

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Jody Goodman (DC Bar No. 404879)
Andrew Hudson (DC Bar No. 996294)
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Mailstop CC-8528
Washington, DC 20580
(202) 326-3096 / jgoodman1@ftc.gov
(202) 326-2213 / ahudson@ftc.gov
(202) 326-3395 (fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Federal Trade Commission

FILED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LODGED
RECEIVED	<input type="checkbox"/>	COPY
OCT 3 2016		
CLERK U S DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA		
BY		DEPUTY

SEALED

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Federal Trade Commission,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Advertising Strategies, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company,

Internet Advertising Solutions, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company,

Internet Resource Group, Inc., an Arizona corporation,

Network Advertising Systems, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company,

Network Professional Systems, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company,

Network Solutions Group, Inc., an Arizona corporation,

Matthew Rodriguez, individually and as an officer, member, and/or manager of Advertising Strategies, LLC and Network Advertising Systems, LLC,

Susan Marie Rodriguez, individually and as an officer, member, and/or manager of Internet Advertising Solutions, LLC and Internet Resource Group, Inc., and

William Matthew Whitley, a/k/a Matt Whitley, individually and as an officer, member, and/or manager of Network Professional Systems, LLC and Network Solutions Group, Inc.,

Defendants.

Filed Under Seal

CV-16-3353-PHX-DJH
Case No.

**COMPLAINT FOR
PERMANENT
INJUNCTION AND
OTHER EQUITABLE
RELIEF**

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

2 1. The FTC brings this action under Section 13(b) and of the Federal Trade
3 Commission Act (“FTC Act”), 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), and the Telemarketing and Consumer
4 Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act (“Telemarketing Act”), 15 U.S.C. §§ 6101-6108, as
5 amended, to obtain temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief, rescission or
6 reformation of contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, disgorgement of ill-gotten
7 monies, and other equitable relief for Defendants’ acts or practices in violation of Section
8 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), and in violation of the FTC’s Telemarketing Sales
9 Rule (“TSR”), 16 C.F.R. Part 310, as amended.

10 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

11 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331,
12 1337(a), and 1345, and 15 U.S.C. §§ 45(a), 53(b), 6102(c), and 6105(b).

13 3. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1), (b)(2), (b)(3),
14 (c)(1), and (c)(2), and 15 U.S.C. § 53(b).

15 **SUMMARY OF THE CASE**

16 4. Defendants operate a fraudulent telemarketing scheme that bilks consumers
17 by offering bogus “risk-free” money-making opportunities. Defendants represent to their
18 consumer victims—many of whom are elderly or veterans—that the consumers will earn
19 substantial income through websites to be owned or invested in by the consumers.
20 Defendants collect hundreds or thousands of dollars from each victim, string their victims
21 along with bogus updates about the status of the victims’ investment earnings, and
22 ultimately cut off communications without providing the promised investment returns.

23 5. Defendants have charged individual consumers substantial amounts of
24 money, ranging from several hundred to more than \$20,000, with total consumer injury
25 exceeding \$9,000,000.

26 6. Defendants’ deceptive sales pitches violate the FTC Act and the TSR. In
27 addition, Defendants violate the TSR by calling individuals who have listed their phone
28 numbers on the Do Not Call registry.

PLAINTIFF

1
2 7. The FTC is an independent agency of the United States Government
3 created by statute. 15 U.S.C. §§ 41-58. The FTC enforces Section 5(a) of the FTC Act,
4 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), which prohibits unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting
5 commerce. The FTC also enforces the Telemarketing Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 6101-6108, as
6 amended. Pursuant to the Telemarketing Act, the FTC promulgated and enforces the
7 TSR, 16 C.F.R. Part 310, which prohibits deceptive and abusive telemarketing acts or
8 practices.

9 8. The FTC is authorized to initiate federal district court proceedings, by its
10 own attorneys, to enjoin violations of the FTC Act and the TSR, and to secure such
11 equitable relief as may be appropriate in each case, including rescission or reformation of
12 contracts, restitution, the refund of monies paid, and the disgorgement of ill-gotten
13 monies. 15 U.S.C. §§ 53(b), 56(a)(2)(A), 6102(c), and 6105(b).

