Case 3:06-cv-00951-SMM Document 1 File 0 100 Page 1 00 GED RECEIVED COPY APR 04 2006 LESLIE J. HUGHES, Colo. Bar No. 15043 ROBERT M. FUSFELD, Colo. Bar No. 13097 1 CLERK US DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA JOHN MULHERN, Illinois Bar No. 6257148 3 Attorneys for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission 1801 California Street, Suite 1500 Denver, Colorado 80202 Email: hughesLJ@sec.gov Email: fusfeldr@sec.gov Email: mulhernj@sec.gov Telephone: (303) 844-1000 7 Facsimile: (303) 844-1068 8 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 11 951 PCT-830nm 12 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE 13 COMMISSION, 14 Plaintiff, **COMPLAINT** 15 VS. 16 DAVID L. MCMILLAN, 17 Defendant. 18 19 Plaintiff, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission alleges the 20 following for its complaint. 21 I. SUMMARY 22 1. From at least February 1999 through October 2005, David L. McMillan, 23 an investment advisor and stock broker working in Bullhead City, Arizona defrauded 24 investors in Arizona, Nevada, California, and Colorado by offering and selling them 25 investments in either annuity or loan programs that did not exist. Rather than investing 26

his clients' money as he had represented, McMillan used it to pay his personal expenses

or to make purported interest payments to earlier investors.

27

- 2. McMillan used three different schemes to defraud these investors: (a) a fictitious annuity investment he claimed was offered by an Arizona company named Transnation Title Insurance Company (Transnation); (b) an investment purportedly making continuing loans to an Arizona real estate developer named Riverside Associates (Riverside) after an original legitimate loan to Riverside had been repaid; and (c) an investment purportedly making loans to people that were building homes in the Bullhead City, Arizona area (referred to herein as the First Deed of Trust investments).
  - 3. At least twenty-one investors lost approximately \$2.6 million.
- 4. As a result of the conduct described in this complaint, defendant McMillan has violated and, unless restrained and enjoined by this Court, will continue to violate Sections 206(1) and (2) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (Advisers Act) [15 U.S.C. § 80b-6(1) and (2)], Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 [15 U.S.C. §77q], Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Exchange Act) [15 U.S.C. §78j(b)] and Rule 10b-5 thereunder [17 C.F.R. §240.10b-5].
- 5. The Commission brings this action pursuant to Section 20(b) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(b)], Sections 21 (d) and (e) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d) and (e)] and Sections 209(d) and (e) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-9(d) and (e)] seeking an order permanently enjoining the defendant from engaging in the transactions, acts, practices and courses of business alleged in this complaint, imposing penalties and granting other relief.

### II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 20(b) and 22(a) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 77t and 77v(a)], Sections 21(d) and (e) and 27 of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u (d) and (e) and 78aa] and Section 209(d) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-9(d)].
- 7. The defendant, directly and indirectly, has made use of the mails, the means and instrumentalities of transportation and communication in interstate

commerce, or the means and instruments of interstate commerce, in connection with the transactions, acts, practices, and courses of business alleged in this complaint.

8. Venue lies in this Court pursuant to Section 27 of the Exchange Act, Section 20(b) of the Securities Act, and Section 209(d) of the Advisers Act because certain of the transactions, acts, practices and courses of business constituting violations have occurred within the District of Arizona, the defendant resides in Arizona, and the defendant's office was in Arizona.

### III. THE DEFENDANT

9. Defendant David L. McMillan is a resident of Fort Mohave, Mohave County, Arizona. He has worked as an investment adviser in Bullhead City, Arizona since at least 1994. He has been associated with Schooner Financial Associates Inc., a registered investment adviser, since 1994. He was employed by Royal Alliance Associates, Inc., a registered broker-dealer, or by Geneos Wealth Management, Inc., a registered broker-dealer, at various times during the course of his fraud.

## IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

## **The Transnation Fraud**

- 10. At all times material to this complaint, McMillan was an investment adviser engaged in the business of advising other persons, for compensation, about the value of securities or the advisability of investing in, purchasing, or selling securities.
- 11. Between February 2002 through October 2005, McMillan employed a device, scheme or artifice to defraud, and engaged in transactions, practices and courses of business that operated as a fraud or deceit upon, his clients in Arizona, California, and Nevada by offering and selling an investment contract which he represented to them was an annuity.
- 12. McMillan told investors that he was offering and selling an annuity issued by Transnation Title Insurance (Transnation), an Arizona title insurance company.
- 13. McMillan also told these investors that the Transnation annuity paid annual interest ranging from 3.75% to 10%.

- 14. McMillan statements to investors about the existence of the Transnation annuities and the rate of return were untrue statements of material facts, because Transnation did not offer any such annuities or pay interest on any such investments.
- 15. McMillan misrepresented how he would use investors' funds. He omitted to tell the investors that he did not use the funds that he received from them to purchase Transnation annuities but instead misappropriated their funds for his personal benefit.
- 16. McMillan acted with scienter because he knew his statements to investors and omissions of material fact were false or misleading because Transnation annuities did not exist and he did not transfer the funds he received from investors to Transnation.
- 17. Based on McMillan's false and misleading statements, at least five of his investment advisory clients, including Eugene Doty, Darlene Bruner, Ronald Laughlin, Lisa Dallman, and Geraldine Teeters paid him at least \$933,000 between February 2002 and April 2004 to invest in the Transnation annuities.
- 18. In furtherance of the fraud, McMillan created and mailed to at least five of the six investors fictitious account statements on Transnation letterhead showing their investment in Transnation and the amount of interest allegedly being earned.
- 19. McMillan issued these false and misleading account statements to lull investors into a sense of security and inaction, and to discourage investors from demanding a return of their principal investment.
- 20. McMillan mailed two false account statements to Eugene Doty in May 2002 showing his investment of \$100,000 had earned approximately 9.6% interest, which induced him to invest an additional \$46,000 in the fictitious Transnation annuities.
- 21. When Geraldine Teeters became suspicious of the validity of the Transnation annuity, she began to question McMillan and pressure him for the return of her money. In August 2004, McMillan paid her \$130,181.66 which included return of her initial \$100,000 investment and interest.
  - 22. However, at least four of the remaining five clients that invested in the

fictitious Transnation annuities did not receive any repayment of their investment.

- 23. By means of the conduct described above, McMillan in the offer and sale of the Transnation annuities obtained money from his clients by means of untrue statements of material fact and omissions of material facts necessary to make the statements he made to his clients not misleading.
- 24. McMillan in the offer and sale of the Transnation annuities engaged in acts, transactions, practices or courses of business that operated as a fraud or deceit upon the purchasers of the annuities.

### The Riverside Fraud

- 25. In 1999, Riverside Associates LP (Riverside) owned approximately 40 acres in Bullhead City, Arizona which it was developing for residential home development. Joel Ontell, the president of the General Partner in Riverside Associates LP determined that the partnership needed a \$200,000 loan to cover some of the costs of developing the lots. Ontell was introduced to a local mortgage broker in Bullhead City, who told him that McMillan and he could locate five to seven people to make the loan.
- 26. By March 1999, McMillan and the mortgage broker had persuaded the following persons and a trust to pool their capital contributions and make the \$200,000 loan to Riverside. The names of the investors and the amount of money that each contributed to the loan are Kimberly Butler who invested \$50,000; Charles and Charlotte Smith who invested \$50,000; David and Sandra Rock who invested \$35,000; Todd and Deborah Taggart who invested \$25,000; Becky and Kenneth Flippan who invested \$25,000 and the Sorensen Family Trust which invested \$15,000. The parties signed a promissory note providing for Riverside to make interest payments of 12% per year which note was secured by a Deed of Trust on certain of the lots in the development.
- 27. Starting in April 1999, Riverside began making monthly interest payments to the investors. Riverside mailed the monthly interest checks to the mortgage broker who in turn gave them to McMillan to distribute to the investors

- 28. In October and December 2001, Riverside made two repayments of \$30,000 in principal which were paid to the investors listed in paragraph 26 above based on their percentage interest in the loan. Riverside mailed the two sets of principal checks to the mortgage broker who in turn gave them to McMillan to distribute to the investors
- 29. Following Riverside's principal payments, McMillan told the investors that they could continue their investment in the Riverside loan by depositing the principal checks into their own bank accounts and then writing a new check to "Schooner Financial" for the same amount. McMillan told investors that their new investment in the Riverside loan would continue to earn the same rate of interest.
- 30. McMillan was the signatory on and owned a credit union account in the name of Schooner Financial.
- 31. Based on McMillan's statements, each of the investors wrote checks in January or February 2002 to Schooner Financial to reinvest in the Riverside loan in the following amounts: Butler re-invested \$15,000; Smiths reinvested \$15,000; Rocks reinvested \$10,500; Taggarts reinvested \$7,500; Flippans reinvested \$7,500; and Sorensen Family Trust reinvested \$4,500. These payments represent the full amount of principal that these investors had received from Riverside to date.
- 32. McMillan deposited these checks into his credit union account. He did not transfer the funds to Riverside.
- 33. On September 30, 2002, and February 29, 2004, Riverside made additional partial payments of principal to the investors in the amounts of \$20,000, and \$60,000 respectively. On March 9, 2004, Riverside made its final principal payment of \$60,000. Each of these payments was distributed to the investors listed in paragraph 26 above based on their percentage interest in the loan. Riverside mailed the principal checks to the mortgage broker who in turn gave them to McMillan to distribute to the investors.
  - 34. Following each of Riverside's principal payments to the investors,

McMillan told the investors that they could continue their investment in the Riverside loan by depositing the principal checks into their own bank accounts and then writing a new check to "Schooner Financial" for the same amount.

- 35. McMillan falsely represented to investors that the Riverside investment would continue on for years.
- 36. Each of the investors reinvested the principal payments they received from Riverside as described in paragraph 33 above by writing a check to Schooner Financial and delivering it to McMillan who deposited it into his credit union account. By May 2004, McMillan had received \$200,000 of reinvested funds from the investors. McMillan did not transfer any of these reinvested funds to Riverside.
- 37. McMillan statements to the investors about continuing their loans to Riverside were false and misleading because Riverside Associates LP had not agreed to continue the loan, to borrow the additional funds from the investors, to make interest payments of 12 % on these additional funds, or to secure these funds with deeds of trust on the land it was developing in Bullhead City, Arizona.
- 38. McMillan also omitted material facts when he failed to tell investors that he was not transferring the funds they had paid to Schooner Financial to Riverside Associates LP for the continuance of their previous loan.
- 39. McMillan knew his statements to investors and omissions of material fact were false and misleading, because Riverside had not signed new promissory notes or deeds of trust to continue the loan arrangement, and he had not transferred the money he received from the investors to Riverside.
- 40. Moreover, in or about August 2002, McMillan began paying investors purported interest on their Riverside loan by issuing checks drawn on Schooner Financial's credit union account when he knew that he had not received any interest payments from Riverside.

- 41. McMillan was operating a Ponzi scheme by making purported interest payments to investors from funds he had received from investors rather than from Riverside.
- 42. In or about February 1999 at the same time that McMillan was raising money for the Riverside loan, McMillan told Sharon Myers that he had a great investment opportunity for her to invest \$50,000 with other investors, including the Rocks and the Taggarts, to make a loan on a housing development on the south side of Bullhead City, Arizona. McMillan said the investment would pay 12% interest, that Myers would receive monthly interest payments, and that the investment would continue for several years. Myers eventually learned that the investment was to be with "Riverside & Associates."
- 43. Based on McMillan's statements, Myers agreed to invest \$50,000 in the loan. She directed McMillan to transfer \$50,000 that she had paid previously to Schooner Financial into the "Riverside & Associates" investment. Shortly after her investment, she began receiving monthly interest checks of \$500 drawn on the Schooner Financial account. These interest checks continued until October 2005.
- 44. McMillan statements to Myers were false and misleading because he did not pool her funds with other investors to make a loan to Riverside Associates.

  McMillan omitted to tell Myers that he had misappropriated her funds and that the monthly payments she was receiving were not interest received from Riverside.
- 45. McMillan knew that Myers' funds were not part of the loan to Riverside because her name was not listed on the promissory note or deed of trust, and he did not receive any monthly interest checks for Myers from Riverside. McMillan made the monthly interest payments to Myers to hide his misappropriation of her funds.
- 46. McMillan defrauded the Riverside investors out of approximately \$250,000 by falsely claiming that Riverside was soliciting additional loans after the original loan to the developer was paid off or by misrepresenting that the investor had made a loan to Riverside that was fictitious.

### First Deed of Trust Fraud

- 47. From at least 1999 to October 2005, McMillan told investors that he had an investment opportunity in which they could invest their money in "First Deed of Trust investments."
- 48. McMillan represented to investors that their money would be used to make loans to a prominent home building company in Bullhead City named Ramsey Homes, Inc. which was previously known as Ramsey Home Development, Inc. (referred to jointly herein as Ramsey Homes) or to other individuals or companies that were building homes in the Bullhead City area.
- 49. McMillan represented to investors they would receive a 10% to 12% annual return on their investment.
- 50. McMillan also told investors that their investments were secured by first deeds of trust on specific lots.
- 51. McMillan told these investors that their investment could continue indefinitely because as one loan was repaid, McMillan would use those funds to make another loan.
- 52. Based on McMillan's representations, at least twelve investors paid him approximately \$1,664,699 to invest in the First Deed of Trust investments between 1999 and October 2005.
- 53. McMillan's statements, to these twelve investors in connection with his offer and sale of the First Deed of Trust investments that were to be loaned to Ramsey Homes, were false and misleading because he did not use the funds received from investors to make loans to Ramsey Homes. He did not receive any interest payments from Ramsey Homes. He did not provide investors with promissory notes or first deeds of trust on specific lots owned by Ramsey Homes to secure their investments.
- 54. McMillan knew his statements to investors were false and misleading because the First Deed of Trust investments with Ramsey Homes did not exist. When he received investments from various individuals, he did not pay the funds to Ramsey

Homes, or obtain a promissory note and deed of trust to secure any of the loans.

McMillan knew that he was not receiving any interest payments from Ramsey Homes.

- 55. McMillan's statements, to these twelve investors in connection with his offer and sale of the First Deed of Trust investments that were to be loaned to individuals or other companies building homes, were false and misleading because he did not use the funds received from investors to make the loans. He did not provide investors with promissory notes or first deeds of trust on specific lots to secure their investments.
- 56. McMillan knew his statements about investments in First Deeds of Trust to other individuals and companies were false and misleading, because he did not use the investors' funds for the purposes that he represented.
- 57. In fact, McMillan was using these investors' money for unauthorized purposes including personal expenditures and to pay interest to other investors.
- 58. In furtherance of the fraud and to hide his misappropriation of the investors' funds, McMillan used part of the funds he had received from investors to make purported interest payments to the investors.
- 59. Many of the investors in the First Deed of Trust investments have not received their principal investment back from McMillan.

## V. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

### A. FIRST CLAIM

## Violations by McMillan of Sections 206(1) and (2) of the Advisers Act

- 60. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 24 above.
- 61. McMillan directly and indirectly, by use of the mails or means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, and while acting as an investment adviser, employed devices, schemes or artifices to defraud clients and prospective clients; and has engaged in transactions, practices or courses of business which have operated, are operating and will operate as a fraud or deceit upon clients or prospective clients.

62. By reason of the foregoing, McMillan violated and, unless restrained and enjoined, will violate Sections 206(1) and 206(2) of the Advisers Act.

## B. SECOND CLAIM

## Violations by McMillan of Section 17(a)(1) of the Securities Act

- 63. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 59 above.
- 64. McMillan, directly and indirectly, with scienter, in the offer and sale of securities, by use of the means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails, has employed devices schemes or artifices to defraud.
- 65. By reason of the foregoing, McMillan violated and, unless restrained and enjoined, will violate Section 17(a)(1) of the Securities Act.

### C. THIRD CLAIM

# Violations by McMillan of Section 17(a)(2) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act

- 66. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 59 above.
- 67. McMillan, directly and indirectly, in the offer and sale of securities, by use of the means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails, has obtained money or property by means of untrue statements of material fact or omissions to state material facts necessary in order to make statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; or has engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which have been, or are operating as a fraud or deceit upon the purchasers of such securities.
- 68. By reason of the foregoing, McMillan violated and, unless restrained and enjoined, will violate Sections 17(a)(2) and (3) of the Securities Act.

