1	MARY ANN SMITH	[Exempt from filing fees pursuant		
2	Deputy Commissioner	to Government Code section 6103]		
2	SEAN ROONEY			
3	Assistant Chief Counsel	FILED UNDER SEAL		
	DANIEL ODONNELL	-040 GTD 0 43540 -0		
4	Assistant Chief Counsel ROBERT LUX (State Bar No. 189191)	2019-SEP-9 AM 10:20		
5	Senior Counsel			
6	BORYANA ARSOVA (State Bar No. 282703) Counsel			
7	Department of Business Oversight 1350 Front Street, #2034			
8	San Diego, California 92101 Email: Robert.Lux@dbo.ca.gov			
9	Telephone: (619) 525-3729 Facsimile: (619) 525-4045			
10	17acsinine. (019) 323-4043			
10	Attorneys for Plaintiff, People of the State of California			
11	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
12	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO			
13	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, by			
14	and through the COMMISSIONER OF	COMPLAINT FOR TEMPORARY		
15	BUSINESS OVERSIGHT,	RESTRAINING ORDER; PRELIMINARY		
1.0	Plaintiff,	INJUNCTION; PERMANENT INJUNCTION;		
16	v. (2)	RESTITUTION; APPOINTMENT OF A		
17		RECEIVER; CIVIL PENALTIES; ASSET		
18	SILVER SADDLE COMMERCIAL	FREEZE; AND ANCILLARY RELIEF		
10	DEVELOPMENT, LP, a California limited partnership; SILVER SADDLE RANCH &			
19	CLUB, INC., a California corporation; THE	FRAUD IN THE OFFER AND SALE OF		
20	GALILEO COMMERCIAL PROPERTY	SECURITIES IN VIOLATION OF		
20	OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., a California non-profit corporation; THOMAS M. MANEY, and	CORPORATIONS CODE SECTION 25401		
21	individual, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	OFFER AND SALE OF UNQUALIFIED		
22	Defendants.	SECURITIES IN VIOLATION OF		
22	And,	CORPORATIONS CODE SECTION 25110		
23	Tild,			
24	MARIAN G. DUCREUX, an individual,	[VERIFIED ANSWER REQUIRED		
25	CLIFFORD J. REYNOLDS, an individual,	PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF		
25	WAYNE A. PEDERSEN, an individual, and Relief	CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 446]		
26	Does 1 through 10, inclusive,			
27	Relief Defendants.			
28				
20				
1	I and the second			

Plaintiff Manuel P. Alvarez, Commissioner of Business Oversight for the State of California (Plaintiff), acting to protect the public from the unlawful and fraudulent sale of unqualified securities, brings this action in the public interest in the name of the People of the State of California. The People of the State of California allege on information and belief as follows:

I.

SUMMARY

- 1. At all times herein, the term "Defendants" shall refer collectively and inclusively to Thomas M. Maney (Maney), Silver Saddle Commercial Development, LP (Silver Saddle Commercial Development), Silver Saddle Ranch & Club, Inc. (Silver Saddle Ranch & Club), The Galileo Commercial Property Owners Association, Inc. (Galileo Association), and Does 1 through 100, and the Relief Defendants Marian G. Ducreux (Ducreux), Clifford J. Reynolds (Reynolds), Wayne A. Pedersen (Pedersen), and Relief Does 1 through 10.
- 2. Beginning in 2011, Defendants implemented highly aggressive sales techniques and contrived information in order to offer and sell securities in California through an investment called "LandBanking Plus" or "The Galileo Project" (hereinafter Galileo Project). Defendants aggressively peddled investments in the real estate investment scheme by selling highly overpriced fractionalized interests in vacant desert land in rural Kern County to thousands of unsophisticated investors by the deliberate omission of material information and blatant misrepresentations. Defendants comingled and diverted funds that they promised to save and preserve for the investors' benefit. Malfeasant financial accounting was designed to cover-up the wrongful comingling and diversion of funds. Each of these misrepresentations was a separate violation of the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 (Corporations Code section 25000, et seq.) (CSL).¹
- 3. Through misleading and targeted advertising in ethnic supermarkets and free buffet dinners, Defendants succeeded in attracting their intended audience—a large group of unsophisticated investors without the experience or education in investing, over 2,000 of whom paid tens of thousands of dollars of their hard-earned savings based on misrepresentations and a lack of

_

¹ Cal. Corporations Code, § 25401.

truthful information. Defendants threatened the investors with financial harm and lawsuits if they complained.

- 4. The centerpiece of the offering was a circa 1000-acre parcel of undeveloped, vacant, desert land in Kern County that was split into four thousand undivided, fractionalized interests to sell to investors. In addition to purchasing the undivided property interest, the investors were required to contribute \$2,000.00 additional funds for each full unit to a pooled development fund, the "Capital Improvement Fund"—touted as a "built in property development account"—that would, according to Defendants, eventually exceed \$8,000,000.00. In addition, the investors were required to make recurring payments for membership in the Silver Saddle Ranch & Club and "travel club" and other assessments and received an option to purchase the Silver Saddle Ranch & Club for \$500,000.00.
- 5. Defendants' violated California law by offering and selling unqualified, non-exempt securities to thousands of unsophisticated investors. Defendants failed to apply to the Department of Business Oversight (DBO) for a permit to sell securities. Security offerings must undergo a review process where the issuer must demonstrate that the terms of the investment are "fair, just and equitable." Defendants sold thousands of securities in California without completing this obligatory process and each sale was a separate violation of selling unqualified securities.²
- 6. Defendants wrongfully received tens of millions of dollars of investor funds, and Defendants continue to receive and squander substantial investor funds. Defendants have demonstrated that they cannot be trusted with investor assets, to comply with the Corporate Securities Laws, or to provide truthful information to investors. The remaining investor assets should not be permitted to remain under the control of Defendants, given their involvement in an ongoing scheme to defraud investors in violation of the CSL.

II.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. The Commissioner is authorized to administer and enforce the provisions of the CSL, and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder, which control the qualification, offer, and sale

² Cal. Corporations Code, § 25110.

of securities in California, specifically Corporations Code sections 25110 and 25401. The Commissioner's authority to obtain preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, rescission, restitution, disgorgement, civil penalties, costs, appointment of receiver, and other equitable relief for violations of the CSL derives from sections 25000 *et seq.* of the Corporations Code.

8. This Court has jurisdiction of the parties and the subject matter of this action. Venue as to all matters between the parties relating to this action is proper in this court. The Defendants maintain and have maintained systematic, continuous and substantial contacts with California consumers by their presence, in the form of investment offerings, websites, individual financial transactions, real property sales, and extensive other business activities within and throughout California, including the County of San Diego. Defendants advertised and solicited consumers throughout California for the purpose of inducing California consumers to purchase the Defendants' investment. Defendants' websites and technology provide Defendants the means of marketing and offering their investments and communicating with investors over the phone, on the internet, by email and by facsimile transmission. Defendants' activities in California are and were highly interactive, systemic and continuous, and have and continue to victimize California consumers, so as to support a finding of general jurisdiction in the State.

III.

DEFENDANTS

- 9. At all relevant times, defendant Thomas M. Maney was a control person and/or managing member, within the meaning of Corporations Code sections 25160 and 25403, of Silver Saddle Commercial Development, LP; Silver Saddle Ranch & Club, Inc.; and The Galileo Commercial Property Owners Association, Inc. Defendant Maney is an individual residing in the State of California.
- 10. At all relevant times, defendant Silver Saddle Commercial Development was a limited partnership formed in California with a business address of 15315 Magnolia Boulevard, Suite 201, Sherman Oaks, California 91403. Silver Saddle Commercial Development's general partner, SSCD Management, LLC, is a forfeited Texas limited liability company.
 - 11. At all relevant times, defendant Silver Saddle Ranch & Club was a California

corporation with a business address of 7635 North San Fernando Road, Suite A, Burbank, California 91505. Silver Saddle Ranch & Club runs and operates a resort facility in California City called the Silver Saddle Ranch and Club (Ranch), located at 20751 Aristotle Drive, California City, California 93505.

- 12. At all relevant times, defendant the Galileo Association was a California non-profit corporation with a business address of 7635 North San Fernando Road, Suite A, Burbank, California 91505.
- Defendants' business activities within the State of California and throughout the nation. There is such a unity of interest, ownership, dominion and control by Maney of all other Defendants that any corporate, company or entity forms of Defendants should be disregarded. Defendants have functioned as Maney's alter ego. Maney, in using the other Defendants as his alter ego, violated numerous provisions of California law. At all times herein mentioned and continuing, Maney engaged in, caused, permitted, and/or ratified untrue and misleading statements and material fact omissions made by the other Defendants to consumers in order to induce consumers to purchase Defendants' illegal securities as described herein.
- 14. Defendant Maney has controlled and continues to control all fees, commissions and compensation paid to him and other Defendants.
- 15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on such information and belief alleges, that, at all relevant times, Defendants and each of them acted as managers, officers, agents or employees, and acted in such capacities in connection with the acts, practices and schemes of business set forth below.
- 16. Plaintiff is not aware of the true names and capacities of the Defendants sued by the fictitious names Does 1 through 100, inclusive. Each of the fictitiously named Defendants is responsible in some manner for the activities alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to add the true names of the fictitiously named defendants once they are discovered.
- 17. Defendants Does 1 through 100, inclusive, are persons, corporations, or other entities that have done or will do acts otherwise alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiff is informed and believes,

and thereon alleges, that all Defendants, including the Doe Defendants 1-100, were at all times mentioned, principals, agents, employers, employees, co-venturers, or co-conspirators, and were acting in their respective capacities in doing the acts complained of, thereby imputing liability to each other.

- 18. Relief Doe Defendants 1-10 are named herein solely as relief defendants as they are or may be in possession of investor assets that were acquired by them as a result of the fraudulent and illegal conduct by the other named defendants and equitable and injunctive relief is sought against them to preserve and protect those assets and facilitate return to the rightful owners or as restitution as the court may direct.
- 19. Whenever any allegation is made in this Complaint to "Defendants" doing any act, the allegation shall mean the act of each Defendant acting individually, jointly and severally and the conspiring of these Defendants to so act. Each Defendant alleged to have committed any act did so pursuant to and in furtherance of a common plan, scheme and conspiracy and as the agent for each and every co-defendant. Each Defendant acted in conspiracy to violate the provisions of the CSL.
- 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on such information and belief alleges that, at all relevant times, each and every Defendant, directly or indirectly controlled other co-defendants by knowingly inducing, or by knowingly providing substantial assistance to other co-defendants, to violate the provisions of the CSL, as alleged in the Complaint within the meaning of Corporations Code section 25403.
- 21. Any allegation made in this Complaint of any act by a Defendant who is a business entity shall mean an act done or authorized by the officers, directors, agents, or employees of the business entity Defendant while actively engaged in the management, direction, or control of the affairs of the business entity Defendants, and while acting within the course and scope of their employment.
- 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all times mentioned herein, the business entity Defendants continued in existence as alter egos of individual Defendants pursuant to a scheme to offer and sell unqualified, non-exempt and fraudulent securities to obtain money from the public for individual Defendants' own personal benefit.

23. At all times herein mentioned, the business entity Defendants were so influenced and controlled by the individual Defendants in the conduct of its business and affairs that there existed a unity of interest and ownership among said parties so that adherence to the fiction of separate corporate and individual existences works an injustice upon the public.

IV.

RELIEF DEFENDANTS

- 24. At all relevant times, Relief Defendant Reynolds was an individual residing in the State of California. On information and belief, from 2005 to 2017, Reynolds was employed as a Managing Director of Defendant Silver Saddle Ranch & Club and was involved in the sales, marketing and operations of the Silver Saddle Ranch & Club and received compensation through sales of the Galileo Project investment contracts to California consumers.
- 25. At all relevant times, Relief Defendant Ducreux was an individual residing in the State of California. On information and belief, Ducreux acted as a real estate broker/sales agent on behalf of Defendants and directly offered and sold the Galileo Project investment contracts to California investors in return for commissions of up to \$300,000.00 per year.
- 26. At all relevant times, Relief Defendant Pedersen was an individual residing in the State of California. On information and belief, Pedersen was involved in the marketing of the Galileo Project and received over \$1,000,000.00 from Defendants through sales of the Galileo Project investment contracts to California consumers.

V.

SUMMARY OF FACTS

- 27. Beginning in 2011, Maney, through Silver Saddle Commercial Development, Silver Saddle Ranch & Club, and the Galileo Association, offered and sold securities in California in the form of an investment contract called "LandBanking Plus+" or "The Galileo Project." The investment contract purportedly comprised a total of 4,000 available "units," offered in one-quarter, one-half, or full units. Each unit consisted of four bundled components:
- (a) A payment by the investor of money, generally between \$10,000.00 to \$30,000.00, for an undivided, 1/4000th fractionalized interest in a parcel of circa 1,020 acres of undeveloped,

commercially zoned, desert real estate in Kern County, California.

(b) A payment by the investor of \$500.00, \$1,000.00 or \$2,000.00 (for, respectively, one-quarter unit, one-half unit, or one full unit) into a pool of investors' funds called the "Capital Improvement Fund." The stated purpose of the Capital Improvement Fund, according to the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for The Galileo Commercial & Industrial Development (CC&Rs) that governed the investments, was for "capital improvements or major renovations" to the 1,020-acres of undeveloped land. Investors were told that the capital contributions of \$500.00, \$1,000.00 or \$2,000.00 made to the Capital Improvement Fund would appreciate in value and that the investors would later use the funds to develop the 1,020 acres of undeveloped land into viable commercial and industrial properties.

- (c) A payment by the investor of several hundreds of dollars per year to establish and maintain a "membership" in the Ranch and pay other recurring assessments and fees.
- (d) A right of first refusal option for the investors to jointly purchase the Silver Saddle Ranch & Club in California City, California, for \$500,000.00.
- 28. Defendants' offering materials and investment contracts portrayed the Galileo Project as an "active" investment where investors would participate in the management and control of the investment. For that purpose, each investor, by purchasing a full-, half-, or quarter unit, became a member of the Galileo Association and, allegedly, could vote on how to develop the investment property and spend the money in the Capital Improvement Fund (those decisions required a majority vote (51 percent) of all investors, excluding the developer Silver Saddle Commercial Development). In reality, however, only full-unit owners who were current on their payment obligations to Silver Saddle Commercial Development, Silver Saddle Ranch & Club and the Galileo Association had the right to vote. Thus, those investors who purchased half- and quarter units a total of 653 separate investments as of 2019 could not vote and were passive.
- 29. Moreover, all decisions of the Galileo Association were made by a "Board of Directors." At least until mid-2019, the Galileo Association Board of Directors consisted of five Board Members, two Silver Saddle Commercial Development/Silver Saddle Ranch & Club staff/employees, Maney, and two investors. Thus, Maney, individually and through Defendants

Galileo Commercial Property Owners Association, Inc., Silver Saddle Commercial Development, LP and Silver Saddle Ranch & Club, Inc. could effectively make and did make all of the management decisions, with investors having no control in the development of the property or the management of the Capital Improvement Fund, despite each having contributed (or contractually committed to contribute) \$500.00 to \$2,000.00 to the Capital Improvement Fund. Thus, even as to the full-unit investors, for the period 2011 to mid-2019, the Galileo Project was a "passive' investment because all decisions of the Galileo Association were made by a Board of Directors that was controlled by Defendants.

- 30. The Galileo Project investment contracts were not qualified or registered as securities with the DBO or any federal securities regulatory bodies. In fact, investment documents provided to investors stated that "[n]either the subject property nor this Disclosure Statement have been reviewed or approved by any national, state or local governmental body or regulatory agency."
- 31. Beginning as early as 2011, more than 2,000 California investors collectively gave or contractually committed millions of dollars to Defendants, including to Maney, through Silver Saddle Commercial Development, Silver Saddle Ranch & Club, and the Galileo Association, for the purpose of investing in the Galileo Project securities. Defendants, including Maney, through Silver Saddle Commercial Development, Silver Saddle Ranch & Club, and the Galileo Association, specifically targeted certain ethnic groups with limited understanding of English and with no regard to investment experience.
- 32. To lure prospective investors to the Ranch, Defendants, including Maney, through Silver Saddle Commercial Development, Silver Saddle Ranch & Club, and the Galileo Association, set up raffles at various ethnic supermarkets throughout California that promised prizes in the form of gift cards, televisions, watches, cameras, and buffet dinners, culminating with a free night stay at the Ranch. The buffet dinners were internally referred to as the "Latino dinner parties," "Filipino dinner parties," and "Chinese Dinner." The consumers who accepted the offer to stay at the Ranch were subjected to high-pressure sales tactics to make payments and sign contracts to become investors. Although many attendees were non-English speaking or spoke English as a second language, they received and signed investment documents in English without clearly understanding the content of

the documents.

- 33. From 2011 to 2019, as Defendants received investor funds for the Galileo Project, those funds were comingled among Defendants' other accounts. Defendants maintained a very low total cash balance in the accounts and withdrew most of the investor funds out of the accounts. Thus, Defendants uniformly, year after year, moved millions of dollars, virtually all the investors' funds, from the corporate bank accounts quickly after the Defendants received the investors' money.
- 34. Defendants' financial accounting for the Galileo Project evidences gross mismanagement and reveals a highly suspicious number of transfers among the various accounts, including widespread comingling among Defendants' bank accounts.
- 35. The investors in the Galileo Project were required to make individual contributions to the Capital Improvement Fund. From 2011- 2018, Defendants diverted investor funds intended for the Capital Improvement Fund into other Silver Saddle accounts and failed to conserve those funds for the benefit of the investors, as promised. Defendants have continued to divert cash funds and make significant cash withdrawals from the Capital Improvement Fund accounts.
- 36. Beginning as early as 2011, in connection with the offer and sale of the Galileo Project securities, Defendants made, or caused to be made, misrepresentations of material facts or omitted to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading, including, but not limited to:
- (a) Promising that investors would make the decisions as to how to use the money they contributed to the Capital Improvement Fund. In fact, Defendants had comingled and diverted the money from the Capital Improvement Fund for their own purposes.
- (b) Falsely representing in the marketing materials and investment documents that the investors would control the investment and make decisions on how to develop the investment property. In fact, half- and quarter-unit owners had no right to vote and could not participate in the management decisions and control of the development of the property.
- (c) Omitting from the investment offerings the fair market value of the fractionalized interests in the undeveloped property, resulting in the investors substantially overpaying for their property interests.

- (d) Misrepresenting the value of the undivided interest in the undeveloped Galileo Project property purchased by investors.
 - (e) Falsely assuring investors that there was no risk in the investment.
- (f) Misrepresenting that the Galileo Project offered high investment returns and that investors could realize a "tremendous return virtually overnight."
- (g) Misrepresenting the value of the Ranch for purposes of falsely inflating the value of the purchase option that the investors were granted as part of the Galileo Project investment.
- (h) Misrepresenting that the Galileo Project property was already serviced with paved roads, piped water, electricity and telephones, when it was not.
- (i) Representing to some investors that the investors would play an active role in developing the Galileo Project property, while representing to other investors that they would play a passive role.
- (j) Falsely representing to some investors that they could build their own residential home on the Galileo Project property that they purchased.
- (k) Misrepresenting the terms of the investment and then, when the investors complained after they purchased the investment, threatening the investors with consumer harm and lawsuits.
- (1) Failing to disclose that Defendant Thomas M. Maney, as signatory, Vice-President and General Counsel for several companies, was the subject of a 1977 Consent and Final Judgment in the United States District Court for the Central District relating to unlawful real estate sales in California City, California, levying civil penalties and permanently enjoining the companies and its officers from, among other things, violating a Final Order to Cease and Desist issued by the Federal Trade Commission on October 20, 1972, and from failing to pay \$3,950,000.00 to prior real estate purchasers.
- 37. The Commissioner is informed and believes that from 2011 to 2019 Defendants have made at least 3,032 offers and sales of the Galileo Project investment contracts for a total purchase price of approximately \$56,517,148.00.
 - 38. On June 18, 2019, the Commissioner issued administrative actions against Defendants

