

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

)	
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Case No. 3:11-CV-2059
)	
v.)	
)	
DEBT RELIEF USA, INC.,)	
a corporation,)	
)	
KELLY REILLY, Individually and as an)	
officer of the corporation,)	
)	
ALVIN BELL, Individually and as an)	
officer of the corporation,)	
)	
JAMES WOJCIK, Individually and as an)	
officer of the corporation, and)	
)	
VALERIE LEATH, Individually and as a)	
manager of the corporation,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

COMPLAINT FOR PERMANENT INJUNCTION AND OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF

Plaintiff, the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”), for its Complaint alleges:

1. The FTC brings this action under Section 13(b) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (“FTC Act”), 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), to obtain preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, disgorgement of ill-gotten monies, and other equitable relief for Defendants’ acts or practices in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1337(a), and 1345, and 15 U.S.C. §§ 45(a) and 53(b).

3. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) and 15 U.S.C. § 53(b).

PLAINTIFF

4. The FTC is an independent agency of the United States Government created by statute. 15 U.S.C. §§ 41-58. The FTC enforces Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), which prohibits unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce.

5. The FTC is authorized to initiate federal district court proceedings, by its own attorneys, to enjoin violations of the FTC Act and to secure such equitable relief as may be appropriate in each case, including rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, and the disgorgement of ill-gotten monies. 15 U.S.C. §§ 53(b) and 56(a)(2)(A).

DEFENDANTS

6. **Defendant Debt Relief USA, Inc.** (“DRUSA”) is a Florida for-profit corporation that had its principal place of business at 16200 Addison Road, Suites 100 and 105, Addison, Texas 75001. DRUSA transacted business in this district and throughout the United States. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, DRUSA advertised, marketed, distributed, or sold debt relief services to consumers throughout the United States. On June 18, 2009, DRUSA filed a voluntary petition under the reorganization provisions of Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.*, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Case No. 09-33836-SGJ. On June 25, 2009, the Bankruptcy Court converted the

case to Chapter 7, and appointed a Chapter 7 Trustee. The instant action against DRUSA is not stayed by 11 U.S.C. § 362(a)(1), (2), (3), or (6), because it is an action brought by the FTC to enforce the FTC's police and regulatory power as a governmental unit pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(b)(4) and, thus, falls within an exception to the automatic stay.

7. **Defendant Kelly Reilly** was the president and a 52 percent shareholder of DRUSA. At times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, he formulated, directed, controlled, had authority to control, or participated in the acts and practices of DRUSA, including the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. Defendant Kelly Reilly, in connection with the matters alleged, transacted business in this district and throughout the United States.

8. **Defendant Alvin Bell** was the executive vice president and a 20 percent shareholder of DRUSA. At times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, he formulated, directed, controlled, had authority to control, or participated in the acts and practices of DRUSA, including the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. Defendant Alvin Bell, in connection with the matters alleged, transacted business in this district and throughout the United States.

9. **Defendant James Wojcik** was the chief operating officer and a 20 percent shareholder of DRUSA. At times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, he formulated, directed, controlled, had authority to control, or participated in the acts and practices of DRUSA, including the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. Defendant James Wojcik, in connection with the matters alleged, transacted business in this district and throughout the United States.

10. **Defendant Valerie Leath** was the Director of Marketing and Director of Information Technology at DRUSA and a three percent shareholder of the company. At times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, she formulated, directed, controlled, had authority to control, or participated in the acts and practices of DRUSA, including the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. Defendant Valerie Leath, in connection with the matters alleged, transacted business in this district and throughout the United States.

COMMERCE

11. At all times material to this Complaint, Defendants maintained a substantial course of trade in or affecting commerce, as “commerce” is defined in Section 4 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 44.

DEFENDANTS’ BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

12. Since at least 2005, and continuing until approximately June 2009, Defendants DRUSA, Kelly Reilly, Alvin Bell, James Wojcik, and Valerie Leath offered a debt relief service to consumers having difficulty with their personal finances. Defendants targeted consumers with substantial amounts of unsecured debt, often claiming that participation in their debt relief service would result in the elimination of 40 to 60 percent of consumers’ debts and that participating consumers would be debt free in 24 to 48 months.

Defendants’ Marketing and Advertising

13. Defendants marketed their debt relief service on the websites www.4debtreliefusa.com, www.drusainfo.com, and www.debtreliefusa.us and through national television and radio advertisements.

14. Through their websites, Defendants represented that, for consumers to become debt free, “It typically takes about 24-36 months after we’ve negotiated the total amount of debt down to 40-60%. This includes all fees”; and stated, “Because we negotiate the debt down to a fraction of what you owe, your savings are far greater than any interest or late fees that could accrue.” Defendants’ websites encouraged consumers to call a toll-free number to learn more about Defendants’ debt relief service.