## D. FOURTH CLAIM

# Violations by McMillan of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5

- 69. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 59 above.
- 70. McMillan, directly or indirectly, with scienter, in connection with the purchase or sale of securities, by use of the means or instrumentalities of interstate

commerce or by use of the mails, has employed devices, schemes, or artifices to
defraud; has made untrue statements of material fact 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; or has engaged in acts, practices, or courses of
business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchasers or
sellers of such securities.

52. By reason of the foregoing, McMillan violated and, unless restrained and enjoined, will violate Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder.

#### RELIEF REQUESTED

Wherefore, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court:

I.

Find that the Defendant committed the violations alleged.

II.

Enter a preliminary injunction during the pendency of this action and thereafter a permanent injunction restraining and enjoining Defendant, and those persons in active concert or participation with him who receive actual notice of the order of injunction, by personal service or otherwise, and each of them, from directly or indirectly violating Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5, and Sections 206 (1) and (2) of the Advisers Act.

III.

Order McMillan to account for, disgorge and pay over, as the Court may direct, all ill-gotten gains received or benefits in any form derived from the illegal conduct alleged in this Complaint, together with pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as provided by law.

#### IV.

Enter an order requiring McMillan to pay third-tier civil penalties pursuant to pursuant to Section 20(d) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(d)], Section 21(d)(3) of

the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(3)], and Section 209(e) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-9(e)].

V.

Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just, equitable, and appropriate in connection with the enforcement of the federal securities laws and for the protection of investors.

DATED this 4th day of April, 2006.

Ceslie J. Hughes

Attorney for the Plaintiff

5

SJS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

### **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS		
Securities and Exchange Commission		David L. McMilla	n	
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		NOTE: IN LANI	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Mohave  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.	
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Leslie J. Hughes, United States Securities and Exchange Commis		Attorneys (If Κποwπ) ion,		
1801 California Street, Ste. 1500, Denver, CO 80202. 303.844.1000				
			RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Only) P1 Citizen of This State □		PTF DEF
2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity	Citizen of Another State		
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country	of Business In .  3	Another State
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only)	Poreign Country		
CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 151 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise ■ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane  315 Airplane Product Liability  320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability  330 Federal Employers' Liability  340 Marine  345 Marine Product Liability  350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability  350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability  360 Other Personal Injury  CIVIL RIGHTS  441 Voting  442 Employment  444 Welfare  445 Amer, w/Disabilities - Employment  446 Amer, w/Disabilities - Other  440 Other Civil Rights  362 Personal Injury Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability  370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 371 Truth in Lending 370 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  385 Property Damage Product Liability  510 Motions to Vaca Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General  535 Death Penalty 550 Civil Rights	620 Other Food & Drug   625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881   630 Liquor Laws   640 R.R. & Truck   650 Airline Regs.   660 Occupational Safety/Health   690 Other   LABOR   710 Fair Labor Standards Act   720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations   730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act   740 Railway Labor Act   790 Other Labor Litigation   791 Empl. Ret. Inc.   Security Act   her	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 840 Trademark  SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUTTS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	400 State Reapportionment   410 Antitrust   430 Banks and Banking   450 Commerce   460 Deportation   470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations   480 Consumer Credit   490 Cable/Sat TV   810 Selective Service   850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange   875 Customer Challenge   12 USC 3410   890 Other Statutory Actions   891 Agricultural Acts   892 Economic Stabilization Act   893 Environmental Matters   894 Energy Allocation Act   895 Freedom of Information Act   900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice   950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
V. ORIGIN Original Proceeding  (Place an "X" in One Box Only) 2 Removed from State Court  Appellate Court  Appellate Court  Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):    Substitute of the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):    Substitute of the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):    Substitute of the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):    Substitute of the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):    Substitute of the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):				
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION    13 USC 77+ (b) 78 u (d) 4 (e) 80 b-9 (d) F(t)   Brief description of cause:				
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMANDS CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:  COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 DEMAND: 1 Yes 1 No				
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY    See instructions): JUDGE   DOCKET NUMBER				
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD				
04/04/2006 s/Leslie J. Hughes				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		- VAJS U	y y wyn	
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG, JUI	DGE

JS 44 Reverse (Rev. 11/04)

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

#### Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I. (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.C.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerks in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.

  Example:

  U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553

  Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

Demand. In this space enter the dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) being demanded or indicate other demand such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.