4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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

Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") alleges as follows:

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 20(b), 1. 20(d)(1), and 22(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(b), 77t(d)(1), & 77v(a), and Sections 21(d)(1), 21(d)(3)(A), 21(e), and 27 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d)(1), 78u(d)(3)(A), 78u(e), & 78aa. Defendants have, directly or indirectly, made use of the means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange, in connection with the transactions, acts, practices, and courses of business alleged in this complaint.
- Venue is proper in this district pursuant to Section 22(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77v(a), and Section 27 of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78aa, because certain of the transactions, acts, practices, and courses of conduct constituting violations of the federal securities laws occurred within this district.

#### **SUMMARY**

- 3. This matter involves an unregistered offering and fraudulent investment scheme perpetrated by Horizon Property Holdings, L.C. ("Horizon"), an entity located in Beverly Hills, California, and its principal, Cydney Sanchez ("Sanchez"). In 2006 and 2007, Horizon and Sanchez sold securities in the form of investments in a purported mortgage reinstatement and refinancing program. They raised approximately \$6 million from at least 150 unsophisticated investors in California and several other states, primarily from the African-American and Hispanic communities.
- 4. Sanchez recruited investors by telling them that Horizon would use their money to help homeowners avoid foreclosure by reinstating mortgages in default and then paying investors principal plus a guaranteed return of 40% by refinancing the homeowners' properties. Sanchez told investors that their "total

26

27

28

1

2

return" on each investment (i.e., principal plus the 40% profit) would be paid within a specific time and was secured by a promissory note and an interest in real property evidenced by notarized Short Form Deeds of Trust and Assignment of Rents ("Short Form Deeds"). Sanchez also told investors that they could withdraw their entire investment at any time and for any reason, although they would forfeit some returns or principal for doing so.

- 5. In reality, Horizon investor money was neither guaranteed nor secured by any interest in real property. Sanchez provided investors with sham Short Form Deeds that were unsuitable for recording, a fact some investors discovered when they tried to record their deeds after Sanchez failed to repay their funds. Moreover, contrary to defendants' representations, investor funds were not used to rescue homes from foreclosure. Instead, of the approximately \$6 million they raised, Horizon and Sanchez used approximately \$3.7 million to pay other investors in a Ponzi scheme. Sanchez misappropriated the remaining investor funds to, among other things, (1) finance unrelated and undisclosed real estaterelated business activities and (2) pay her personal expenses (including at least \$536,000 for airline tickets, clothing, jewelry, handbags, electronic equipment, furniture, and cars).
- The defendants, by engaging in the conduct described in this complaint, have violated the antifraud and registration provisions of the federal securities laws.
- 7. By this complaint, the Commission seeks permanent injunctions prohibiting further violations, disgorgement with prejudgment interest, and civil penalties.

#### THE DEFENDANTS

8. Horizon Property Holdings, L.C. is a Utah limited liability corporation based in Beverly Hills, California. In 2006 and 2007, Horizon purported to be a real estate investment company seeking investments in its

6

9

10 11 12

14 15

13

16 17 18

19 20

22 23

21

24 25

27

26

28

foreclosure reinstatement and refinancing program. On August 11, 2008, the California Department of Corporations issued a desist and refrain order to Horizon in connection with the purported foreclosure reinstatement program.

Cydney Sanchez, age 59 and a resident of Los Angeles, California, owned and managed Horizon.

