UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

PAUL NAVESTAD AKA PAUL RICHARD INDIVIDUALLY AND DOING BUSINESS AS THE CASH GRANT INSTITUTE, GLOBAL AD AGENCY, GLOBAL ADVERTISING AGENCY, DOMAIN LEASING COMPANY AND/OR CASH GRANT SEARCH, AND

CHINTANA MASPAKORN AKA CHRISTINA MASPAKORN INDIVIDUALLY AND DOING BUSINESS AS THE CASH GRANT INSTITUTE, GLOBAL AD AGENCY, GLOBAL ADVERTISING AGENCY, DOMAIN LEASING COMPANY AND/OR CASH GRANT SEARCH,

Defendants.

Case No. 09-CV-6329-T

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO HOLD DEFENDANT PAUL NAVESTAD (JONES) IN CIVIL CONTEMPT OF MODIFIED ORDER FOR PERMANENT INJUNCTION AND MONETARY RELIEF

The Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission moved pursuant to

Local Rule 83.4 for an order finding Defendant Paul Navestad

(known legally as Paul Richard Jones) in contempt of the Modified

Order for Permanent Injunction and Monetary Relief entered by

this Court on April 3, 2013 ("Modified Order") (ECF 166), for

failure to comply with the provision in Subpart C of Section VI

("Monetary Relief") of the Modified Order. In this provision, this Court directed Navestad to pay \$1,105,078.96 in disgorgement and \$20,000,000 in civil penalties, to the FTC and the United States Treasury, respectively, within ten (10) days of entry of the Modified Order, or by April 17, 2013 ("Order to Pay") (ECF 166 at 14). Having considered the facts and law presented by the FTC

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

- A. Navestad is in Contempt of the Order to Pay.
 - 1. The Order to Pay is Clear and Unambiguous.
 - a) In the Modified Order, this Court adjudged

 Navestad liable for \$1,105,078.96 as disgorgement

 for unjust enrichment, and \$20,000,000 in civil

 penalties for violations of the TSR.
 - b) In Section VI.C of the Modified Order, this Court expressly ordered Navestad to pay the above sums within "ten (10) business days" "after entry of [the Modified Order]," or by April 17, 2013.
 - c) This payment directive was clear and unambiguous, and unequivocal that Navestad was to remit payment within ten (10) business days of the entry of the Modified Order.

2. Navestad's Failure to Comply with the Order to Pay is Clear and Convincing.

- a) Although the Modified Order's payment directive to

 Navestad was clear and unambiguous, there is no

 evidence that Navestad made any payment in

 satisfaction of his obligations.
- b) To the contrary, the undisputed evidence presented by the FTC demonstrates clearly and convincingly that Navestad made no payments towards the outstanding judgment.

3. Navestad has not Been Reasonably Diligent and Energetic in Attempting to Comply with the Order to Pay.

- a) The evidence shows that Navestad has made no effort to attempt to comply with the Modified Order's payment directive.
- b) He has never contacted the FTC to discuss his payment obligations or arrangements.
- c) The FTC sent a demand letter to Navestad, via his counsel appearing in this matter, on May 1, 2013. The undisputed evidence shows that the letter was delivered, but that Navestad never responded to it, and made no payment.
- d) The undisputed evidence demonstrates a total lack of diligence by Navestad in attempting to comply with the Modified Order's payment directive.

- B. Incarceration of Navestad is the Appropriate Civil Contempt Remedy.
 - 1. The Character and Magnitude of the Harm Caused by Navestad's Contumacy Support Incarceration as a Remedy.
 - a) The harm resulting from Navestad's contempt is serious and far reaching. Numerous consumers were harmed by Navestad's deceptive actions.
 - b) Navestad's failure to pay the disgorgement and civil penalties signals to the public that monetary awards in these types of cases are not meaningful and can simply be ignored, as they have been here.
 - c) By evading payment, Navestad undermines the deterrent effect of civil penalties.
 - 2. Incarceration is the Only Coercive Civil Contempt Remedy that Will Compel Navestad to Pay the Adjudged Amounts.
 - a) Because the violation here is non-payment, a fine would not be an effective coercive remedy.
 - b) Only incarceration would compel Navestad to pay the sums due.
 - 3. Navestad has Financial Resources From Which to Pay Some or All of the Adjudged Amounts.
 - a) The record below demonstrates that Navestad received significant funds in connection with his

- unlawful business activities.
- b) Specifically, the FTC introduced evidence in connection with its Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF 133) demonstrating that: (1) there are numerous accounts in the United States and overseas in the name of or otherwise under the control of Navestad that were used in connection with Navestad's unlawful activities; (2) significant sums were moved between and among such accounts; from these accounts to persons paid; (3) Navestad has never repatriated any of the sums in the foreign bank accounts; and (4) Navestad personally received no less than \$335,041.72. See FTC's Statement of Material Facts in support of its Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF 131-2) at ¶¶ 274, 275, 277, 279, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 294, 295, 296).

For all of the foregoing reasons IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- 1. United States Customs is hereby ordered to arrest Navestad upon his reentry into the United States; and thereafter, to transfer him to the custody of the United States Marshal.
- 2. The United States Marshal is directed to hold Navestad in custody until such time as he has paid all amounts

due under the Modified Order, less the \$963.12 applied to Navestad's disgorgement obligation, and the \$5,246 applied to his civil penalty obligation, and together with all interest accruing at the rate set forth in 28 U.S.C. §1961(a) from April 17, 2013, which, as of October 23, 2013 is \$1,104.859.08 for disgorgement and \$20,008,213.48 for civil penalties.

3. To effect this Order, this Court issues herewith a warrant for the arrest of Paul Richard Jones.

ALL OF THE ABOVE IS SO ORDERED.

S/ Michael A. Telesca

MICHAEL A. TELESCA United States District Judge

Dated: Rochester, New York November 22, 2013