

1 WILLIAM P. WOOD  
Corporations Commissioner  
2 WAYNE STRUMPFER (SBN 160080)  
Acting Deputy Commissioner  
3 ALAN S. WEINGER (SBN 86717)  
Supervising Counsel  
4 JAMES K. OPENSHAW (SBN 137667)  
Senior Corporations Counsel  
5 MARY ANN CLARK (SBN 230943)  
Corporations Counsel  
1515 K Street, Suite 200  
6 Sacramento, California 95814  
Telephone: (916) 322-6998

**FILED**  
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF ORANGE  
CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

FEB 01 2005

ALAN SLATER, Clerk of the Court

BY: MERCY DOMINGUEZ, DEPUTY

7 Attorneys for the People of the State of California

8  
9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

10 FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

11 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA, by and through the  
12 COMMISSIONER OF CORPORATIONS,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL, a  
Corporation; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL  
16 BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION; MRD  
NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE,  
17 LLC; ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES;  
NIA (NGHIA) S. CANO, individually, HELEN  
18 TKALEC, individually; BEN APARICIO,  
individually; FRANCISCO CANDEDO,  
individually; and DOES 1-20, inclusive.

19 Defendants.  
20

Case No.:

**05 CC 00021**

JUDGE JONATHAN H. CANNON

DEPT. CX102

COMPLAINT FOR TEMPORARY  
RESTRAINING ORDER; PRELIMINARY  
INJUNCTION; PERMANENT INJUNCTION;  
CIVIL PENALTIES; AND ANCILLARY  
RELIEF

(Corporations Code §§ 25110, 25210, 25230;  
and 25401)

21 William P. Wood, Commissioner of Corporations for the State of California, acting to protect  
22 the public from the unlawful and fraudulent sale of unqualified securities and unlicensed activity by a  
23 natural persons involved in the securities and escrow businesses, brings this action in the public  
24 interest in the name of the People of the State of California. The People of the State of California  
25 allege as follows:

26 ///

27 ///

**COPY**



1 and other states, including Utah and Nevada, and as an alter ego of Cano was used to defraud  
2 investors with sales of securities.

3 4. Defendant, PRO-FIN, LLC is and at all times mentioned herein, was a corporation  
4 licensed to conduct business in the State of California with a principal place of business in Orange  
5 County. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that PRO-FIN, LLC was one of the  
6 various companies utilized by Cano and other defendants in a scheme to defraud investors with sales  
7 of securities.

8 5. Defendant, MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION at all times mentioned  
9 herein, was a corporation licensed to conduct business in the State of California with a principal place  
10 of business in Orange County. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that MUTUAL  
11 BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION was one of the various companies utilized by Cano and other  
12 defendants in a scheme to defraud investors with the sales of securities.

13 6. Defendant, MRD NETWORK, LLC is a corporation licensed to conduct business in  
14 the State of California with a principal place of business in Orange County. Plaintiff is informed and  
15 believes, and thereon alleges, that MRD NETWORK, LLC was one of the various companies utilized  
16 by Cano and other defendants in a scheme to defraud investors with the sales of securities.

17 7. Defendant, ABC, LLC is a corporation licensed to conduct business in the State of  
18 California with a principal place of business in Orange County. Plaintiff is informed and believes,  
19 and thereon alleges, that ABC, LLC was one of the various companies utilized by Cano and other  
20 defendants in a scheme to defraud investors with the sales of securities.

21 8. Defendant SELL MORE, LLC is a corporation licensed to conduct business in the  
22 State of California with a principal place of business in Orange County. Plaintiff is informed and  
23 believes, and thereon alleges, that SELL MORE, LLC was one of the various companies utilized by  
24 Cano and other defendants in a scheme to defraud investors with the sales of securities.

