



0000044284

21

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

DOCKETED

MAY - 4 2000

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED
MAY 04 2000

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

CARL J. KUNASEK
CHAIRMAN
JIM IRVIN
COMMISSIONER
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
COMMISSIONER

IN THE MATTER OF
Charles Shull
687 Pampas Place
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85636

John Ebdon
4814 Equestrian Avenue
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85650

Cochise Financial Corp.
687 Pampas Place
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85636

IN THE MATTER OF
Carol Ebdon
1101 E. Carmelita Drive
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85636

Daniel Joe Garcia
8823 N. 38th Drive
Phoenix, Arizona 85051

DOCKET NO. S-03312A-99-000
Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED
MAY 04 2000

DOCKETED BY

DOCKEY NO. S-03375A-99-0000

DECISION NO. 62509

OPINION AND ORDER

DATE OF HEARING: February 8 & 9, 2000

PLACE OF HEARING: Tucson, Arizona

PRESIDING OFFICER: Jane L. Rodda

APPEARANCES: Mr. Anthony B. Bingham, Special Assistant Attorney General, and Mr. Robert A. Zumoff, Assistant Attorney General, on behalf of the Securities Division of the Arizona Corporation Commission;

Mr. Charles Shull, In Propria Persona, and on behalf of Cochise Financial Corp.;

Mr. John Ebdon, In Propria Persona; and

Ms. Carol Ebdon, In Propria Persona.

BY THE COMMISSION:

On August 24, 1999, the Securities Division (the "Division") of the Arizona Corporation

1 Commission ("Commission") filed a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing Regarding Proposed Order
2 for Relief ("Notice") naming Respondents Charles Shull, John Ebdon and Cochise Financial Corp.
3 ("Cochise"). On September 9, 1999, Respondents Shull and Cochise filed with the Commission
4 requests for a hearing. On November 9, 1999, John Ebdon requested that a hearing be held in
5 Cochise County for medical and financial reasons.

6 On November 12, 1999, the Division filed a Notice against Respondents Carol Ebdon and
7 Daniel Joe Garcia. On November 19, 1999, Respondent Daniel Joe Garcia requested a hearing.

8 On November 17, 1999, the Division filed a Motion to Consolidate Cases and Request for
9 Pre-Hearing Conference. Pursuant to Procedural Order dated December 2, 1999, the matters were
10 consolidated for hearing to commence at the Commission's offices in Tucson, Arizona on February
11 8, 2000. The hearing was held as scheduled before a duly authorized Hearing Officer of the
12 Commission. Respondents John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon and Charles Shull appeared at the hearing. Mr.
13 Shull was the only Respondent to testify. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Hearing Officer took
14 the matter under advisement pending the submission of a Recommended Opinion and Order to the
15 Commission.

16 DISCUSSION

17 John Ebdon, a resident of Sierra Vista, Arizona, is retired from his construction and real estate
18 business. Carol Ebdon is John Ebdon's daughter. Daniel Garcia was a long-time family friend of the
19 Ebdon family. For a short period Carol Ebdon and Daniel Garcia were married. Charles Shull
20 currently resides in Las Vegas, Nevada, but at the time pertinent to this action lived in Sierra Vista.
21 Charles Shull was a business acquaintance of John Ebdon and owned and operated Cochise, a
22 mortgage brokerage business.

23 Sometime in the 1990's, Daniel Garcia represented that he had a lawsuit or judgment against
24 the State of Arizona arising out of a medical misdiagnosis. There never was a lawsuit or judgment
25 against the State of Arizona in favor of Mr. Garcia.

26 Beginning in or about June 1995 through June 1999, Respondents, Daniel Garcia, John
27 Ebdon, Carol Ebdon and Charles Shull offered promissory notes to individuals who provided funds
28 to assist in the purported effort to collect the alleged judgment.

1 Respondents told investors that Daniel Garcia had a \$120 million judgment against the State
2 of Arizona and that he needed money for court costs, attorneys fees, bonding, to pay for competency
3 tests, and living expenses. Respondents gave investors promissory notes in return for their
4 investment in the purported effort to collect on the judgment. The promissory notes would offer a
5 return of 2, 5, 10 or 200 times the amount of the investment depending on the time they were signed.
6 The promissory notes had short terms, typically of ten days or two weeks. When the notes were not
7 paid pursuant to their terms, Respondents would provide the investors with any number of excuses,
8 including, but not limited to: judicial corruption; the transfer to another court; the suspension of the
9 attorney; Mr. Garcia needing to pass competency tests; and State Attorney General Grant Woods
10 holding up disbursement of the judgment. Respondents repeatedly asked the same investors for more
11 money and the promised return on the face of the notes increased over time.

12 The promissory notes were signed by Respondents John Ebdon and/or Carol Ebdon or Dan
13 Garcia. Respondent Shull did not sign any promissory notes, but he did solicit funds and drafted and
14 delivered some of the notes to investors. Investors provided funds in cash, by check, by mail gram or
15 wire transfer. The funds provided by check were often deposited in bank accounts belonging to Carol
16 Ebdon or Charles Shull or Cochise. Respondent Charles Shull asserts that he gave all funds he
17 received to John Ebdon or Carol Ebdon. Respondents John Ebdon and Carol Ebdon assert that they
18 gave all funds received from investors to Daniel Garcia. Respondents John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon and
19 Charles Shull state that they too provided money to Mr. Garcia on account of the purported judgment.

20 Respondents continued to solicit funds to purportedly collect on the non-existent judgment
21 until mid-July 1999, when police raided Respondents' homes and confiscated documents. At that
22 time investors were informed that there never was a lawsuit or judgment on behalf of Dan Garcia
23 against the State of Arizona. The Division presented evidence, based on information provided by
24 Respondents, that Respondents raised at least \$4,200,879 over the course of the scheme. Respondent
25 Shull was responsible for soliciting \$1,292,929 of the total amount raised.

26 The Division charged that the Respondents violated A.R.S. §44-1841 because from on or
27 about June 1995, Respondents offered and/or sold securities in the form of promissory notes within
28 Arizona. The securities were not registered under A.R.S. § 44-1871 through 44-1875, or 44-1891

1 through 44-1902; were not securities for which a notice filing has been made under A.R.S. §44-3321;
2 were not exempt under A.R.S. §§44-1843 or 44-1843.01; were not offered or sold in exempt
3 transactions under A.R.S. § 44-1844; and were not exempt under any rule or order promulgated by
4 the Commission. Further, in connection with the offer to sell and the sale of the promissory notes,
5 Respondents acted as dealers and/or salesmen from Arizona, but were not registered pursuant to the
6 provision of Article 9 of the Arizona Securities Act, which violates A.R.S. §44-1842. Finally, the
7 Division alleged that Respondents violated A.R.S. §44-1991 (fraud in connection with the offer and
8 sale of Securities) because they represented to investors that money was needed to pay court costs
9 and fees, attorneys costs, fees to a bonding company and other miscellaneous expenses and fees to
10 collect a judgment against the State of Arizona when in fact no such judgment ever existed;
11 represented to investors that the promissory notes issued to them would be paid at face value from
12 collection of the judgment, which did not exist; and issued numerous promissory notes over a more
13 than two year period, with very short due dates, to investors and failing to pay as promised on any
14 note.

15 Respondent Shull claims that until informed by the authorities that there was no judgment, he
16 sincerely believed there was a judgment, and never knowingly made false statements. He claims
17 there is no evidence to indicate that he knew the scheme was false or that he received any of the
18 money collected from "investors." He also claims that he was not acting through Cochise when he
19 was raising money for the purported Garcia judgment. Respondents John Ebdon and Carol Ebdon
20 also assert that they believed Mr. Garcia's story about the lawsuit and the delays.

21 The undisputed evidence shows that all the Respondents offered and sold unregistered
22 promissory notes to investors, and that none of the Respondents were registered securities dealers or
23 salesmen. It is also not refuted that all the Respondents made untrue statements of material fact
24 related to the offer to sell or sale of the promissory notes. Respondents' claims that they lacked
25 knowledge that the statements they made were false and that they had no intent to defraud are not a
26 defense to the charges brought under A.R.S. § 44-1991 (2) and (3). Despite Mr. Shull's claims that
27 Cochise played no role in the offer and sale of the promissory notes, the evidence indicates that often
28 the money Mr. Shull raised was deposited in Cochise's bank account before he would give it to the

1 Ebdon and Charles Shull told investors that Daniel Garcia had been awarded a judgment against the
2 State of Arizona.

3 8. Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon and Charles Shull told
4 investors that the judgment would be paid in the matter of a week or two but that Mr. Garcia needed
5 funds for court costs.

6 9. Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon and Charles Shull told
7 investors that funds were needed to pay Mr. Garcia's attorney to collect the judgment, to pay court
8 costs, to pay a bonding company and for other miscellaneous costs and expenses.

9 10. In return for funds provided to assist in the collection of the judgment and for Mr.
10 Garcia's living expenses, investors received promissory notes, which had very short maturities.

11 11. When the judgment wasn't paid as represented, Respondents Daniel Garcia, John
12 Ebdon, Carol Ebdon and Charles Shull told investors various excuses for the delay.

13 12. Investors did not receive any repayment on the promissory notes.

14 13. There is not, and has never been a judgment against the State of Arizona in favor of
15 Daniel Garcia.

16 14. Respondent John Ebdon is the sole payer on the majority of promissory notes,
17 although some of the notes were signed by John Ebdon and Irene Ebdon, or John Ebdon and Carol
18 Ebdon, or solely by Carol Ebdon or Daniel Garcia.

19 15. None of the Respondents were registered securities dealers or salesmen in the State of
20 Arizona.

21 16. The promissory notes were not registered for sale in the State of Arizona, nor exempt
22 securities, nor offered in reliance upon an available exemption from registration.

23 17. Respondents raised at least \$4,200,879 from 92 different investors.

24 18. Respondent Shull solicited funds from and sold promissory notes to at least 17 of the
25 investors for a total of \$1,292,929.

26 19. At times Respondent Shull offered and sold promissory notes under the aegis of
27 Cochise.

1 exceed \$1,292,929 of the total amount owed to the investors in the purported lawsuit. Said restitution
2 to be made pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032 and A.A.C. R14-4-308 and subject to any legal set-offs.

3 10. All named Respondents should be assessed an administrative penalty jointly and
4 severally pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2036 as follows: for the violation of A.R.S. § 44-1841 the sum of
5 \$20,000; for the violation of A.R.S. § 44-1842 the sum of \$20,000; and for the violation of A.R.S. §
6 44-1991 the sum of \$92,000. However, Respondents Charles Shull and Cochise should be jointly
7 and severally liable for not more than \$27,000 of the total \$132,000 as follows: for the violation of
8 A.R.S. §44-1841 the sum of \$5,000; and for the violation of A.R.S. § 44-1842 the sum of \$5,000 and
9 for the violation of A.R.S. §44-1991 the sum of \$17,000.

10 **ORDER**

11 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that pursuant to the authority granted to the Commission
12 under A.R.S. §44-2032, Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon, Charles Shull and
13 Cochise Financial Corp. shall cease and desist from their actions described hereinabove in violation
14 of A.R.S. §§ 44-1841, 44-1842 and 44-1991.

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pursuant to the authority granted to the Commission under
16 A.R.S. §44-2036, Respondents John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon and Daniel Garcia, shall jointly and
17 severally pay as and for administrative penalties: for the violation of A.R.S. § 44-1841 the sum of
18 \$20,000; for violation of A.R.S. § 44-1842 the sum of \$20,000; and for violation of A.R.S. § 44-1991
19 the sum of \$92,000, for the violations of the Arizona Securities Act described hereinabove, said
20 administrative penalties to be paid within 60 days of the effective date of this Decision.

21 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that that pursuant to the authority granted to the Commission
22 under A.R.S. §44-2036, Respondents Charles Shull and Cochise Financial Corp shall jointly and
23 severally pay as and for administrative penalties, an amount not to exceed \$27,000 of the previously
24 ordered penalty of \$132,000 as follows: for the violation of A.R.S. § 44-1841 the sum of \$5,000; for
25 violation of A.R.S. § 44-1842 the sum of \$5,000; and for violation of A.R.S. § 44-1991 the sum of
26 \$17,000, for the violations of the Arizona Securities Act described hereinabove, said administrative
27 penalties to be paid within 60 days of the effective date of this Decision.

28 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the administrative penalties ordered hereinabove shall be

1 made payable to the State Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund for the State of Arizona.

2 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the administrative penalties ordered hereinabove shall bear
3 interest at the rate of ten percent per year for any outstanding balance after 60 days from the effective
4 date of this Decision.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the administrative penalties assessed hereinabove against
6 Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon and Carol Ebdon shall be reduced to \$3,000 per statutory
7 violation if restitution is made in accordance with the terms of this Decision hereinafter.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the administrative penalties assessed hereinabove against
9 Respondents Charles Shull and Cochise Financial Corp. shall be reduced to \$3,000 per statutory
10 violation if restitution is made in accordance with the terms of this Decision hereinafter.

11 IT IS FRUTHER ORDERED that pursuant to the authority granted to the Commission under
12 A.R.S. §44-2032, Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon and Carol Ebdon jointly and severally
13 shall make restitution in the amount of \$4,200,879 together with Respondents Charles Shull and
14 Cochise Financial Corp. who shall jointly and severally make restitution in an amount not to exceed
15 \$1,292,929 of the \$4,200,879, which restitution shall be made pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-308, subject
16 to any legal set-offs by any other Respondents and confirmed by the Director of Securities, said
17 restitution to be made within ninety days of the effective date of this Decision.

18 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the restitution ordered hereinabove shall bear interest at the
19 rate of ten percent per year for the period from the dates of investment to the date of payment of
20 restitution by Respondents.

21 ...
22 ...
23 ...
24 ...
25 ...
26 ...
27 ...
28 ...

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all restitution payments ordered hereinabove shall be
2 deposited into an interest-bearing account(s), if appropriate, until distributions are made.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.


4 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.

5
6 
7 CHAIRMAN

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
COMMISSIONER


COMMISSIONER

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL, Executive Secretary of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix, this 4th day of MAY, 2000.


BRIAN C. McNEIL
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

DISSENT _____

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

DOCKETED

MAY - 4 2000

CARL J. KUNASEK
CHAIRMAN
JIM IRVIN
COMMISSIONER
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
COMMISSIONER

DOCKETED BY *sd*

IN THE MATTER OF
Charles Shull
687 Pampas Place
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85636

DOCKET NO. S-03312A-99-000

John Ebdon
4814 Equestrian Avenue
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85650

Cochise Financial Corp.
687 Pampas Place
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85636

IN THE MATTER OF
Carol Ebdon
1101 E. Carmelita Drive
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85636

DOCKET NO. ~~S-03312A-99-0000~~

Daniel Joe Garcia
8823 N. 38th Drive
Phoenix, Arizona 85051

DECISION NO. 62509

OPINION AND ORDER

DATE OF HEARING: February 8 & 9, 2000

PLACE OF HEARING: Tucson, Arizona

PRESIDING OFFICER: Jane L. Rodda

APPEARANCES: Mr. Anthony B. Bingham, Special Assistant Attorney General, and Mr. Robert A. Zumoff, Assistant Attorney General, on behalf of the Securities Division of the Arizona Corporation Commission;

Mr. Charles Shull, In Propria Persona, and on behalf of Cochise Financial Corp.;

Mr. John Ebdon, In Propria Persona; and

Ms. Carol Ebdon, In Propria Persona.

BY THE COMMISSION:

On August 24, 1999, the Securities Division (the "Division") of the Arizona Corporation

1 Commission ("Commission") filed a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing Regarding Proposed Order
2 for Relief ("Notice") naming Respondents Charles Shull, John Ebdon and Cochise Financial Corp.
3 ("Cochise"). On September 9, 1999, Respondents Shull and Cochise filed with the Commission
4 requests for a hearing. On November 9, 1999, John Ebdon requested that a hearing be held in
5 Cochise County for medical and financial reasons.

6 On November 12, 1999, the Division filed a Notice against Respondents Carol Ebdon and
7 Daniel Joe Garcia. On November 19, 1999, Respondent Daniel Joe Garcia requested a hearing.

8 On November 17, 1999, the Division filed a Motion to Consolidate Cases and Request for
9 Pre-Hearing Conference. Pursuant to Procedural Order dated December 2, 1999, the matters were
10 consolidated for hearing to commence at the Commission's offices in Tucson, Arizona on February
11 8, 2000. The hearing was held as scheduled before a duly authorized Hearing Officer of the
12 Commission. Respondents John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon and Charles Shull appeared at the hearing. Mr.
13 Shull was the only Respondent to testify. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Hearing Officer took
14 the matter under advisement pending the submission of a Recommended Opinion and Order to the
15 Commission.

