	for the second	
		DGED IPY
	JUN 0 1 2009	
1	LISA WEINTRAUB SCHIFFERLE, DC#46390&THIGT GC	DURT
2	COLLEEN B. ROBBINS, NY# 2882710 ^{IISTRICT OF ARIZONA} Federal Trade Commission	
3	600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20580	
4	Phone: (202) 326-3377 / (202) 326-2548	
5	Facsimile: (202) 326-3395 Email: <u>lschifferle@ftc.gov:</u> crobbins@ftc.gov	
6	ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION	
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DIST FOR THE DISTRICT OF A	1
9		
	Federal Trade Commission,	SEALED
10	Plaintiff,	
11	V.	Case No. CU-09-1167- PHX- FJM
12		FJM
13	Freedom Foreclosure Prevention Services, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company;	
14	Loss Mitigation Training Centers of America,	
15	LLC , an Arizona limited liability company also doing business as Mastermind Consulting Group;	
16	Jeffrey C. Segal, individually and as an officer of	
17	Freedom Foreclosure Prevention Services, LLC and Loss Mitigation Training Center of America, LLC;	
18	and	
19	Michael R. Workman, individually and as an officer	
20	of Freedom Foreclosure Prevention Services, LLC;	
21	Defendants.	
22	ا ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	
23	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND OTH	<u>IER EQUITABLE RELIEF</u>
24	Plaintiff, the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC"),	for its complaint alleges:
25	1. The FTC brings this action under Section 1.	3(b) of the Federal Trade Commission
26	Act ("FTC Act"), 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), to obtain temporary,	
27	relief, rescission of contracts, restitution, disgorgement of	
28	rener, resensation of contracts, restitution, disgorgement of	m-gotten momes, and other equitable
ľ		

1	relief for Defendants' acts or practices in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. §	
2	45(a).	
3	JURISDICTION AND VENUE	
4	2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C.	
5	§§ 1331, 1337(a), and 1345, and 15 U.S.C. §§ 45(a) and 53(b).	
6	3. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c), and 15 U.S.C.	
7	§ 53(b).	
8 9 PLAINTIFF		
9 10	4. The FTC is an independent agency of the United States Government created by	
11	statute. 15 U.S.C. §§ 41-58. The FTC is charged, inter alia, with enforcement of the FTC Act,	
12	15 U.S.C. § 45(a), which prohibits unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce.	
13	5. The FTC is authorized to initiate federal district court proceedings, by its	
14	attorneys, to enjoin violations of the FTC Act and to secure such equitable relief as may be	
15	appropriate in each case, including restitution and disgorgement. 15 U.S.C. § 53(b).	
16	DEFENDANTS	
17	6. Defendant Freedom Foreclosure Prevention Services, LLC ("Freedom	
18		
19	November 1, 2003 and terminated its articles of organization on January 26, 2009. In its	
20	registration documents, Freedom Foreclosure listed its principal place of business as 1234 S.	
21	Power Road, Mesa, Arizona 85206. Freedom Foreclosure also used a maildrop located at 70 S.	
22 23	Val Vista Drive, Suite 3, #420, Gilbert, Arizona 85296. Freedom Foreclosure transacts or has	
24	transacted business in this District and throughout the United States. At all times material to this	
25	Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, Freedom Foreclosure has advertised,	
26	marketed, distributed, and/or sold business opportunities and mortgage loan modification	
27	services to consumers throughout the United States.	
28	- 2 -	
	- <i>2</i> -	

