) Titus Transfers in the total amount of \$62,921.89; (4) Kokusai Transfers in the total amount of \$1,271,846.00; and (5) Kokusai and Larsen Transfer in the total amount of \$25,000.00.

E. Pursuant to the Receiver's Fifth Claim for Relief, judgment against Defendant 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 Defendant for unjust enrichment, and requiring Defendant to disgorge the: (1) Larsen Transfers in the total amount of \$214,832.84; (2) Superior Transfers in the total amount of \$830,206.35; (3) Titus Transfers in the total amount of \$62,921.89; (4) Kokusai Transfers in the total amount of \$1,271,846.00, or alternatively, the Kokusai False Profit Transfers, in the total amount of \$642,981.98; and (5) Kokusai and Larsen Transfer in the total amount of \$25,000.00.

G. Pursuant to the Receiver's Sixth Claim for Relief, entry of an Order requiring Defendant to disgorge the: (1) Larsen Transfers in the total amount of \$214,832.84; (2) Superior Transfers in the total amount of \$830,206.35; (3) Titus Transfers in the total amount of \$62,921.89; (4) Kokusai Transfers in the total amount of \$1,271,846.00, or alternatively, the Kokusai False Profit Transfers, in the total amount of \$642,981.98; and (5) Kokusai and Larsen Transfer in the total amount of \$25,000.00.

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.DATED this _____ 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.)

barbose or minating the civil (iocket sneet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS	S ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS	FORM.)			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS R. Wayne Klein, as Receiver			DEFENDANTS REED LARSEN, SUPERIOR PROPERTIES, INC., TITUS BOATS, LLC, KINJIRUSHI KOKUSAI, INC., 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 Salt Lake (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Peggy Hunt Dorsey & Whitney, LLP 136 South Main Street #1000, SLC, UT 84101; 801-933-7360			Attorneys (If Known)			
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box	: Only) III.	 CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PART	T IES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif	
🗇 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a F	Party) C			and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF ed or Principal Place	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Pa		itizen of Another State		ed and Principal Place	
		Ci	itizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	J 3 ☐ ⋅ 3 Foreign Na	tion	
IV. NATURE OF SUI						
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	PERSONAL INJURY	ERSONAL INJURY 5 Personal Injury - Product Liability 7 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 8 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 8 SONAL PROPERTY 0 Other Fraud 1 Truth in Lending 0 Other Personal Property Damage 5 Property Damage Product Liability SONER PETTIONS beas Corpus: 3 Alien Detainee 0 Motions to Vacate Sentence 0 General 5 Death Penalty her:	FORFETTURE/PENALTY 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Management Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Application 465 Other Immigration Actions	422 Appeal 28 USC 15	375 False Claims Act	
	noved from 🔲 3 Reman		instated or		tidistrict gation	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute un 28 U.S.C. § 754 Brief description of cause: Recovery of the value of		(Do not cite jurisdictional state		estate	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A C UNDER RULE 23, F.R.	CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$ 1,271,846.00		only if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(Can instructions)	E Jenkins		DOCKET NUMBER	2:12-cv-00591	
DATE (0/24/2013	SIG	INATURE OF ATTORNEY	OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	OUNT	A DDL VING PD				
RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE						