	Granted as Submitted ***See eSignature page***	Michael K Jeanes, Clerk of Court *** Electronically Filed *** T. Nosker, Deputy 7/3/2014 8:00:00 AM Filing ID 5965249
1	Thomas C. Horne Attorney General (Firm State Bar No. 14000)	
2		
3	Jordan Christensen Assistant Attorney General	
4	State Bar No. 29077 Office of the Attorney General	
5	1275 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007-2926 Telephone: (602) 542-8327	
6	Facsimile: (602) 542-4377 consumer@azag.gov	
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA	
- 9,	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA	
10		
11	STATE OF ARIZONA, <i>ex rel.</i> THOMAS C.	
12	HORNE, Attorney General,	Case No.: CV2014-007493
13	Plaintiff,	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT
14	VS.	
15	PRIETO'S AUTO SALES, INC., an Arizona Corporation; GUSTAVO PRIETO and RITA	Assigned to the Hon. Colleen French
16	PRIETO, husband and wife	
17	Defendants	
18		
19	Plaintiff, State of Arizona, ex rel. Thomas C. Horne, Attorney General, filed a	
20	complaint alleging violations of the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act, A.R.S. § 44-1521 et seq.,	
21	and Defendants Prieto's Auto Sales, Inc, Gustavo Prieto, and Rita Prieto waived service of the	
22	Summons and Complaint. After being fully advised of their right to a trial in this matter,	
23	Defendants have waived their right to trial and have admitted that this Court has jurisdiction	
24	over the subject matter and the parties for the purposes of entry and enforcement of this	
~ .	Consent Judgment. The State and Defendants have agreed on a basis for the settlement of	

these matters in dispute. Defendants stipulate that the Court may enter the following Findings
 of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment.

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff is the State of Arizona, *ex rel*. Thomas C. Horne, the Attorney General ("the State"), who is authorized to bring this action under the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act, A.R.S. § 44-1521 *et seq*.

2. Defendant Prieto's Auto Sales, Inc ("Prieto's Auto"), an Arizona corporation doing business in Phoenix, Arizona at 3450 West Broadway Road, has engaged in the business of selling used automobiles since 1998.

3. Defendant Gustavo Prieto is the Director and Manager of Defendant Prieto's Auto. At all times material to the Complaint filed on May 20, 2014, Defendant Gustavo Prieto formulated, directed, ratified, controlled, had the authority to control, or participated in the acts and practices of Prieto's Auto. As such, Defendant Gustavo Prieto is responsible for the acts, practices, omissions, and misrepresentations of Defendant Prieto's Auto.

4. Defendant Rita Prieto is the President and Director of Defendant Prieto's Auto. At all times material to the Complaint filed on May 20, 2014, Defendant Rita Prieto formulated, directed, ratified, controlled, had the authority to control, or participated in the acts and practices of Prieto's Auto. As such, Defendant Rita Prieto is responsible for the acts, practices, omissions, and misrepresentations of Defendant Prieto's Auto. Additionally, Defendant Rita Prieto is and was, at all relevant times, the wife of Defendant Gustavo Prieto, who acted on behalf of their marital community with respect to the allegations contained in the Complaint. Defendant Rita Prieto is also named for any interest she had or has in the marital estate owned with Defendant Gustavo Prieto.

5. Reference to Prieto's Auto refers to the above named corporate Defendants and to the actions of its owners, officers, managers, employees, agents and independent contractors.

3

4

5

6

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Defendants have engaged in the sale of automobiles to consumers in Phoenix, Arizona since 1998. Prieto's Auto clientele usually consists of minorities who have no credit history or adverse credit. Prieto's Auto is one of the few places they can purchase a vehicle.

2. At all times relevant to the Complaint, Defendant Prieto's Auto was under the sole direction and control of Defendants Gustavo Prieto and Rita Prieto. As such, Defendants Gustavo Prieto and Rita Prieto were responsible for the acts, practices, omissions and misrepresentations of Prieto's Auto and its agents.

3. In May of 2006, Defendants Prieto's Auto Sales, Gustavo Prieto, and Rita Prieto signed an Assurance of Discontinuance in which they made assurances to remedy consumer fraud violations. Defendants violated the Assurance of Discontinuance many times during the period it was in effect. Defendants continued to commit consumer fraud violations thereafter.

4. Defendants engaged in the following deceptive and unfair acts and practices and/or made the following false promises, misrepresentations and/or concealment, suppression or omission of a material fact in violation of the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act.

5. Defendants failed to thoroughly inspect vehicles and repair defects before placing them for sale. Defendants represent that their vehicles are free from major defects, but they routinely entered into agreements with consumers for the sale of automobiles that were not fit for use on public roadways. The vehicles were often riddled with several major and minor defects, to the point of placing their occupants in danger. Often, vehicles purchased from Prieto's Auto could not make it back to the customer's home on the day of the sale without breaking down.

6. Defendants convince consumers to complete vehicle purchases by promising to repair any defects that consumers find, free of charge, after the sale is completed. Defendants failed to repair vehicles in a timely manner, failed to conduct the repairs correctly, and required payment for repairs that, they represented, were to be free of charge.

-3-

7. Defendants provided consumers with a 15-day/500 mile warranty on each vehicle sold, as required by A.R.S. § 44-1267. Defendants failed to honor the statutorily mandated warranty. After Defendants failure to honor the warranty, Defendants refused to honor consumers' option to void the transaction, as provided by A.R.S § 44-1267 (B). Defendants routinely refused to return consumers' down-payments after they exercised their option to void the transaction.

8. Defendants denied consumers the opportunity to test drive vehicles in an effort to prevent them from discovering defects in the vehicles.

9. Defendants refused to allow some consumers to see the odometer before purchasing their vehicle. The consumers signed odometer disclosures without seeing the odometer. The actual odometer reading was often significantly higher than the disclosure statement, rendering the warranty useless as soon as the sale was completed.

10. Defendants sold consumers trade-in vehicles before the consumer completed the purchase of their next vehicle from Prieto's Auto.

11. Defendants sold vehicles for which they did not hold a valid title, in violation of A.R.S § 44-1267.

12. Defendants sold vehicles with salvage titles without disclosing the defect in the title in violation of A.R.S § 28-2091.

13. Defendants sold vehicles that had been involved in major collisions without disclosing the damage to consumers.

14. Defendants failed to deliver titles to consumers that had paid in full.

15. Defendants represented that certain vehicles were in high demand to induce
consumers to make deposits on the vehicles. Defendants accepted deposits to hold the
vehicles for consumers, but refused to refund the deposits when the consumers did not
purchase the vehicle.

-4-

16. Defendants failed to adequately explain their practice of requiring multiple down-payments. When consumers do not pay the second or third down-payment, of which they were previously unaware, Defendants often repossess the vehicle before the first payment is due.

17. Defendants falsely assured some consumers that financing would be approved or represented that consumers had already been approved for financing, when no such lender approval had been obtained. Defendants let consumers leave with vehicles without having fully secured financing. Often, Defendants knew that the consumers had not been approved for financing and would not likely be approved. Defendants called consumers back in, significantly altered the terms of the contract, and forced the consumers to sign the new agreements or relinquish the vehicles. In some instances, Defendants refused to return consumers' trade in vehicles in violation of A.R.S. § 44-1371 and/or the down-payments made by consumers.

18. Defendants knowingly and repeatedly issued checks to consumers that were drawn on bank accounts containing insufficient funds.

19. Defendants failed to send authenticated notifications of disposition to consumers before selling their repossessed vehicles. A.R.S § 47-9611.

20. Defendants failed to dispose of repossessed vehicles in a commercially reasonable manner. A.R.S. § 47-9627.

21. Defendants failed to send explanations of surplus or deficiency to consumers upon the sale of repossessed vehicles. A.R.S. § 47-9616.

22. Defendants failed to account to and pay consumers for surpluses obtained in the sale of repossessed vehicles. A.R.S. § 47-9608.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

523. The acts of Defendants, including, without limitation, those set forth in the6Findings of Fact paragraphs 1 through 22 above, constitute deceptive and unfair acts and

-5-

practices, fraud, false pretenses, false promises, misrepresentations or the concealment, omission, and suppression of material facts in violation of A.R.S § 44-1522, *et seq*.

24. Defendants were, at all times, acting willfully as defined by A.R.S. § 44-1522(B) while engaging in the acts and practices alleged herein.

ORDER

1. Defendants and their officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and upon those persons in active concert or participation with them, directly or indirectly, in connection with the advertisement or sale of any merchandise are permanently enjoined from:

A. Engaging in any and all deceptive and unfair acts or practices, fraud, false pretense, false promises, misrepresentations, and/or concealment, suppression or omission of material fact in violation of the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act, A.R.S. § 44-1522, *et seq*, as it is currently written, or as it is amended in the future;

B. Selling or attempting to sell any vehicle that has not been fully inspected for major defects.

C. Selling or attempting to sell any vehicle that is not substantially free of any and all defects that would significantly limit the use of the motor vehicle for the ordinary purpose of transportation on any public roadway. For the purposes of this provision, this requirement is met if the vehicle functions in a safe condition as provided in A.R.S §§ 28-921 to 28-966;

D. Failing to honor statutorily mandated warranty regarding used vehicles as required by A.R.S. § 44-1267;

E. Selling vehicles with salvage title without disclosing the salvage nature of the title in violation of A.R.S. § 28-2091;

F. Making deceptive statements about the availability of vehicles to encourage consumers to place a deposit on a vehicle;

G. Failing to return a refundable deposit to consumers in a timely manner in the event that the sale is not completed;

H. Failing to adequately disclose all significant contractual terms to consumers, including, but not limited to, provisions regarding second or third down-payments (also called "pick payments"), payment amount, due date, annual percentage rate, finance charges, document fees, motor vehicle registration fees, gap insurance, warranty cost, and tax;

I. Failing to retain title and possession of motor vehicles traded by consumers as a part of transactions that are conditioned on final approval of financing until the financing is finally approved, pursuant to A.R.S 44-1371;

J. Knowingly issuing refund checks to consumers on bank accounts that contain insufficient funds to pay the check;

K. Selling vehicles for which they do not carry a title, in violation of A.R.S. § 44-1267;

L. Prohibiting consumers from test driving vehicles placed for sale;

M. Presenting any fabricated or deceptive documents to a consumer, including, but not limited to, fabricated or forged bills of sale, false odometer statements, fabricated or forged purchase contracts, invoices, fabricated certificates of title, or any other sales related documents;

N. Making false assurances to consumers regarding loan qualification;

O. Making changes to documents signed by a consumer without first obtaining the consumer's informed written consent;

P. Engaging in any conduct in violation of the Arizona Motor Vehicle Warranties Act, A.R.S. §§ 44-1261, *et seq*;

Q. Engaging in any conduct in violation of the statutory requirements contained in the Truth in Lending Act, 15 U.S.C. §§1601, *et seq.*, the Arizona

Requirements for Consumer Lender Loans, A.R.S. §§ 6-631, *et seq.*, and the Arizona Motor Vehicle Time Sales Disclosure Act, A.R.S. §§ 44-281, *et seq*;

R. Failing to send consumers an authenticated notification of disposition before disposing of a repossessed vehicle pursuant to A.R.S. § 47-9611.

S. Failing to sell repossessed vehicles in a commercially reasonable manner pursuant to A.R.S. § 47-9627.

T. Failing to send consumers an explanation of surplus or deficiency upon the sale of a repossessed vehicle pursuant to A.R.S. § 47-9616; and

U. Failing to pay consumers any surplus upon the sale of a repossessed vehicle pursuant to A.R.S. § 47-9608.

2. Defendants shall, jointly and severally, pay to the Arizona Attorney General the amount of Eighty Thousand Dollars (\$80,000) in civil penalties pursuant to A.R.S § 44-1531, to be deposited into the Consumer Protection – Consumer Fraud Revolving Fund pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1531.01, used for the purposes set forth therein, and paid pursuant to the terms in paragraph 5.

3. Defendants shall, jointly and severally, pay to the Arizona Attorney General the amount of Ten Thousand Six Hundred Forty Five Dollars (\$10,645) in attorneys' fees, expert costs, and investigative costs, to be deposited into the Consumer Protection – Consumer Fraud Revolving Fund pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1531.01, used for the purposes set forth therein, and paid pursuant to the terms in paragraph 5.

4. Defendants shall, jointly and severally, pay to the Arizona Attorney General the amount of Fifteen Thousand Seven Hundred Sixteen Dollars (\$15,716) in consumer restitution, paid pursuant to the terms in paragraph 5 below. The payment ordered herein shall be deposited by the Attorney General into the consumer restitution subaccount of the interest-bearing consumer restitution and remediation revolving fund pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1531.02
(B) and distributed to eligible consumers by the Attorney General's Office. For purposes of

this Stipulated Consent Judgment, "eligible consumers" mean consumers who filed a complaint with the Arizona Attorney General's Office before the date this Stipulated Consent Judgment is submitted to the Court for its approval, whose complaint arose as a result of the consumer purchasing a vehicle or vehicles from Prieto's Auto, and who were not previously refunded the monies they paid to Prieto's Auto. In the event the amount ordered as restitution herein is not sufficient to fully restore eligible consumers the amounts they paid Prieto's Auto, the amount shall be distributed to them on a pro rata basis. In the event that any portion of the restitution, such portion shall be deposited by the Attorney General's Office into the Consumer Protection – Consumer Fraud Revolving Fund in accordance with A.R.S. § 44-1531.01 and used for the purposes specified therein.

5. Defendants shall make monthly payments of Fifteen Hundred Dollars (\$1,500) each month, to be applied to the restitution, civil penalties, and fees and costs due under this Consent Judgment. Each payment is to be delivered, or mailed and postmarked, to the Attorney General on or before the 1st day of each month, beginning July 1, 2014. If all payments are made in a timely fashion, no interest or collection costs shall accrue. Failure to make a payment within ten (10) days of the date due is a default, and the entire unpaid balance shall be accelerated and shall become due and owing in its entirety, plus interest at a rate of ten percent (10%) from the date of the entry of this Consent Judgment and costs of collection.

6.

The effective date of this Consent Judgment is the date it is entered by the Court.

7. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the State may institute an action or proceeding to enforce the terms and provisions of this Consent Judgment or to take action based on future conduct by the Defendants.

8. Defendants shall not represent or imply that the Attorney General, the State, or any agency thereof, has approved any of their actions or has approved any of their present or

-9-

future actions or practices, and Defendants are enjoined from representing anything to the
 contrary.

9. Defendants shall not participate directly or indirectly in any activity to form a separate entity or corporation for the purpose of engaging in acts prohibited in this Consent Judgment or for any other purpose which would otherwise circumvent any part of this Consent Judgment or the spirit or purposes of this Consent Judgment.

10. This Court retains jurisdiction of this matter for the purpose of entertaining an application by the State for the enforcement of this Consent Judgment.

11. If any portion of this Consent Judgment is held invalid by operation of law, the remaining terms thereof shall not be affected and shall remain in full force and effect.

12. Pursuant to Rule 54(b) of the Arizona Rules of Civil procedure, the Court has determined that there is no just reason for delay and hereby directs that this Judgment against Defendants be entered forthwith.

DATED this _____ day of July, 2014.

Judge of the Superior Court

CONSENT TO JUDGMENT

1. Defendants state that no promise of any kind or nature whatsoever was made to them to induce them to enter into this Consent Judgment and have entered into the Consent Judgment voluntarily.

2. Defendants, or their authorized representative, have fully read and understand this Consent Judgment, understand the legal consequences involved in signing it, assert that this is the entire agreement of the parties, and that there are no other representations or

DAT DAT 1. em to inc dgment v 2. is Conser is is the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

-10-

agreements not stated in writing herein, and no force, threats, or coercion of any kind have been used to obtain its signature.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

3. Defendants understand that acceptance of this Consent Judgment is solely for the purpose of settling this litigation and does not preclude the Plaintiff, or any other agency or officer of this State, or subdivision thereof, from instituting other civil or criminal proceedings as may be appropriate for any acts unrelated to this litigation or committed after the entry of this Consent Judgment.

4. Defendant Prieto's Auto Sales, Inc. represents and warrants that the person signing below on its behalf is duly appointed and authorized to do so.

10 12 DATED this day of June, 2014. 11 12 By: Defendant Prieto's Auto Sales, Inc 13 Rita Prieto, President 14 15 $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{v}$ 16 Defendant Gustavo Prieto 17 Bý: 18 Defendant Rita Prieto 19 20**APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:** 21 Thomas C. Horne 22 **Attorney General** 23 By: By: 24 Jordan Christensen Ronald J. Newman 25 Assistant Attorney General **Counsel for Defendants** 26 #3734512

eSignature Page 1 of 1

Filing ID: 5965249 Case Number: CV2014-007493 Original Filing ID: 5962034

Granted as Submitted



/S/ Colleen French Date: 7/2/2014 Judicial Officer of Superior Court

ENDORSEMENT PAGE

CASE NUMBER: CV2014-007493

E-FILING ID #: 5965249

SIGNATURE DATE: 7/2/2014 FILED DATE: 7/3/2014 8:00:00 AM

JORDAN JOHN CHRISTENSEN

GUSTAVO PRIETO NO ADDRESS ON RECORD

PRIETOS AUTO SALES INC NO ADDRESS ON RECORD

RITA PRIETO NO ADDRESS ON RECORD