Thomas Maney, Silver Saddle Commercial Development, LP, Silver Saddle Ranch & Club, Inc. and The Galileo Commercial Property Owners Association, Inc., ordering Defendants to desist and refrain from the further offer or sale of securities in the State of California in violation of Corporations Code sections 25110 and 25401, requesting ancillary relief in the form of a repurchase offer, and requesting penalties. The administrative actions are currently pending hearing before the Office of Administrative Hearings.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION OFFER AND SALE OF UNQUALIFIED, NON-EXEMPT SECURITIES IN VIOLATION OF CORPORATIONS CODE SECTION 25110 (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 39. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 38, inclusive, as though set forth at length herein.
 - 40. Corporations Code section 25110, in pertinent part, provides:

It is unlawful for any person to offer or sell in this state any security in an issuer transaction...unless such sale has been qualified...or unless such security or transaction is exempted or not subject to qualification under Chapter 1 [commencing with CSL section 25100] of this part.

- 41. Beginning in at least 2011, Defendants, and each of them, offered or sold at least 3,032 securities in the form of investment contracts to over 2,000 investors for a total purchase price of \$56,517,148.00³. Approximately seventy of the investors are residents of the County of San Diego.
- 42. From at least 2011, Defendants offered and sold to California's investing public, securities in the form of investment contracts in the Galileo Project. The investment contracts offered and sold by Defendants are "securities" within the meaning of Corporations Code section 25019.
- 43. Defendants offered and sold the securities within the State of California within the meaning of Corporations Code sections 25008 and 25017.
 - 44. The offer and sale of these securities were issuer transactions within the meaning of

³ This represents only the aggregate purchase price for the undivided property interests, excluding the investors' contributions for the Capital Improvement Fund and the recurring membership fees and association dues.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Corporations Code sections 25010 and 25011.

- 45. The Commissioner has not issued a permit or other form of qualification authorizing Defendants to offer or sell the securities referred to herein.
- 46. The offer and sale of the securities referenced herein were not exempt from the qualification requirements of Corporations Code section 25110.
- 47. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendants will continue to violate Corporations Code section 25110. Further, Defendants' pattern of conduct demonstrates the need for the appointment of a receiver and the granting of the ancillary relief prayed for.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION MISREPRESENTATION OR OMISSION OF MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF CORPORATIONS CODE SECTION 25401 (AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 48. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 47, inclusive, as though set forth at length herein.
- 49. Corporations Code section 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 to buy or offer to buy a security in this state, by means of any written or oral communication that includes an untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state a material fact necessary to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which the statements were made, not misleading.

- 50. From at least 2011, in connection with the offer and sale of the Galileo Project investment contracts, Defendants made, or caused to be made, written and oral misrepresentations of material facts and omitted to state material facts necessary to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which the statements were made, not misleading, including, but not limited to:
- (a) Promising that investors would make the decisions as to how to use the money they contributed to the Capital Improvement Fund. In fact, Defendants had comingled and diverted the Capital Improvement Fund for their own purposes.
 - (b) Falsely representing in the marketing materials and investment documents that the

investors would control the investment and make decisions on how to develop the investment property. In fact, half- and quarter-unit owners had no right to vote and could not participate in the management decisions and control of the development of the property.

- (c) Omitting from the investment offerings the fair market value of the fractionalized interests in the undeveloped property, resulting in the investors substantially overpaying for their property interests.
- (d) Misrepresenting the value of the undivided interest in the undeveloped Galileo Project property purchased by investors.
 - (e) Falsely assuring investors that there was no risk in the investment.
- (f) Misrepresenting that the Galileo Project offered high investment returns and that investors could realize a "tremendous return virtually overnight."
- (g) Misrepresenting the value of the Ranch for purposes of falsely inflating the value of the purchase option that the investors were granted as part of the Galileo Project investment.
- (h) Misrepresenting that the Galileo Project property was already serviced with paved roads, piped water, electricity and telephones, when it was not.
- (i) Representing to some investors that the investors would play an active role in developing the Galileo Project property, while representing to other investors that they would play a passive role.
- (j) Falsely representing to some investors that they could build their own residential home on the Galileo Project property that they purchased.
- (k) Misrepresenting the terms of the investment and then, when the investors complained after they purchased the investment, threatening the investors with consumer harm and lawsuits.
- (l) Failing to disclose that Defendant Thomas M. Maney, as signatory, Vice-President and General Counsel for several companies, was the subject of a 1977 Consent and Final Judgment in the United States District Court for the Central District relating to unlawful real estate sales in California City, California, levying civil penalties and permanently enjoining the companies and its officers from, among other things, violating a Final Order to Cease and Desist issued by the Federal Trade Commission on October 20, 1972, and from failing to pay \$3,950,000.00 to prior real estate

purchasers.

51. Unless enjoined by this Court, Defendants will continue to violate Corporations Code section 25401. Further, Defendants' pattern of conduct demonstrates the need for the appointment of a receiver and the granting of the ancillary relief prayed for.

Plaintiff prays for Judgment as follows:

A. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 52. For a temporary restraining order, issued on *ex parte* application, followed by a preliminary and permanent injunction issued pursuant to Corporations Code section 25530, subdivision (a), restraining and enjoining the Defendants, their officers, directors, successors in interest, agents, employees, attorneys in fact, and all persons acting in concert or participating with them, or any of them, except the receiver in the lawful exercise of his duties under the receivership, directly or indirectly:
- a. Selling or purchasing or offering to sell or purchase any security as defined by California law, without first qualifying that security as required by law.
- b. Violating Corporations Code section 25110 of the Corporate Securities Law of 1968
 (CSL) by offering or selling unqualified, non-exempt securities, including, but not limited to, the
 Galileo Project (also known as Landbanking Plus) investment contracts.
- c. Violating Corporations Code section 25401 by offering or selling or buying or offering to buy any securities 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 light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading, including, but not limited to, the Galileo Project.
- d. Removing, destroying, mutilating, concealing, altering, transferring, or otherwise disposing of, in any manner, any books, records, documents, correspondence, brochures, manuals, or other documentation of any kind in the possession, custody or control of any of the Defendants that relate in any way to the offer and sale of securities, specifically, but not limited to, the Galileo Project.

- e. Transferring, changing, disbursing, selling, dissipating, converting, pledging, assigning, foreclosing or otherwise disposing of any real or personal property or other assets, in their possession or under their control, or in the possession of, or under the control of, any of them, which property or other assets are or were to be held for the benefit of Defendants' investors and/or creditors, or by any person for the benefit of any investors and/or creditors of Defendants, and each of them, whether in trust or otherwise, without further Order from this Court.
- f. Withdrawing from any bank account, transferring, changing, disbursing, selling, dissipating, converting, pledging, assigning, foreclosing, or otherwise disposing of any real property or personal property in their possession or under their control, or in the possession of, or under the control of, any of the Defendants, which property or other assets were derived or emanated from directly, or indirectly, the sale or purchase or offer to sell or purchase, investment contracts or other securities, without further Order from this Court.

B. RESCISSION, RESTITUTION, AND DISGORGEMENT

53. For a Final Judgment and Order pursuant to Corporations Code section 25530, subdivision (b), requiring Defendants, and each of them, to disgorge all profits and compensation obtained as a result of the violations of law complained of herein, and pay full restitution to each person determined to have been subjected to Defendants' acts or practices which constitute violations of the CSL in the amounts and manner provided for by law and according to proof.

C. CIVIL PENALTIES

54. As against all Defendants for a Final Judgment and Order pursuant to Corporations Code section 25535, that each of them, individually, jointly and severally, pay to the Plaintiff, a civil penalty in the maximum approximate sum of \$150,000,000.00 or according to proof, which represents \$25,000.00 for each act in violation of Corporations Code sections 25110 and 25401, in a total amount as according to proof at trial.

D. REPURCHASE OFFER

- 55. For an order that Defendants shall repurchase the Galileo Project securities as to each purchaser who accepts the repurchase offer, on the following terms and conditions:
 - (i) Pursuant to Corporations Code section 25507, subdivision (b), and California

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

- Code of Regulations, tit. 10, section 260.507 (10 CCR 260.507), with respect to all investors who purchased a security from Defendants in the form of a Galileo Project investment contract, Defendants shall offer to repurchase the security or offer to rescind the transaction. As set forth in Corporations Code section 25507(b), and 10 CCR 260.507, Defendants shall submit an application for approval as to the form of the offer to repurchase securities to the Securities Regulation Division of the Department of Business Oversight. Defendants shall complete the repurchase offer and repurchase the securities or rescind the transaction as to all investors who accept the offer.
- (ii) The repurchase offer shall be accompanied by all of the information required under Corporations Code section 25507 and 10 CCR 260.507, including, but not limited to, a disclosure informing the offeree of the findings set forth herein, and describing the current status of Defendants' business operations.

E. APPOINTMENT OF A RECEIVER

56. For an order appointing a receiver, namely Thomas McNamara of Regulatory Resolutions, 655 West Broadway, Suite 1600, San Diego, California 92101, issued pursuant to Corporations Code section 25530 subdivision (a), upon an ex parte application, to remain in effect during the pendency of this action or until further order of the court, to take possession of all real and personal property and assets of Defendants SILVER SADDLE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT, LP; SILVER SADDLE RANCH & CLUB, INC.; THE GALILEO COMMERCIAL PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., as well as any other entity that has conducted any business related to Defendants' offering and selling of the Galileo Project investment contracts, including receipt of assets derived from any activity that is the subject of the Complaint in this matter, and that the receiver determines is controlled or owned by any Defendant (hereinafter "Receivership Defendants"), and their respective subsidiaries and affiliates, and their successors and assigns wherever situated, or to which Receivership Defendants have any right of possession, custody or control, beneficially or otherwise, irrespective of whosoever holds such assets, including all such assets which Receivership Defendants carry or maintain, or which may be received during the pendency of this receivership, in order to obtain an adequate accounting of Receivership Defendants' assets and liabilities and to secure a marshalling of said assets; and,

- 57. For an order further providing that:
- a. Receiver be authorized and directed to take possession of all real and personal property and assets of Defendants SILVER SADDLE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT, LP; SILVER SADDLE RANCH & CLUB, INC.; THE GALILEO COMMERCIAL PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC. as well as any other entity that has conducted any business related to Defendants' offering and selling of the Galileo Project investment contracts, including receipt of assets derived from any activity that is the subject of the Complaint in this matter, and that the Receiver determines is controlled or owned by any Defendant and/or Receivership Defendants, and their respective subsidiaries and affiliates, and their successors and assigns wherever situated, or to which Receivership Defendants have any right of possession, custody or control, beneficially or otherwise, irrespective of whosoever holds such assets, including all such assets which Receivership Defendants carry or maintain, or which may be received during the pendency of this receivership, in order to obtain an adequate accounting of Receivership Defendants' assets and liabilities and to secure a marshalling of said assets.
 - b. For good cause appearing, the Receiver's bond be set by the court at a fair amount.
- c. Upon his appointment and entering upon his duties, the Receiver be authorized, empowered and directed: to marshal, collect, review, observe, discover and take charge of all the real and personal property, premises and other assets of, or in the possession of or under the control of, Receivership Defendants, beneficially or otherwise, or wherever else situated, including, but not limited to the following premises:
 - A. <u>Silver Saddle Ranch & Club, Inc.</u>: 20751 Aristotle Dr, California City, CA
 93505, and 7635 North San Fernando Road, Suite A; Burbank, CA 91505;
 - B. <u>Silver Saddle Commercial Development, LP</u>: 7635 North San Fernando Road,
 Suite A; Burbank, CA 91505, and 15315 Magnolia Boulevard, Suite 201,
 Sherman Oaks, CA 91403;
 - C. <u>The Galileo Commercial Property Owners Association, Inc.</u>: 7635 North San Fernando Road, Suite A; Burbank, CA 91505;

and all accounts or safe deposit boxes of Receivership Defendants in financial depository or other institutions, including, but not limited to the following:

- A. JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.;
- B. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.;
- C. Mission Bank;
- D. One West Bank;
- E. Frost Bank:

and of any other property in which Receivership Defendants have an interest, regardless by whom it may be held, beneficially or otherwise, on an ongoing and continual basis pursuant to this Court's order. No other signatory, including spouses or relatives of Receivership Defendants, on any bank account, investment account or safe deposit box may withdraw or cause to be withdrawn any amount from the accounts frozen by this or related order, except by Order from the Court. Periodically, as set forth in paragraphs 7 and 8, below, the Receiver shall report to this Court the results of the review, observation, discovery and abstracts resulting from the activities of the Receiver as ordered by this Court, and specifically on any commingling of funds, unauthorized loans or other disposition of property of whatever description between any and each of the Receivership Defendants herein and/or any person, corporation, entity, sole proprietorship, affiliate, association of whatever type or structure, whether or not said entities are or are not Receivership Defendants in this action.

