| 1 | GREGORY C. GLYNN, Cal. Bar No. 039999 |
|---|---|
| 2 | GREGORY C. GLYNN, Cal. Bar No. 039999 E-mail: glynng@sec.gov PETER F. DEL GRECO, Cal. Bar No. 164925 |
| 3 | E-mail: delgrecop@sec.gov |
| 4 | Securities and Exchange Commission Rosalind Tyson, Regional Director |
| 5 | John M. McCoy III, Associate Regional Director |
| 6 | Los Angeles, California 90036 |
| 7 | Michele Wein Layne, Associate Regional Director John M. McCoy III, Associate Regional Director 5670 Wilshire Boulevard, 11th Floor Los Angeles, California 90036 Telephone: (323) 965-3998 Facsimile: (323) 965-3908 |
| 8 | |

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CURTIS PETERSON, ERIC MAHER, RONALD WHITE, and EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL, LLC,

Case 6 V 11 01143 0DW (JEM)

Complaint for violations of the Federal Securities LAWS

CURTIS PETERSON, ERIC MAHER
RONALD WHITE, and EXPRESS
INTERNATIONAL, LLC,

Defendants,

and

CURTIS INTERNATIONAL
EXPRESS, INC. and ANN SCOTT,

Relief Defendants.

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

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 20(b), 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.
- 2. 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 the violations alleged herein occurred within the Central District of California.
- 3. The Defendants, directly and indirectly, have made, and are making, use of the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce and of the mails or of the facilities of a national exchange in connection with the acts, practices, and courses of business alleged herein in the Central District of California and elsewhere.

SUMMARY

4. This matter concerns a fraudulent offering scheme operated by Curtis Peterson ("Peterson"), Eric Maher ("Maher"), and Express International, LLC ("Express International"), and aided and abetted by attorney Ronald White ("White") (collectively, the "Defendants"). From September through December 2009, the Defendants raised almost \$3.3 million from at least 10 investors through an unregistered offering of securities in the form of investment contracts. Peterson and Maher told investors that they would pool their monies to purchase international bank instruments, then "lease" those instruments to "top 25" international banks willing to pay substantial fees for the right to place the

instruments on their balance sheet for a brief period of time. By using the same instrument in multiple transactions per day, they claimed that they would generate profits sufficient to pay investors returns of as much as 1,000% per month for 12 months. Moreover, they promised investors that their monies would remain in a trust account at all times and never be placed at risk.

- 5. In reality, none of what Peterson and Maher told investors was true. Specifically, the program does not exist and the promised rates of return cannot be obtained. White, the attorney who controlled the trust account to which Express International investors were instructed to wire their monies, aided and abetted the fraudulent scheme by, among other things, converting investor principal into cashier's checks payable to Peterson, thus allowing Peterson to dissipate investor funds. Indeed, Peterson used only about 20% of investor monies for their avowed purpose and used the remainder to pay his personal expenses and to funnel monies to third parties with no legitimate claim to them, including Curtis International Express, Inc. and Peterson's wife, Ann Scott (collectively, the "Relief Defendants").
- 6. The Defendants, by engaging in the conduct described in this Complaint, violated and/or aided and abetted violations of the antifraud, securities registration, and/or broker-dealer registration provisions of the federal securities laws. The Commission requests that the Court permanently enjoin each of the Defendants from further violations of these laws, require them to disgorge with prejudgment interest all proceeds from their fraudulent conduct, and impose a substantial civil penalty on each of them. The Commission further requests that the Court order the Relief Defendants to disgorge with prejudgment interest all monies received improperly from the Defendants since September 2009.

THE DEFENDANTS

7. **Curtis Peterson**, age 48, is a resident of Glendora, California. Peterson is not registered with the Commission. He is the co-managing member

of defendant Express International and the sole owner and officer of relief defendant Curtis International Express.

- 8. **Eric Maher**, age 42, is a resident of Novato, California. Maher is a former registered representative, having worked at A. G. Edwards & Sons, Prudential Securities, and Washington Mutual Financial Services from 1996 through 2000.
- 9. **Ronald White**, age 55, is a resident of Gardena, California. He is an attorney licensed to practice law by the State Bar of California, California Bar No. 85723.
- 10. Express International, LLC is a California limited liability company formed by Peterson and Scott in 2007 and located in Pasadena, California.

 Peterson and Scott are its managing members. It is not registered with the Commission in any capacity and it has not registered any offering of its securities under the Securities Act or a class of securities under the Exchange Act.

THE RELIEF DEFENDANTS

- 11. **Curtis International Express, Inc.** is a California corporation formed by Peterson in 2007 and located in Pasadena, California.
- 12. **Ann Scott**, age unknown, resides in Glendora, California with Peterson, her husband. She is the co-managing member of Express International.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- A. Peterson and Maher Conduct an Unregistered and Fraudulent
 Offering of Securities
- 13. Between September and December 2009, Express International entered into written investment agreements with 10 individuals located in several different states who invested almost \$3.3 million in Defendants' fraudulent scheme.
- 14. Maher and/or Peterson personally solicited all of the individuals contracting with Express International.

15. Maher held himself out as Express International and was authorized by Peterson to do so.

- 16. Maher told prospective investors that their monies would be pooled with the monies of others to purchase international bank instruments that would be leased to European banks. Maher refused to identify the borrowing banks other than to describe them as being among the 25 largest financial institutions in Europe. According to Maher, these banks would use the leased instruments as collateral for loans that the banks would use to fund their trading of securities. Maher told investors that the same instrument might be leased 10 or 20 times per day, and that each time it was leased the borrowing bank would pay a fee. These fees purportedly funded the pool of profits from which Express International investors would be paid their returns.
- 17. Maher told investors that, notwithstanding the fact that their monies would be used to purchase bank instruments, somehow their monies would remain at all times in the trust account and never be placed at risk.
- 18. Peterson provided Maher with a form investment agreement, and Maher emailed the investment agreement and wiring instructions to prospective investors.
- 19. The written agreements contain representations consistent with fraudulent "prime bank" or "high-yield investment program" schemes: that investor monies "will be used to purchase an instrument" in a sum many times greater than the amount invested, that said instrument "will be placed into trade," and that said trade activities will generate "payout returns" to the investor which, though they vary from contract to contract, range from the ludicrous (300% in 45 days) to the surreal (1,000% per month for 12 months).
- 20. Some of the agreements identify a particular instrument or instruments purportedly "available for investment"; others do not. The agreements also contain a section entitled "History of Why Our Program Works," which

purports to describe the rise in "off-balance sheet transactions" between "top 25 European banks" and the profits to be realized from related "fee-based trading."

- 21. The written agreements direct the investor to wire his or her funds to an attorney-client trust account in the name of White (the "Trust Account") and assure investors that their funds are not at risk because "[the instrument purchased] will be cash backed and can be liquidated to secure initial investment."
- 22. All of the written agreements bear Peterson's signature. Most of the written agreements also bear White's signature.
- 23. Maher was authorized by Peterson to negotiate, and did negotiate and insert into the investment agreement, the rate of return due each investor.
- 24. Maher's name and contact information appear, along with Peterson's, on the letterhead of several of the investment agreements, as well as on Express International correspondence.
- 25. Peterson agreed to pay Maher a share of the profits to be realized from the leasing of the bank instruments.
- 26. Maher received at least \$25,000 from Express International. The monies provided to Maher were derived from investor principal. Maher knew that the monies he received were not derived from the leasing of bank instruments.
- 27. A website at www.expressinternationalllc.com promoted Express International as "the principal Private Placement and Holdings Company for a collaborative of multi-industrial international companies with assets under management valued over 10 Billion Dollars" and provided Peterson's mailing address, email address and phone number.

B. White Aids and Abets the Fraudulent Scheme

- 28. Investors wired almost \$3.3 million to the Trust Account, per the written and oral instruction of Maher and Peterson.
- 29. The involvement of White and his control of the Trust Account provided investors with unwarranted assurance as to the legitimacy of the

investment program and the safety of their principal, and was a significant factor in their decision to invest with Express International.