16 DISCUSSION

17 John Ebdon, a resident of Sierra Vista, Arizona, is retired from his construction and real estate
18 business. Carol Ebdon is John Ebdon's daughter. Daniel Garcia was a long-time family friend of the
19 Ebdon family. For a short period Carol Ebdon and Daniel Garcia were married. Charles Shull
20 currently resides in Las Vegas, Nevada, but at the time pertinent to this action lived in Sierra Vista.
21 Charles Shull was a business acquaintance of John Ebdon and owned and operated Cochise, a
22 mortgage brokerage business.

23 Sometime in the 1990's, Daniel Garcia represented that he had a lawsuit or judgment against
24 the State of Arizona arising out of a medical misdiagnosis. There never was a lawsuit or judgment
25 against the State of Arizona in favor of Mr. Garcia.

26 Beginning in or about June 1995 through June 1999, Respondents, Daniel Garcia, John
27 Ebdon, Carol Ebdon and Charles Shull offered promissory notes to individuals who provided funds
28 to assist in the purported effort to collect the alleged judgment.

1 Respondents told investors that Daniel Garcia had a \$120 million judgment against the State
2 of Arizona and that he needed money for court costs, attorneys fees, bonding, to pay for competency
3 tests, and living expenses. Respondents gave investors promissory notes in return for their
4 investment in the purported effort to collect on the judgment. The promissory notes would offer a
5 return of 2, 5, 10 or 200 times the amount of the investment depending on the time they were signed.
6 The promissory notes had short terms, typically of ten days or two weeks. When the notes were not
7 paid pursuant to their terms, Respondents would provide the investors with any number of excuses,
8 including, but not limited to: judicial corruption; the transfer to another court; the suspension of the
9 attorney; Mr. Garcia needing to pass competency tests; and State Attorney General Grant Woods
10 holding up disbursement of the judgment. Respondents repeatedly asked the same investors for more
11 money and the promised return on the face of the notes increased over time.

12 The promissory notes were signed by Respondents John Ebdon and/or Carol Ebdon or Dan
13 Garcia. Respondent Shull did not sign any promissory notes, but he did solicit funds and drafted and
14 delivered some of the notes to investors. Investors provided funds in cash, by check, by mail gram or
15 wire transfer. The funds provided by check were often deposited in bank accounts belonging to Carol
16 Ebdon or Charles Shull or Cochise. Respondent Charles Shull asserts that he gave all funds he
17 received to John Ebdon or Carol Ebdon. Respondents John Ebdon and Carol Ebdon assert that they
18 gave all funds received from investors to Daniel Garcia. Respondents John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon and
19 Charles Shull state that they too provided money to Mr. Garcia on account of the purported judgment.

20 Respondents continued to solicit funds to purportedly collect on the non-existent judgment
21 until mid-July 1999, when police raided Respondents' homes and confiscated documents. At that
22 time investors were informed that there never was a lawsuit or judgment on behalf of Dan Garcia
23 against the State of Arizona. The Division presented evidence, based on information provided by
24 Respondents, that Respondents raised at least \$4,200,879 over the course of the scheme. Respondent
25 Shull was responsible for soliciting \$1,292,929 of the total amount raised.

26 The Division charged that the Respondents violated A.R.S. §44-1841 because from on or
27 about June 1995, Respondents offered and/or sold securities in the form of promissory notes within
28 Arizona. The securities were not registered under A.R.S. § 44-1871 through 44-1875, or 44-1891

1 through 44-1902; were not securities for which a notice filing has been made under A.R.S. §44-3321;
2 were not exempt under A.R.S. §§44-1843 or 44-1843.01; were not offered or sold in exempt
3 transactions under A.R.S. § 44-1844; and were not exempt under any rule or order promulgated by
4 the Commission. Further, in connection with the offer to sell and the sale of the promissory notes,
5 Respondents acted as dealers and/or salesmen from Arizona, but were not registered pursuant to the
6 provision of Article 9 of the Arizona Securities Act, which violates A.R.S. §44-1842. Finally, the
7 Division alleged that Respondents violated A.R.S. §44-1991 (fraud in connection with the offer and
8 sale of Securities) because they represented to investors that money was needed to pay court costs
9 and fees, attorneys costs, fees to a bonding company and other miscellaneous expenses and fees to
10 collect a judgment against the State of Arizona when in fact no such judgment ever existed;
11 represented to investors that the promissory notes issued to them would be paid at face value from
12 collection of the judgment, which did not exist; and issued numerous promissory notes over a more
13 than two year period, with very short due dates, to investors and failing to pay as promised on any
14 note.

15 Respondent Shull claims that until informed by the authorities that there was no judgment, he
16 sincerely believed there was a judgment, and never knowingly made false statements. He claims
17 there is no evidence to indicate that he knew the scheme was false or that he received any of the
18 money collected from "investors." He also claims that he was not acting through Cochise when he
19 was raising money for the purported Garcia judgment. Respondents John Ebdon and Carol Ebdon
20 also assert that they believed Mr. Garcia's story about the lawsuit and the delays.

21 The undisputed evidence shows that all the Respondents offered and sold unregistered
22 promissory notes to investors, and that none of the Respondents were registered securities dealers or
23 salesmen. It is also not refuted that all the Respondents made untrue statements of material fact
24 related to the offer to sell or sale of the promissory notes. Respondents' claims that they lacked
25 knowledge that the statements they made were false and that they had no intent to defraud are not a
26 defense to the charges brought under A.R.S. § 44-1991 (2) and (3). Despite Mr. Shull's claims that
27 Cochise played no role in the offer and sale of the promissory notes, the evidence indicates that often
28 the money Mr. Shull raised was deposited in Cochise's bank account before he would give it to the

1 Ebdons, and that some of the investors he solicited were acquaintances on account of prior business
2 dealings through Cochise.

3 Consequently, we find that Respondents violated A.R.S. §44-1841 (unlawful sale of
4 unregistered securities); A.R.S. §44-1842 (unlawful transactions by unregistered dealer or salesmen);
5 and A.R.S. §44-1991 (fraud in connection with the offer and sale of securities). We find that
6 Respondents should be jointly and severally liable for the restitution to investors in the amount of
7 \$4,200,879, except that Respondent Charles Shull should be jointly and severally liable for restitution
8 in the amount not to exceed \$1,292,929, the amount invested by those investors to which he
9 introduced to the scheme. Further, Respondents shall each be assessed administrative penalties for
10 their violations of the Arizona Securities Act.

11 * * * * *

12 Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the
13 Commission finds, concludes, and orders that:

14 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

15 1. Respondent Daniel Garcia's last known address is 8823 N. 38th Drive, Phoenix,
16 Arizona. At the time relevant to this action, Respondent Garcia resided in Sierra Vista, Arizona.

17 2. Respondent John Ebdon's last known address is 4814 Equestrian Avenue, Sierra
18 Vista, Arizona.

19 3. Respondent Carol Ebdon is the daughter of John Ebdon. Carol Ebdon was at one time
20 married to Daniel Garcia, although the marriage was later annulled. Respondent Carol Ebdon's last
21 known address is 1101 E. Carmelita Drive, Sierra Vista, Arizona.

22 4. Respondent Shull currently resides in Las Vegas, Nevada, but at the times relevant to
23 this proceeding resided at 687 Pampas Place, Sierra Vista, Arizona.

24 5. Respondent Shull was the President, CEO, Secretary and Treasurer and sole director
25 of Cochise.

26 6. Cochise was a mortgage brokerage business which was incorporated in Arizona in
27 September 1986, and dissolved in September 1999.

28 7. Commencing in or around June 1995, Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon, Carol

1 Ebdon and Charles Shull told investors that Daniel Garcia had been awarded a judgment against the
2 State of Arizona.

3 8. Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon and Charles Shull told
4 investors that the judgment would be paid in the matter of a week or two but that Mr. Garcia needed
5 funds for court costs.

6 9. Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon and Charles Shull told
7 investors that funds were needed to pay Mr. Garcia's attorney to collect the judgment, to pay court
8 costs, to pay a bonding company and for other miscellaneous costs and expenses.

9 10. In return for funds provided to assist in the collection of the judgment and for Mr.
10 Garcia's living expenses, investors received promissory notes, which had very short maturities.

11 11. When the judgment wasn't paid as represented, Respondents Daniel Garcia, John
12 Ebdon, Carol Ebdon and Charles Shull told investors various excuses for the delay.

13 12. Investors did not receive any repayment on the promissory notes.

14 13. There is not, and has never been a judgment against the State of Arizona in favor of
15 Daniel Garcia.

16 14. Respondent John Ebdon is the sole payer on the majority of promissory notes,
17 although some of the notes were signed by John Ebdon and Irene Ebdon, or John Ebdon and Carol
18 Ebdon, or solely by Carol Ebdon or Daniel Garcia.

19 15. None of the Respondents were registered securities dealers or salesmen in the State of
20 Arizona.

21 16. The promissory notes were not registered for sale in the State of Arizona, nor exempt
22 securities, nor offered in reliance upon an available exemption from registration.

23 17. Respondents raised at least \$4,200,879 from 92 different investors.

24 18. Respondent Shull solicited funds from and sold promissory notes to at least 17 of the
25 investors for a total of \$1,292,929.

26 19. At times Respondent Shull offered and sold promissory notes under the aegis of
27 Cochise.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1
2 1. The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article XV of the
3 Arizona Constitution and A.R.S. §44-1801 et seq.

4 2. The promissory notes offered and sold by Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon,
5 Carol Ebdon, Charles Shull and Cochise were securities within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-1801(23).

6 3. The securities were neither registered not exempt from registration, in violation of
7 A.R.S. §44-1841.

8 4. The actions and conduct of Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon,
9 Charles Shull and Cochise constitute the offer and/or sale of securities within the meaning of A.R.S.
10 § 44-1801(13) and (19).

11 5. Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon, Charles Shull and Cochise
12 violated A.R.S. §44-1841 by offering for sale and selling unregistered securities within or from
13 Arizona.

14 6. Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon, Charles Shull and Cochise
15 violated A.R.S. §44-1842 by acting as dealers and/or salesmen of securities although they were not
16 registered pursuant to Article 9 of the Arizona Securities Act.

17 7. Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon, Charles Shull and Cochise
18 violated A.R.S. §44-1991 by making untrue statements of material fact or omitting a material fact
19 necessary to make the statements made not misleading and engaging in practices that operated as a
20 fraud or deceit upon offerees and investors.

21 8. Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon, Charles Shull and Cochise are
22 found herein to have violated the Arizona Securities Act, and should cease and desist pursuant to
23 A.R.S. § 44-2032 from any future violations of A.R.S. §§ 44-1841, 44-1842 and 44-1991 and all
24 provisions of the Act.

25 9. Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon and Carol Ebdon should be jointly and
26 severally liable to make restitution pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032 and A.A.C. R14-4-308 totaling
27 \$4,200,879 subject to any legal set-offs. Respondents Charles Shull and Cochise should be jointly
28 and severally liable with Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon in an amount not to

1 exceed \$1,292,929 of the total amount owed to the investors in the purported lawsuit. Said restitution
2 to be made pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032 and A.A.C. R14-4-308 and subject to any legal set-offs.

3 10. All named Respondents should be assessed an administrative penalty jointly and
4 severally pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2036 as follows: for the violation of A.R.S. § 44-1841 the sum of
5 \$20,000; for the violation of A.R.S. § 44-1842 the sum of \$20,000; and for the violation of A.R.S. §
6 44-1991 the sum of \$92,000. However, Respondents Charles Shull and Cochise should be jointly
7 and severally liable for not more than \$27,000 of the total \$132,000 as follows: for the violation of
8 A.R.S. §44-1841 the sum of \$5,000; and for the violation of A.R.S. § 44-1842 the sum of \$5,000 and
9 for the violation of A.R.S. §44-1991 the sum of \$17,000.

10 **ORDER**

11 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that pursuant to the authority granted to the Commission
12 under A.R.S. §44-2032, Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon, Charles Shull and
13 Cochise Financial Corp. shall cease and desist from their actions described hereinabove in violation
14 of A.R.S. §§ 44-1841, 44-1842 and 44-1991.

