| 1          | MARY ANN SMITH   |   |  |
|------------|--|---|--|
| _          | Deputy Commissioner  |   |  |
| 2          | SEAN ROONEY  |   |  |
| _          | Assistant Chief Counsel  |   |  |
| 3          | AFSANEH EGHBALDARI (SBN 250107)  |   |  |
|            | Corporations Counsel   |   |  |
| 4          | DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS OVERSIGHT   |   |  |
|            | 1350 Front Street, #2034   |   |  |
| 5          | San Diego, California 92101  |   |  |
|            | Tel: (619) 645-3166  |   |  |
| 6          |  |   |  |
|            | Attorneys for the People of the State of Californi                       | Ia  |  |
| 7          | 7   Autoriteys for the reopie of the State of Camornia                   |   |  |
| <i>'</i>   | STIDEBTOR COTIRT OF TH   | IE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  |  |
| 8          | SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA<br>FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO |   |  |
|            |  |   |  |
| 9          |  |   |  |
|            | THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF   | Case No.: 37-2011-00103198-CU-MC-CTL  |  |
| 10         | CALIFORNIA, by and through the   |   |  |
| 10         | CALIFORNIA CORPORATIONS  | STIPULATION TO ENTRY OF   |  |
| 11         | COMMISSIONER   | FINAL JUDGMENT AS TO  |  |
| 11         | COMMINISSIONER   | DEFENDANT BURGESS NATHANIEL   |  |
| 12         | Dlaintiff  | HALLUMS   |  |
| 12         | Plaintiff,   | Intelleris  |  |
| 12         |  | [IMAGED FILE]   |  |
| 13         | VS.  |   |  |
| 1.4        |  |   |  |
| 14         | RMC CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, INC., a  |   |  |
| 1.5        | California corporation; BURGESS  |   |  |
| 15         | NATHANIEL HALLUMS, an individual;  |   |  |
| 1.0        | INNOVATION FUND 2000, LLC, a   |   |  |
| 16         | California limited liability company; SEGUE                              |   |  |
|            | CAPITAL, INC., a California corporation;                                 |   |  |
| 17         | PACIFIC PHOENIX COMMUNITIES, LLC,  | ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES TO:   |  |
|            | a California limited liability company;                                  | HON. WILLIAM S. DATO  |  |
| 18         | DAVID W. HOPTAR, an individual; and                                      | TION. WILLIAM 5. DATO   |  |
|            | DOES 1-10, inclusive,  |   |  |
| 19         |  | Dept: C-67  |  |
|            | Defendants,  |   |  |
| 20         | and  |   |  |
|            | DO COLDEN COTTON DIG DI  |   |  |
| 21         | IMMCAPNMOTION, INC., a Delaware  |   |  |
|            | corporation; MISTNET MEDICAL   | Date Action Filed: December 30, 2011  |  |
| 22         | DEVICES, INC., a Delaware corporation;                                   | , in the second |  |
| _          | MAGNETO INERTIAL SENSING   |   |  |
| 23         | TECHNOLOGY, INC., aka, MIST, a Nevada                                    |   |  |
|            | corporation; MIST NET, INC., an entity of                                |   |  |
| 24         | unknown form; MIST, INC., an entity of                                   |   |  |
| <b>-</b> т | unknown form; THORNTON CAPITAL   |   |  |
| 25         | ADVISORS, INC., a California corporation;                                |   |  |
| 43         | DONALD J. COURTNEY, an individual;                                       |   |  |
| 26         | WALLACE BENWARD, an individual; and                                      |   |  |
| 20         | RELIEF DOES 1-10, inclusive,   |   |  |
| 27         | D 1: CD C 1  |   |  |
| 41         | Relief Defendants.   |   |  |
|            |  |   |  |