•

ľ

1 7. Defendant Loss Mitigation Training Centers of America, LLC ("LMTCOA") is 2 an Arizona limited liability company which registered in the state of Arizona on August 27, 3 2008, using a maildrop located at 70 S. Val Vista Drive, Suite 3, #420, Gilbert, Arizona 85296 as 4 its registered office address. In addition, LMTCOA directs correspondence to the physical 5 address of 1234 S. Power Road, Mesa, Arizona 85206. LMTCOA also does business as 6 Mastermind Consulting Group. LMTCOA transacts or has transacted business in this District 7 and throughout the United States. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in 8 concert with others, LMTCOA has advertised, marketed, distributed, and/or sold business Q opportunities and loan modification services to consumers throughout the United States. 10 8. Defendant Jeffrey C. Segal ("Segal") was the manager and president of Freedom 11 Foreclosure until at least August 2008. Now, Segal is the sole managing member of LMTCOA. 12 13 At all times material to this Complaint, individually or in concert with others, Segal has 14 formulated, directed, controlled, had the authority to control, or participated in the acts and 15 practices of Freedom Foreclosure and LMTCOA, including the acts and practices set forth in this 16 Complaint. Defendant Segal is a resident of Arizona, and, in connection with the matters alleged 17 herein, transacts or has transacted business in this District and throughout the United States. 18 9. Defendant Michael R. Workman ("Workman") was the president of Freedom 19 Foreclosure from August 2008 until at least January 2009. Prior to that, from November 2003 20 until August 2008, Workman was a co-owner and vice president of the company. At all times 21 material to this Complaint, individually or in concert with others, he has formulated, directed, 22 controlled, had the authority to control, or participated in the acts and practices of Freedom 23 Foreclosure, including the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. Defendant Workman, 24 in connection with the matters alleged herein, transacts or has transacted business in this District 25 26 and throughout the United States. 27

- 3 -

- /
- 28

1	COMMERCE	
2	10. Defendants have maintained a substantial course of trade, in or affecting	
3	commerce, as "commerce" is defined in Section 4 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 44.	
4	DEFENDANTS' BUSINESS PRACTICES	
5	11. From November 2003 until January 2009, Freedom Foreclosure marketed and	
6	sold "loss mitigation services" and "loss mitigation consultant" business opportunities (referred	
7	to hereinafter as "loan modification services" and "loan modification consultant business	
8	opportunities") to consumers throughout the United States. "Loss mitigation" refers to a process	
9 10	of attempting to prevent foreclosure by negotiating with a consumer's mortgage lender to secure	
10	a modification of a consumer's mortgage payment or loan terms. From approximately January	
12	2009 until the present, LMTCOA has sold nearly identical loan modification consultant business	
13		
14	12. From November 2003 until January 2009, Freedom Foreclosure, Segal, and	
15	Workman ("Freedom Foreclosure Defendants") marketed and sold mortgage loan modification	
16		
17	foreclosure in 97 percent of cases. Freedom Foreclosure Defendants also claimed to offer a	
18	"100% money-back guarantee" if they failed to obtain successful loan modifications for	
19		
20	13. In truth and in fact, most homeowners who have applied for Freedom Foreclosure	
21	Defendants' loss mitigation services received no loan modification and no refund.	
22		
23	14. During the same time period, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants marketed and sold	
24	business opportunities in which purchasers become "consultants" and earn money by referring	
25	homeowners to Defendants for loan modification services. Freedom Foreclosure Defendants	
26	routinely claimed that consultants would earn \$10,000 monthly, while saving consumers' homes	
27	from foreclosure.	
28	- 4 -	

In truth and in fact, no consultant earned \$10,000 per month from Freedom
 Foreclosure Defendants' loan modification consultant business opportunities. In fact, most
 consultants earned far less income and many earned nothing at all.

- 4 16. In late 2008, Freedom Foreclosure stopped soliciting new consultants and
 5 homeowners. Around the same time, Segal began using Loss Mitigation Training Center of
 6 America ("LMTCOA") to solicit new purchasers of a loan modification business opportunity,
 7 boasting that their consultants could earn as much as \$2,000 to \$6,000 per week from their loan
 9 modification consultant business opportunity.
- 10
 17. Freedom Foreclosure and Loss Mitigation Training Center of America have the
 11 same principal and use the same addresses and same web site URLs. In addition, while winding
 12 down its operations, Freedom Foreclosure's main phone number referred callers to a phone
 13 number associated with Segal and LMTCOA. Segal regularly sends emails to former Freedom
 14 Foreclosure consultants trying to recruit them to become LMTCOA consultants.
- 15

Misrepresentations to Homeowners by Freedom Foreclosure Defendants

16 18. Freedom Foreclosure Defendants lured homeowners with promises of 97% success 17 rates in saving homes from foreclosure and a 100% money-back guarantee. Homeowners usually 18 found Freedom Foreclosure Defendants' loan modification service either through Internet 19 searches or through referrals from family, friends, or other mortgage brokers. Once a homeowner 20called or emailed Freedom Foreclosure Defendants, one of their consultants collected the 21 homeowner's financial information and an upfront fee, equivalent to one month's mortgage 22 payment. After forwarding the fee and documents to Freedom Foreclosure Defendants, a 23consultant's responsibilities ended and Freedom Foreclosure Defendants were supposed to 24 negotiate directly with the homeowner's lender to secure a loan modification. 25 2619. In truth and in fact, in numerous instances, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants failed

- 27 to secure loan modifications and failed to provide refunds.
- 28

20. On their web sites, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants routinely claimed that they
 successfully negotiated loan modifications in virtually all cases. For instance, on their web site
 10kpermonth.net, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants claimed a "97% success rate in saving homes
 from foreclosure."