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pursuant to the authority granted to the Commission under
16 A.R.S. §44-2036, Respondents John Ebdon, Carol Ebdon and Daniel Garcia, shall jointly and
17 severally pay as and for administrative penalties: for the violation of A.R.S. § 44-1841 the sum of
18 \$20,000; for violation of A.R.S. § 44-1842 the sum of \$20,000; and for violation of A.R.S. § 44-1991
19 the sum of \$92,000, for the violations of the Arizona Securities Act described hereinabove, said
20 administrative penalties to be paid within 60 days of the effective date of this Decision.

21 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that that pursuant to the authority granted to the Commission
22 under A.R.S. §44-2036, Respondents Charles Shull and Cochise Financial Corp shall jointly and
23 severally pay as and for administrative penalties, an amount not to exceed \$27,000 of the previously
24 ordered penalty of \$132,000 as follows: for the violation of A.R.S. § 44-1841 the sum of \$5,000; for
25 violation of A.R.S. § 44-1842 the sum of \$5,000; and for violation of A.R.S. § 44-1991 the sum of
26 \$17,000, for the violations of the Arizona Securities Act described hereinabove, said administrative
27 penalties to be paid within 60 days of the effective date of this Decision.

28 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the administrative penalties ordered hereinabove shall be

1 made payable to the State Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund for the State of Arizona.

2 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the administrative penalties ordered hereinabove shall bear
3 interest at the rate of ten percent per year for any outstanding balance after 60 days from the effective
4 date of this Decision.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the administrative penalties assessed hereinabove against
6 Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon and Carol Ebdon shall be reduced to \$3,000 per statutory
7 violation if restitution is made in accordance with the terms of this Decision hereinafter.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the administrative penalties assessed hereinabove against
9 Respondents Charles Shull and Cochise Financial Corp. shall be reduced to \$3,000 per statutory
10 violation if restitution is made in accordance with the terms of this Decision hereinafter.

11 IT IS FRUTHER ORDERED that pursuant to the authority granted to the Commission under
12 A.R.S. §44-2032, Respondents Daniel Garcia, John Ebdon and Carol Ebdon jointly and severally
13 shall make restitution in the amount of \$4,200,879 together with Respondents Charles Shull and
14 Cochise Financial Corp. who shall jointly and severally make restitution in an amount not to exceed
15 \$1,292,929 of the \$4,200,879, which restitution shall be made pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-308, subject
16 to any legal set-offs by any other Respondents and confirmed by the Director of Securities, said
17 restitution to be made within ninety days of the effective date of this Decision.

18 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the restitution ordered hereinabove shall bear interest at the
19 rate of ten percent per year for the period from the dates of investment to the date of payment of
20 restitution by Respondents.

21 ...
22 ...
23 ...
24 ...
25 ...
26 ...
27 ...
28 ...


1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all restitution payments ordered hereinabove shall be
2 deposited into an interest-bearing account(s), if appropriate, until distributions are made.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.

4 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.

5
6 
7 CHAIRMAN

8
9
10 COMMISSIONER

11 
12 COMMISSIONER

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL, Executive
14 Secretary of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have
15 hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the
16 Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix,
17 this 4th day of May, 2000.

18 
19 BRIAN C. McNEIL
20 EXECUTIVE SECRETARY 

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 SERVICE LIST FOR:

CHARLES SHULL, JOHN EBDON, COCHISE
FINANCIAL CORP.; CAROL EBDON and DANIEL
JOE GARCIA

2
3 DOCKET NO.

S-03312A-99-0000
S-03375A-99-0000

4
5 Charles Shull
6 P.O. Box 530400
7 Henderson, Nevada 89053

8 John Ebdon
9 4814 Equestrian Avenue
10 Sierra Vista, Arizona 85650

11 Cochise Financial Corp.
12 687 Pampas Place
13 Sierra Vista, Arizona 85636

14 Carol Ebdon
15 1101 E. Carmelita Drive
16 Sierra Vista, Arizona 85636

17 Daniel Joe Garcia
18 8823 N. 38th Drive
19 Phoenix, Arizona 85051

20 Robert Zumoff
21 ARIZONA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
22 1275 W. Washington Street
23 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

24 Mark Sendrow
25 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
26 1200 W. Washington Street
27 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
28