## **RECITALS**

- A. Defendant Burgess Nathaniel Hallums ("DEFENDANT") is an individual residing in Ramona, California. At all relevant times, DEFENDANT was a licensed investment adviser representative in California.
- B. At all relevant times, DEFENDANT managed and controlled Defendants RMC Capital Management, Inc., Innovation Fund 2000, LLC, Segue Capital, Inc., and Pacific Phoenix Communities, LLC.
- C. The People of the State of California, by and through the Commissioner of Business Oversight, formerly the Commissioner of Corporations ("Commissioner" or "Plaintiff"), filed a civil action in San Diego Superior Court against Defendants RMC Capital Management, Inc., Burgess Nathaniel Hallums, Innovation Fund 2000, LLC, Segue Capital, Inc., Pacific Phoenix Communities, LLC, David W. Hoptar and Does 1 -10, in this case, for violating the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 ("CSL"), and against relief defendants for receiving ill-gotten gains from defendants' unlawful activities.
- D. Plaintiff alleges in the complaint that DEFENDANT employed fraudulent, deceptive and manipulative practices to the detriment of clients and engaged in multiple violations of the CSL.
- E. Plaintiff further alleges in the complaint that DEFENDANT operated a Ponzi scheme, misrepresented a material fact, engaged in investment advisory activities in an unfair, inequitable and unethical manner, maintained false books and records, misled the Commissioner, failed to have clients' funds and securities audited, failed to provide itemized statements to clients, and failed to disclose material facts in connection with the offer and sale of securities.
- F. The Court granted a temporary restraining order, freezing of assets and appointing Eric J. Benink, as the receiver ("Receiver"), over DEFENDANT, and other parties, on January 10, 2012. Subsequently, the Court granted a preliminary injunction, confirming the asset freeze and appointing of the Receiver, on April 27, 2012.

28 | | ///

///

## **TERMS AND CONDITIONS**

It is hereby stipulated by and between the Plaintiff and DEFENDANT (collectively, "PARTIES"), as follows:

- 1. DEFENDANT admits service of the Second Amended Summons and Second Amended Complaint filed in this matter.
- 2. DEFENDANT having entered a general appearance, in this action, acknowledges that entry of a general appearance is equivalent to personal service of the Second Amended Summons on him pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 410.50.
- 3. DEFENDANT consents to the Court's jurisdiction over him and the subject matter of this action.
- 4. DEFENDANT has read the Second Amended Complaint, this Stipulation to Entry of Final Judgment as to Defendant Burgess Nathaniel Hallums (referenced hereinafter as "Stipulation") and the proposed Final Judgment Against Defendant Burgess Nathaniel Hallums (hereinafter "Final Judgment") in the form attached hereto as Exhibit 1.
- 5. DEFENDANT voluntarily consents to entry of the Final Judgment without admitting or denying the allegations of the Second Amended Complaint (except as to jurisdiction over him and the subject matter), waives findings of fact and conclusions of law under California Code of Civil Procedure section 632, waives any right to appeal entry of the Final Judgment, and waives any defense to this action.
- 6. DEFENDANT waives any claims known and unknown to him against the Plaintiff, her agents, officers, or employees based on the facts underlying the present action. DEFENDANT specifically waives any rights provided by California Civil Code section 1542, which provides: "A general release does not extend to claims which the Creditor does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release, which if known by him or her must have materially affected his or her settlement with the Debtor."
  - 7. DEFENDANT waives recovery of any costs or expenses arising out of this action.
- 8. DEFENDANT consents to the issuance by the Court in the above-entitled action of a permanent injunction enjoining DEFENDANT from, directly or indirectly:

- a. Violating Corporations Code section 25235 by engaging in any act, practice, or course of business which is fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative, including but not limited to, operating a Ponzi scheme, misusing clients funds, employing fraudulent practices and engaging in transactions that operate as a fraud to the detriment of clients;
- b. Violating Corporations Code section 25238 and California Code of Regulations section 260.238 by engaging in investment advisory activities in an unfair, inequitable and unethical manner, including but not limited to failing to disclose material facts about the representative, and misrepresenting or omitting to state a material fact about fees for the advisory services;
- c. Violating Corporations Code section 25241 and California Code of Regulations section 260.241.3 by maintaining false and inaccurate books and records;
- d. Violating Corporations Code section 25404 by knowingly making an untrue statement to the Commissioner during the course of her investigation and examination, with the intent to impede, obstruct, or influence the administration or enforcement of the CSL;
- e. Violating California Code of Regulations section 260.237, by failing to have clients' funds and securities audited and failing to provide itemized statements to clients; and
- f. Violating Corporations Code section 25401 by offering to sell or selling any security of any kind, including but not limited to the securities described in the Second Amended Complaint, by means of any written or oral communication which includes any untrue statement of material fact or omits or fails to state any material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they are made, not misleading, including but not limited to the misrepresentations and/or omissions alleged in the Second Amended Complaint.
- 9. DEFENDANT consents to the issuance by the Court in the above-entitled action of an order barring DEFENDANT from any position of employment, management or control of any broker-dealer, investment adviser or commodity adviser.
- 10. DEFENDANT hereby agrees to the Court's entry of the final monetary judgment against him and in favor of the Plaintiff for the payment of restitution in the total amount of