#### THE FRAUDULENT SCHEME

#### Horizon's Mortgage Reinstatement and Refinancing Program A.

- 10. From approximately January 2006 through July 2007, Horizon and Sanchez recruited at least 150 investors to invest in a purported mortgage reinstatement and refinancing program. Sanchez told investors that Horizon helped homeowners who had fallen behind in their mortgage payments avoid foreclosure by reinstating their mortgages and refinancing their properties on more favorable terms. Sanchez claimed to have been in the "foreclosure business" for more than 20 years.
- 11. Sanchez and Horizon relied on word-of-mouth referrals and testimonials from current investors to recruit new investors. Investors resided in California, Illinois, Florida, Georgia, and Washington and were primarily from the African-American and Hispanic communities. Most were unsophisticated, of modest means, and had little or no investment or financial experience.
- Sanchez also used "investment coordinators" to recruit investors and 12. handle investor paperwork. These coordinators, who also invested in Horizon, called or met with family members, friends, and co-workers, shared their experiences as Horizon investors, and explained Horizon's investment program using the information and sales pitch that Sanchez provided. If potential investors expressed interest, the coordinators arranged for them to meet with Sanchez, so that Sanchez could explain in detail how the investment program worked. The coordinators typically received a 10% commission on the principal amount invested by those they recruited.

28

13. At meetings and in offering materials prepared at Sanchez's direction, Sanchez told investors that their money would be pooled and used to help homeowners avoid foreclosure. Sanchez also told investors that she would refinance the distressed properties and pay investors their principal plus a guaranteed 40% return from the proceeds. Investors were also told and given a payout sheet documenting that their "total return" on each investment (i.e., principal plus the 40% profit) was secured by both a promissory note signed by Sanchez and an interest in real property evidenced by the Short Form Deeds. Sanchez promised investors that they would receive their returns within specific periods of time according to a written schedule, ranging from 30 days to one year. Investors were also told orally and in writing that they could withdraw their entire investment at any time for any reason, although they would forfeit their returns or some principal for doing so. Sanchez presented an investment in Horizon as safe, risk-free, a "no lose investment," and "100% guaranteed" to generate a 40% profit.

#### Horizon and Sanchez Solicited Investors with False and В. **Misleading Information**

- Horizon's purported program to generate investor returns by helping 14. homeowners avoid foreclosure was a sham. Although Horizon and Sanchez claimed to use investor funds to save properties from foreclosure, there is no evidence that they helped any homeowners to avoid foreclosure. Only two homeowners appear to have sought foreclosure help from Sanchez, and both lost their homes after Sanchez transferred title of the properties to Horizon affiliates.
- Moreover, Horizon's and Sanchez's representations that the "total 15. return" on each investment was secured by an interest in real property as set forth in the Short Form Deeds were false. Investments in Horizon were not secured by any interest in real property. The Short Form Deeds were invalid and could not be recorded, which some investors discovered when they tried unsuccessfully to record their deeds. Sanchez knew that the Short Form Deeds were not recordable

and did not actually represent a secured property interest.

16. Horizon's and Sanchez's representations that the investments were guaranteed and virtually risk free because investors could cash out at any time were also false. Investors have made repeated attempts to recover their principal without success.

#### C. Sanchez Misappropriated Investor Funds

- 17. Of the approximately \$6 million raised from investors, Horizon and Sanchez used approximately \$3.7 million to pay other investors in a Ponzi scheme. Sanchez misappropriated the remaining investor funds to, among other things, (1) finance undisclosed and potentially illegal real estate-related business activities; and (2) pay at least \$536,000 for personal expenses (including \$77,000 for her granddaughter's sweet sixteen party and at least \$300,000 for airline tickets, clothing, jewelry, electronic equipment, furniture, and cars).
- 18. Sanchez never disclosed to Horizon investors that she transferred investor funds to accounts for her own use. To the contrary, while she was misappropriating millions of dollars of investor funds, Sanchez told Horizon investors that she was using investor proceeds for Horizon's purported real estate foreclosure business.
- 19. Sanchez, in her capacity as the owner and manager of Horizon, developed the pitch to investors and directed the preparation of Horizon's offering materials, met with investors and explained in detail the Horizon investment program, and personally prepared the promissory notes and Short Form Deeds issued for each investment. In so doing, Sanchez misrepresented the use of offering proceeds, the source of the returns, and the risk of investment and concealed the facts that investor funds were neither guaranteed nor secured by an interest in real property. Sanchez also controlled Horizon's bank accounts and thus knew that Horizon's purported investment program was not generating any returns

and that investor funds were instead being diverted to pay prior investors and for other undisclosed purposes.

#### FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

#### FRAUD IN THE OFFER OR SALE OF SECURITIES

### Violations of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act (Against Both Defendants)

- The Commission realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 20. through 19 above.
- 21. Defendants Horizon and Sanchez, and each of them, by engaging in the conduct described above, directly or indirectly, in the offer or sale of securities by the use of means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails:
  - with scienter, employed devices, schemes, or artifices to a. defraud;
  - **b**. obtained money or property by means of untrue statements of a material fact or by omitting 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; or
  - engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which c. operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser.
- 22. By engaging in the conduct described above, defendants Horizon and Sanchez violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77q(a).

21

22

23

24

#### 

#### SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

# FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH THE PURCHASE OR SALE OF SECURITIES

## Violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 Thereunder (Against Both Defendants)

- 23. The Commission realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 19 above.
- 24. Defendants Horizon and Sanchez, and each of them, by engaging in the conduct described above, directly or indirectly, in connection with the purchase or sale of a security, by the use of means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange, with scienter:
  - a. employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud;
  - b. made untrue statements of a material fact or omitted to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; or
  - engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business which
    operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon other
    persons.
- 25. By engaging in the conduct described above, defendants Horizon and Sanchez violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5.

### THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

#### UNREGISTERED OFFER AND SALE OF SECURITIES

## Violations of Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act (Against Both Defendants)

- 26. The Commission realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 19 above.
- 27. Defendants Horizon and Sanchez, and each of them, by engaging in the conduct described above, directly or indirectly, made use of means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails, to offer to sell or to sell securities, or to carry or cause such securities to be carried through the mails or in interstate commerce for the purpose of sale or for delivery after sale.
- 28. No registration statement has been filed with the Commission or has been in effect with respect to any of the offerings alleged herein.
- 29. By engaging in the conduct described above, Horizon and Sanchez violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77e(a) and 77e(c).

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court:

I.

Issue findings of fact and conclusions of law that the defendants committed the alleged violations.

#### II.

Issue judgments, in a form consistent with Rule 65(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, permanently enjoining defendants Horizon and Sanchez and their officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them, who receive actual notice of the order by personal service or otherwise, and each of them, from violating Sections

5(a), 5(c), and 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77e(a), 77e(c), and 77q(a), and Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b) and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5.

#### III.

Order defendants Horizon and Sanchez to disgorge all ill-gotten gains from the illegal conduct, together with prejudgment interest thereon.

#### IV.

Order defendants Horizon and Sanchez to pay civil penalties under Section 20(d) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77t(d), and Section 21(d)(3) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(3).

#### V.

Retain jurisdiction of this action in accordance with the principles of equity and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in order to implement and carry out the terms of all orders and decrees that may be entered, or to entertain any suitable application or motion for additional relief within the jurisdiction of this Court.

#### VI.

Grant such other and further relief as this Court may determine to be just and necessary.

DATED: June 17, 2009

John M. McCoy III

Finola H. Manvelian Marshall S. Sprung

Leslie A. Hakala

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Securities and Exchange Commission

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □) SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION					DEFENDANTS HORIZON PROPERTY HOLDINGS, L.C., and CYDNEY SANCHEZ									
						Los	Ang	eles County						
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number. If you are representing						Attorne	ys (l	f Known)						
y	ourself, provide same.)					Jeror	ne A	. Kaplan			(31	0) 859-7700		
	ohn M. McCoy and Lesli		•	98				enegos & Ka	din		•	•		
	ecurities and Exchange C			26				shire Bouleva		uite 175				
	5670 Wilshire Boulevard, 11th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90036 Beverly Hills, CA 90212													
								RINCIPAL P for plaintiff a			for Diversity Cases fendant.)	Only		
<b>№</b> 1 U.S	S. Government Plaintiff	□ 3	Federal Question (U.S.						PTF	DEF			PTF	DEF
			Government Not a Party	)	Citizen of This	State					Incorporated or P		ce □4	□ 4
											of Business in thi			
□ 2 0.3	S. Government Defendant	□ 4	Diversity (Indicate Citize of Parties in Item III)	enship	Citizen of Ano	ther State	•		□2	□ 2	Incorporated and		ace □ 5	□ 5
			or raities in noin in;		Citi on Sul	: C - T	÷	C			of Business in Another State			П.
					Citizen or Sub	ject of a s	ore	gn Country	<u> </u>	□ 3	Foreign Nation	···	□ 6	□ 6
	RIGIN (Place an X in on	e box o	nly.)											
I <b>V</b> I O₁	riginal 2 Remove occeeding State Co		☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court		instated or  copened	5 Transi	ferre	d from anothe	er dist	rict (spe	ecify): 🗆 6 Mult Distr		Appeal to Judge from	
• • •	occurry ourse	, u. (	Appendie Court	,,,,	оренец								Magistrat	
V. RE	QUESTED IN COMPL	AINT:	JURY DEMAND: □ Y	res <b>v</b>	No (Check 'Ye	s' only if	den	nanded in con	nplain	t.)				
CLASS	ACTION under F.R.C	.P. 23:	☐ Yes ☑ No			MONEY	Y DI	EMANDED I	N CC	MPLA	INT: \$			
VI. CA	USE OF ACTION (Cite	the U.	S. Civil Statute under which	ch you a	are filing and w	rite a brie	f sta	tement of cau	se. D	o not c	ite jurisdictional st	tutes unless	diversity	.)
T	he Complaint alleges viol	ations o	of the federal securities law	/s. 15 U	J.S.C. § 77q(a):	; 15 U.S.C	C. §	78j(b) and 17	C.F.F	R. § 240	.10b-5; 15 U.S.C.	§§ 77e(a) an	d 77e(c).	
VII. N	ATURE OF SUIT (Plac	e an X	in one box only.)											
O	THER STATUTES		CONTRACT		TORTS		Vi de	TORTS		100015	PRISONER		ABOR	
\$49071544600	State Reapportionment	□ 110	Insurance	PEF	RSONAL INJUR	Y	2565654	ERSONAL		2.65. 38.12.	PETITIONS	□ 710 Fai		\$6556 (\$7656 \$666 \$660 \$600 \$600 \$600 \$600 \$600 \$
	Antitrust		Marine		Airplane	[		ROPERTY		□ 510	Motions to	Ac		
	Banks and Banking Commerce/ICC		Miller Act Negotiable Instrument	17 212	Airplane Produ Liability			Other Fraud Truth in Lend	dina		Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus	□ 720 Lal	or/Mgmt. ations	
L 730	Rates/etc.		Recovery of	□ 320	Assault, Libel			Other Person	- 1	□ 530	General	□ 730 Lal		
□ 460	Deportation		Overpayment &	<u>_</u>	Slander						Death Penalty		orting &	
	Racketeer Influenced		Enforcement of	□ 330	Fed. Employer Liability	's' 🖂 3	385	Property Dan	nage		Mandamus/		closure A	
	and Corrupt	C 151	Judgment	□ 340	•	120		Product Liab	ility	m eco	Other	□ 740 Ra		or Act
	Organizations Consumer Credit		Medicare Act Recovery of Defaulted	□ 345	Marine Produc	n 🗀	122	NKRUPTCY Appeal 28 U	SC		Prison Condition	□ 790 Oti	ier Labor igation	
	Cable/Sat TV	132	Student Loan (Excl.		Liability		722	158	"		RFEITURE	□ 791 Em		ıc.
<b>□</b> ,810	Selective Service		Veterans)	1	Motor Vehicle Motor Vehicle	11 1 2	423	Withdrawal 2	28		PENALTY	Sec	urity Act	
<b>₩</b> 850	Securities/Commodities/	□ 153			Product Liabili	itv	doruna	USC 157				PROPE		HIS
□ 975	Exchange Customer Challenge 12		Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	□ 360	Other Personal	4,,,,,,,	~ ~~~~	VIL RIGHTS		□ 620	Other Food &	□ 820 Co □ 830 Pat		
□ 0/3	USC 3410	□ 160	Stockholders' Suits	T 262	Injury Personal Injury			Voting Employment		□ 625	Drug Drug Related	□ 840 Tra	,	
□ 890			Other Contract	□ 302	Med Malpracti	, I		Housing/Acc			Seizure of	SOCIA		UГY
	Agricultural Act	□ 195	Contract Product	□ 365	Personal Injury	y-		mmodations			Property 21 USC	□ 861 HI.		
□ 892	Economic Stabilization		Liability		Product Liabil	,,, I		Welfare	. [	- /aa	881	□ 862 Bla		
□ 903	Act Environmental Matters	120,200,200,000,000,000	Franchise REAL PROPERTY	□ 368	Asbestos Perso Injury Product		445	American wi Disabilities			Liquor Laws R.R. & Truck	□ 863 DI	wc/Diw 5(g))	w .
	Energy Allocation Act		Land Condemnation		Liability	1		Employment		-	Airline Regs	□ 864 SS		VI
	Freedom of Info. Act	□ 220	Foreclosure	, u	MMIGRATION	(()   o	446	American wi			Occupational	□ 865 RS		
	Appeal of Fee Determi-		Rent Lease & Ejectment	□ 462	Naturalization			Disabilities -			Safety /Health	FEDER		
	nation Under Equal Access to Justice		Torts to Land	□ 463	Application Habeas Corpus	.  _	440	Other Civil	1	□ 690	Other	□ 870 Ta:		
□ 950	Constitutionality of	ı	Tort Product Liability All Other Real Property	ļ_ '	Alien Detained		<del>+4</del> U	Other Civil Rights	1			or: □ 871 IR:	Defendant S-Third Pa	•
> 5 O	State Statutes	~~~~	Care require topolity	□ 465	Other Immigra	tion			ł			t .	C 7609	, _0
					Actions									
		L		<u> </u>								<u> </u>		