5 21. At Freedom Foreclosure's web site usforeclosurepro.com, Freedom Foreclosure 6 Defendants stated that an "average timeline for a typical negotiation" at Freedom Foreclosure 7 included an initial contact "within 24 hours," contact with a lender decision "within 72 hours," 8 and "usually most successful negotiations are completed within 6 weeks." In fact, Freedom 9 Foreclosure Defendants failed to act on homeowners' cases for longer than four to six weeks, 10 without completing - or, in some cases, even starting - negotiations with the lender. To make 11 matters worse, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants routinely failed to return consumers' repeated 12 telephone calls, even when homeowners were on the brink of foreclosure. 13

14 22. Contrary to their representations to consumers, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants
15 failed to prevent mortgage foreclosure or save consumers' homes from foreclosure in 97% of
16 cases. In fact, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants completed loan modifications in only about 6%
17 of cases.

18 23. Many homeowners avoided foreclosure only through their own efforts and not 19 through any service provided by Freedom Foreclosure Defendants. In numerous instances, 20consumers learned from their lenders that Freedom Foreclosure Defendants had not even 21 contacted the lender or had made only minimal, non-substantive contacts with the lender. In the 22 end, as a result of Freedom Foreclosure Defendants' delays in negotiations with consumers' 23 lenders, and because of additional late fees, penalties, and other costs that accrue during such 24 delays, many consumers who kept their homes were harmed by having purchased Freedom 25 26 Foreclosure Defendants' services.

24. When a homeowner signed a contract with Freedom Foreclosure Defendants, the

- 6 -

28

contract specified that there was a "100% money-back guarantee" if Freedom Foreclosure failed
 to negotiate a solution for the homeowner.

3 25. Freedom Foreclosure Defendants' contracts instructed homeowners not to contact 4 their lender directly or else the homeowners would void their contract and the money-back 5 guarantee. In some cases, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants' consultants also told homeowners to 6 stop making their mortgage payments while Freedom Foreclosure Defendants were working on 7 their cases. In many instances, such instructions further harmed consumers. 8 26. In many cases where Freedom Foreclosure Defendants failed to negotiate a 9 solution, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants simply denied or ignored refund requests from 10 homeowners. 11 **Misrepresentations Regarding Earning Potential by All Defendants** 12 27. Since November 2003, Defendants have lured prospective consultants through 13 14 their web sites and Internet ads with promises of significant earnings potential. 15 28. From November 2003 until January 2009, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants 16 claimed that consultants could earn \$10,000 per month by saving homes from foreclosure. 17 Freedom Foreclosure Defendants offered their loan modification consultant business opportunity 18 on a variety of their own web sites including www.freedomforeclosure.com, 19 www.ffpsloannetwork.com, and www.10kpermonth.net. 2029. Freedom Foreclosure Defendants also marketed their business opportunity through 21classified ads in USA Today, The Arizona Republic, and smaller local franchise/business 22 opportunity publications, such as South Dakota's *Coteau Shopper*. 23 30. Freedom Foreclosure Defendants' marketing materials also claimed or implied that 24 consultants would earn significant income from the business opportunity. For example, typical 25 26Freedom Foreclosure marketing materials at ffpsloannetwork.com stated: "Earn \$500-\$5,000 27 Monthly Part Time" and advertised a "Business Plan to Make \$10,000+ Per Month." The 28 - 7 -

domain name of the web site itself, "10kpermonth," suggested that consultants would earn
 \$10,000 per month from the opportunity.

- 3 31. Until at least in or around June 2008, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants' web site
 4 10kpermonth.com regularly posted a large font banner headline at the top of the page stating,
 5 "Are you ready for a \$ix-figure income?" Similarly, Defendants' web site 10kpermonth.net
 6 stated, "Your earning potential could exceed 5-6 figures in your first year."
- 32. Freedom Foreclosure's web site requested interested potential consultants to
 submit their contact information online. Other consumers were recruited into the consultant
 opportunity by friends, acquaintances, or former colleagues who are already consultants.
- 33. After submitting their contact information online, prospective consultants then
 received a return call and/or email from an established consultant. The established consultant
 told the consumer about the business opportunity, often emphasizing the ability to earn a large
 income from becoming a loss mitigation consultant.
- After paying a fee of approximately \$500 to \$1,500 for the Freedom Foreclosure
 consultant opportunity, prospective consultants were required to attend four webinars and pass a
 written test. Then, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants provided them with a loss mitigation
 certificate, signed by Jeff Segal, and access to the members-only web site with leads and sample
 marketing materials.
- 35. A certified Freedom Foreclosure consultant was eligible to earn money in two
 ways: (1) for each homeowner recruited, the consultant would receive 40% of the homeowner's
 upfront fee, if and only if the defendants completed a loan modification; and/or (2) for each new
 consultant recruited, the recruiting consultant would receive between 40% to 50% of that
 consultant's training fee.
- 36. On the members-only web site, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants provided
 consultants with a business plan entitled "Business Plan to Potentially Earn \$10,000+ Per
- 28

1 Month."

•

2	27 Erzeden Ferzelenung Defendente? huginerg alen ales insluded the following
	37. Freedom Foreclosure Defendants' business plan also included the following
3	statements purporting to disclaim the earnings claims contained within the document:
4	Disclaimer: Freedom Foreclosure Prevention Services, LLC (FFPS) makes no
5	guarantees regarding income; FFPS will teach you everything required to earn an income as a Certified Loss Mitigation Consultant. Applying that education is up to
6	you. You COULD earn nothing! With that said, we have documented proof of Consultants who have applied the education received here and are earning \$400+ per
7	hour or more using our proven system.
8 9	Remember this potential spreadsheet is based on a minimum loss mitigation case fee of only \$1,250; your income could be higher.
10	and
11	Closing ratios are conservative. Your results may be higher; FFPS cannot guarantee what your results will be.
12	38. Furthermore, the "Frequently Asked Questions" section on Freedom Foreclosure
13 14	Defendants' web site, 10kpermonth.net, asks the question, "How much can I earn?" and answers,
15	"You could earn five to six figures per year, or more."
16	39. After shutting down Freedom Foreclosure, Segal continues to make similar
17	representations, using a similar business model with LMTCOA. LMTCOA, doing business as
18	Mastermind Consulting Group, now markets loss mitigation business opportunities at
19	www.10kpermonth.com and www.lossmitigationguru.info. LMTCOA lures prospective
20	consultants claiming that they can earn \$2,000 to \$6,000 per week by helping save homes from
21	foreclosure.
22	40. On a recent version of its website 10kpermonth.com, LMTCOA claims to offer a
23	"passport to wealth" with the ability to "earn \$2,000-\$6,000 weekly!" and commissions of
24	"\$1,000-\$3,000 Per Sale, Paid Daily!" Thus, LMTCOA is now advertising earnings potential
25	even higher than Freedom Foreclosure – as high as \$24,000 per month.
26	41. After the initial pitch, prospective LMTCOA consultants follow a similar
27	
28	- 9 -

1	business model to Freedom Foreclosure consultants. Prospective consultants register online for	
2	webinars and pay a fee for the opportunity to submit homeowners for loss mitigation services.	
3	Like Freedom Foreclosure consultants, LMTCOA consultants can then earn money both by	
4	referring homeowners and by recruiting new consultants.	
5	42. In fact, numerous consultants fail to earn significant income from Defendants'	
6	loan modification consultant opportunities.	
7	VIOLATIONS OF THE FTC ACT	
° 9	43. Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), prohibits "unfair or deceptive acts	
10	or practices in or affecting commerce."	
11	44. Misrepresentations or deceptive omissions of material fact constitute deceptive	
12	acts or practices prohibited by Section 5(a) of the FTC Act.	
13	<u>COUNT I</u>	
14	Misrepresentations Regarding Loan Modification Success	
15	46. In numerous instances, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants represented to	
16	consumers, expressly or by implication, that they would obtain a mortgage loan modification or	
17	stop foreclosure in all or virtually all instances.	
18	47. In truth and in fact, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants did not obtain a mortgage	
19 20	loan modification or stop foreclosure in all or virtually all instances.	
21	48. Therefore, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants' representation as set forth in	
22	Paragraph 46 is false and misleading and constitutes a deceptive act or practice in violation of	
23	Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).	
24		
25		
26	<u>COUNT II</u>	
27	Misrepresentations Regarding Refunds	
28	- 10 -	