\$10,409,046.99. Any restitution amount recovered shall become an asset of the receivership estate. The liability for the restitution portion of the judgment shall be joint and several as against DEFENDANT and Defendants RMC Capital Management, Inc., Innovation Fund 2000, LLC, Segue Capital, Inc. and Pacific Phoenix Communities, LLC. DEFENDANT also agrees to the entry of a final monetary judgment against him and in favor of the Plaintiff for the payment of civil penalties authorized under Corporations Code section 25535 in the amount of \$875,000.00. The liability of DEFENDANT for the payment of the judgment for civil penalties is joint and several as against DEFENDANT and Defendants RMC Capital Management, Inc., Innovation Fund 2000, LLC, Segue Capital, Inc. and Pacific Phoenix Communities, LLC.

- 11. The Receiver shall retain control over all money and assets, as set forth in Exhibit 2, acquired at the time the Receivership was ordered by this Court over DEFENDANT. The items set forth in Exhibit 2 shall be referred to as the "Receivership Assets."
- 12. It is also agreed that with respect to the entry and satisfaction of the monetary judgment to be entered against DEFENDANT pursuant to this Stipulation, the following terms and conditions apply:
- a. All monies obtained through the enforcement of this judgment shall be applied first to the restitution order and second to the civil penalty order.
- b. All monies actually recovered by the Receiver from third parties in the future shall be credited to the restitution order.
- c. All current Receivership Assets, including those assets identified in Exhibit 2, are hereby forfeited by DEFENDANT, which shall be subject to the terms and conditions in the April 27, 2012 Receivership Order. All assets identified in Exhibit 3 are not subject to the Receivership Order.
- d. The Final Judgment attached as Exhibit "1" may be entered by the Court at any time after the execution of this Stipulation. Upon entry of the Final Judgment, Plaintiff or Receiver may seek to enforce the Final Judgment. Any recovery obtained by the Receiver through the enforcement of the Final Judgment shall become property of the Receivership Estate.

///

- e. The PARTIES understand that the Receiver will be requesting the release of DEFENDANT from the receivership. The PARTIES stipulate and agree that this Stipulation is contingent upon DEFENDANT's release from the receivership.
- 13. As part of this Stipulation, DEFENDANT hereby represents and warrants that he does not currently have title to, possession of or control over any additional assets, or real or personal property other than those assets identified in Exhibits 2 and 3. In the event it is shown by the Plaintiff that DEFENDANT had assets that were not known to the Receiver or identified in Exhibits 2 and 3, the Plaintiff may seek relief from the court to modify the Final Judgment against the party violating this Stipulation to seek additional amounts of restitution and civil penalties from that party in an amount according to proof by the Plaintiff. The request shall be made by noticed motion to permit sufficient opportunity for all PARTIES to be heard. The Court retains jurisdiction to make whatever orders are just and proper as to the later identified asset. The violation of this provision of the Stipulation by DEFENDANT or efforts to seek additional restitution or civil penalties by the Plaintiff pursuant to such violation shall not affect the ability of the Plaintiff to seek to collect from DEFENDANT the amount of the restitution and civil penalties specified in the Final Judgment attached as Exhibit "1".
- 14. The PARTIES stipulate and agree that this Court shall retain jurisdiction of this action in order to implement and enforce the terms of this Stipulation and entry of the Final Judgment pursuant thereto, and to entertain any suitable application or motion for additional relief or modification or any order made herein within the jurisdiction of the Court.
- 15. Notwithstanding any other provision contained herein, nothing in this Stipulation shall operate to limit the Commissioner's ability to investigate and prosecute violations of the CSL not addressed herein, or in the Second Amended Complaint, or to assist any other agency (federal, state, or local) with any prosecution, administrative, civil or criminal, brought by such agency against DEFENDANT concerning violations alleged herein or otherwise. DEFENDANT further agrees and acknowledges that nothing in this Stipulation or in the Final Judgment in this matter shall bind or otherwise prevent any other federal, state or local agency from the performance of its duties.

- 16. The PARTIES hereby acknowledge and agree that this Stipulation constitutes the entire Stipulation between the PARTIES with respect thereto. This Stipulation supersedes any and all prior or contemporaneous agreements between the PARTIES hereto.
- 17. Each party hereto represents and warrants that it has received independent advice from his or her attorney and/or other representative prior to entering into this Stipulation, and in executing this Stipulation relied solely on the statements set forth herein and the advice of his or her own counsel and/or representative.
- 18. In that the PARTIES have had the opportunity to draft, review and edit the language of this Stipulation, no presumption for or against any party arising out of drafting all or any part of this Stipulation will be applied in any action relating to or arising out of this Stipulation. Accordingly, the PARTIES hereby waive the benefit of California Civil Code section 1654 and any successor statute.
- 19. The waiver of any provision of this Stipulation shall not operate to waive any other provision set forth herein, and any waiver, amendment and/or change to the terms of this Stipulation must be in writing signed by the PARTIES hereto.
- 20. Each signatory hereto represents and warrants that he or she possesses the necessary capacity and authority to execute this Stipulation and bind the PARTIES hereto.
- 21. If any paragraph, clause, or provision of this Stipulation or of the Final Judgment entered thereto, or the application thereof, is held invalid or unenforceable, such decision shall affect only the paragraph, clause or provisions so construed or interpreted, and the invalidity shall not affect the provisions of the application of this Stipulation, or of the Final Judgment entered thereto, which can be given effect without the invalid provisions or application, and to this end, the provisions of the Stipulation, and of the Final Judgment entered thereto, are declared by Plaintiff and by DEFENDANT to be severable.
- 22. This Stipulation may be executed in one or more separate counterparts, each of which when so executed, shall be deemed an original. Such counterparts shall together constitute and be one and the same instrument. An electronically transmitted signature shall be deemed the same as an original.

| 1                               | 23. DEFENDANT enters into this stipulation voluntarily and without coercion, and                |  |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| 2                               | acknowledges that no promises, threats or assurances have been made by Plaintiff or any agents, |  |
| 3                               | officers, or employees thereof to induce him to enter into this stipulation.                    |  |
| 4                               | AGREED AND ACCEPTED:  |  |
| 5                               |   | PLAINTIFF, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF                            |
| 6                               |   | CALIFORNIA by and through the Commissioner of Business Oversight |
| 7                               |   |  |
| 8                               | Dated: <u>11/18</u> , 2013  | MADY AND CMITH   |
| 9                               |   | MARY ANN SMITH Deputy Commissioner                               |
| 10                              |   |  |
| 11                              |   | DEFENDANT BURGESS NATHANIEL HALLUMS                              |
| 12                              |   | DEFENDANT BURGESS NATHANIEL HALLUMS                              |
| 13                              | Dated: <u>11/12</u> , 2013  |  |
| 14                              |   | BURGESS NATHANIEL HALLUMS, as an individual                      |
| 15                              | A PRO CAMER A GITTO FORM  | marviduai  |
| 16                              | APPROVED AS TO FORM:  |  |
| 17                              | Dated:11/15_, 2013  | MICHAEL LIPMAN   |
| 18                              |   | HEATHER GUERENA  |
| 19                              |   | Attorneys for Burgess Nathaniel Hallums                          |
| 20                              |   |  |
| 21                              |   |  |
| 22                              |   |  |
| <ul><li>23</li><li>24</li></ul> |   |  |
| 25                              |   |  |
| 26                              |   |  |
| 27                              |   |  |
| 28                              |   |  |
|                                 |   | 8  |
|                                 | 11  |  |