25 9. Defendant ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES is a corporation licensed to conduct  
26 business in the State of California with a principal place of business in Orange County. Plaintiff is  
27 informed and believes, and thereon-alleges, that ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES is a successor  
28 company to Alternate Business Capital and was one of the various companies utilized by Cano and

1 other defendants in a scheme to defraud investors with the sales of securities.

2 10. Defendant, HELEN TKALEC at all times mentioned herein, is a natural person  
3 residing in Orange County, California on information and belief, was working along with Cano, and  
4 similarly engaged in the offer and sale of unqualified non-exempt securities in California and other  
5 states, specifically including Utah. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that  
6 TKALEC, working in conjunction with CANO, was an owner, principal, partner, joint venturer, or  
7 authorized agent in many of the various businesses also named as defendants, that were engaged in  
8 activities that resulted in a fraud on investors by means of the sale of unqualified non-exempt  
9 securities and unlicensed broker-dealer activities.

10 11. Defendant, BEN APARICIO at all times mentioned herein, is a natural persons  
11 residing in Orange County, California on information and belief, was working along with Cano, and  
12 was an owner, principal, partner, joint venturer, or authorized agent in many of the various businesses  
13 also named as defendants, that were engaged in the offer and sale of unqualified non-exempt  
14 securities in California and other states, specifically including Utah. Plaintiff is informed and  
15 believes, and thereon alleges, that APARICIO, working in conjunction with CANO, was engaged in  
16 activities that resulted in a fraud on investors by means of sales of unqualified non-exempt securities  
17 and unlicensed broker-dealer activities in violation of the California Corporate Securities Law.

18 12. Defendant, FRANCISCO CANDEDO at all times mentioned herein, is a natural  
19 persons residing in Orange County, California on information and belief, was working along with  
20 Cano, and was an owner, principal, partner, joint venturer, or authorized agent in many of the various  
21 businesses also named as defendants, that were engaged in the offer and sale of unqualified non-  
22 exempt securities in California and other states, specifically including Utah. Plaintiff is informed and  
23 believes, and thereon alleges, that CANDEDO, working in conjunction with CANO, was engaged in  
24 activities that resulted in a fraud on investors by means of sales of unqualified non-exempt securities  
25 and unlicensed broker-dealer activities in violation of the California Corporate Securities Law.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

DEFENDANTS

1  
2 13. At all relevant times hereto, CANO, individually and doing business as ALTERNATE  
3 BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION; MRD  
4 NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC and ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES,  
5 engaged in the unlicensed business of effecting transactions in unqualified, nonexempt securities in  
6 this state by means of misrepresentations or omissions of material facts, in violation of Corporations  
7 Code §§ 25110, 25210, 25230 and 25401. While unlawfully engaged, CANO, individually and  
8 doing business as ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS  
9 UNION CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC and ASSET  
10 ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES sold more than \$3 million in unlawful securities to at least 100  
11 investors. On November 16, 2004, CANO pled guilty to criminal securities fraud charges in Utah,  
12 based on the operation of various businesses, including Alternate Business Capital, and stipulated that  
13 she defrauded investors, under factual circumstances substantially the same as those alleged herein.

14 14. At all relevant times hereto, TKALEC, individually and doing business as  
15 ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION  
16 CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC and ASSET  
17 ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES engaged in the unlicensed business of effecting transactions in  
18 unqualified, nonexempt securities in this state by means of misrepresentations or omissions of  
19 material facts, in violation of Corporations Code §§ 25110, 25210, 25230 and 25401. Plaintiff is  
20 informed and believes, and thereon alleges that, while unlawfully engaged, TKALEC, individually  
21 and doing business as ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL  
22 BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC  
23 and ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES sold more than \$3 million in unlawful securities to  
24 investors, for which she charged and received commissions from Cano.