DEFENDANTS

14
15 9. Defendant **Advertising Strategies, LLC** (“AdStrat”) is an Arizona limited
16 liability company with a registered business address of 3039 W. Peoria Ave. #474,
17 Phoenix, Arizona 85029. AdStrat transacts or has transacted business in this district and
18 throughout the United States.

19 10. Defendant **Internet Advertising Solutions, LLC** (“AdSolutions”) is an
20 Arizona limited liability company with a registered business address of 1414 W.
21 Broadway Road #117, Tempe, Arizona 85282. AdSolutions transacts or has transacted
22 business in this district and throughout the United States.

23 11. Defendant **Internet Resource Group, Inc.** (“Resource”) is or was an
24 Arizona corporation with a registered business address of 4112 East Indian School Road,
25 Phoenix, Arizona. Resource transacts or has transacted business in this district and
26 throughout the United States.

27 12. Defendant **Network Advertising Systems, LLC** (“NetASystems”) is an
28 Arizona limited liability company with a registered business address of 1710 East Indian

1 School Road #210, Phoenix, Arizona. NetASystems transacts or has transacted business
2 in this district and throughout the United States.

3 13. Defendant **Network Professional Systems, LLC** (“NetPSystems”) is an
4 Arizona limited liability company with a registered business address of 2925 E Riggs
5 Road, Suite 245, Chandler, Arizona 85249. NetPSystems transacts or has transacted
6 business in this district and throughout the United States.

7 14. Defendant **Network Solutions Group, Inc.** (“NetSolutions”) is or was an
8 Arizona corporation with a registered business address of 2925 E Riggs Road, Suite #8-
9 245, Chandler, Arizona 85249. NetSolutions transacts or has transacted business in this
10 district and throughout the United States.

11 15. Defendant **Matthew Rodriguez** (“M. Rodriguez”) is an Arizona resident.
12 He is a member and manager of AdStrat and NetASystems. During all or part of the
13 times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, he has
14 formulated, directed, controlled, had the authority to control, or participated in the acts
15 and practices set forth in this Complaint. M. Rodriguez resides in this district and, in
16 connection with the matters alleged herein, transacts or has transacted business in this
17 district and throughout the United States.

18 16. Defendant **Susan Marie Rodriguez** (“S. Rodriguez”) is an Arizona
19 resident. She is a member and manager of AdSolutions and a director of Resource.
20 During all or part of the times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with
21 others, she has formulated, directed, controlled, had the authority to control, or
22 participated in the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. S. Rodriguez resides in
23 this district and, in connection with the matters alleged herein, transacts or has transacted
24 business in this district and throughout the United States.

25 17. Defendant **William Matthew Whitley**, a/k/a Matt Whitley (“Whitley”) is
26 an Arizona resident. He is a member and manager of NetPSystems and a director of
27 NetSolutions. During all or part of the times material to this Complaint, acting alone or
28 in concert with others, he has formulated, directed, controlled, had the authority to

1 control, or participated in the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. Whitley
2 resides in this district and, in connection with the matters alleged herein, transacts or has
3 transacted business in this district and throughout the United States.

4 **COMMON ENTERPRISE**

5 18. Corporate Defendants AdStrat, AdSolutions, Resource, NetPSystems,
6 NetASystems, and NetSolutions have operated as a common enterprise while engaging in
7 the deceptive acts and practices and other violations of law alleged in the Complaint.
8 Defendants have conducted the business practices described herein through an
9 interrelated network of companies that have a common business purpose, business
10 functions, employees, and office locations, commingled funds or shared profits from the
11 scheme, and are all controlled by the three individual Defendants. Because the Corporate
12 Defendants have operated as a common enterprise, each of them is jointly and severally
13 liable for the acts and practices alleged below. Defendants M. Rodriguez, S. Rodriguez,
14 and Whitley have formulated, directed, controlled, had the authority to control, or
15 participated in the acts and practices of the Corporate Defendants that constitute the
16 common enterprise.

17 **COMMERCE**

18 19. At all times material to this Complaint, Defendants have maintained a
19 substantial course of trade in or affecting commerce, as “commerce” is defined in Section
20 4 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 44.

21 **DEFENDANTS’ BUSINESS PRACTICES**

22 20. Since at least 2011, Defendants have marketed and sold purported money-
23 making opportunities to consumers throughout the United States. Defendants typically
24 contact consumers through outbound telemarketing sales calls. In numerous instances,
25 Defendants’ telemarketers have initiated outbound telemarketing sales calls to telephone
26 numbers on the National Do Not Call Registry. In some cases, Defendants’ brochures
27 direct consumers to call Defendants’ telemarketers. Consumers may also learn of
28 Defendants through internet advertisements.

1 21. In the telemarketing calls, Defendants offer consumers an opportunity to
2 share in revenue from e-commerce (*i.e.*, trading or facilitation of trading in goods or
3 services using computer networks, such as the internet) websites.

4 22. The details of the offer differ, but Defendants routinely describe it as an
5 offer to purchase or invest in e-commerce websites, or websites that direct traffic to e-
6 commerce websites such as Amazon.com. Defendants' telemarketers typically promise
7 consumers that they will earn money based on sales at the e-commerce websites and/or
8 traffic through their websites to the e-commerce websites. Defendants promise
9 consumers substantial returns or income, such as hundreds or thousands of dollars every
10 quarter.

11 23. Defendants' telemarketers typically assure consumers that they do not need
12 to do anything to earn the promised returns or income other than make a payment to join
13 the program (whether framed as a purchase of websites, an investment in websites or a
14 web-based business, or otherwise).

15 24. Defendants also typically promise consumers that the purported money-
16 making program is "risk-free," or that it includes a "100% money back guarantee."

17 25. After eliciting a hefty payment from consumers, Defendants frequently
18 mail them a package that often includes a letter, glossy brochures, and itemized bills.
19 These documents typically include references to business coaching or advertising
20 services and often direct consumers to complete certain tasks related to advertising.
21 Defendants, however, routinely tell consumers that they can ignore these statements or
22 tasks, or that the representations in the written materials do not apply to the consumers.

23 26. Defendants frequently contact consumers again after the initial payment
24 and persuade them to pay more money, promising that doing so will yield greater returns.
25 In some instances, Defendants convince consumers who initially paid hundreds of dollars
26 to pay thousands of dollars more.

27 27. Defendants often tell consumers that in order to receive their income or
28 returns, the consumers must sign forms that appear to be itemized bills—frequently for

1 purported advertising services or websites. In small print beneath the signature line, the
2 forms falsely state that the consumer has already received services in the amount shown.

3 28. Defendants bill consumers' credit cards, sometimes offering to help
4 consumers move the resulting balances to new credit accounts that offer temporary low or
5 zero-interest balance transfers. Defendants often assure their consumer victims that the
6 consumers will be able to pay off the balance in full with their first quarterly payment,
7 before the balance begins accruing interest.

8 29. After a consumer authorizes payment, Defendants typically respond to
9 telephone calls from that consumer for approximately ninety (90) days. During this time,
10 Defendants typically claim that the consumer has an "account" in which her earnings are
11 accumulating. Defendants often promise the consumer that the funds in the consumer's
12 account will be paid to the consumer at the end of the quarter.

13 30. When consumers become suspicious about the status of their investment or
14 payment, Defendants routinely employ stall tactics to dissuade the consumers from
15 disputing the charges to their credit card accounts. They often offer various excuses for a
16 "delay" in issuing the quarterly payment and reassure consumers that the payment will be
17 sent out soon. After approximately ninety (90) days from a consumer's payment,
18 Defendants typically cut off all contact and cease answering the consumer's calls.

19 31. Defendants seem to be targeting older consumers who may be less familiar
20 with e-commerce, thus less likely to realize that the marketed "opportunity" is a scam.
21 Many of Defendants' victims are veterans.

22 32. Defendants use mail-forwarding services to disguise their location, and
23 have changed the name and mailing address under which they operate, and their physical
24 office location, to avoid detection. For example, in 2013, the Arizona Attorney General's
25 Office obtained the lease agreement for 4112 E. Indian School Rd., Phoenix, Arizona,
26 which was the office of Defendant Internet Advertising Solutions. Defendant S.
27 Rodriguez had signed that lease agreement. When the Attorney General summoned S.
28

1 Rodriguez to appear and testify about the business at that address, Defendants quickly
2 closed their office at that location, and S. Rodriguez failed to appear and testify.

