1	EDMUND G. BROWN JR.				
2	Attorney General of the State of California ALBERT NORMAN SHELDEN				
3	Senior Assistant Attorney General SANFORD H. FELDMAN Supervising Deputy Attorney General ANGELA K. ROSENAU, State Bar No. 182175 Deputy Attorney General 110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101 P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266				
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff				
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA				
11	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, CENTRAL DIVISION				
12					
13	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,	CASE NO.			
14	Plaintiff,				
15	v.				
16	FLG COMPANY, LLC, and LAND GRANT	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL			
17 18	SERVICES, LLC, California Limited Liability Corporations; KBS RESOURCES, LLC, a Nevada  AND EQUITABLE RELIEF				
19	Limited Liability Corporation; WILLIAM J. HUTCHINGS, individually and as Managing Mamber of FLC Company, LLC: Land Creat				
20	Member of FLG Company, LLC; Land Grant Services, LLC and KBS Resources LLC; XIAOKE LI, individually and as Managing Member of KBS Resources LLC; LANDIS BUSINESS SERVICES,INC., a California Corporation;				
21					
22	SHAWNA M. LANDIS individually and as CEO of Landis Business Services; DOES I through 100,				
23	inclusive,				
24	Defendants.				
25					
26	Plaintiff, the People of the State of California ("People" or "Plaintiff"), by and through Edmund G. Brown Jr., Attorney General of the State of California, is informed and believes and thereupon				
27					
28					
	alleges as follows:				
	Complaint for Civil Penalties and Injunction and Equitable Relief				

## PARTIES AND VENUE

- 1. Defendants FLG COMPANY, LLC ("FLG"), and LAND GRANT SERVICES, LLC, ("LGS") are California Limited Liability Corporations; KBS RESOURCES, LLC, ("KBS") is Nevada Limited Liability Corporation; LANDIS BUSINESS SERVICES, INC, ("LBS") is a suspended California Corporation, that each, at all relevant times transacted business within the State of California, including in San Diego County.
- 2. At all relevant times, defendant WILLIAM J. HUTCHINGS ("Hutchings") was a Managing Member of FLG, LGS, and KBS. Defendant Hutchings directs, formulates, controls and has knowledge of, and approves the acts and practices of defendants, FLG, LGS, and KBS, including their mortgage foreclosure consultant and equity purchaser business. Defendant Hutchings is sued individually and in his capacity as Managing Member of FLG, LGS, and KBS. Defendant Hutchings resides in San Diego County.
- 3. At all relevant times, defendant XIAOKE LI ("Li") was a Managing Member of KBS. Defendant Li directs, formulates, controls and has knowledge of, and approves the acts and practices of defendant KBS including its mortgage foreclosure consultant and equity purchaser business. Defendant Li is sued individually and in her capacity as Managing Member of KBS. Defendant Li resides in San Diego County.
- 4. At all relevant times, defendant SHAWNA M. LANDIS (Landis) was the Chief Executive Officer and President of LBS. Defendant Landis, formulates, controls and has knowledge of, and approves the acts and practices of defendant LBS including its foreclosure consultant and equity purchaser business. Defendant Landis is sued individually and in her capacity as CEO and president of LBS. Defendant Landis resides in Riverside County.
- 5. Plaintiff is not aware of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued as Does 1 through 100, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Each of these 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. Defendants FLG, LGS, KBS, LBS, Hutchings, Li, Landis, and Does 1-100 are collectively referred to hereinafter as "Defendants."

- 6. Whenever reference is made in this Complaint to any act of Defendants, that allegation shall mean that each Defendant acted individually and jointly with the other Defendants.
- 7. Whenever reference is made in this complaint to an act or transaction of a Defendant such allegation shall be deemed to mean that said Defendant and its owners, officers, directors, agents, employees, or representatives, did or authorized such acts while engaged in the management, direction, or control of the affairs of the Defendant and while acting within the scope of their duties.
- 8. At all relevant times, each Defendant committed the acts, caused others to commit the acts, ratified the acts, or permitted others to commit the acts alleged in this Complaint.

  Additionally, some or all of the Defendants acted as the agent of the other Defendants, and all of the Defendants acted within the scope of their agency if acting as an agent of another.
- 9. At all relevant times, each Defendant knew or realized that the other Defendants were engaging in or planned to engage in the violations of law alleged in this Complaint. Knowing or realizing that other Defendants were engaging in or planning to engage in unlawful conduct, each Defendant nevertheless facilitated the commission of those unlawful acts. Each Defendant intended to and did encourage, facilitate, or assist in the commission of the unlawful acts, and thereby aided and abetted the other Defendants in the unlawful conduct.
- 10. Defendants have engaged in a conspiracy, common enterprise, and common course of conduct, the purpose of which is and was to engage in the violations of law alleged in this Complaint. The conspiracy, common enterprise, and common course of conduct continues to the present.
- 11. The violations of law alleged in this Complaint occurred in San Diego County and elsewhere throughout California.

## DEFENDANTS BUSINESS PRACTICES AND GOVERNING LAW

12. Defendants engage in a complex and widespread foreclosure rescue scam by which they acquire a grant deed to homes in foreclosure by representing to the grantor that the conveyance is necessary for Defendants to place the property in a "land grant." Defendants explain the land grant will ensure the grantors ownership rights over their land and protect it

against loss through through foreclosure.