25 15. At all relevant times hereto, APARICIO, individually and doing business as  
26 ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION  
27 CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC and ASSET  
28 ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES, engaged in the unlicensed business of effecting transactions in

1 unqualified, nonexempt securities in this state by means of misrepresentations and omissions of  
2 material facts, in violation of Corporations Code §§ 25110, 25210, 25230 and 25401. Plaintiff is  
3 informed and believes, and thereon alleges that, while unlawfully engaged, APARICIO, individually  
4 and doing business as ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL  
5 BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC  
6 and ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES sold more than \$3 million in unlawful securities to  
7 investors, for which he charged and received commissions from Cano.

8 16. At all relevant times hereto, CANDEDO, individually and doing business as  
9 ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION  
10 CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC and ASSET  
11 ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES, engaged in the unlicensed business of effecting transactions in  
12 unqualified, nonexempt securities in this state by means of misrepresentations or omissions of  
13 material facts, in violation of Corporations Code §§ 25110, 25210, 25230 and 25401. Plaintiff is  
14 informed and believes, and thereon alleges that, while unlawfully engaged, CANDEDO, individually  
15 and doing business as ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL  
16 BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC  
17 and ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES, sold more than \$3 million in unlawful securities to  
18 investors, for which he charged and received commissions from Cano.

19 17. At all relevant times hereto, ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC;  
20 MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL  
21 MORE, LLC and ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES were engaged in the unlicensed business of  
22 effecting transactions in unqualified, nonexempt securities in this state by means of  
23 misrepresentations or omissions of material facts, in violation of Corporations Code §§ 25110,  
24 25210, 25230 and 25401. While unlawfully engaged, ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-  
25 FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC;  
26 SELL MORE, LLC and ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES were not licensed to offer or sell  
27 securities, nor were they exempt.

28 18. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that all defendants,

1 ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION  
2 CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC and ASSET  
3 ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES, LLC; NIA (NGHIA) S. CANO; HELEN TKALEC; BEN APARICIO;  
4 and FRANCISCO CANDEDO were at all times mentioned, principals, agents, employers,  
5 employees, co-venturers, or co-conspirators, and were acting in their respective capacities in doing  
6 the acts complained of, thereby imputing liability to each other and jointly and severally liable for the  
7 violations of the Corporate Securities Law as alleged herein.

8 19. Plaintiff alleges upon information and belief that at all times mentioned herein, all  
9 defendants, ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION  
10 CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC and ASSET  
11 ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES; NIA (NGHIA) S. CANO; HELEN TKALEC; BEN APARICIO; and  
12 FRANCISCO CANDEDO were each alter egos of the other, being concurrently engaged and  
13 cooperating with each other in the offer and sale of unqualified, nonexempt securities in the State of  
14 California, namely securities in the form of investment contracts under the Mutual Benefits Union  
15 company, to investors in California and Utah and, upon belief, other states as well, based on  
16 misrepresentations and omissions of material facts that resulted in a fraud on investors. As a result,  
17 each defendant should be held jointly and severally liable for the acts and omissions,  
18 misrepresentations and fraud, of all other defendants.

19 20. Plaintiff is unaware of the identities of the defendants fictitiously-named as DOES 1  
20 through 20, inclusive, and alleges upon information and belief that at all times mentioned herein, that  
21 these DOE defendants, along with all other defendants, ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-  
22 FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC;  
23 SELL MORE, LLC and ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES; NIA (NGHIA) S. CANO; HELEN  
24 TKALEC; BEN APARICIO; and FRANCISCO CANDEDO were each alter egos of the other, being  
25 concurrently engaged and cooperating with each other in the offer and sale of unqualified, nonexempt  
26 securities in the State of California, namely securities in the form of investment contracts under the  
27 Mutual Benefits Union company, to investors in California and Utah and, upon belief, other states as  
28 well, based on misrepresentations and omissions of material facts that resulted in a fraud on investors.

1 As a result, each defendant should be held jointly and severally liable for the acts and omissions,  
2 misrepresentations and fraud, of all other defendants. Upon learning of the true identities of those  
3 named as DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, plaintiff will amend the complaint as appropriate.

#### 4 FACTS

5 21. Within past four years Defendants, and each of them, engaged in a course of conduct  
6 utilizing various business entities that ultimately created investment opportunities involving  
7 unqualified nonexempt securities in the State of California in violation of Corporations Code section  
8 25110. Through the use of the businesses including but not limited to Alternate Business Capital,  
9 Pro-Fin, Mutual Benefits Union Corporation, MRD Network, ABC, Sell More, and Asset Achievers  
10 Associates, defendants solicited members of the general public for membership in the ABC company,  
11 and once members in ABC, defendants encouraged the members to utilize MBU as an investment  
12 company to invest in speculative and allegedly high yield investments in non specified "foreign"  
13 bank deposit accounts. Defendants further solicited membership in ABC through seminars located at  
14 upscale hotels, offering lavish meals, and yacht trips all to create the illusion of wealth and financial  
15 success of the promoters. Investors were promised "100% of principal and interest guaranteed."  
16 They were promised returns at rates up to and exceeding 11% per month.

17 22. In offering these investment opportunities in the high yield off shore accounts the  
18 individual defendants and their affiliated companies were engaged in unlicensed broker/dealer  
19 activities in violation of Corporations Code section 25210.

20 23. The promotional materials touted the success of the companies as follows: "After five  
21 decades in the business, MBU Management is now managing fund assets of over \$3 billion for more  
22 than 3600 private and business owner investors worldwide." Defendants claim that they are  
23 "affiliated with over 300 investment professionals" in numerous countries around the world.  
24 Defendants failed however, to disclose that in October 1997 the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC")  
25 issued an injunction against Defendant Cano and others for operating a pyramid scheme and Cano  
26 stipulated to a permanent injunction by the FTC on June 23, 1998. Defendants further failed to  
27 inform investors that they had no license to offer or sell securities in or from the State of California  
28 and failed to inform investors that the securities in the form of investment of contracts could not be



1 sold in California without obtaining a qualification from the Commissioner of Corporations and that  
2 no qualification statement had been obtained. As a result the defendants misrepresented and/or  
3 omitted material facts in conjunction with the offer or sale of securities in violation of Corporations  
4 Code section 25401.

5 24. As part of the investment strategy defendants created various corporations purportedly  
6 designed to fully service professional and business needs of the members, by offering business  
7 services including, bill paying services, credit cards, and vehicle lease programs. However, Plaintiff  
8 is informed and believes and therefore alleges that the entire business planning scheme is nothing  
9 more than a scheme to entice members to invest more money into the defendants' companies.  
10 Members who obtained credit cards through defendants companies were urged to charge cash  
11 advances to the cards and use that money to investment in defendants' companies, with the promised  
12 returns to be used to pay off the monthly credit card bills. However, many members who utilized  
13 these services were disappointed by the defendant's failure to perform the services offered, because  
14 credit card bills went unpaid and investors lost not only their investment money, but in some cases  
15 were faced with massive debt and forced into bankruptcy.

16 25. Defendants actively recruited members through affiliation with various ethnic,  
17 religious and community groups, utilizing the leaders of the various groups as recruiters for  
18 defendants' business ventures. Recruiters were paid a significant amount of money as an inducement  
19 to bring others into the scheme. Additionally, the defendants' offered a Friends and Family Incentive  
20 Plan that paid current members cash for bringing in friends and family. This fostered trust and  
21 confidence in the investors that defendants' business opportunities were legitimate when in fact they  
22 were simply a scheme to separate investors' money for defendants' own purposes. As a result, when  
23 the business services were not performed or the investments failed, the members were reluctant to  
24 report these failures to the appropriate authorities and, in fact, were urged by the alleged trustworthy  
25 recruiters to believe defendants' assurances that the services would be provided or that the  
26 investments would pay the promised returns. Many of the members have gone more than a year with  
27 no payments made or services provided resulting in significant financial losses.

28 ///

1 26. The plaintiff is informed and thereon alleges that all of the defendants and their  
2 affiliated companies are interrelated as follows: Nia Cano is recorded in secretary of State documents  
3 as the managing member of Sell More owned by Fancisco Candedo and the organizer of Sell More  
4 LLC is ABC, LLC aka Alternate Business Capital, LLC. Jelena Tkalec owns Pro-Fin, LLC and Cano  
5 is listed as a manager. Mutual Benefits Union Corporation lists Nia Cano as President and Helen  
6 Tkalec as Treasurer. Alternate Business Capital and Asset Achievers Associates are owned by Nia  
7 Cano and the current fictitious name registration lists MRD Network as the owner. MRD Network,  
8 LLC lists Nia Cano as the registered agent. The fictitious business name filed for Alternate Business  
9 Capital, LLC lists the owner as Pro-Fin, LLC, owned by Tkalec and "managed" by Cano.

10 27. By employing professionals such as accountants and lawyers who speak various  
11 foreign languages, defendants are able to obtain client lists to use for recruiting "members" of ABC  
12 and future investors in the defendants' scheme of companies.

13 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

14 UNLAWFUL OFFER AND SALE OF UNQUALIFIED, NONEXEMPT SECURITIES  
15 (Corporations Code §25110)  
16 AS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

17 28. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 27,  
18 inclusive, as though set forth at length herein.

19 29. Corporations Code §25110 makes it unlawful to offer or sell nonexempt, unqualified  
20 securities. That section states:

21 It is unlawful for any person to offer or sell in this state any security in an issuer  
22 transaction (other than in a transaction subject to Section 25120), whether or not by or  
23 through underwriters, unless such sale has been qualified under Section 25111, 25112  
24 or 25113 (and no order under Section 25140 or subdivision (a) of Section 25143 is in  
25 effect with respect to such qualification) or unless such security or transaction is  
26 exempted or not subject to qualification under Chapter 1 (commencing with Section  
27 25100) of this part.

28 Corporations Code §25535 states:

(a) Any person who violates any provision of this law, or who violates any rule or  
order under this law, shall be liable for a civil penalty not to exceed twenty-five  
thousand dollars (\$25,000) for each violation, which shall be assessed and recovered  
in a civil action brought in the name of the people of the State of California by the  
commissioner in any court of competent jurisdiction.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

30. Beginning at an exact date that is unknown to plaintiff; but at least since October 2000, and continuing through the present, ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC; ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES; NIA (NGHIA) S. CANO; HELEN TKALEC; BEN APARICIO; and FRANCISCO CANDEDO, and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, unlawfully offered and sold to more than 20 residents of the State of California and Utah unqualified, nonexempt securities.

31. Defendants' pattern of conduct, as set forth above, demonstrates the necessity for granting injunctive and ancillary relief restraining such and similar acts in violation of §25110, and providing restitution or disgorgement to investors, as well as imposition of appropriate civil penalties.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against defendants, and each of them, as set forth below.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION  
UNLICENSED BROKER-DEALER ACTIVITY  
(Corporations Code §25210)  
AS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

32. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 27, inclusive, as though set forth at length herein.

33. Corporations Code § 25210(a) sets forth the securities broker-dealer licensure requirement as follows:

Unless exempted under the provisions of Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 25200) of this part, no broker-dealer shall effect any transaction in, or induce or attempt to induce the purchase or sale of; any security in this state unless the broker-dealer has first applied for and secured from the commissioner a certificate, then in effect, authorizing that person to act in that capacity.