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number: 3 CV 09-04340

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

	•	eviously filed in this court an	d dismissed, remanded or closed? ☑ No □ Yes						
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have If yes, list case number(s):	any cases been pre	viously filed in this court that	t are related to the present case?  No  Yes						
□ B. ( □ C. F	Arise from the same Call for determination For other reasons we involve the same pa	e or closely related transaction on of the same or substantiall ould entail substantial duplication, trademark or copyright,	y related or similar questions of law and fact; or ation of labor if heard by different judges; or and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.						
(a) List the County in this District; (	California County o	outside of this District; State it	f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. this box is checked, go to item (b).						
County in this District:*	s agencies of emplo	yees is a mained planners. If	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country						
			f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. If this box is checked, go to item (c).						
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country						
Horizon Property Holdings, L.C. Cydney Sanchez - Los Angeles (	-	County; and							
(c) List the County in this District; C Note: In land condemnation ca	•	·	f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.						
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country						
Los Angeles County									
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernar Note: In land condemnation cases, us			San Luis Obispo Counties						
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (		26 -	ung Date June 17, 2009						
Notice to Counsel/Parties: The or other papers as required by law	e CV-71 (JS-44) C	ivil Cover Sheet and the infor wed by the Judicial Conference	mation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings e of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ing the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)						
Key to Statistical codes relating to So	cial Security Cases	:							
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	f Cause of Action						
861	НІА	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))							
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)							
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))							
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widow Act, as amended. (42 U.S	s or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security .C. 405(g))						
864	SSID	All claims for supplements Act, as amended.	al security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security						
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (U.S.C. (g))	old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42						

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

#### NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Stephen V. Wilson and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Jacqueline Chooljian.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV09- 4340 SVW (JCx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge

	•		
======		 	
		 _ <i></i>	

#### **NOTICE TO COUNSEL**

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

[X]	Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012	L	Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516	Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501	1

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.