1	49. In numerous instances, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants represented to	
2	consumers, expressly or by implication, that they would give full refunds to consumers in all	
3	instances when Freedom Foreclosure Defendants failed to obtain a loan modification or stop	
4	foreclosure.	
5	50. In truth and in fact, in numerous of these instances, Freedom Foreclosure	
6 7	Defendants did not give refunds to consumers when Freedom Foreclosure Defendants failed to	
8	obtain a loan modification or stop foreclosure.	
9	51. Therefore, Freedom Foreclosure Defendants' representation as set forth in	
10	Paragraph 49 is false and misleading and constitutes a deceptive act or practice in violation of	
11	Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).	
12	<u>COUNT III</u>	
13	Misrepresentations Regarding Income	
14	52. In numerous instances, Defendants have represented to consumers, expressly or by	
15	implication, that purchasers of Defendants' loan modification consultant opportunities are likely	
16	to earn:	
17	a. \$10,000 per month from Freedom Foreclosure	
18 19	b. \$2,000 to \$6,000 per week from LMTCOA.	
20	53. In truth and in fact, purchasers of Defendants' loan modification consultant	
21	opportunity are not likely to earn:	
22	a. \$10,000 per month from Freedom Foreclosure	
23	b. \$2,000 to \$6,000 per week from LMTCOA.	
24	54. Therefore, Defendants' representation as set forth in Paragraph 52 of this	
25	Complaint is false and misleading and constitutes a deceptive act or practice in violation of	
26	Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45.	
27	CONSUMER INJURY	
28	- 11 -	

1	55. Consumers throughout the United States have suffered and continue to suffer	
2	substantial injury as a result of Defendants' violation of the FTC Act. In addition, Defendants	
3	have been unjustly enriched as a result of their unlawful acts and practices. Absent injunctive	
4	relief by this Court, Defendants are likely to continue to injure consumers, reap unjust	
5	enrichment, and harm the public interest.	
6	THIS COURT'S POWER TO GRANT RELIEF	
7 8	56. Section 13(b) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), empowers this Court to grant	
9	injunctive and such other relief as the Court may deem appropriate to halt and redress violations	
10	of the FTC Act. The Court, in the exercise of its equitable jurisdiction, may award ancillary	
11	relief, including rescission of contracts and restitution, and the disgorgement of ill-gotten	
12	monies, to prevent and remedy any violation of any provision of law enforced by the FTC.	
13	PRAYER FOR RELIEF	
14	Wherefore, Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission, pursuant to Section 13(b) of the FTC	
15	Act, 15 U.S.C. § 53(b) and the Court's own equitable powers, requests that the Court:	
16	A. Award Plaintiff such preliminary injunctive and ancillary relief as may be	
17	necessary to avert the likelihood of consumer injury during the pendency of this action and to	
18	preserve the possibility of effective final relief, including but not limited to, temporary and	
19 20	preliminary injunctions, an order freezing assets, and expedited discovery;	
20	B. Enter a permanent injunction to prevent future violations of the FTC Act by	
22	Defendants;	
23	C. Award such relief as the Court finds necessary to redress injury to consumers	
24	resulting from Defendants' violations of the FTC Act, including but not limited to, rescission or	
25	reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, and the disgorgement of ill-	
26	gotten monies; and	
27	D. Award Plaintiff the costs of bringing this action, as well as such other and	
28	- 12 -	

additional relief as the Court may determine to be just and proper. Respectfully submitted, DAVID C. SHONKA Acting General Counsel Dated: 6/1/09NIA VI. LISA WEINTRAUB SCHIFFERLE, DC# 463928 COLLEEN B. ROBBINS, NY# 2882710 Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20580 Telephone: (202) 326-3377 / (202) 326-2548 Facsimile: (202) 326-3395 Email: lschifferle@ftc.gov; crobbins@ftc.gov ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION - 13 -