Corporations Code §25535 states:

(a) Any person who violates any provision of this law, or who violates any rule or order under this law, shall be liable for a civil penalty not to exceed twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000) for each violation, which shall be assessed and recovered in a civil action brought in the name of the people of the State of California by the commissioner in any court of competent jurisdiction.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

34. Defendants, ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC; ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES; NIA (NGHIA) S. CANO; HELEN TKALEC; BEN APARICIO; and FRANCISCO CANDEDO, and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, are not licensed to offer or sell securities by the Corporations Commissioner or any other similar licensing entity. Beginning at an exact date unknown to Plaintiff, but at least since October 2000, and continuing until the present, defendants unlawfully engaged in the business of effecting transactions in the State of California by acting in such capacity without securing from the Corporations Commissioner or any similar licensing entity an authorizing broker-dealer certificate. Defendants' unlawful acts include, but are not limited to, engaging in a course of business of offering and selling unregistered and nonexempt securities within the state to more than 20 people, most residents of California and Utah. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that the scheme defrauded hundreds of investors and millions of dollars invested have been lost.

35. Defendants' pattern of conduct, as set forth above, demonstrates the necessity for granting permanent injunctive and ancillary relief restraining such and similar acts in violation of §25210, and providing restitution to investors and disgorgement of all profits obtained, as well as imposition of appropriate civil penalties.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against defendants, and each of them, as set forth below.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION  
UNLICENSED INVESTMENT ADVISER ACTIVITY  
(Corporations Code §25230)  
AS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

36. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 27, inclusive, as though set forth at length herein.

37. Corporations Code § 25230(a) sets forth the investment adviser licensure requirement as follows:

It is unlawful for any investment adviser to conduct business as an investment adviser in this state unless the investment adviser has first applied for and secured from the commissioner a certificate, then in effect, authorizing the investment adviser to do so or unless the investment adviser is exempted by the provisions of Chapter 1

1 (commencing with Section 25200) of this part, or unless the investment adviser is  
2 subject to Section 25230.1.

3 Corporations Code §25009 defines an investment advisor as: "any person who, for  
4 compensation, engages in the business of advising others, either directly or through  
5 publications or writings, as to the value of securities or as to the advisability of  
6 investing in, purchasing or selling securities, or who, for compensation and as a part of  
7 regular business, publishes analyses or reports concerning securities.

8 Corporations Code §25535 states:

9 (a) Any person who violates any provision of this law, or who violates any rule or  
10 order under this law, shall be liable for a civil penalty not to exceed twenty-five  
11 thousand dollars (\$25,000) for each violation, which shall be assessed and recovered  
12 in a civil action brought in the name of the people of the State of California by the  
13 commissioner in any court of competent jurisdiction.

14 38. Defendants, ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL  
15 BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC;  
16 ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES; NIA (NGHIA) S. CANO; HELEN TKALEC; BEN  
17 APARICIO; and FRANCISCO CANDEDO, and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, are not licensed to  
18 as investment advisors, nor are they exempt. Beginning at an exact date unknown to Plaintiff, but at  
19 least since October 2000, and continuing until the present, defendants unlawfully engaged in the  
20 business of advising others, as to the value of securities or as to the advisability of investing in,  
21 purchasing or selling securities for compensation and as part of their regular business. Defendants'  
22 unlawful acts include, but are not limited to, engaging in a course of business of offering and selling  
23 unregistered and nonexempt securities within the state to more than 20 people, most residents of  
24 California and Utah. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that the scheme  
25 defrauded hundreds of investors and millions of dollars invested have been lost.

26 39. Defendants' pattern of conduct, as set forth above, demonstrates the necessity for  
27 granting permanent injunctive and ancillary relief restraining such and similar acts in violation of  
28 §25230, and providing restitution to investors and disgorgement of all profits obtained, as well as  
imposition of appropriate civil penalties.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against defendants, and each of them, as set forth  
below.

/// .

///

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNLAWFUL OFFER AND SALE OF SECURITIES BY MEANS OF  
UNTRUE STATEMENTS OR OMISSIONS OF MATERIAL FACT  
(Corporations Code §25401)  
AS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

40. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 27, inclusive, as though set forth at length herein.

41. Corporations Code §25401 makes it unlawful to offer or sell securities by means of untrue statements or omissions of material fact. This section states:

It is unlawful for any person to offer or sell a security in this state or buy or offer to buy a security in this state by means of any written or oral communication which includes an untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.

42. Beginning at an exact date that is unknown to plaintiff; but at least since October 2000 and continuing through the present, defendants ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC; ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES; NIA (NGHIA) S. CANO; HELEN TKALEC; BEN APARICIO; and FRANCISCO CANDEDO, and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, offered and sold to California's investing public securities issued by

43. ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC; ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES; NIA (NGHIA) S. CANO; HELEN TKALEC; BEN APARICIO; and FRANCISCO CANDEDO, and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, offered and sold the securities by representing to these prospective investors that they had professional skill and work experience relating to investments and management of personal finances.

44. Defendants, and each of them, made the above misrepresentations of fact to the investors with full knowledge of the truth, as indicated in Paragraphs 1 through 27. To date, none of the investors have received a return of their principal or interest, as promised.

45. Defendants' pattern of conduct, as set forth above, demonstrates the necessity for granting injunctive and ancillary relief restraining such and similar acts in violation of §25401, and providing restitution or disgorgement to investors, as well as imposition of appropriate civil penalties.

1 46. Corporations Code §25535 states:

2 (a) Any person who violates any provision of this law, or who violates any rule or  
3 order under this law, shall be liable for a civil penalty not to exceed twenty-five  
4 thousand dollars (\$25,000) for each violation, which shall be assessed and recovered  
in a civil action brought in the name of the people of the State of California by the  
commissioner in any court of competent jurisdiction.

5 47. Defendants, and each of them, have violated the securities laws in the State of  
6 California, as alleged in the First, Second and Third Causes of Action, alleged above. As a result,  
7 defendants' pattern of conduct, as set forth above, demonstrates the necessity for granting permanent  
8 injunctive and ancillary relief restraining such and similar acts in violation of §25401, and providing  
9 restitution or disgorgement to investors, as well as imposition of appropriate civil penalties.

10 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:  
11 AS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION:

12 1. For a temporary restraining order and order of preliminary injunction restraining and  
13 enjoining all Defendants, their officers, directors, successors in interest, agents, employees, attorneys  
14 in fact, and all persons acting in concert or participating with them, or any of them, except the  
15 Receiver in the lawful exercise of his duties under the receivership, from directly or indirectly:

16 a. Violating Corporations Code Section 25110 by offering or selling or buying or  
17 offering to buy investment contracts or any other securities without that security being qualified  
18 pursuant to the Corporate Securities Law of 1968, or unless exempt;

19 b. Violating Corporations Code Section 25210 by effecting transactions in,  
20 attempting to induce or attempt to induce the purchase or sale of any security without having  
21 obtained a license as a broker-dealer from the Commissioner of Corporations;

22 c. Violating Corporations Code Section 25230 by engaging in the business of  
23 advising others, directly or through publications or writings, as to the value of securities or as to the  
24 advisability of investing in, purchasing or selling securities, without having obtained a license as an  
25 investment adviser from the Commissioner of Corporations;

26 d. Violating Corporations Code Section 25401 by offering or selling or buying or  
27 offering to buy investment contracts or any other securities by means of any written or oral  
28 communication which includes an untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state a material fact

1 necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were  
2 made, not misleading.

3 e. Removing, destroying, mutilating, concealing, altering, transferring, or  
4 otherwise disposing of, in any manner, any books, records, documents, correspondence, brochures,  
5 manuals, or other documentation of any kind in the possession, custody or control of any of the  
6 Defendants.

7 f. Transferring, changing, disbursing, selling, dissipating, converting, pledging,  
8 assigning, foreclosing or otherwise disposing of any real or personal property or other assets, in their  
9 possession or under their control, or in the possession of, or under the control of, any of them, which  
10 property or other assets are or were to be held for the benefit of defendants' investors and/or  
11 creditors, or by any person for the benefit of any investors and/or creditors of defendants, and each of  
12 them, whether in trust or otherwise.

13 g. Withdrawing from any bank account, transferring, changing, disbursing,  
14 selling, dissipating, converting, pledging, assigning, foreclosing, or otherwise disposing of any real  
15 property or personal property in their possession or under their control, or in the possession of, or  
16 under the control of, any of the Defendants, which property or other assets were derived or emanated  
17 from directly, or indirectly, the sale or purchase or offer to sell or purchase securities under California  
18 law.

19 2. For an Order that, pursuant to section 25535(a) of the Corporations Code Defendants,  
20 and each of them, individually, jointly and severally, pay to the Department of Corporations, a civil  
21 penalty in the maximum sum of \$25,000 (Twenty-five Thousand Dollars) for each act in violation of  
22 Corporations Code Section 25110, a maximum penalty of \$25,000 (Twenty-five Thousand Dollars)  
23 for each act in violation of Corporations Code Section 25210, a maximum penalty of \$25,000  
24 (Twenty-five Thousand Dollars) for each act in violation of Corporations Code Section 25230, and a  
25 maximum penalty of \$25,000 (Twenty-five Thousand Dollars) for each act in violation of  
26 Corporations Code Section 25401.

27 3. That pursuant to section 25530(b) of the Corporations Code defendants. and each of  
28 them, be ordered to disgorge all profits and compensation obtained as a result of the violations of law



1 complained of herein, all in the amounts and manner provided for by law.

2 4. For a Temporary Restraining Order and Permanent Injunction placing an immediate  
3 freeze on all funds, negotiable instruments and/or assets held in any bank or other accounts,  
4 certificates of deposit or otherwise, without limitation, in the name of or for the benefit of defendants  
5 ALTERNATE BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION  
6 CORPORATION; MRD NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC; ASSET ACHIEVERS  
7 ASSOCIATES; NIA (NGHIA) S. CANO; HELEN TKALEC; BEN APARICIO; and FRANCISCO  
8 CANDEDO, and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, directly or indirectly, and each of them.

9 5. For an Order pursuant to Corporations Code section 25530(a) Appointing a Receiver  
10 ex parte, without notice, immediately and during the pendency of this action or until further order of  
11 the court, to take possession of all real and personal property and assets of defendants ALTERNATE  
12 BUSINESS CAPITAL; PRO-FIN, LLC; MUTUAL BENEFITS UNION CORPORATION; MRD  
13 NETWORK, LLC; ABC, LLC; SELL MORE, LLC; ASSET ACHIEVERS ASSOCIATES; NIA  
14 (NGHIA) S. CANO; HELEN TKALEC; BEN APARICIO; and FRANCISCO CANDEDO, and  
15 DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, whether directly or indirectly owned, beneficially or otherwise by, or  
16 in the possession, custody or control of defendants, and each of them, and such Does as may be  
17 subsequently named (hereinafter "receivership defendants"), and their respective subsidiaries and  
18 affiliates, and their successors and assigns wherever situated, or to which receivership defendants  
19 have any right of possession, custody or control, beneficially or otherwise, irrespective of whosoever  
20 holds such assets, including all such assets which receivership defendants carry or maintain, or which  
21 may be received during the pendency of this receivership, in order to obtain an adequate accounting  
22 of receivership defendants' assets and liabilities and to secure a marshalling of said assets, as more  
23 fully set forth in the Ex Parte Application for an Order Issuing a Temporary Restraining Order and  
24 Appointing a Receiver, filed herewith;

25 6. For an Order of restitution comprising all money taken in from investors;

26 7. For an Order that all defendants disgorge all profits arising from or generated through  
27 the use of the money taken in from investors;

28 8. That plaintiff recover its costs of suit herein, including costs of investigation; and;

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

9. For such and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.  
Dated: January 31, 2005

WILLIAM P. WOOD  
California Corporations Commissioner