

<u>\_</u>]

		0000098505
1	<b>BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION</b>	
2	<u>COMMISSIONERS</u>	Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED
4	KRISTIN K. MAYES, Chairman GARY PIERCE	MAY 21 2009
5	PAUL NEWMAN SANDRA D. KENNEDY BOB STUMP	DOCKETED BY
6   7	In the matter of	) DOCKET NO. S-20657A-09-0089
8	DAN WISE (a/k/a "DANNY WISE" and "DAN R. WISE") and CYNTHIA WISE, husband and wife,	) DECISION NO. <b>71067</b>
9	WHISPERING WINDS PROPERTIES, L.L.C., an Arizona limited liability company,	) ) ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST, ORDER ) FOR RESTITUTION AND ORDER FOR ) ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES AGAINST:
1   2	LM BEAGLE PROPERTIES, L.L.C., a	) ) DAN WISE and CYNTHIA WISE )
3	KARLENA, INC., a Nevada corporation,	) WHISPERING WINDS PROPERTIES, L.L.C.
+	AXIS INTERNATIONAL, INC., an Arizona corporation,	) LM BEAGLE PROPERTIES, L.L.C. ) ) KARLENA, INC.
5	Respondents.	) AXIS INTERNATIONAL, INC.
7	Ι.	
3	FINDINGS OF FACT	
•	1. On February 27, 2009, the Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona	
o	Corporation Commission ("Commission") filed a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing Regarding	
1	Proposed Order to Cease and Desist, Order For Restitution, Order For Administrative Penalties	
2	and for Other Affirmative Action ("Notice") against respondents: (1) DAN WISE (a/k/a	
3	"DANNY WISE" and "DAN R. WISE") ("WISE") and his spouse CYNTHIA WISE	
4	("SPOUSE"); (2) WHISPERING WINDS PROPERTIES, L.L.C. ("WWP"); (3) LM BEAGLE	
5	PROPERTIES. L.L.C. ("BEAGLE"): (4) KARLENA INC. ("KARLENA"): and (5) AXIS	

26 INTERNATIONAL, INC. ("AXIS").

2. The Notice specified in two separate places and, in particular, on the first page in capitalized, bold print that respondents had 10 days to request a hearing, and 30 days to file an answer.

3. The Notice was personally served on respondents WISE, WWP, BEAGLE, KARLENA and AXIS on March 5, 2009.

4.

6.

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

The Notice was personally served on SPOUSE on March 24, 2009.

5. Respondents did not request a hearing or file an answer within the required time limits. Respondents did not properly appear in or defend this action despite their actual notice of all aspects of the same.<sup>1</sup>

At all times relevant, WISE was a married man who resided in Scottsdale, Arizona.

7. At all times relevant, WWP was an Arizona limited liability company that conducted business within and from Scottsdale, Arizona. At all times relevant, WISE conducted business through WWP as its owner and managing member.

8. At all times relevant, BEAGLE was a Nevada limited liability company that conducted business within and from Scottsdale, Arizona. At all times relevant, WISE conducted business through BEAGLE as its owner and managing member.

9. At all times relevant, respondent KARLENA was a Nevada corporation that conducted business within and from Scottsdale, Arizona. At all times relevant, WISE conducted business through KARLENA as its owner, president, chief executive officer and director.

10. At all times relevant, respondent AXIS was an Arizona corporation that conducted business within and from Scottsdale, Arizona. At all times relevant, WISE conducted business through AXIS as its owner, president, chief executive officer and director.

11. At all times relevant, respondent SPOUSE was married to WISE.

Decision No.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> WISE, WWP, BEAGLE, KARLENA and AXIS were in default of this matter on April, 6, 2009. SPOUSE was in default of this matter on April 24, 2009.

1 12. At all times relevant, WISE acted for his own benefit and for the benefit, and in
 2 furtherance of WISE and SPOUSE's marital community.

3 13. WISE, WWP, BEAGLE, KARLENA and AXIS may be referred to hereafter
4 collectively as "RESPONDENTS" as the context requires.

14. WWP, BEAGLE, KARLENA and AXIS may be referred to hereafter collectively as the "WISE COMPANIES" as the context requires.

7 15. From on or about July 17, 2001 to January, 2009, RESPONDENTS offered and
8 sold securities within and from Arizona in the form of notes.

9 16. WISE represented to investors that RESPONDENTS would use their money to 10 fund real estate loans to, "borrowers who cannot or do not want to meet stringent lending 11 guidelines."

12 17. WISE described the underlying investor funded loans to investors as short-term, 13 renewable deals (the "Deals"). WISE represented to investors that the Deals were fully secured 14 by: (a) real estate such as commercial buildings, residential homes and land; (b) "liquid assets" 15 such as brokerage and trust accounts; and (c) "fixed assets" such as rare art, jewelry and 16 commodities (collectively the "Collateral").

17 18. The terms of the note investments varied, and stated profits ranging from 3 to 20%
18 per year.

19. RESPONDENTS documented the note investments in two ways. First, RESPONDENTS prepared and provided investors with unsecured promissory notes signed by: (a) WISE individually; or (b) WISE individually and on behalf of one of the WISE COMPANIES.

22 20. RESPONDENTS also prepared and provided investors with a one-page "Deal 23 Summary." Note investments were generically described in the Deal Summaries with acronyms 24 such as, without limitation: (a) "Deal RCC-65;" (b) "Deal RW-67;" (c) "Deal SZ-84;" (d) "Deal 25 BV-5593;" (e) "Deal GHH-6;" (f) "Deal KP-9;" (g) "Deal NN-76;" and (h) "Deal HN-812." Deal

3

19

20

21

26

5

6

÷ 4

Summaries provided to the Securities Division of the Commission by RESPONDENTS and investors identify 270 separate Deals funded with investor money. 2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Upon the conclusion of a note investment, RESPONDENTS frequently "rolled" 21. investors' principal investments and paper-profits into new investments (the "Roll-Over Investments"). Investors often added new money to the Roll-Over Investments. Investors often rolled their investment monies into many additional Roll-Over Investments over an extended period of time without taking distributions.

Thus, in addition to Deal acronyms, Deal Summaries identified: (a) note investment 22. dates; (b) principal investment money; (c) accrued "paper" profits/interest; (d) investor monies transferred and/or added to Roll-Over Investments; and (e) any actual cash distributions made by **RESPONDENTS** to investors.

**RESPONDENTS** managed all aspects of the note investments and, without limitation, 23. negotiated the terms and conditions of the Deals. WISE deposited investor money into Arizona bank accounts owned and controlled by the RESPONDENTS. At WISE's direction, investors also often wired their investment funds directly into RESPONDENTS' Arizona bank accounts.

24. WISE promised investors that their note investments were: (a) secure; and/or (b) 16 safe. 17

25. The investors' note investments were not secure because RESPONDENTS did not assign investors a security interest in any Collateral associated with the underlying Deals.

26. **RESPONDENTS** further failed to inform investors that their note investments were not safe because: (a) the Collateral underlying the Deals is subject to unpredictable market fluctuations and/or declines; (b) the ability of the Deal-related borrowers to repay RESPONDENTS could be negatively impacted by unpredictable, expensive and time consuming civil and bankruptcy litigation; and (c) investors could lose all or a vast portion of their investments because RESPONDENTS did not assign investors a security interest in any Collateral associated with the Deals. 26

4

Decision No. 71067

1 2

3

4

5

27. At present, both WISE and WWP are debtors in consolidated Chapter 7 bankruptcies in which many note investment investors are creditors, and in which the note investments and underlying Deals are being litigated. (*See*, 2:08-BK-15620 (RJH)). RESPONDENTS are also defendants in approximately twenty-one pending and concluded state and federal civil lawsuits involving the note investments.

28. WISE solicited some of RESPONDENTS' investors by virtue of the fact that WISE 6 7 had acted as their accountant ("CPA"). At all times relevant, WISE was licensed as a CPA by the Arizona State Board of Accountancy, Certificate 8957-R. WISE also held CPA Firm Registration 8 No. 4534-S. WISE's CPA licenses were revoked by his consent on December 10, 2008 for 9 misappropriating \$2,578,230 from five of his tax clients and investors. (See, Office of 10 11 Administrative Hearing Docket & Arizona Statement Board of Accountancy File Nos. 2009.004, 2009.008, 2009.010, 2009.012 & 2009.030). 12

29. During the offering period, RESPONDENTS sold hundreds of note investments
totaling \$67,782,698.69 to 125 investors residing in 13 states, including: (a) Arizona; (b)
California; (c) Colorado; (d) Connecticut; (e) Delaware; (f) Florida; (g) Kansas; (h) Pennsylvania;
(i) Maryland; (j) New Jersey; (k) New York; (l) North Carolina; and (m) Texas.

30. Of this amount, note investments totaling: (a) \$3,460,370.21 were jointly and severally issued and sold by WISE and WWP; (b) \$300,000 were jointly and severally issued and sold by WISE and KARLENA; (c) \$7,183,119.90 were jointly and severally issued and sold by WISE and BEAGLE; (d) \$400,000 were jointly and severally issued and sold by WISE and AXIS; and (e) \$56,439,208.58 were issued and sold by WISE in his individual capacity.

31. Considering known repayments made by: (a) WISE individually totaling \$680,249.78 and (b) WISE and BEAGLE, jointly and severally, totaling \$110,000, RESPONDENTS owe investors at \$66,992,448.91.

5

26

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Decision No.