- 30. The Defendants failed to disclose that almost as soon as investors wired their monies to the Trust Account, White transferred those monies directly to Peterson.
- 31. White did so primarily by purchasing, with investor funds, cashier's checks made payable to Peterson, Express International, or Curtis International Express, each of which maintained bank accounts controlled by Peterson (the "Peterson Accounts").
- 32. Relief Defendant Curtis International Express had and has no right to any investor funds that it has received from White or any other Defendant herein.
- 33. In all, White transferred more than \$2.2 million of investor monies from the Trust Account to the Peterson Accounts.
- 34. White also used investor monies to purchase cashier's checks payable to third parties having nothing to do with the purported investment program.
- 35. In addition, White withdrew or cashed checks payable to himself totaling more than \$500,000.
- 36. White did not use any investor monies for their purported investment purpose.

C. Peterson Misappropriates Investor Monies

- 37. In addition to the more than \$2.2 million which White transferred from the Trust Account to the Peterson Accounts, an additional amount of investor money was wired directly to one of the Peterson Accounts.
- 38. In all, Peterson gained direct control of about \$2.3 million of the almost \$3.3 million of investor monies committed to Express International.
- 39. Peterson wired \$460,620 from the Peterson Accounts to accounts in the name of Altofin Bancorp Ltd. (the "Altofin Accounts") at Magyarorszagi Volksbank in Hungary.

- 40. Peterson wired an additional \$225,000 from the Peterson Accounts to an account in the name of Buykontrol Mortgage, Inc. dba Liberty One Lending ("Liberty One") at Regions Bank in Florida.
- 41. The monies wired to Liberty One were subsequently wired to the Altofin Accounts as well.
- 42. None of the monies wired to the Altofin Accounts were used to purchase any international bank instruments.
- 43. None of the monies remaining in the Peterson Accounts were used to purchase any international bank instruments either.
- 44. Peterson did not have a reasonable basis to believe that any of the monies wired to the Altofin Accounts would be used to purchase international bank instruments.
- 45. Rather than purchasing, or even attempting to purchase, bank instruments with investor funds, as he promised to do, Peterson used the lion's share of investor monies for undisclosed personal use, including:
 - More than \$300,000 to repay personal loans;
 - More than \$270,000 to make mortgage payments on a house owned by a third party;
 - More than \$195,000 toward purchases made with a check card tied to the Peterson Accounts;
 - Almost \$125,000 to purchase three new automobiles used by himself or family members;
 - More than \$70,000 in mortgage payments on the house he and his wife own;
 - More than \$60,000 in donations and tithes made to his church and/or pastor; and
 - o \$45,000 to his wife, Ann Scott.
- 46. Relief Defendant Ann Scott had and has no right to any investor funds that she has received from Peterson or any other Defendant herein.

- 47. In addition, Peterson used almost \$450,000 of investor monies in the Peterson Accounts in ways that are untraceable, but which did not include the purchase of any international bank instruments. These transactions include:
 - o \$154,000 in checks made payable to cash;
 - \$140,000 in transactions for which the banks are unable to produce the underlying documentation;
 - o \$107,800 in cash withdrawals; and
 - \$43,975 extracted in cash from checks deposited to the Peterson Accounts at the time of deposit.

D. The Defendants Engage in Lulling Behavior

- 48. Through mid-2010, long after the time for Express International to perform under its agreements with investors had elapsed, Peterson and Maher continued to knowingly and falsely assure investors that progress was steady, setbacks were temporary, and they would soon receive payouts that would make them wealthy beyond their wildest dreams. The cumulative effect was to deter investors from seeking redress for the Defendants' fraudulent conduct.
- 49. In December 2009, White knowingly and falsely told an investor that Express International's failure to make its planned profit payment was caused by a change in protocol by one of the banks involved in the alleged transaction, urged him to be patient, and assured the investor that his principal was still in the Trust Account. Based on White's assurances, the investor took no further action.

E. The Defendants Acted With Scienter

- 50. Peterson and Maher knew that the oral and written representations they made to investors about the nature of the investment program, the safety of investor principal, and the profits to be realized from participation, were false.
- 51. Neither Peterson nor Maher conducted any due diligence into the veracity of the investments purportedly underlying their investment program.

 Thus, they had no reason for believing that the oral and written representations

they made to investors about the nature of the investment program, the safety of investor principal, and the profits to be realized from participation, were true.

- 52. Neither Peterson nor Maher invested any of their own money in the investment program that they promoted to others, notwithstanding the fact that had it performed as they represented, a single dollar invested at 1000% per month would be worth 120 times that amount by the end of the year without compounding, and would be worth \$10 billion by the end of the year with compounding.
- 53. Peterson controlled all transactions in the Peterson Accounts and instructed White as to the Trust Account. Accordingly, Peterson knew that he had misappropriated the vast majority of investor funds for his undisclosed personal use.
- 54. White knew that Peterson and Maher were engaged in fraudulent activity. White received copies of the investment agreements, which bear his signature, and evidenced his familiarity with them by discussing their contents with others on several occasions. Those contents are so inherently ludicrous as to put White on notice that he was furthering a fraudulent scheme.
- 55. White knew that he was being compensated almost solely for lending an attorney's imprimatur of legitimacy to the Defendants' fraudulent scheme because there was no rational relation between the compensation he received and the value of the services he rendered. White was paid more than \$100,000 and withdrew from the Trust Account more than \$400,000 for (1) maintaining the Trust Account to which investors were instructed to wire their money and (2) converting those monies into cashier's checks payable to Peterson.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Unregistered Offer And Sale of Securities
Violations of Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act
(Against Peterson, Maher and Express International)

- 56. The Commission realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 55 above.
- 57. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendants Peterson, Maher, and Express International, and each of them, 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.
- 58. No registration statement has been filed with the Commission or has been in effect with respect to the offering alleged herein.
- 59. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendants Peterson, Maher, and Express International, and each of them, 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).

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

FRAUD IN THE OFFER OR SALE OF SECURITIES Violations of Section 17(a) Of the Securities Act (Against Peterson, Maher and Express International)

- 60. The Commission realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 55 above.
- 61. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendants Peterson, Maher, and Express International, and each of them, 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 defraud;
 - 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
- engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser.
- 62. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendants Peterson, Maher, and Express International, and each of them, violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77q(a).

THIRD 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 All Defendants)

- 63. The Commission realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 55 above.
- 64. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendants Peterson, Maher, Express International, and each of them, 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;
 - made untrue statements of a material fact or omitted 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 acts, practices, or courses of business which
 operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon other
 persons.

28 | ///

65. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendants Peterson, Maher, and Express International, and each of them, 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. Defendant White aided and abetted, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to aid and abet, the violations by Defendants Peterson, Maher, and Express International of 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.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

FAILURE TO REGISTER AS A BROKER-DEALER Violation of Section 15(a) of the Exchange Act (Against Maher)

- 66. The Commission realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 55 above.
- 67. Defendant Maher, by engaging in the conduct described above, made use of the mails or means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce to effect transactions in, or to induce or attempt to induce the purchase or sale of securities, without being registered as a broker or dealer in accordance with Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 780(b).
- 68. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendant Maher violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Section 15(a) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78o(a).

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.

Express International, and their officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys,

of Civil Procedure, permanently enjoining Defendants Peterson, Maher, and

Issue judgments, in a form consistent with Rule 65(d) of the Federal Rules

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

and those 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) and 5(c) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77e(a) and 77e(c), Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 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; and further enjoining Defendant White, and his officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those 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 aiding and abetting Peterson, Maher, and/or Express International in violating 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; and further enjoining Defendant Maher from violating Section 15(a) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78o(a).

III.

Order the Defendants and the Relief Defendants to disgorge all ill-gotten gains from the illegal conduct alleged herein, together with prejudgment interest thereon.

IV.

Order Defendants to pay civil penalties pursuant to 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.

February <u>7</u>, 2011 DATED:

Gregory C. Glynn
Peter F. Del Greco
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Securities and Exchange Commission