- 13. Defendants operate as an equity purchaser. California Civil Code section 1695.1 subdivision (a) defines an equity purchaser as any person who accepts title to any residence in foreclosure unless title is acquired pursuant to specified exceptions.
- 14. Defendants also operate as a mortgage foreclosure consultant. In pertinent part, California Civil Code section 2945.1, subdivision (a) defines a foreclosure consultant as "any person who makes any solicitation, representation, or offer to any [home] owner to perform for compensation or who, for compensation, performs any service which the person in any manner represents will in any manner do [among others] any of the following: (1) Stop or postpone the foreclosure sale . . . . (8) Save the owner's residence from foreclosure."
- 15. Pursuant to their foreclosure scheme, Defendants make contact with homeowners who have a Notice of Default filed against their property and are, thus, in foreclosure. Defendants invite the homeowners to attend a presentation about Defendants' land grant program.

  Defendants tell homeowners to bring a copy of their Notice of Default to the presentation and be prepared to sign-up for the land grant program by signing a grant deed and making a payment, usually equivalent to one month's rent.
- 16. At the presentation, Defendants explain the history of land grants in the United States and claim that their program takes advantage of land grant protections not typically provided to average homeowners.
- 17. Defendants tell homeowners that a land grant will protect them against losing their property due to foreclosure. Defendants claim that once property is put into a land grant, the mortgage lender cannot use it as collateral to pay the mortgage debt. Defendants further claim that after the Statute of Limitations expires for collecting the mortgage, the homeowner will own their property free and clear of this debt.
- 18. Defendants tell homeowners that they must convey the grant deed on their property to Defendants so it can be put into a land grant. They tell homeowners that they can stay in their home and pay rent to Defendants and that when the Statute of Limitations expires, the homeowner can take back full ownership of their property by paying Defendants 50% of the

though fully set forth at this place.

27

28

26. Defendants are violating and have violated Business and Professions Code section				
17500 by making or disseminating untrue or misleading statements, or causing untrue or				
misleading statements to be made or disseminated, to California homeowners, with the intent to				
nduce them to convey title in their property to a purported land grant or land patent or to an				
individual or entity for the purpose of conveying title to a purported land grant or land patent.				
The untrue or misleading statements include, but are not necessarily limited to:				

- A. There is a means, method, or mechanism involving a purported land grant, or land patent, by which the owner of privately held property can convey their property to the federal government and by doing so the homeowner will have superior ownership of their property and protect it against loss due to foreclosure;
- B. Defendants' method for conveying private property to a land grant will stop the assessment of property taxes;
- C. Defendants' method for conveying private property to a land grant prohibits the homeowners mortgage lender from selling the property as collateral to pay their mortgage debt;
- D. Defendants' method for conveying private property to a land grant ensures the homeowner will own a share in their property after the Statute of Limitations period has expired for collection of their mortgage debt;
- E. Defendants' method for conveying private property to a land grant ensures the homeowner can either sell their ownership share of their home or purchase Defendants' ownership share of their home afer the Statute of Limitations period for collection of their mortgage has expired;
- F. Homeowners must convey the grant deed on their property to Defendants in order for the land grant program to work.;
- G. Defendants' method for conveying private property to a land grant entitles

  Defendants to collect rent from homeowners who have conveyed their grant deed to Defendants.
- 27. Defendants knew or should have known that the statements set forth in paragraph 26 above were untrue or misleading at the time the statements were made.

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS 1 VIOLATIONS OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200 2 3 (UNFAIR COMPETITION) 28. The People reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 though 27 above, as 4 5 though fully set forth at this place. 29. Defendants are engaging in and have engaged in unfair competition as defined in 6 Business and Professions Code section 17200 by committing acts or practices which include, but 7 8 are not necessarily limited to, the following: 9 A. Violating Business and Professions Code section 17500, as set forth in Paragraphs 26 and 27 of the First Cause of Action: 10 B. Unlawfully obtaining title to real property by making untrue or misleading 11 12 statements as set forth in paragraph 26 above; 13 C. Unlawfully collecting rent proceeds based on untrue or misleading statements as set forth in paragraph 26 above; 14 D. Failing to give owners of a residence in foreclosure who sign a contract with 15 Defendants and from whom Defendants collect money, notice of the owner's 5-day right to 16 cancel their contract with Defendants, in violation of Civil Code section 1695.5(a); 17 18 E. Acting as a an equity purchaser, and violating Civil Code section 1695.6(b)(1) by 19 during the 5-day cancellation period: i. Inducing owners of a residence in foreclosure to convey an interest in said 20 21 residence; ii. Accepting from the owner of a residence in foreclosure conveyance of an 22 23 interest in said residence: iii. Transferring an interest in a residence in foreclosure; 24 25 iv. Recording with a county recorder a document signed by the owner of a residence in foreclosure. 26 27 28 ///

26 | ///

27

28

///

1	6. Such other and further relief that the court deems just and proper to dissipate the effect		
2	of the Defendants' use of untrue or misleading statements or acts of unfair competition;		
3	7. That the People recover their costs of suit.		
4			
5	Dated: May 2008	EDMUND G. BROWN JR. Attorney General	
6		Attorney General ALBERT NORMAN SHELDEN Senior Assistant Attorney General SANFORD H. FELDMAN	
7		Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
8		ANGELA K. ROSENAU Deputy Attorney General	
9		ByANGELA K. ROSENAU	
10		ANGELA K. ROSENAU	
11		Attorneys for Plaintiff People of the State of California	
12		Toopio of the source of cultivities	
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26	5		
27	,		
28	3		
		11	
	Complaint for Civil Penalties and Injunction and Equitable Relief		