15. In their national television and radio advertisements, Defendants made claims such as “you can settle your credit card debt for pennies on the dollar without filing for bankruptcy” and “you typically save about half of what you owe and can truly be debt free in less than 36 months.” Defendants’ radio and television advertisements urged interested consumers to call a toll-free number for a free consultation and to enroll in their debt relief service.

The Sales Call

16. Consumers who called one of Defendants’ toll-free numbers were connected to a sales representative. These representatives often told consumers that they could save a significant amount of the debt owed to their creditors by making low monthly payments to Defendants that would cover settlement of the reduced debt and Defendants’ fees. In numerous instances, Defendants’ sales representatives stated that consumers’ debts would be settled in 36 months and provided settlement averages such as 40 to 50 percent.

17. Defendants’ sales representatives typically told consumers that, in order for the debt relief service to work, consumers had to stop making payments to creditors and cease communications with creditors. These representatives told consumers to rely on Defendants to communicate and negotiate with consumers’ creditors. In some instances, sales representatives

stated that, based on Defendants' special relationships with creditors, Defendants could negotiate significant discounts for consumers.

Client Settlement Agreement

18. Consumers who agreed to enroll in Defendants' debt relief service were required to authorize a bank account debit over the telephone for the initial monthly payment prior to receiving enrollment documents. Among the enrollment documents were a Client Settlement Agreement ("Agreement"), forms authorizing recurring monthly withdrawals from consumers' bank accounts, and a form used to identify the amounts owed to various creditors.

19. The Agreement was a five or six page single-spaced document. The Agreement contained provisions that often were not previously disclosed or were contrary to the representations on Defendants' websites or in Defendants' sales calls. For example, the Agreement stated "in no manner has DRUSA represented that Client stop making payments to their Creditors." This contradicted the instruction in the sales call that consumers must agree to stop paying their creditors for Defendants' debt relief service to work. The Agreement also indicated that creditors may choose not to participate in Defendants' service.

Defendants' Fees

20. Defendants charged consumers fees, including administrative fees, monthly maintenance fees, and negotiation fees. Defendants took these fees from the monthly recurring withdrawals consumers authorized. Pursuant to the Agreement, administrative fees were non-refundable unless consumers cancelled enrollment in Defendants' debt relief service during a seven-day period following enrollment.

21. Defendants charged consumers an upfront administrative fee that was calculated as 8 to 10 percent of the amount of debt that consumers owed their unsecured creditors at the time of enrollment.

22. Defendants also charged a monthly maintenance fee of \$29.95 or \$39.95 for each month consumers were enrolled in Defendants' debt relief service.

23. Defendants also charged a negotiation fee for each account settled. The negotiation fee was calculated as 13 to 15 percent of the purported savings the company obtained in the settlement. Many consumers never paid a negotiation fee because Defendants did not settle any of their debts.

Defendants' Reference Booklet

24. After consumers enrolled in Defendants' debt relief service, they received a reference booklet from Defendants. The booklet provided additional information about Defendants' debt relief service.

25. The booklet stated it could take up to six months for DRUSA to achieve the first settlement. Additionally, consumers were instructed not to tell creditors to call DRUSA, and that DRUSA would inform creditors of consumers' involvement in its service only when consumers were financially ready to settle one or more accounts. In numerous instances, Defendants did not disclose this information to consumers prior to their enrollment.

Failure to Deliver Promised Results

26. In numerous instances, Defendants did not contact or commence settlement negotiations with consumers' creditors immediately upon consumers' enrollment in Defendants' debt relief service. Typically, Defendants did not contact or initiate negotiations with any creditor

until after (a) consumers had paid the administrative fee in full and (b) consumers had accumulated enough funds in a “set aside” account to settle the debt with that creditor. Often, the first time Defendants mentioned this fact was in the Reference Booklet, which consumers received after enrollment.

27. For numerous consumers, it took over six months after enrollment to pay Defendants’ administrative fee in full and even begin accumulating funds for the first settlement offer. Throughout this time, Defendants typically did not contact consumers’ creditors and continued to advise consumers to cease making payments to and communicating with their creditors.

28. Contrary to Defendants’ representations, Defendants rarely negotiated settlements for all accounts consumers entered into the debt relief service. Moreover, even when Defendants succeeded in negotiating a settlement on one or more of the consumers’ accounts, the consumers’ account balances had increased from the time of enrollment to the time of settlement due to creditors’ additional late fees, finance charges, and other charges. Therefore, the total aggregate amount consumers were required to pay was, in numerous instances, higher than 40 to 60 percent of the total amount they owed to their creditors at the time of enrollment.

29. Contrary to Defendants’ representations that consumers would pay off their total debt in 24 to 48 months at a 40 to 60 percent savings and that consumers’ financial situations would improve, numerous consumers enrolled in Defendants’ service did not achieve the promised results. In fact, consumers frequently found that the amount of their debt actually increased due to creditors’ additional late fees, finance charges, and other charges. As a result, consumers’ financial situations worsened and numerous consumers did not have their total debt paid off in 24 to 48 months.

30. Few consumers enrolled in Defendants' debt relief service ever completed the service and received the promised results. In numerous instances, consumers cancelled or dropped out of Defendants' debt relief service before any debt was negotiated because they could not afford to pay Defendants' substantial fees and also accumulate money to pay off their debts. Other consumers cancelled or dropped out because of harassment and escalating collection attempts by their creditors. Consumers who cancelled or dropped out after the seven-day cancellation period typically forfeited all fees paid to Defendants.

31. Consumers who purchased Defendants' debt relief services frequently sought a refund from the Defendants. Defendants routinely denied consumers' refund requests.

VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 5 OF THE FTC ACT

32. Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), prohibits "unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce."

33. Misrepresentations or deceptive omissions of material fact constitute deceptive acts or practices prohibited by Section 5(a) of the FTC Act.

COUNT I

34. In numerous instances, in connection with the advertising, marketing, promotion, offering for sale, or sale of their debt relief services, Defendants represented, directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, that by participating in Defendants' debt relief services, consumers would eliminate their unsecured debt by paying a substantially reduced amount, realizing savings of 40 to 60 percent of the total debt initially enrolled in the program.

35. The representation set forth in Paragraph 34 was false or was not substantiated at the time the representation was made. Among other reasons, in making this representation, Defendants

relied on calculations of past consumers' results that: (a) included only consumers' debts that Defendants actually settled, omitting those debts that Defendants were unable to or did not settle; (b) were based on the amounts consumers owed at the time of settlement, rather than at the time they initially enrolled; (c) excluded fees paid by consumers to Defendants; and (d) excluded consumers who dropped out of Defendants' debt relief services before achieving any results. All of these factors tended to inflate the percentage saved by consumers enrolled in Defendants' services. Therefore, the making of the representation as set forth in Paragraph 34 of this Complaint constitutes a deceptive act or practice in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

COUNT II

36. In numerous instances, in connection with the advertising, marketing, promotion, offering for sale, or sale of their debt relief services, Defendants represented, directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, that consumers who enrolled in Defendants' debt relief services would be out of debt in 24 to 48 months.

37. The representation set forth in Paragraph 36 was false or was not substantiated at the time the representation was made. Therefore, the making of the representation as set forth in Paragraph 36 of this Complaint constitutes a deceptive act or practice in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

CONSUMER INJURY

38. Consumers have suffered and will continue to suffer substantial injury as a result of Defendants' violations of the FTC Act. In addition, Defendants have been unjustly enriched as a result of their unlawful acts or practices. Absent injunctive relief by this Court, Defendants are likely to continue to injure consumers, reap unjust enrichment, and harm the public interest.

THIS COURT'S POWER TO GRANT RELIEF

39. Section 13(b) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), empowers this Court to grant injunctive and such other relief as the Court may deem appropriate to halt and redress violations of any provision of law enforced by the FTC. The Court, in the exercise of its equitable jurisdiction, may award ancillary relief, including rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, and the disgorgement of ill-gotten monies, to prevent and remedy any violation of any provision of law enforced by the FTC.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff FTC, pursuant to Section 13(b) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), and the Court's own equitable powers, requests that the Court:

- A. Award Plaintiff such preliminary injunctive and ancillary relief as may be necessary to avert the likelihood of consumer injury during the pendency of this action and to preserve the possibility of effective final relief, including, but not limited to, preliminary injunctions;
- B. Enter a permanent injunction to prevent future violations of the FTC Act by Defendants;
- C. Award such relief as the Court finds necessary to redress injury to consumers resulting from Defendants' violations of the FTC Act, including, but not limited to, rescission or reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, and the disgorgement of ill-gotten monies; and

D. Award Plaintiff the costs of bringing this action, as well as such other and additional relief as the Court may determine to be just and proper.

Dated: August 17, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

WILLARD K. TOM
General Counsel

DEANYA T. KUECKELHAN
Regional Director

/s/ Susan E. Arthur

SUSAN E. ARTHUR

Texas Bar No. 01365300

SHEREEN EL DOMEIRI

Texas Bar No. 24036518

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Southwest Regional Office

1999 Bryan Street, Suite 2150

Dallas, Texas 75201

Tel: 214-979-9370 (Arthur)

Tel: 214-979-9395 (El Domeiri)

Fax: 214-953-3079

Email: sarthur@ftc.gov

Email: seldomeiri@ftc.gov

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF