1 2 3 4 5	Terry Goddard Attorney General (Firm State Bar No. 14000) Nancy V. Anger Assistant Attorney General State Bar No. #006810 1275 W. Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2997 Telephone: (602) 542-7710 Facsimile: (602) 542-4377  Attorneys For Plaintiff	
7	Consumer@azag.gov CPA06-367/953720	
8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF	F THE STATE OF ARIZONA
9	IN AND FOR THE COU	NTY OF MARICOPA
10	STATE OF ARIZONA, ex rel. TERRY GODDARD, Attorney General,	Case No:
11	Plaintiff,	VERIFIED COMPLAINT AND
12	-VS-	APPLICATION FOR INJUNCTIVE AND OTHER RELIEF
14	BRENT D. EMERSON and LOUISE	(Consumer Fraud; Civil Racketeering;
15	JAYNE GORE, husband and wife; ANTHONY WHITE and LISA K. WHITE,	In Rem Forfeiture)
16	husband and wife; GARY MURDIE and JANE DOE MURDIE, husband and wife,	
17	dba GUARANTEED PRESCRIPTIONS; GUARANTEED ADVERTISING;	
18	PREMIER MARKETING GROUP; PHARMACEUTICAL WEALTH	
19	NETWORK, NATIONAL PHARMACY NETWORK; VIP MARKETING and	
20	EXECUTIVE MARKETING GROUP,	
21	INC., a New York Corporation,	
22	Defendants in personam.	
23	REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 10629 E. TROON NORTH DRIVE,	
24	SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA,	
25	Defendant in rem.	
L		

JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, NA; WELLS FARGO BANK, NA; BANK OF AMERICA, NA; COMPASS BANK,

### Relief Defendants.

Plaintiff, State of Arizona, alleges:

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 1. This action is brought pursuant to the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act, A.R.S. § 44-1521, *et seq.* and the Arizona Racketeering Act, A.R.S. § 13-2301, *et seq.* and § 13-4301, *et seq.* Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief, restitution, civil penalties, investigative expenses, costs and attorneys' fees and other relief. Additionally, the racketeering action is brought to obtain treble damages; to prevent, restrain or remedy racketeering as defined by A.R.S. § 13-2301(D)(4); and to forfeit to the State of Arizona all interest in the property described herein, pursuant to A.R.S. § \$ 13-2314 and 13-4301, *et seq.*
- 2. Each defendant has transacted business within or from Maricopa County at all material times.
- 3. Each defendant has caused events to occur in this state out of which the claims which are the subject of this complaint arose.
- 4. This Court has jurisdiction to enter appropriate orders both prior to and following a determination of liability pursuant to A.R.S. § \$44-1528, 13-2314, including forfeiture order pursuant to §§ 13-2314 and 13-4301, *et seq.* particularly § 13-4302.
- 5. Venue is proper in this county pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-2314 and A.R.S. § 13-4303 as the defendants have transacted business and engaged in conduct in Maricopa County and the property seized for forfeiture is located in this county.

||••

25 || • •

-

#### THE PARTIES

- 6. The party bringing this action is the State of Arizona, *ex rel*. Terry Goddard, Attorney General.
- 7. Defendants Brent D. Emerson, Louise Jayne Gore, Anthony White and Gary Murdie are residents of Maricopa County, Arizona. At all times relevant hereto, each of these defendants conducted business in the State of Arizona under the names Guaranteed Prescriptions, Guaranteed Advertising, Premier Marketing Group, Pharmaceutical Wealth Network, National Pharmacy Network and VIP Marketing. Defendants promote and sell internet-based business opportunities to consumers nationwide.
- 8. Defendant Executive Marketing Group, Inc. is a New York corporation, conducting business in the State of Arizona. Defendant Executive Marketing Group, Inc. facilitates the unlawful activities of defendants Brent D. Emerson, Louise Jayne Gore, Anthony White and Gary Murdie by collecting payments from consumers solicited by said defendants. Defendant Executive Marketing Group, Inc. utilizes the following Arizona addresses to further defendants' unlawful activities: 9015 E. Via Linda, Suite 107, Box 224, Scottsdale, Arizona; 2833 N. Central Avenue, Box 480, Phoenix, Arizona, and 3219 E. Camelback Road, Box 530 in Phoenix, Arizona.
- 9. Defendant Lisa K. White is and at all relevant times was the wife of defendant Anthony White. Defendant Anthony White acted on behalf of their marital community with respect to the allegations contained in this Complaint.
- 10. Defendant Jane Doe Murdie is and at all relevant times was the wife of defendant Gary Murdie. Defendant Gary Murdie acted on behalf of their marital community with respect to the allegations contained in this Complaint.

- 11. Defendants utilize numerous individuals and/or entities in carrying out the plan or scheme described in this Complaint. These individuals and/or entities may be named as defendants herein when the nature and extent of their activities and culpability are determined.
- 12. Whenever in this complaint reference is made to any act of defendants, such allegations shall be deemed to mean that each defendant, acting individually, jointly and/or severally, did such act or is accountable for it.
- 13. The property interest against which forfeiture is asserted in this action is listed in Appendix One, consisting of property interests seized for forfeiture to date and not released, which is forfeited to the State of Arizona pursuant to the Arizona Racketeering Act, A.R.S. § 13-2301, *et seq.* and § 13-4301, *et seq.*
- 14. Defendant Wells Fargo Bank, whose main office is located at 420 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California and who conducts business in Maricopa County, Arizona, is named as a defendant herein solely due to the possible existence in its possession of proceeds of the consumer fraud alleged herein and not for the purpose of alleging that the bank participated in the unlawful acts. Any reference to defendants does not include Wells Fargo Bank.
- 15. Defendant J.P Morgan Chase Bank, whose main office is located at 270 Park Avenue, New York, New York, and who conducts business in Maricopa County, Arizona, is named as a defendant herein solely due to the possible existence in its possession of proceeds of the consumer fraud alleged herein and not for the purpose of alleging that the bank participated in the unlawful acts. Any reference to defendants does not include J.P. Morgan Chase Bank.
- 16. Defendant Compass Bank, whose main office is located in Birmingham, Alabama and who conducts business in Maricopa County, Arizona is named as a

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

defendant herein solely due to the possible existence in its possession of proceeds of the consumer fraud alleged herein and not for the purpose of alleging that the bank participated in the unlawful acts. Any reference to defendants does not include Compass Bank.

17. Defendant Bank of America, who main office is located in Charlotte, North Carolina and who conducts business in Maricopa County, Arizona, is named as a defendant herein solely due to the possible existence in its possession of proceeds of the consumer fraud alleged herein and not for the purpose of alleging that the bank participated in the unlawful acts. Any reference to defendants does not include Bank of America.

### **DEFENDANTS' BUSINESS PRACTICES**

- 18. From 2003 and continuing to the present, defendants market and sell internet-based business opportunities using direct mail, internet advertising and telemarketing.
- 19. Defendants purport to design, setup and sell websites to consumers through which the general public can order prescription medications at discounted prices.

  Defendants represent that their customers can earn thousands of dollars in commissions which are paid each time a prescription medication is purchased from the customers' websites.
- 20. Defendants initially sent mailers to consumers nationwide in order to market their internet business opportunity. Defendants' mailer contains the following deceptive statements and misrepresentations:
- A. "We've teamed up with Pfizer, Merck, Bristol Myers, Johnson and Johnson and many others to create a completely automated online pharmacy website!"

- B. "Every order placed at your pharmacy is filled by a U.S. based manufacturer. Every prescription order is reviewed by a licensed U.S. based physician! This practice is in accordance with FDA regulations and is perfectly legal."
- C. Pfizer, Merck, Bristol Myers and Johnson and Johnson pay commissions directly to website owners each time a prescription is purchased from the owner's website.
- D . The general public could purchase the following prescription drugs online, without a prescription from their personal physicians: Viagra, Xanax, Hydrocodone, Codine, Vicodin and Valium.
- 21. Defendants eventually discontinued the use of their mailer and instead solicited consumers using outbound telemarketing and internet advertising. Defendants employed telephone representatives to cold-call consumers or respond to inquiries made through the internet. Defendants made various false and deceptive statements in order to induce the consumer to purchase defendants' business opportunity, including but not limited to:
- A. Defendants have established relationships with major prescription drug manufacturers;
- B. Defendants are authorized to set up a limited number of on-line drug pharmacies to process prescription drug orders generated over the internet;
- C. The federal government approved the sale of prescription drugs on the internet, opening up a whole new market for prescription drug buyers;
  - D. Consumers can operate their business without owning a computer;
- E. Consumers need only possess \$500 to \$1,000 of established credit in order to start their web-based business.

- 22. In all of their marketing efforts, defendants consistently make false income claims, including, but not limited to:
- A. "We are lunging forward at the speed of technology and right now is a great time to be aware that you can choose to be one of the millions of millionaires created by the Internet worldwide!"
- B. If you get started now, you could generate thousands of dollars every single week!
- C. Are you going to be one of the many people that make a lot of money and continue to turn a profit day after day, week after week, year after year from their customers purchasing prescription drugs from your website?
  - D. Commissions in excess of \$20,000 per month can be earned;
  - E. As many as 500 prescriptions could be sold per second.
- 23. Defendants assure potential customers that their entire pharmacy website will be built for them for a "one-time set-up fee," typically less than \$1,000.00. Consumers are told by defendants that they will receive various services for the set-up fee, including a personal website with e-commerce capabilities, a domain name and "guaranteed" visitors within the first 90 days that the website is established.
- 24. The web pages set-up by defendants for their clients are all identical and stem from a common URL. An ID number at the end of each URL identifies the individual consumer.
- 25. Soon after purchasing a website, consumers receive a call from a telemarketer employed by one of defendants' marketing companies Guaranteed Advertising, Premier Marketing Group or VIP Marketing. Defendants engage in high-pressure sales tactics to persuade consumers to purchase advertising services, such as pop-up ads and search engine submission packages to promote their individual websites.

Defendants tell consumers that their websites will be profitable only if they purchase the internet marketing packages. Consumers pay between \$500 to \$40,000 for defendants' advertising packages.

- 26. Few, if any, consumers who purchase defendants' business opportunity and/or advertising services make any money. When customers complain to defendants that they are not receiving any commission checks, defendants' sales representatives attempt to sell additional internet marketing packages at an added expense.
- 27. Defendants claim to provide their customers with a written "risk free guarantee", promising to provide refunds to customers who do not earn 100% of their money back after the first 12 months of operating their pharmacy website. Few, if any, consumers receive refunds from defendants.

# FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF: VIOLATIONS OF CONSUMER FRAUD ACT A.R.S. § § 44-1521, et seq.

- 28. In connection with the advertisement and sale of pharmaceutical websites and advertising to support those businesses, defendants engaged in the act, use or employment of deception, deceptive acts or practices, fraud, false pretenses, false promises, misrepresentations, or the concealment, suppression or omission of material facts with the intent that consumers rely upon such concealment, suppression or omission, including but not limited to the following:
- a. Defendants made deceptive and misleading claims to consumers regarding the amount of earnings that they could make by selling pharmaceutical drugs via the internet;
- b. Defendants made deceptive and misleading claims to consumers regarding the effectiveness of its advertising and the increased earnings that consumers would realize by its use;

- c. Defendants made deceptive and misleading claims to consumers regarding their ability to obtain full refunds if their earnings did not equal or exceed their expenses in purchasing a web site;
- d. Defendants made deceptive and misleading claims to consumers regarding the legality of selling certain prescriptions drugs, particularly narcotic drugs, over the internet.

# SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF Racketeering by Schemes and Artifices to Defraud A.R.S. § 13-2310

- 29. Plaintiff realleges the prior allegations of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 30. Defendants Brent D. Emerson, Louise Jayne Gore, Anthony White, Gary Murdie and Executive Marketing Group, Inc., all doing business as Guaranteed Advertising, Guaranteed Prescriptions, Premier Marketing Group, Pharmaceutical Wealth Network, National Pharmaceutical Network and/or VIP Marketing, committed acts for financial gain which are chargeable or indictable under the laws of Arizona and punishable by imprisonment for more than one year, involving schemes and artifices to defraud (A.R.S. § 13-2310), within and from Arizona, in which defendants operated a business in a manner which was designed to and did improperly divert monies to their own use.
- 31. Defendants Brent D. Emerson, Louise Jayne Gore, Anthony White, Gary Murdie and Executive Marketing Group, Inc., all doing business as Guaranteed Advertising, Guaranteed Prescriptions, Premier Marketing Group, Pharmaceutical Wealth Network, National Pharmaceutical Network and/or VIP Marketing, violated A.R.S. § 13-2310 by engaging in a scheme or artifice to defraud another person by means of false or

fraudulent pretenses, representations, promises or material omissions, including, without limitation, the acts alleged elsewhere in this Complaint.

31. Defendants Brent D. Emerson, Louise Jayne Gore, Anthony white, Gary Murdie and Executive Marketing Group, Inc. knowingly obtained benefits by means of the scheme or artifice alleged herein.

# THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF Racketeering by Theft A.R.S. § 13-2301; A.R.S. § 13-1802

- 32. Plaintiff realleges the prior allegations of the Complaint as if set forth fully herein.
- 33. Defendants Brent D. Emerson, Louise Jayne Gore, Anthony White, Gary Murdie and Executive Marketing Group, Inc., all doing business as Guaranteed Advertising, Guaranteed Prescriptions, Premier Marketing Group, Pharmaceutical Wealth Network, National Pharmaceutical Network and/or VIP Marketing, committed acts for financial gain which are chargeable or indictable under the laws of Arizona and punishable by imprisonment for more than one year, involving theft in which defendants have violated the provisions of A.R.S. § 13-1802.
- 34. Defendants Brent D. Emerson, Louise Jayne Gore, Anthony White, Gary Murdie and Executive Marketing Group, Inc., all doing business as Guaranteed Advertising, Guaranteed Prescriptions, Premier Marketing Group, Pharmaceutical Wealth Network, National Pharmaceutical Network and/or VIP Marketing violated A.R.S. § 13-1802 by: controlling the property of another with the intent to deprive him or her of the property; obtaining the property from another by means of material misrepresentations with the intent to deprive him or her of such property, or; converting for an unauthorized term or use property of another entrusted to defendants or placed in the defendants'

possession for a limited, authorized term or use, or all of such conduct, including, without limitation, the acts alleged elsewhere in this Complaint.

# FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF In Rem Forfeiture A.R.S. §§ 13-2314, 13-4313

- 35. Plaintiff realleges the prior allegations of the Complaint as if set forth fully herein.
- 36. Defendants acquired or maintained a gain through the above-described offenses, which are included in the definition of racketeering in A.R.S. § 13-2301(D)(4), in an amount in excess of \$1 Million. The property representing said gains, which would be subject to forfeiture, cannot be located; has been transferred or conveyed to, sold to or deposited with a third party; has been substantially diminished in value by an act or omission of the defendants; or has been commingled with other property which cannot be divided without difficulty. The property described in Appendix One to this Verified Complaint is subject to forfeiture to the State of Arizona as a substitute asset as provided under A.R.S. § 13-4313(A).

### REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court:

- 37. Pursuant to A.R.S. 44-1531, order defendants Brent D. Emerson, Louise Jayne Gore, Anthony White, Lisa K. White, Gary Murdie, Jane Doe Murdie and Executive Marketing Group, Inc., jointly and severally, to pay civil penalties as deemed appropriate in an amount not to exceed ten thousand dollars (\$10,000.00) per violation.
- 38. Order each defendant, jointly and severally, to restore to any person in interest any monies or property which any defendant acquired by means of any unlawful practice alleged herein under A.R.S. § 44-1522(A), in such amount as the Court deems proper pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1528.

- 40. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-2314, enter a preliminary and permanent injunction, enjoining and restraining defendants, and any person acting in concert with them directly or indirectly, from:
- A. Destroying, secreting, defacing, transferring or otherwise altering or disposing of any books, records, accounts, mail, papers, memos or any documents or things of any kind or nature, or relating to any and all business property and finances of defendants; and transferring, secreting, dissipating, altering, selling, pledging, assigning, encumbering, expending, concealing, conveying, liquidating or otherwise disposing of any assets, funds or property or rights in property owned controlled or in the possession of defendants, or proceeds thereof, obtained or maintained by them or any of them by means of the acts and practice described in this Complaint including, without limitation, any and all property or evidence of rights in property, or any books or records or other items described herein, located in or concerning any safe deposit repository or other safekeeping facility owned or controlled by defendants.
- 41. Pursuant to § 13-2314, issue preliminary and permanent injunctions enjoining defendants, and any person acting in concert with them, directly or indirectly, from transferring, receiving, dissipating, altering, selling, pledging, assigning, liquidating, concealing or otherwise disposing of any proceeds traceable to racketeering and all monies, negotiable instruments, securities and other things of value used or intended to be used to facilitate the commission of racketeering as alleged above and any property or other interest subject to damages, forfeiture or other restraints pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 13-2314 and 13-4301 *et seq.*

42. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-2314, order the defendants to pay treble damages to those persons injured by the racketeering alleged in this Complaint.

- 43. Pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 13-2314 and 13-4301 *et seq.*, enter an order forfeiting to the State of Arizona, to the extent not already ordered to be paid as other damages, any property or other interest acquired or maintained in violation of A.R.S. §§ 13-2310 and 13-1802; all proceeds traceable to an offense included in the definition of racketeering, in A.R.S. § 13-2301(D)(4) and all monies, negotiable instruments, securities and other things of value used or intended to be used to facilitate commission of the offenses.
- 44. Pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 13-2313 and 13-4301 *et seq.*, enter an order forfeiting to the State of Arizona, to the extent not already ordered to be paid as other damages, the property described in Appendix One to this Verified Complaint, which is a substitution asset for property otherwise subject to forfeiture which cannot be located; has been transferred or conveyed to, sold to or deposited with a third party, has been substantially diminished in value by an act or omission of the defendants, or has been commingled with other property which cannot be divided without difficulty.
- 45. Enter an order providing that this Court retain jurisdiction of this action in order to implement and carry out the terms of all orders and decrees that may be entered herein, and in order to entertain any suitable applications or motions by the State for additional relief within the jurisdiction of the Court.
- 46. Enter an order providing that the owners of any interest in forfeited property pay to the State, agency, or instrumentality of the State to which that owner's real property is forfeited, the dollar amount of the taxes, penalties, and interest on that forfeited property which were unpaid as of the date the court ordered forfeiture of the real property.

1	47. Order defendants to pay the State's costs and	expenses incurred in the	
2	investigation and prosecution of the defendants' activities alleged in this Complaint,		
3	including reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to A.R.S. § 1	including reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-2314 and 44-1534.	
4	4 48. Retain jurisdiction of this action in order to in	48. Retain jurisdiction of this action in order to implement and carry out the	
5	terms of all orders, decrees and judgments that may be entered herein and in order to		
6	entertain any applications or motions by plaintiff for additional relief.		
7	Dated this day of	, 2006.	
8	TERRI GODDA		
9	9 Attorney General		
10	Nancy V. Anger		
11	11 Assistant Attorne	•	
12	Attorneys for the	State of Arizona	
13	13		
14	14		
15	15		
16	16		
17	17		
18	18		
19	19		
20	20		
21	21		
22	22		
23	23		
24	24		
25	25		

# **APPENDIX ONE**

**Property Description** 

10629 East Troon North Drive, Scottsdale, Arizona 85262 with a legal description of Lot 93, Boulder Crest Estates, Unit III at Troon North according to Book 435 of Maps, Page 1 and Affidavit of Correction recorded July 29, 1997 in instrument no. 97-0510427, records of Maricopa County, Arizona.

1	VERIFICATION	
2	STATE OF ARIZONA )	
3	County of Maricopa )	
4		
5	FRANK ARVIZU, first being duly sworn, upon his oath, states as follows:	
6	1. I am a Special Agent with the Special Investigations Section of the Office of	
7	the Attorney General, and am duly authorized to make this verification.	
8	2. I have read the foregoing Verified Complaint and Application for Injunctive	
9	and Other Relief and know the contents thereof.	
10	3. The statements contained therein are true and correct to the best of my	
11	knowledge, information and belief.	
12	4. Further Affiant sayeth not.	
13		
14	<del></del>	
15	Frank Arvizu	
16	SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this day of	
17	2006.	
18		
19		
20	Notary Public	
21	My Commission Expires:	
22	Wy Commission Expires.	
23		
24		
25		