58. For an order further providing that the Receiver take all steps necessary to secure all premises that Receivership Defendants are using to conduct business operations that relate to the unlawful activity alleged in the Complaint, including, but not limited to the premises listed in paragraph 56, subdivision (c), above. Steps to secure premises may include, but are not limited to, any of the following, as Receiver deems necessary or advisable: (a) serving the receivership Order; (b) completing a written inventory of all receivership assets; (c) obtaining pertinent information from all employees and other agents of Receivership Defendants, including, but not limited to, requiring such employees and agents to complete a questionnaire provided by Receiver; (d) photographing and videotaping any or all portions of the premises; (e) securing the location by changing any locks or security codes and disconnecting any computer modems or other means of access to the computer or

other records maintained at that location; (f) obtaining access to any locked storage containers believed to contain assets or documents; (g) requiring any persons present on the premises at the time this Order is served to leave the premises, to provide Receiver with proof of identification, or to demonstrate to the satisfaction of Receiver that such persons are not removing from the premises assets or documents of Receivership Defendants or otherwise subject to this Order; and (h) securing the assistance of law enforcement officers. Law enforcement officers may assist Receiver in implementing these provisions to keep the peace and maintain security.

- 59. For an order further providing that the Receiver employ the law firm of McNamara Smith LLP where the Receiver is a partner and may employ such other attorneys and persons upon further order of this Court to assist the Receiver in the performance of his duties and responsibilities, such employment to be approved by the Court upon ex parte application of the Receiver.
- 60. For an order further providing that the Receiver employ other such persons, including accountants, investigators, clerical and professional personnel, and the Receiver's in-house staff and counsel, to perform such tasks as may be necessary to aid the Receiver in the performance of his duties and responsibilities, without further order of the Court.
- 61. For an order further providing that the Receiver file, within 30 days of his qualification and appointment hereunder, an initial inventory of all property which he shall then have reviewed, observed and/or discovered pursuant to this Court's Order. Additionally, the Receiver is to file one or more supplemental inventories when and if he shall subsequently come into knowledge of additional items appropriate to the inventory.
- 62. For an order further providing that the Receiver undertake an independent review into the affairs and transactions of Receivership Defendants and to file with this Court, within 120 days, and every six months thereafter, a report detailing the Receiver's findings of his review of the condition of Receivership Defendants, other affairs and transactions of Receivership Defendants, reflecting the existence of any liabilities, both those claimed by others to exist and those to which the Receiver believes to be the legal obligations of each of said Receivership Defendants, including a review of any possible conflicts of interest and any further information the Receiver believes may assist in an equitable disposition of this matter, and to include in the report the Receiver's opinion

regarding the ability of said Receivership Defendants to meet their obligations as they come due, and the Receiver's recommendation regarding the necessity for, and the best method of handling, preserving, or disposing of said assets.

- 63. For an order further providing that the Receiver invest funds of the receivership estate in any interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in any interest-bearing accounts in financial institutions approved by the United States Trustee as an authorized depository for funds of bankruptcy estate, without further order of the Court; and to be the signatory on all bank accounts of Receivership Defendants, and each of them, including, but not limited to:
 - A. JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.;
 - B. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.;
 - C. Mission Bank;
 - D. One West Bank;
 - E. Frost Bank;

and of any depository or investment account in any financial institution that the Receiver may discover at a later date containing any investor funds, upon presentation of this Order.

- 64. For an order further providing that the Receiver bring such proceedings as are necessary to enforce the provisions hereof, including issuance of subpoenas to compel testimony or production of documents as to the existence or location of assets or any other information pertinent to the business, financial affairs, and other transactions of Receivership Defendants.
- 65. For an order further providing that the Receiver bring such proceedings as are necessary to modify the provisions hereof, as the Receiver deems appropriate.
- 66. For an order further providing that the Receiver make such payments and disbursements from the funds so taken into custody, control and possession of the Receiver or otherwise received by him, as may be necessary and advisable in discharging his duties as receiver, without further order of the Court, including, without limitation, the payment of interim compensation to the Receiver and persons or entities under subparagraphs (5) and (6) above, subject to the provisions of subparagraph (27) and (28). The Receiver shall apply to the Court for prior approval of any payment of any debt or obligation incurred by the Receivership Defendants prior to

the date of entry of this order, except payments that the Receiver deems necessary or advisable to secure assets of the Receivership Defendants.

- 67. For an order further providing that the Receiver carry on any lawful business activity of the entities and persons or entities in receivership, to preserve investors' assets and to foreclose and/or actively seek and negotiate with potential buyers, assignees or other parties who may be interested in acquiring, purchasing, leasing, subleasing or renting real or personal property of Receivership Defendants and to sell, lease, sublease or rent such real or personal property of Receivership Defendants, subject to court approval.
- 68. For an order further providing that the Receiver institute, prosecute, defend, compromise, intervene in and become a party, either in his own name or in the name of Receivership Defendants, to such suits, actions or proceedings as may be necessary for the protection, maintenance, recoupment or preservation of the assets or property of Receivership Defendants, or in his custody, in his discretion, without further order of the Court.
- 69. For an order further providing that the Receiver divert, take possession of and secure all mail of Receivership Defendants, in order to screen such mail, retaining so much as it relates to the business of Receivership Defendants, and forwarding to the individual or other appropriate addresses so much as is not, in the Receiver's opinion, appropriate for retention by him, and to effect a change in the rights to use any and all post office boxes and other mail collection facilities used by Receivership Defendants.
- 70. For an order further providing that the Receiver be empowered to undertake an immediate review of all readily available assets of the Receivership Defendants in order to determine the economic viability of a receivership. Upon such review, if the Receiver determines that sufficient assets are readily available to fund the receivership, then the Receiver shall file such finding with the Court, and the receivership shall continue until further order of the Court. If upon initial review the Receiver determines that readily available assets are insufficient to maintain the receivership, then the Receiver shall so notify the Court, and may request that the Court dissolve the receivership, or modify the duties and responsibilities of the Receiver, and Plaintiff will not oppose such request, it

being understood that the Receiver and professionals employed by the Receiver shall not be expected to perform services unless readily available assets exist to pay the expenses of the receivership.

- 71. For an order further providing that the Receiver shall cooperate fully with the Plaintiff, and any other state and federal law enforcement and regulatory agencies having jurisdiction over matters relating to the conduct or business of Receivership Defendants so as not to impair the ability of said state and federal law enforcement regulatory agencies to perform their duly authorized investigative and enforcement duties.
- 72. For an order further providing that the Receiver's powers shall be in addition to, and not by way of limitation of, the powers described in Corporations Code section 25530, subdivision (a), and Government Code section 12896 and Code of Civil Procedure section 564 et seq.
- 73. For an order further providing that any state or federal law enforcement or regulatory agency having jurisdiction over matters related to Receivership Defendants' business shall be permitted to review, without exception, all reports of the Receiver and all books, records, and files of Receivership Defendants at any time during normal business hours, with reasonable notice, and to make any abstracts or copies of said documents as it desires, provided that nothing herein shall waive or abrogate any applicable attorney-client or other legally recognized privilege.
- 74. For an order further providing that the Receiver be vested with, and is authorized, directed and empowered to exercise, all of the power of Receivership Defendants, their officers, directors, shareholders, general partners or persons who exercise similar powers and perform similar duties; Receivership Defendants, their officers, agents, employees, representatives, directors, successors in interest, attorneys in fact and all persons acting in concert or participating with them, are hereby divested of, restrained and barred from exercising any of the powers vested herein in the Receiver.
- 75. For an order further providing that, if the Receiver identifies a nonparty entity as a Receivership Defendant, the Receiver shall promptly notify the entity as well as the parties and inform the entity that it can challenge the Receiver's determination by filing a motion with the Court. Provided, however, that the Receiver may delay providing such notice until the Receiver has established control of the nonparty entity and its assets and records, if the Receiver determines that

notice to the entity may result in the destruction of records, dissipation of assets, or any other obstruction of the Receiver's control of the entity.