-

II. 1 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW 2 The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article XV of the 3 1. Arizona Constitution and the Securities Act. 4 **RESPONDENTS and SPOUSE did not request a hearing pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-**2. 5 1972, nor did they file an answer pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-305. 6 RESPONDENTS offered or sold securities within or from Arizona, within the 7 3. meaning of A.R.S. §§ 44-1801(15), 44-1801(21), and 44-1801(26). 8 RESPONDENTS violated A.R.S. § 44-1841 by offering or selling securities that 4. 9 were neither registered nor exempt from registration. 10 RESPONDENTS violated A.R.S. § 44-1842 by offering or selling securities while 11 5. neither registered as dealers or salesmen nor exempt from registration. 12 RESPONDENTS violated A.R.S. § 44-1991 by (a) employing a device, scheme, or 6. 13 artifice to defraud, (b) making untrue statements or misleading omissions of material facts, and (c) 14 engaging in transactions, practices, or courses of business that operate or would operate as a fraud 15 or deceit. RESPONDENTS' conduct included: 16 Misrepresenting to investors that their note investments were secure, when Α. 17 RESPONDENTS did not assign investors a security interest in Collateral associated 18 with the underlying Deals; and 19 Representing to investors that their note investments were safe, while failing to В. 20 disclose to them that their investments were not safe because: (a) the Collateral 21 (i.e., real estate, brokerage accounts, etc.) underlying the Deals is subject to 22 unpredictable market fluctuations and/or declines; (b) the Deals, Collateral and the 23 ability of the Deal-related borrowers to repay RESPONDENTS could be negatively 24 impacted by unpredictable, expensive and time consuming civil and bankruptcy 25 litigation; and (c) investors could lose all or a vast portion of their investments 26 6

- -

2

3

4

5

6

12

13

17

18

19

1

because RESPONDENTS did not assign investors a security interest in any Collateral associated with the Deals.

7. RESPONDENTS' conduct is grounds for a cease and desist order pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032.

RESPONDENTS' conduct is grounds for an order of restitution pursuant to A.R.S.
 § 44-2032.

7 9. RESPONDENTS' conduct is grounds for administrative penalties under A.R.S. §
8 44-2036.

9 10. WISE acted for the benefit and in furtherance of his marital community with 10 SPOUSE and, pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 25-214 and 25-215, this Order of restitution and 11 administrative penalties is a debt of WISE and SPOUSE's marital community.

## III.

## ORDER

THEREFORE, on the basis of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the
Commission finds that the following relief is appropriate, in the public interest, and necessary for
the protection of investors:

IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032, that RESPONDENTS and any of their agents, employees, successors and assigns, permanently cease and desist from violating the Securities Act.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032, that WISE, WISE and SPOUSE's marital community and the WISE COMPANIES shall, jointly and severally, pay restitution to the Commission in the amount of \$66,992,448.91: (a) WISE and WISE and SPOUSE's marital community shall be liable for \$66,992,448.91; (b) BEAGLE shall be liable for \$7,073,119.90; (c) WWP shall be liable for \$3,460,370.21; (d) AXIS shall be liable for \$400,000; and (e) KARLENA shall be liable for \$300,000. Payment shall be made in full within 60 days of the date of this Order. Any amount outstanding shall accrue interest at the rate of 10% per annum

7

Decision No. 71067

from the date of this Order until paid in full. Payment shall be made to the "State of Arizona" to be placed in an interest-bearing account controlled by the Commission. The Commission shall disburse the funds on a pro-rata basis to investors shown on the records of the Commission. Any restitution funds that the Commission cannot disburse because an investor refuses to accept such payment, or any restitution funds that cannot be disbursed to an investor because the investor is deceased and the Commission cannot reasonably identify and locate the deceased investor's spouse or natural children surviving at the time of the distribution, shall be disbursed on a pro-rata basis to the remaining investors shown on the records of the Commission. Any funds that the Commission determines it is unable to or cannot feasibly disburse shall be transferred to the general fund of the state of Arizona.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2036, that WISE, the WISE COMPANIES and WISE and SPOUSE's marital community shall, jointly and severally, pay an administrative penalty in the amount of \$5,400,000. Payment shall be made to the "State of Arizona." Any amount outstanding shall accrue interest at the rate of 10% per annum from the date of this Order until paid in full. The payment obligations for these administrative penalties shall be subordinate to any restitution obligations ordered herein and shall become immediately due and payable only after restitution payments have been paid in full or upon RESPONDENTS' or SPOUSE's default with respect to their restitution obligations.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if any of the RESPONDENTS or SPOUSE fail(s) to comply with this Order, any outstanding balance shall be in default and shall be immediately due and payable without notice or demand. The acceptance of any partial or late payment by the Commission is not a waiver of default by Commission.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that default shall render RESPONDENTS or SPOUSE liable to the Commission for its costs of collection and interest at the maximum legal rate.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that if any of the RESPONDENTS or SPOUSE fail to comply with this order, the Commission may bring further legal proceedings against the

1

8

Decision No. 71067

1 RESPONDENT(S) or SPOUSE, including application to the superior court for an order of 2 contempt.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order shall become effective immediately. 3 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 4 5 6 COMMISSIONER CHAIRMAN 7 8 9 COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER 10 11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, MICHAEL P. KEARNS, Interim Executive Director of the Arizona Corporation 12 Commission, have hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the Commission to be affixed at the 13 Capitol, in the City of Phoenix, this 21st day of May, 2009. 14 15 16 MICHAEL P. KEARNS 17 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR 18 19 20 DISSENT 21 22 DISSENT 23 This document is available in alternative formats by contacting Shaylin A. Bernal, ADA 24 Coordinator, voice phone number 602-542-3931, e-mail sabernal@azcc.gov. 25 (MD)26 9 Decision No. 71067