Kamala D. Harris (SBN 146672) Attorney General of California Daniel A. Olivas (SBN 130405) Supervising Deputy Attorney General David A. Jones (SBN 250287) 3 Deputy Attorneys General Deputy Attorneys General
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, California 90013
Tel.: (213) 897-8764
Fax: (213) 897-4951
Email: David.Jones@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff The People of the
State of California 5 Daniel M. Benjamin (SBN 209240) Andrew W. Robertson (SBN 62541) BALLARD SPAHR LLP 655 West Broadway, Suite 1600 San Diego, California 92101-8494 Tel.: (619) 696-9200 (619) 696-9269 11 Fax: Email: benjamind@ballardspahr.com 12 robertsona@ballardspahr.com Attorneys for Court-Appointed Receiver 13 14 15 16 17 18 ٧. 19 THE LAW OFFICES OF KRAMER AND 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

CONFORMED COPY ORIGINAL FILED Superior Court of California

DEC - 92014

Sherri R. Carrer, executive Officer/Clerk By: Maria C. Concepcion, Deputy

BY FAX

## SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CENTRAL CIVIL WEST COURTHOUSE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff,

KASLOW, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. LC094571

Related Cases: LS021816 [Kramer]; LS021817 [Stein]; LS021818 [Van Son]

NOTICE OF OMNIBUS MOTION AND OMNIBUS MOTION FOR ORDER APPROVING PROCEDURES FOR RECEIVERSHIP RESTITUTION PROGRAM; DECLARATION OF DAVID A. JONES IN SUPPORT OF OMNIBUS MOTION; DECLARATION OF ELI D. MORGENSTERN IN SUPPORT OF OMNIBUS MOTION

Action filed: August 15, 2011

Judge:

Hon. Jane L. Johnson

Dept.:

308

Date:

March 12, 2015

Time:

10:00 a.m.

Case No. LC094571

OMNIBUS MOTION FOR ORDER APPROVING RECEIVERSHIP RESTITUTION PROGRAM



28

## TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on March 12, 2015 at 10:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as this matter may be heard in the above-entitled Court, located at 600 South Commonwealth Avenue, Los Angeles, California, Plaintiff, the People of the State of California ("Plaintiff"), and Thomas W. McNamara, as court-appointed Receiver (the "Receiver"), will and hereby do respectfully move this Court for an Order approving procedures for the Receivership Restitution Program.

This motion is based on this application and memorandum of points and authorities, the attached declarations of David A. Jones and Eli. D. Morgenstern in support of the omnibus motion, the pleadings and files in this matter, and any documentary or other evidence submitted at any hearing on the application.

Dated: December **X**, 2014

Kamala D. Harris

Attorney General of California
Daniel A. Olivas
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
David A, Jones

Deputy Attorney General

David A. Jones
Attorneys for Plaintiff People of the State of
California

Dated: December 2014 BALLARD SPAHR LLP

Manlel M. Benjamin
Attorneys for Thomas W. McNamara,
Court-Appointed Receiver

The purpose of this motion is to obtain approval of a restitution plan developed by Plaintiff, the State Bar, and the Receiver. This motion is being made by the Plaintiff, the People of the State of California ("Plaintiff" or the "People"), and the court-appointed receiver, Thomas W. McNamara (the "Receiver"). Although not a party to this case, the State Bar will file motions to implement the proposed plan in related State Bar actions. This motion is supported by the State Bar, which has approved the proposed order on this motion. (Declaration of Eli D. Morgenstern in support of Omnibus Motion, ¶ 6 ["Morgenstern Declaration"].)

This action was brought by the People to enjoin ongoing unlawful conduct by the Defendants with regard to so-called "mass joinder" lawsuits. Plaintiff obtained, among other things, appointment of the Receiver to marshal certain assets of the Defendants. (See Order Appointing Receiver, filed herein on September 8, 2011.) In this action, the Court has now entered Final Judgments against all defendants except Mitchell J. Stein. (Declaration of David A. Jones in support of Omnibus Motion, ¶¶ 3-7 ["Jones Declaration"].)

Because the Defendants included both attorneys and non-attorneys, this action was brought in conjunction with a number of State Bar enforcement actions against attorneys. (Jones Decl., ¶2.) Three of the State Bar actions were before this Court. (In the Matter of the Assumption of Jurisdiction Over the Law Practice of Philip A. Kramer, dba Law Offices of Kramer and Kaslow, Case No. LS021816; In the Matter of the Assumption of Jurisdiction Over the Law Practice of Christopher J. Van Son, dba Consolidated Litigation Group and Van Son Law Group, Case No. LS021818; and In the Matter of the Assumption of Jurisdiction over the Law Practice of Mitchell J. Stein, Case No. LS021817.) This Court has entered Permanent Orders Assuming Jurisdiction in those actions, finally resolving them except as to final distribution of any remaining funds. (Morgenstern Decl., ¶3.)

The State Bar has also secured Permanent Orders Assuming Jurisdiction in two additional State Bar Actions in Orange County Superior Court. (In the Matter of the Assumption of Jurisdiction Over the Law Practice of Paul W. Petersen dba Mesa Law Group Corp. and Petersen Legal Services, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2011-00499800; In the

Matter of the Assumption of Jurisdiction Over the Law Practice of Anthony J. Kassas, dba Law Offices of Anthony Kassas and Kassas Law Group, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2011-00505386.) The courts in those actions have entered Permanent Orders Assuming Jurisdiction, finally resolving them except as to final distribution of any remaining funds. (Morgenstern Decl., ¶ 4.)

Notably, the Permanent Orders in the State Bar actions permit the use of a receiver to take possession and control of bank accounts related to the respective attorneys. (Morgenstern Decl., ¶ 5.) This motion thus seeks to create an omnibus methodology for carrying out restitution as to both those actions and this action. That is why the proposed restitution plan here is contingent on approval by both this Court and the courts overseeing the relevant State Bar actions. (Jones Decl., ¶ 8.)

Specifically, with all actions resolved (except as to Mr. Stein, whose trial in this matter has been delayed due to his criminal conviction in Florida), the People and the Receiver (supported by the State Bar) believe it is necessary and appropriate to adopt procedures to govern a restitution program to be administered by the Receiver. (See [Proposed] Order lodged concurrently with this motion.) With the consent of the Plaintiff Attorney General and the State Bar, the restitution program will be funded by:

- All funds which remain frozen, and still subject to the possession of the State Bar, in the accounts of Attorney Defendants Philip A. Kramer and the Law Offices of Kramer and Kaslow and related entities, specifically including, but not limited to, the following accounts which total in the aggregate approximately \$609,862: (i) Citibank, N.A. accounts ending 4317, 4325, 3578, 4387, and 4412; (ii) PNC Bank, N.A. accounts ending 5538, 5546 and 5554; (iii) US Bank accounts ending 0639, 5758, and 9349; and (iv) Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. accounts ending 0895, 2958, 3642, 5146, 6429, and 9256.
- All funds which remain frozen, and still subject to the possession of the
   State Bar, in the IOLTA account of Anthony Kassas at JP Morgan Chase

Bank, account ending 3585, in the approximate amount of \$14,500.

\$50,000 to be transferred from funds currently in the receivership account.

With the consent of Plaintiff and the State Bar, all other funds frozen in this action or the State Bar actions (with the sole exception of Mitchell J. Stein, whose funds shall remain frozen until his case is resolved) have been remitted to the receivership as credits against the penalties and fees portions of the judgments secured by the People in this action. Any net funds in the receivership upon termination will be disbursed to the People and applied to those penalties and fees.

The proposed procedures for the administration of the restitution fund are set out in the proposed order being submitted herewith. However, the essence of it is as follows:

- 1. Notice to Potential Claimants. The Receiver shall initially take reasonable steps to provide notice of the Restitution Program through a notice posted on his website and through mailing sent to: (i) the State Bar's database of consumers whose names have appeared in the files and records of the Attorney Defendants<sup>1</sup>; (ii) any additional consumers not included in that database who have, to date, filed a claim with the State Bar's Client Security Fund regarding mass joinder; and (iii) any additional consumers reasonably known to the Receiver to have paid a fee to secure the services of an Attorney Defendant in connection with mass joinder litigation.
- 2. <u>Submitting a Claim Form to the Receiver</u>. Claimants shall then submit the Claim Form and supporting documentation to the Receiver on or before the date which is within forty-five (45) days of the Effective Date<sup>2</sup> of the order, either by mail or via the website.
- 3. <u>Bar Date</u>. The Court would set a Bar Date for the submission of all Claim Forms to be the date forty-five (45) days after the entry of the order. All claims must be submitted by

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The term "Attorney Defendants" is defined in the Court's Preliminary Injunction in this matter.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> "Effective Date" shall be the date on which the Court enters the requested order authorizing the restitution program set out herein and orders also have been entered in the relevant State Bar Actions: In the Matter of the Assumption of Jurisdiction Over the Law Practice of Philip A. Kramer, d.b.a. Law Offices of Kramer and Kaslow, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. LS021816, and In the Matter of the Assumption of Jurisdiction Over the Law Practice of Anthony J. Kassas, d.b.a. Law Offices of Anthony Kassas and Kassas Law Group, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2011-00505386.

this Bar Date. Claims submitted after the Bar Date will be rejected, except the Bar Date shall be extended an additional thirty (30) days for any claimant whose mailed notice from the Receiver was returned to the Receiver as undeliverable. As to any such returned notices, the Receiver shall make a reasonable effort to obtain an accurate address and resend the notice, if feasible.

- 4. Review of Claim Forms. The Receiver and/or his designated counsel or staff shall review and evaluate all Claim Forms submitted by the Bar Date. The Receiver, in his discretion, shall approve a claim only if it complies with the procedures set forth in the order. The Receiver shall notify all Claimants of the Receiver's decision regarding approved claims by posting a Preliminary Schedule of Approved Claims on the Receiver's website on or before the date which is within ninety (90) days of the entry of this Order and shall send notice by email, if available, or by U.S. mail, if email is not available, to all Claimants that the Preliminary Schedule has been posted. For any claim that is denied by the Receiver and not included in the Preliminary Schedule of Approved Claims, the denied Claimant may appeal that decision by submitting a written objection by U.S. Mail or email to the Receiver within fourteen (14) days after the Preliminary Schedule is posted.
- 5. Objections. The Receiver shall review any submitted objections and file a Final Schedule of Approved Claims within twenty-eight (28) days after the date on which the Preliminary Schedule is posted. All decisions of the Receiver set forth in the Final Schedule of Approved Claims shall be final. A Claimant who desires to object to the Final Schedule of Approved Claims, and who has previously submitted a written objection to the Receiver, may do so by submitting a written objection to the Court within fourteen (14) days after the Receiver has posted the Final Schedule of Approved Claims.
- 6. <u>Distributions.</u> Within twenty-one (21) days after the Receiver has posted the Final Schedule of Approved Claims, the Receiver shall apply to the Court for approval to disburse the Net Restitution Fund to all approved Claimants on a per capita basis calculated as the Net Restitution Fund divided by the number of approved claims, except that such payments shall not exceed that amount of fees actually paid by the Claimant. Within five (5) days after the

8

12 13

11

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

Court's approval, the Receiver shall send by U.S. Mail distribution payments to all Claimants with approved claims.

- 7. Expenses. The Receiver and professionals and staff that he may retain at his discretion shall be entitled to reasonable compensation and reimbursement of expenses for administration of the Restitution Program. Subject to Court approval, such compensation and reimbursement of expenses shall be paid from the Restitution Fund before the distribution to approved Claimants is made. The Receiver is authorized, without further order of the Court, to expend funds from the Restitution Fund account up to a maximum of \$20,000, for direct costs for mailings and for compensation and payroll-related costs to temporary personnel retained by the Receiver, at the Receiver's discretion, for administrative staffing necessary for the review and processing of claims. If the Receiver determines that such direct costs will exceed that amount, he shall apply to the Court for authorization to expend additional funds from the Restitution Fund for that purpose. Within five (5) days after the Receiver has posted the Final Schedule of Approved Claims, the Receiver shall submit an application to this Court for approval to pay any fees and expenses of the Receiver and professionals retained by the Receiver in connection with the Restitution Program, and any additional direct costs related to the Restitution Program, including costs to prepare and mail distributions approved pursuant to paragraph 6 below.
- 8. <u>Undistributed Funds</u>. The Receiver shall deliver to the California Attorney General's office any undistributed funds remaining ninety (90) days after the distribution is completed. These undistributed funds shall include any distribution to approved Claimants that are not negotiated by the Claimants within ninety (90) days or whom the Receiver has been unable to locate during this period despite his best efforts.

4 ///

///

| ı        | CONCLUSION  |      |
|----------|---|------|
| 2        | For the reasons set forth above, the People and the Receiver seek entry of the Prop | osed |
| 3        | Order regarding Procedures for the Receivership Restitution Program.                |      |
| 4        | Attorney General of California  |      |
| 6        | Supervising Deputy Attorney General David A. Jones Deputy Attorney General          |      |
| 7        |   |      |
| 8        | David A, Jones  |      |
| 10       | California  |      |
| 11       | Dated: December 52014 BALLARD SPAHR LLP   |      |
| 12       |   |      |
| 13       | Attorneys for Thomas W. McNamara,   |      |
| 14<br>15 |   |      |
| 16       | ·   |      |
| 17       |   |      |
| 18       |   |      |
| 19       |   |      |
| 20       | o d   |      |
| 21       | 1   |      |
| 22       | 2   |      |
| 23       | 3 .   |      |
| 24       |   | •    |
| 25       |   |      |
| 26       |   |      |
| וויכינ   | 711   |      |

DMWEST #11499279 v1

28

8T #11488278 v1 6 Case No. LC094571 MPA ISO OMNIBUS MOTION FOR ORDER APPROVING RECEIVERSHIP RESTITUTION PROGRAM

## **DECLARATION OF DAVID A. JONES**

I, David A. Jones, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California as follows:

- 1. I am a Deputy Attorney General in the Office of the California Attorney General, attorneys for Plaintiff in this action, and am a duly licensed member of the California State Bar. I have firsthand knowledge of the matters set forth below and could testify competently to them if called as a witness.
- 2. The Office of the California Attorney General filed this action in conjunction with the State Bar, which filed a number of enforcement actions against the defendants in this action who were licensed attorneys.
- 3. On August 10, 2012, the Court entered the final judgment against Defendants Clarence Butt, Thomas Phanco, and Lewis Marketing Corp.
- 4. On May 21, 2013, the Court entered final judgments against Defendants Paul Petersen and Mesa Law Group; and James Eric Pate, Ryan William Marier, and Pate, Marier and Associates, Inc.
- 5. On May 24, 2013, the Court entered final judgments against Michael Tapia, an individual and d.b.a. Home Litigation help, Document Compliance Division and Home Retention Division; Christopher Van San, an individual and d.b.a. The Law Offices of Christopher J. Van Son Law Group and Consolidated Litigation Group; and Glen Reneau and Mitigation Professions.
- 6. On June 5, 2013, the Court entered final judgment against Gary DiGirolamo, Attorneys Processing Center, LLC, and Data Management LLC.
- 7. On September 30, 2013, the Court entered final judgment against Philip A. Kramer and the Law Offices of Kramer and Kaslow.
- 8. The [Proposed] Order re Procedures for Receivership Restitution Program sought by the concurrently-filed omnibus motion is necessary for the court-appointed receiver in this action to carry out a single restitution program using funds from the Permanent Orders in the

| 1        | actions brought by the State Bar and the final judgments in the action brought by the Office of |
|----------|---|
| 2        | the California Attorney General.  |
| 3        | Executed on December _\( \int \), 2014 in Los Angeles, California.                              |
| 4        | $\mathcal{D}_{-}$ $\mathcal{I}_{\alpha, \gamma}$  |
| 5        | David A. Jones  |
| 6        |   |
| 7        |   |
| 8        |   |
| 9        |   |
| 10       |   |
| 11       |   |
| 12       |   |
| 13       |   |
| 14       |   |
| 15       |   |
| 16       |   |
| 17       |   |
| 18       |   |
| 19       |   |
| 20       |   |
| 21       |   |
| 22<br>23 |   |
| 24       |   |
| 25       |   |
| 26       |   |
| 27       |   |
| 28       | 2   |
| - 1      | ·   |

## **DECLARATION OF ELI D. MORGENSTERN**

I, Eli D. Morgenstern, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California as follows:

- 1. I am a Senior Trial Counsel in the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of The State Bar of California, and am a duly licensed member of the California State Bar. I have firsthand knowledge of the matters set forth below and could testify competently to them if called as a witness.
- 2. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel of The State Bar of California initiated separate enforcement actions against the defendants in this action who were licensed as attorneys.
- 3. This Court entered Permanent Orders Assuming Jurisdiction in In the Matter of the Assumption of Jurisdiction Over the Law Practice of Philip A. Kramer, dba Law Offices of Kramer and Kaslow, Case No. LS021816; In the Matter of the Assumption of Jurisdiction Over the Law Practice of Christopher J. Van Son, dba Consolidated Litigation Group and Van Son Law Group, Case No. LS021818; and In the Matter of the Assumption of Jurisdiction over the Law Practice of Mitchell J. Stein, Case No. LS021817.
- 4. The Orange County Superior Court has also entered Permanent Orders Assuming Jurisdiction in In the Matter of the Assumption of Jurisdiction Over the Law Practice of Paul W. Petersen dba Mesa Law Group Corp. and Petersen Legal Services, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2011-00499800; In the Matter of the Assumption of Jurisdiction Over the Law Practice of Anthony J. Kassas, dba Law Offices of Anthony Kassas and Kassas Law Group, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2011-00505386.
- 5. The Permanent Orders Assuming Jurisdiction in the above-referenced actions permit the use of a take possession and control of the law firm and attorney bank accounts.
- 6. The [Proposed] Order re Procedures for Receivership Restitution Program sought by the concurrently-filed omnibus motion is necessary for the court-appointed receiver in this action to carry out a single restitution program using funds from the Permanent Orders in the

| - 1      | $\mathbf{f}$  |
|----------|---|
| 1        | actions brought by the State Bar and the final judgments in the action brought by the Office of |
| 2        | the California Attorney General. The State Bar supports the omnibus motion and approves of the  |
| 3        | [Proposed] Order re Procedures for Receivership Restitution Program.                            |
| 4        | Executed on December, 2014 in Los Angeles, California.  |
| 5        | WithhatoA   |
| 6        | Eli D. Morgenstern  |
| 7        |   |
| 8        |   |
| 9        |   |
| 10       |   |
| 11       |   |
| 12       |   |
| 13       |   |
| 14       |   |
| 1.5      |   |
| 16       |   |
| 17       |   |
| 18       | ,   |
| 19       | · .   |
| 20       |   |
| 21       | ·   |
| 22       |   |
| 23       |   |
| 24       |   |
| 25<br>26 |   |
| 27       |   |
| 28       | 2   |
| 40       | <u> </u>  |