- 76. For an order further providing that defendants, including, but not limited to the Receivership Defendants, their officers, directors, shareholders, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, salespersons, successors, assigns, subsidiaries, affiliates, and other persons or entities under their control and all persons or entities in active concert or participation with Receivership Defendants, and all persons owing a duty of disclosure to Receivership Defendants, and each of them, and all individually named Defendants, shall cooperate with the Receiver in his investigation and shall immediately turn over to the Receiver records, computers and passwords, and/or access codes for all computers and any security systems, documentation, charts and/or descriptive material of all funds, assets, property owned beneficially or otherwise, and all other assets of Receivership Defendants wherever situated, and all books and records of accounts, title documents and other documents in the possession or under their control, which relate, directly or indirectly, to assets of Receivership Defendants.
- 77. For an order further providing that, except by leave of this Court and during the pendency of this receivership, all claimants, creditors, lessors and other persons seeking relief of any kind, in law or in equity, from Receivership Defendants, and all others acting on behalf of any such persons, including sheriffs, marshals, servants, agents, attorneys and employees, be restrained and enjoined, directly or indirectly, from:
- a. Commencing, prosecuting, continuing or enforcing any suit or proceeding, except by motion before this Court;
- b. Executing or issuing or causing the execution or issuance of any court attachment, subpoena, replevin, execution or other process for the purpose of impounding or taking possession of or interfering with or creating or enforcing a lien upon any property owned or in the possession of Receivership Defendants, their subsidiaries or affiliates, or the receiver appointed therein, wherever situated;

28 | | ///

///

c	•	Commencing or continuing judicial or non-judicial foreclosure proceedings or
proceedings for	the ap	ppointment of a receiver for any property owned or claimed by Receivership
Defendants in th	is act	ion;
d	•	Creating, perfecting, or enforcing any lien or encumbrance against any real or
personal propert	y;	

- e. Accelerating the due date of any obligation or claimed obligation;
- f. Exercising any right of set-off;
- g. Taking, retaining, retaking or attempting to retake possession of any real or personal property;
 - h. Withholding or diverting any rent or other obligation; and
- i. Doing any act or thing whatsoever to interfere with the possession of or management by the Receiver herein and of the property and assets owned, controlled or in the possession of Receivership Defendants or to, in any way, interfere with the Receiver or to interfere in any manner during the pendency of this proceeding with the exclusive jurisdiction of this Court over Receivership Defendants.
 - 78. For an order further providing that the Receiver Order not stay:
 - a. The commencement or continuation of a criminal action or proceeding;
- b. The commencement or continuation of an action or proceeding by a government unit, to enforce such government unit's police or regulatory power;
- c. The enforcement of a judgment, other than a money judgment, obtained in an action or proceeding by a government unit to enforce such government unit's police or regulatory power; or
 - d. The issuance to a Receivership Defendant of a notice of tax deficiency.
- 79. For an order further providing that any and all provisions of any agreement entered into by and between any third party and Receivership Defendants, including, by way of illustration, but not limited to, the following types of agreements (as well as any amendments or modifications thereto), mortgages, partnership agreements, financial guarantee bonds, joint venture agreements, promissory notes, remarketing agreements, loan agreements, security agreements, indemnification

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

agreements, subrogation agreements, subordination agreements, deeds of trust, pledge agreements, assignments of rents and other collateral, financing statements, letters of credit, leases, insurance policies, guarantees, escrow agreements, management agreements, real estate brokerage and rental agreements, servicing agreements, consulting agreements, easement agreements, license agreements, franchise agreements, construction contracts, or employment contracts that provide in any manner that the selection, appointment, or retention of a receiver or trustee by any court, or the entry of an order such as hereby made, shall be deemed to be, or otherwise operate as a breach, violation, event of default, termination, event of dissolution, event of acceleration, insolvency, bankruptcy, or liquidation, shall be stayed, and the assertion of any and all rights, remedies relating thereto shall also be stayed and barred, except as otherwise ordered by this Court, and this Court shall retain jurisdiction over any causes of action that have arisen or may otherwise arise under any such provision.

80. For an order further providing that, in the event Receiver receives notice that a bankruptcy has been filed by any Defendant and part of the bankruptcy estate includes assets that are the subject to this Order, Receiver shall immediately contact the People and determine whether the People intend to move in the bankruptcy court for an order for (i) relief from the automatic stay, and (ii) relief from Receiver's obligation to turn over assets in the receivership estate (11 U.S.C. § 543). If the People have no intention to make such a motion, Receiver shall immediately turn over the appropriate receivership assets to the appropriate entity – either to the trustee in bankruptcy if one has been appointed or, if not, to the debtor in possession – and otherwise comply with 11 U.S.C.§ 543. If the People intend to seek relief from the automatic stay and from Receiver's obligation to turn over assets in the receivership estate, Receiver may remain in possession and preserve the receivership estate pending ruling on those motions (11 U.S.C. § 543, subd. (a).) Receiver's authority to preserve assets that are subject to the bankruptcy shall be limited as follows: (a) Receiver may continue to collect rents and other income; (b) Receiver may make only those disbursements necessary to preserve and protect those assets; (c) Receiver shall not execute any new leases or other long-term contracts; and (d) Receiver shall do nothing that would affect a material change in the circumstances of those assets.