3 33. The d/b/as Defendants have used in connection with the acts and practices
4 discussed in this Complaint include the following, among others: WyzeMoney, Prime
5 Cash, and BuildingMoney.cash.

6 34. Consumers who pay for Defendants' purported money-making
7 opportunities typically do not receive the promised returns, nor do they receive their
8 money back.

9 35. Defendants have victimized numerous consumers throughout the United
10 States and caused an estimated loss to consumers of more than \$9,000,000.

11 **VIOLATIONS OF THE FTC ACT**

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

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

16 **COUNT I**

17 **False or Unsubstantiated Earning Claims**

18 38. In numerous instances in connection with the advertising, marketing,
19 promotion, offering for sale, or sale of their purported money-making opportunities,
20 Defendants have represented, directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, that
21 purchasers of their purported money-making opportunities would earn or were likely to
22 earn substantial income, such as hundreds or thousands of dollars each quarter.

23 39. Defendants' representations set forth in Paragraph 38 of this Complaint are
24 false, misleading, and/or were not substantiated at the time the representations were made
25 because consumers who purchased Defendants' purported money-making opportunities
26 were not likely to earn substantial income, such as hundreds or thousands of dollars each
27 quarter, or any income at all, and in truth and in fact, in numerous instances in which
28 Defendants have made the representations set forth in Paragraph 38 of this Complaint,

1 consumers who purchased Defendants' purported money-making opportunities did not
2 earn substantial income, such as hundreds or thousands of dollars each quarter, or any
3 income at all.

4 40. Therefore, Defendants' representations as set forth in Paragraph 38 of this
5 Complaint are false or misleading and constitute a deceptive act or practice in or affecting
6 commerce in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

7 **COUNT II**

8 **False Risk-Free or Money Back Guarantee Claims**

9 41. In numerous instances in connection with the advertising, marketing,
10 promotion, offering for sale, or sale of Defendants' purported money-making
11 opportunities, Defendants have represented, directly or indirectly, expressly or by
12 implication, that purchase of Defendants' purported money-making opportunities is risk-
13 free or that purchasers receive a 100% money back guarantee.

14 42. In truth and in fact, in numerous instances in which Defendants have made
15 the representations set forth in Paragraph 41 of this Complaint, consumers who purchased
16 Defendants' purported money-making opportunities lost the money they paid to
17 Defendants or were unable to obtain a refund from Defendants.

18 43. Therefore, Defendants' representation as set forth in Paragraph 41 of this
19 Complaint is false or misleading and constitutes a deceptive act or practice in or affecting
20 commerce in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

21 **VIOLATIONS OF THE TSR**

22 44. Congress directed the FTC to prescribe rules prohibiting abusive and
23 deceptive telemarketing acts or practices pursuant to the TSR in 1994. The FTC adopted the
24 original TSR in 1995, extensively amended it in 2003, and amended certain provisions
25 thereafter. 16 C.F.R. Part 310.

26 45. Defendants are "sellers" or "telemarketers" engaged in "telemarketing" as
27 defined by the TSR, 16 C.F.R. § 310.2(dd), (ff), and (gg).
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

COUNT IV

Do Not Call Violations

52. In numerous instances, in connection with telemarketing, Defendants have engaged in initiating an outbound telephone call to a person’s telephone number on the National Do Not Call Registry, in violation of the TSR, 16 C.F.R. § 310.4(b)(1)(iii)(B).

CONSUMER INJURY

53. Consumers have suffered and will continue to suffer substantial injury as a result of Defendants’ violations of the FTC Act and the TSR. 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.

THE COURT’S POWER TO GRANT RELIEF

54. 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 TSR, 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, temporary and preliminary injunctions, an order freezing assets, immediate access, and the appointment of a receiver;

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

B. Enter a permanent injunction to prevent future violations of the FTC Act and the TSR by Defendants;

C. Award such relief as the Court finds necessary to redress injury to consumers resulting from Defendants' violations of the FTC Act and the TSR, 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.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID C. SHONKA
Acting General Counsel

Dated: October 3, 2016

/s/ Jody Goodman



Jody Goodman
Andrew Hudson
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Mailstop CC-8528
Washington, DC 20580
(202) 326-3096 / jgoodman1@ftc.gov
(202) 326-2213 / ahudson@ftc.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION