EXHIBIT L

Page 2 of 8 Case 2:09-cv-01112-RCJ-LRL Document 8 Filed 06/22/2009 DANIEL O. HANKS 1 KATHLEEN BENWAY 2 Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W. Washington, D.C. 20580 3 (202) 326-2472 (Hanks) (202) 326-2024 (Benway) (202) 326-3395 (facsimile) 4 5 dhanks@ftc.gov kbenway@ftc.gov 6 7 BLAINE T. WELSH Assistant United States Attorney Bar No. 4790
333 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 5000
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(702) 388-6336 (phone)
(702) 388-6787 (facsimile) 8 9 10 Blaine. Welsh@usdoj.gov Attorneys for Plaintiff 11 12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 13 DISTRICT OF NEV 14 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION. 15 2:09-cv-01112-RCJ-LRL Plaintiff, 16 ٧. 17 CERTIFICATION OF DANIEL INFUSION MEDIA, INC., 18 a corporation, also O. HANKS PURSUANT TO d/b/a Google Money Tree, FED. R. CIV. P. 65(b)(2) IN 19 SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S EX Google Pro, Internet Income Pro, and **PARTE MOTION FOR** 20 TEMPORARY RESTRAINING Google Treasure Chest; **ORDER AND PLAINTIFF'S** 21 WEST COAST INTERNET MEDIA, INC., MOTION TO TEMPORARILY a corporation, also **SEAL ENTIRE FILE** 22 d/b/a Google Money Tree, Google Pro, 23 Internet Income Pro, and [FILED UNDER SEAL] Google Treasure Chest; 24 TWO WARNINGS, LLC, 25 a limited liability company; 26 PLATINUM TELESERVICES, INC., 27 a corporation; 28 1 of 7

7

8

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

2324

25 26

2728

JONATHAN EBORN, individually and as an officer of Infusion Media, Inc., Two Warnings, LLC,

Two Part Investments, LLC, and West Coast Internet Media, Inc.;

STEPHANIE BURNSIDE,

individually and as an officer of Two Warnings, LLC, Two Part Investments, LLC, and West Coast Internet Media, Inc.;

MICHAEL McLAIN MILLER, individually and as an officer of Infusion Media, Inc., Two Warnings, LLC, and Two Part Investments, LLC; and

TONY NORTON, individually and as an officer of Platinum Teleservices, Inc.

Defendants.

I, Daniel O. Hanks, hereby declare as follows:

- I am over eighteen years of age and am a citizen of the United States. I am one of the attorneys representing the Federal Trade Commission (the "FTC" or "Commission") in this action against Infusion Media, Inc., West Coast Internet Media, Inc., Two Warnings, LLC, Two Part Investments, LLC, Platinum Teleservices, Inc., Jonathan Eborn, Stephanie Burnside, Michael McLain Miller, and Tony Norton, (collectively "Defendants").
- 2. I am a member in good standing of the bars of the District of Columbia and Virginia. My work address is FTC, Division of Marketing Practices, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580. Unless indicated otherwise, I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein and if called as a witness, would competently testify thereto.
- 3. I submit this certification pursuant to Rule 65(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in support of Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission's Ex Parte Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order with Asset Freeze, Appointment of a Receiver, and Other Equitable Relief,

and Order to Show Cause ("TRO Motion") and in support of the Commission's request that the Temporary Restraining Order ("TRO") be issued without notice to Defendants. I also submit this certification in support of the Commission's *Ex Parte* Motion for Order Temporarily Sealing Entire File, filed contemporaneously with the Commission's application for a TRO.

- 4. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 65(b), this Court may issue a TRO without notice to Defendants if the Commission's counsel "certifies to the court in writing the efforts, if any, which have been made to give the notice and the reasons supporting the claim that notice should not be required." For the reasons discussed herein, the Commission has not provided Defendants with notice of the filing of this action or of the Commission's application for a TRO. For the reasons stated below, the interests of justice require that the Commission's applications be heard *ex parte*.
- 5. The evidence set forth in the FTC's Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission's Ex Parte Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order with Asset Freeze, Appointment of a Receiver, and Other Equitable Relief, and supporting exhibits, filed concurrently herewith, demonstrates that Defendants induce consumers to purchase a work-at-home "kit" for a nominal cost of \$1.97 or \$3.88, but then initiate recurring unauthorized charges of \$72.21 to consumers' financial accounts. Defendants market their work-at-home kits online by making eye-catching claims about the income their kits will generate for consumers and by using prominently the "Google" name and logo to cloak their venture in a false aura of legitimacy. These representations are false, but together with the nominal cost for the Google Money Tree kit, they lull consumers into believing there is little risk in ordering. Hidden, however, on "terms and conditions" pages that can only be reached by inconspicuous hyperlinks are disclosures that the purchase of a kit will trigger recurring charges of \$72.21. Through this scheme, the defendants have extracted millions of dollars from consumers across the country.
- 6. The defendants have continued their scheme unabated despite more than a thousand consumer complaints including 250 in the last month alone, several administrative

citations from Utah's Division of Consumer Protection, and even in the face of a lawsuit filed earlier this year by the Texas Attorney General.

- 7. The FTC has alleged that Defendants' deceptive activities violate Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act ("FTC Act"), 15 U.S.C. § 45; Section 907(a) of the Electronic Funds Transfer Act ("EFTA"), 15 U.S.C. § 1693e(a); and Section 205.10(b) of Regulation E, 12 C.F.R. § 205.12(b). By violating Section 907(a) of the EFTA and Regulation E, Defendants have violated the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1693o(c).
- 8. The evidence shows that Defendants' failure to disclose material terms of their offer and their misrepresentations about affiliation with Google Inc. constitute deceptive acts or practices in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).
- 9. The evidence shows that Defendants violate Section 907(a) of the EFTA, 15 U.S.C. § 1693e(a) and Section 205.10(b) of Regulation E, 12 C.F.R. § 205.12(b) by debiting consumers' bank accounts on a recurring basis without obtaining a written authorization signed or similarly authenticated from consumers for preauthorized electronic fund transfers from the accounts. By violating Section 907(a) of the EFTA and Regulation E, Defendants have violated the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1693o(c).
- 10. Accordingly, the FTC seeks an ex parte TRO: (a) prohibiting Defendants from involvement in marketing, promoting or selling business opportunity ventures; (b) freezing Defendants' assets; (c) appointing a temporary receiver; (d) providing the FTC with immediate access to Defendants' business premises and records; (e) permitting the FTC to take expedited discovery; and (f) other equitable relief
- 11. There is ample evidence that Defendants have the motivation and opportunity to conceal and dissipate assets and destroy important documents, as demonstrated by: (a) the pervasive fraudulent enterprise in which they are engaged; (b) the presence of easily concealed and portable assets (i.e., cash); and (c) Defendants' repeated and flagrant violation of the consumer protection laws.
 - 12. Consequently, absent the requested ex parte relief and seal order, it is reasonably

L 04

likely that Defendants will destroy documents and dissipate or hide assets. If Defendants are permitted the opportunity to hide their assets and destroy business records, it will render ineffective any restitution order this Court may enter at the ultimate disposition of this matter, and irreparably harm consumers victimized by Defendants' deceptive scheme.

- 13. As illustrated by the following examples (provided on information and belief), it has been the Commission's experience that Defendants, who receive notice of the filing of an action by the FTC or of the FTC's intent to file an action alleging consumer fraud, often attempt to undermine the FTC's efforts to preserve the status quo by immediately dissipating or concealing assets and/or destroying documents. Often Defendants or their affiliates, who have been served with a temporary restraining order, attempt to remove assets from their financial institutions or to conceal offshore assets;
- a. In <u>FTC v. World Class Network, Inc.</u>, CV-97-162 AHS (C.D. Cal. 1997), after the court had issued an *ex parte* restraining order, two of the Defendants withdrew from the bank, spent, and hid \$202,000 in assets after being served with the restraining order and asset freeze. The spouse of another defendant withdrew over \$100,000 and left the state to open and deposit funds into an out-of-state account.
- b. In FTC v. Thomas E. O'Day, No. 94-1108-CIV-ORL-22 (M.D. Fla. 1994), the district court denied the FTC's request to issue an *ex parte* TRO with asset freeze, and scheduled a noticed hearing on the relief sought. Several days later, the FBI executed a search warrant on the Defendants' business premises as the FTC served notice of its action and the upcoming hearing. Within hours, an individual defendant withdrew approximately \$200,000 from one of his bank accounts.
- c. In <u>FTC v. Academic Guidance Services</u>, No. 92-3001 (AET) (D.N.J. 1992), the Defendants discovered that the FTC intended to file a case against them (and seek an *ex parte* TRO) the following week. An informant told the FTC that the Defendants then leased a document shredder and spent the weekend destroying documents. The FTC verified that a shredder had been leased, and one of the defendants' employees confirmed that documents had

been shredded.

- d. In FTC v. Applied Telemedia Engineering and Management, Inc., No. 91-635 (S.D. Fla. 1991), the Defendants were advised, pursuant to an agreement with the FTC, that the FTC had filed its complaint and intended to seek a restraining order with an asset freeze from the court. When the FTC's agents went to the Defendants' offices to serve process, they observed the Defendants removing boxes of documents from the premises. The FTC moved for, and received, an *ex parte* TRO the following day.
- e. In <u>FTC v. Intellicom</u>, 97-4572 TJH (Mcx) (C.D. Cal. 1997), a telemarketing investment fraud case, the FTC obtained an *ex parte* TRO and served banks at which the Defendants were known to have accounts. One defendant, whose bank was served earlier in the day, called the bank and asked the branch manager to wire out approximately \$100,000 held in an account that was specifically designated in the TRO as frozen. The branch manager encountered a red flag in the system, discovered that the account had been frozen, and refused to release the funds.
- f. In <u>FTC v. Lopinto</u>, No. CV S-93-561 (LDG) (D. Nev. 1993), a case involving the telemarketing of prize promotions, the district court issued an *ex parte* TRO with an asset freeze. The order was served on a bank where one of the defendant businesses maintained an account. However, before the bank could implement the freeze, an agent of the defendant business who knew of the freeze withdrew \$12,300 from defendant's account.
- g. In FTC v. American National Cellular, Inc., No. CV 85-7375 WJR (C.D. Cal. 1985), the court issued an *ex parte* TRO with an asset freeze. A defendant learned of the court's ruling, and immediately withdrew \$1.2 million from his bank accounts before the banks were served with a copy of the freeze order. The defendant fled California and dissipated the money while living overseas.
- 14. For the above reasons, as contemplated by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b), there is good cause to believe that immediate and irreparable damage will result to consumers from the dissipation of assets, and from the concealment, transfer or destruction of

Defendants' records, if Defendants receive advance notice of the FTC's application for a temporary restraining order. Thus, it is in the interests of justice that this Court grant such application without notice.

15. For the same reasons, there is good cause to believe that immediate and irreparable harm will result to consumers if any of the Defendants receive premature notice of the filing of this action. Thus, the interests of justice would be served if the Commission's Motion for Temporary Seal of the Entire File were granted.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on June 19, 2009, in Washington, D.C.

DANIEL O. HANKS

Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20580

(202) 326-2472

(202) 326-3395 (facsimile)

dhanks@ftc.gov