- 81. For an order further providing that the Receiver, the Receiver's employees and agents, and professionals employed by the Receiver, are entitled to monthly payment of interim compensation for services rendered, at their normal hourly rates, and monthly reimbursement for all expenses incurred by them on behalf of the receivership estate, and the Receiver is authorized to make such payments without further order of the Court. Within 10 days after such monthly payments, the Receiver shall serve written notice upon the counsel of record for Receivership Defendants of the amount paid to each payee, with an itemization of the services rendered or expenses incurred.
- 82. For an order further providing that interim monthly fees paid shall be subject to review and approval by this Court, on a quarterly basis. This Court retains jurisdiction to award a greater or lesser amount as the full, fair and final value of such services. In the event that extraordinary services are performed by the Receiver, or any professionals employed by the Receiver, the Court may approve extraordinary compensation to such persons.
- 83. For an order further providing that neither Plaintiff, nor any officer, employee or agent of Plaintiff, shall have any liability for the payment, at any time, for any such fees or expenses in connection with said receivership.
- 84. For an order further providing that it further be ordered that Defendants and their officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and any other persons who are in custody, possession or control of any assets, collateral, books, records, computers, papers or other property of Receivership Defendants shall forthwith give access to and control of such property to the Receiver.
- 85. For an order further providing that until further order of the Court and in order to ensure the effectiveness of the Court's appointment of Receiver, as follows:
 - A. Each Receivership Defendant shall provide the People and Receiver with the following information regarding its assets (Asset Information):
 - a. For any real property (i) owned in whole or in part or controlled by any
 Receivership Defendant, in whole or in part, (ii) in the actual or constructive
 possession of any Receivership Defendant, (iii) held by an agent of any
 Receivership Defendant on its behalf, or (iv) owned, controlled by, or in the actual

- or constructive possession of, or otherwise held for the benefit of, any
 Receivership Defendant or any corporation, partnership, or other entity directly or
 indirectly owned or controlled by any Receivership defendant, as of the date of
 this Order, the legal description and address of each property.
- b. For each and every bank account or investment account, including checking accounts, saving accounts, money market accounts, retirement accounts, mutual fund and stock brokerage accounts, that are (i) owned in whole or in part or controlled by any Receivership Defendant, in whole or in part, (ii) in the actual or constructive possession of any Receivership Defendant, (iii) held by an agent of any Receivership Defendant on its behalf, or (iv) owned, controlled by, or in the actual or constructive possession of, or otherwise held for the benefit of, any Receivership Defendant or any corporation, partnership, or other entity directly or indirectly owned or controlled by any Receivership Defendant, as of the date of this Order, the account number, name(s) on the account, current balance, and the name and contact information of the financial institution.
- c. For all personal property with a fair market value in excess of \$2,500, that is (i) owned in whole or in part or controlled by any Defendant, in whole or in part, (ii) in the actual or constructive possession of any Receivership Defendant, (iii) held by an agent of any Receivership Defendant on its behalf, or (iv) owned, controlled by, or in the actual or constructive possession of, or otherwise held for the benefit of, any Receivership Defendant or any corporation, partnership, or other entity directly or indirectly owned or controlled by any Receivership Defendant, as of the date of this Order, a list of the property, the location of the property, and a reasonably detailed description of the property, including, as applicable, serial numbers or other identification numbers and registration information.
- B. Each Receivership Defendant shall provide this Asset Information by overnight delivery service, facsimile, email, or hand delivery to:

- a. Senior Counsel Robert Lux, 1350 Front Street, Suite 2034, San Diego, California
 92101, fax (619) 525-4045, email Robert.Lux@dbo.ca.gov; and
- Receiver Thomas McNamara of Regulatory Resolutions, 655 West Broadway,
 Suite 1600, San Diego, California 92101, fax (619) 269-0401, email
 tmcnamara@mcnamarallp.com
- C. The Asset Information must be received by the People and Receiver within three (3) business days of service of this Order on Receivership Defendants or their counsel.
- 86. For an order further providing that no officer, agent, servant, employee, or attorney of Receivership Defendants or their subsidiaries or affiliates, shall take any action or purport to take any action, in the name of or on behalf of any Receivership Defendant or any of their subsidiaries and affiliates, without the written consent of the Receiver or order of this Court.
- 87. For an order further providing that, except by leave of this Court, during the pendency of this receivership, all clients, investors, trust beneficiaries, note holders, creditors, claimants, lessors, and all other persons or entities seeking relief of any kind, in law or equity, from Defendants and all persons acting on behalf of any such investor, trust beneficiary, note holder, creditor, claimant, lessor, or other person, including sheriffs, marshals, servants, agents, employees, and attorneys, are hereby restrained and enjoined from, directly or indirectly with respect to Receivership Defendants:
 - A. using self-help or executing or issuing or causing the execution or issuance of any court attachment, subpoena, replevin, execution or other process for the purpose of impounding or taking possession of or interfering with or creating or enforcing a lien upon any property or property interest owned by or in the possession of Receivership Defendants and any partnerships or joint ventures for which Receivership Defendants are the Managing General Partner, wherever situated; and
 - B. doing any act or thing whatsoever to interfere with taking control, possession or management by the Receiver appointed hereunder of the property and assets owned, controlled or in the possession of Receivership Defendants or in any way to interfere with

or harass the temporary receiver or to interfere in any manner with the discharge of his or her duties and responsibilities hereunder.

- 88. For an order further providing that that Receivership Defendants and their subsidiaries and affiliates and their officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, shall cooperate with and assist the Receiver and shall take no action, directly or indirectly, to hinder, obstruct, or otherwise interfere with the Receiver in the conduct of his duties or to interfere in any manner, directly or indirectly, with the custody, possession, management, or control by the Receiver of the funds, assets, collateral, premises, and chooses in action described above.
- 89. For an order further providing that the Receiver shall determine upon taking possession of the property whether in the Receiver's judgment there is sufficient insurance coverage. With respect to any insurance coverage in existence or obtained, the Receiver shall be named as an additional insured on the policies for the period that the Receiver shall be in possession of the property. If sufficient insurance coverage does not exist, the Receiver shall immediately notify the parties to this lawsuit and shall have thirty (30) calendar days to procure sufficient all-risk and liability insurance on the property (excluding earthquake and flood insurance) provided, however, that if the Receiver does not have sufficient funds to do so, the Receiver shall seek instructions from the Court with regard to whether insurance shall be obtained and how it is to be paid for. If consistent with existing law, the Receiver shall not be responsible for claims arising from the lack of procurement or inability to obtain insurance.

F. ASSET FREEZE

90. For an Order that a freeze be placed on all funds, negotiable instruments and/or assets held in any bank, savings or checking, brokerage or other accounts, certificates of deposit, safe deposit box, or otherwise, without limitation, in the name of Defendants SILVER SADDLE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT, LP; SILVER SADDLE RANCH & CLUB, INC.; and THE GALILEO COMMERCIAL PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., or for the benefit of said Defendants directly or indirectly, and each of them.

28 | 1//

G. OTHER RELIEF

- 91. For an Order that this court will retain jurisdiction of this action in order to implement and carry out the terms of all orders and decrees that may be entered herein or to entertain any suitable application or motion by Plaintiff for additional relief within the jurisdiction of this court.
 - 92. That plaintiff recovers its costs of suit herein, including costs of investigation.
 - 93. For such and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

Dated: September 6, 2019 MANUEL P. ALVAREZ
Commissioner of Business Oversight

By: _____

ROBERT R. LUX Senior Counsel California Department of Business Oversight Attorney for the People of the State of California