

ORIGINAL



0000106155

1 Robert D. Mitchell, 011922  
 2 Julie M. Beauregard, 023093  
 3 Sarah K. Deutsch, 026229  
 4 MITCHELL & ASSOCIATES  
 5 A Professional Corporation  
 6 Viad Corporate Center, Suite 1715  
 7 1850 North Central Avenue  
 8 Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
 9 Telephone (602) 468-1411  
 10 Fax (602) 468-1311  
 11 [robertmitchell@mitchell-attorneys.com](mailto:robertmitchell@mitchell-attorneys.com)  
 12 [juliebeauregard@mitchell-attorneys.com](mailto:juliebeauregard@mitchell-attorneys.com)  
 13 [sarahdeutsch@mitchell-attorneys.com](mailto:sarahdeutsch@mitchell-attorneys.com)  
 14 [www.mitchell-attorneys.com](http://www.mitchell-attorneys.com)

RECEIVED

2009 DEC 15 A 11:43

AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

Arizona Corporation Commission  
**DOCKETED**

DEC 15 2009

DOCKETED BY

9 Counsel for Respondents MJG Enterprises, Inc.,  
 10 Anthony Boscarino, and Marguerite Jeane Gerhart

**BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

14 In the matter of:

Docket No. S-20709A-09-0524

15 MJG ENTERPRISES, INC., doing business as  
 16 Mike's Lock Club, an Arizona corporation;  
 17 ANTHONY BOSCARINO (a/k/a Mike Brown and  
 18 Anthony Kokas), a married man;  
 19 MARGUERITE JEANE GERHART (a/k/a  
 20 Marguerite Boscarino) a married woman;  
 21 Respondents.

**RESPONDENTS' ANSWER TO  
NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY FOR  
HEARING REGARDING PROPOSED  
ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST,  
ORDER FOR RESTITUTION,  
ORDER FOR ADMINISTRATIVE  
PENALTIES AND FOR OTHER  
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION**

22 Respondents MJG Enterprises, Inc. ("MJG"), an Arizona corporation, Anthony Boscarino  
 23 ("Mr. Boscarino"), a married man, and Marguerite Jeane Gerhart ("Ms. Gerhart"), a married  
 24 woman, by and through undersigned counsel, herein answer or otherwise respond to the allegations  
 25 of the Arizona Corporation Commission, Securities Division contained in the November 16, 2009,  
 26 Notice of Opportunity for Hearing Regarding Proposed Order to Cease and Desist, Order for  
 27  
 28

1 Restitution, Order for Administrative Penalties and for other Affirmative Action. Respondents  
2 herein specifically deny that they engaged in any acts, practices, or transactions that would  
3 constitute violations of the Securities Act of Arizona, ARS § 44-1801, et seq. ("Securities Act").  
4

5 Respondents admit that Marguerite Jeane Gerhart is the namesake, President and sole  
6 shareholder of MJG. Ms. Gerhart, along with her husband Anthony Boscarino, initially formed  
7 MJG to conduct Internet advertising business, and MJG eventually branched off into other areas of  
8 business, including on-line sports handicapping. Mr. Boscarino is the only employee of MJG and  
9 manages the day-to-day activities of the company.

#### 10 **I. JURISDICTION**

11 1. Answering paragraph one, Respondents admit that the Commission has jurisdiction  
12 over matters pertaining to the Arizona Securities Act.  
13

#### 14 **II. RESPONDENTS**

15 2. Answering paragraph two, Respondents admit that MJG Enterprises, Inc. is an  
16 Arizona corporation incorporated on or about November 9, 2007 and does business as Mike's Lock  
17 Club; and further alleges that its principal place of business is in Phoenix, Arizona.

18 3. Answering paragraph three, Respondents admit that MJG registered Mike's Lock  
19 Club as a trade name on May 22, 2008.  
20

21 4. Answering paragraph four, Respondents admit that Mr. Boscarino is a married  
22 person who resides in Arizona. Respondents aver that Mr. Boscarino's adopted name was Anthony  
23 Kokas and when his adoptive parents divorced, Mr. Boscarino lawfully changed his name to his  
24 original birth name, which was Anthony Boscarino. Respondents further aver that the name Mike  
25 Brown is the business name used on Mr. Boscarino's sports handicapping website to protect his and  
26  
27  
28

1 his family's personal identity. Respondents admit that Mr. Boscarino has been a director of MJG  
2 since September 1, 2007. Respondents deny each and every other allegation of said paragraph.

3 5. Answering paragraph five, Respondents admit that Ms. Gerhart is a married person  
4 residing in Arizona and that she is the President of MJG. Respondents further aver that the  
5 referenced public records of the Commission speak for themselves.  
6

7 6. Answering paragraph six, to the extent the public records referenced in said  
8 paragraph exist and are accurate, they speak for themselves; therefore, Respondents deny each and  
9 every other allegation of said paragraph.

10 7. Answering paragraph seven, Respondents admit that Mr. Boscarino and Ms. Gerhart  
11 are husband and wife, but deny each and every other allegation of said paragraph.

12 8. Answering paragraph eight, Respondents deny said paragraph.  
13

### 14 III. FACTS

15 9. Answering paragraph nine, Respondents admit that Mike's Lock Club is an Internet  
16 sports handicapping business that can be found at [www.mikeslockclub.com](http://www.mikeslockclub.com), but deny each and  
17 every other allegation of said paragraph.

18 10. Answering paragraph ten, Respondents admit that, for a fee, a person can join Mike's  
19 Lock Club and receive sports picks, but deny each and every other allegation of said paragraph.  
20

21 11. Answering paragraph eleven, Respondents admit that persons who joined Mike's  
22 Lock Club were known as Mike's Lock Club Members. Respondents further aver that the name  
23 Mike Brown is the business name used on Mr. Boscarino's sports handicapping website to protect  
24 his and his family's personal identity. Respondents deny each and every other allegation of said  
25 paragraph.  
26  
27  
28

1           12.     Answering paragraph twelve, Respondents admit that MJG received revenue from  
2 those who joined Mike's Lock Club for the sports handicapping services provided.

3           13.     Answering paragraph thirteen, Respondents deny said paragraph.

4     **A.     PROJECT DRILL**

5           14.     Answering paragraph fourteen, Respondents deny said paragraph. To the extent the  
6 emails referenced in paragraph fourteen exist, they speak for themselves. The drilling project never  
7 went forward and no funds were retained by MJG.  
8

9           15.     Answering paragraph fifteen, Respondents deny said paragraph.

10          16.     Answering paragraph sixteen, Respondents deny said paragraph.

11          17.     Answering paragraph seventeen, Respondents deny said paragraph.

12          18.     Answering paragraph eighteen, Respondents deny said paragraph.

13          19.     Answering paragraph nineteen, Respondents deny said paragraph.

14          20.     Answering paragraph twenty, Respondents deny said paragraph.

15     **B.     SBLC PRIVATE PLACEMENT TRADE PROGRAM**

16          21.     Answering paragraph twenty-one, Respondents respond that to the extent the emails  
17 referenced in paragraph twenty-one exist, they speak for themselves.  
18

19          22.     Answering paragraph twenty-two, Respondents deny said paragraph.

20          23.     Answering paragraph twenty-three, Respondents deny said paragraph.

21          24.     Answering paragraph twenty-four, Respondents deny said paragraph.

22          25.     Answering paragraph twenty-five, Respondents deny said paragraph.

23          26.     Answering paragraph twenty-six, Respondents deny said paragraph.

24          27.     Answering paragraph twenty-seven, Respondents deny said paragraph. To the extent  
25 the email referenced in paragraph twenty-seven exists, it speaks for itself.  
26  
27  
28

1           28.     Answering paragraph twenty-eight, Respondents deny said paragraph.

2     **C.     COLLATERALIZED MORTGAGE OBLIGATION (CMO) PROGRAM**

3           29.     Answering paragraph twenty-nine, Respondents deny said paragraph. To the extent  
4 the emails referenced in paragraph twenty-nine exist, they speak for themselves. Respondents aver  
5 that other parties not named by the Division are the culpable parties who have defrauded MJG and  
6 the other participating investors. MJG has initiated two lawsuits in Maricopa County Superior  
7 Court, CV2009-020325 and CV2009-020326, against the culpable parties in an attempt to recover  
8 misappropriated investor funds.  
9

10          30.     Answering paragraph thirty, Respondents deny said paragraph. Respondents aver  
11 that other parties, not named by the Division, are the culpable parties who have defrauded MJG and  
12 the other participating investors.  
13

14          31.     Answering paragraph thirty-one, Respondents deny said paragraph. Respondents  
15 aver that other parties, not named by the Division, are the culpable parties who have defrauded MJG  
16 and the other participating investors.  
17

18          32.     Answering paragraph thirty-two, Respondents deny said paragraph. Respondents  
19 aver that other parties not named by the Division are the culpable parties who have defrauded MJG  
20 and the other participating investors.  
21

22          33.     Answering paragraph thirty-three, Respondents deny said paragraph. Respondents  
23 aver that other parties, not named by the Division, are the culpable parties who have defrauded MJG  
24 and the other participating investors. MJG has initiated two lawsuits in Maricopa County Superior  
25 Court, CV2009-020325 and CV2009-020326, against the culpable parties in an attempt to recover  
26 misappropriated investor funds.  
27  
28

1           34.     Answering paragraph thirty-four, Respondents deny said paragraph. Respondents  
2 aver that other parties, not named by the Division, are the culpable parties who have defrauded MJG  
3 and the other participating investors.

4           35.     Answering paragraph thirty-five, Respondents admit that Tom Nantais ("Nantais"), a  
5 California licensed attorney, solicited MJG's business members to contribute money towards a  
6 CMO investment by recording a conference call in which Nantais explained the CMO investment  
7 and by making that recording available to MJG's business members so that they could call in and  
8 listen to the recording at their own convenience. The recorded conference call speaks for itself. To  
9 the extent the email referenced in paragraph thirty-five exists, it speaks for itself. Respondents deny  
10 each and every other allegation of said paragraph.  
11

12           36.     Answering paragraph thirty-six, Respondents deny said paragraph and aver that  
13 Nantais described the CMO investment in the recorded conference call, which speaks for itself.  
14 Respondents deny each and every other allegation of said paragraph. To the extent that  
15 Respondents made any representations, they were only to pass along the information they had been  
16 told.  
17

18           37.     Answering paragraph thirty-seven, Respondents admit the existence of a conference  
19 call recording, the contents of which speak for itself, but deny each and every other allegation of  
20 said paragraph.  
21

22           38.     Answering paragraph thirty-eight, Respondents admit the existence of a conference  
23 call recording, the contents of which speak for itself, but deny each and every other allegation of  
24 said paragraph. To the extent that Respondents made any representations, they were only to pass  
25 along the information they had been told.  
26  
27  
28

1           39.     Answering paragraph thirty-nine, Respondents admit the existence of a conference  
2 call recording, the contents of which speak for itself, but deny each and every other allegation of  
3 said paragraph.

4           40.     Answering paragraph forty, Respondents deny said paragraph. To the extent the  
5 email referenced in paragraph forty exists, it speaks for itself.  
6

7           41.     Answering paragraph forty-one, Respondents admit the existence of an account  
8 located at a Phoenix, Arizona credit union. To the extent the email referenced in paragraph forty-  
9 one exists, it speaks for itself. Respondents deny each and every other allegation of said paragraph.

10          42.     Answering paragraph forty-two, Respondents deny said paragraph and further aver  
11 that the contract referenced in paragraph forty-two speaks for itself.  
12

13          43.     Answering paragraph forty-three, Respondents admit that Ms. Gerhart, on behalf of  
14 MJG, wired \$1 million dollars to a Chicago Law firm, namely Rieck and Crotty's HPHC Client  
15 Trust Account c/o Matthew Tucker Acct, Chicago Investment Group, CMO Buy/Sell. Respondents  
16 deny each and every other allegation of said paragraph.

17          44.     Answering paragraph forty-four, Respondents admit that such statements referenced  
18 in paragraph forty-four were included in emails that were distributed among other culpable parties  
19 not named by the Division, who have defrauded MJG and the other participating investors. To the  
20 extent the statements referenced in paragraph forty-four were taken from emails or documents, such  
21 emails and documents speak for themselves. All information communicated by MJG was merely  
22 passed along from the principals offering the CMO investment opportunity to MJG. Respondents  
23 deny each and every other allegation of said paragraph.  
24

25          45.     Answering paragraph forty-five, Respondents deny said paragraph and aver that the  
26 contract referenced in paragraph forty-five speaks for itself.  
27  
28

1           46.     Answering paragraph forty-six, Respondents admit that they have never received any  
2 profits or a return of the \$1 million dollars from the purchase of the First CMO. Respondents deny  
3 each and every other allegation of said paragraph.

4           47.     Answering paragraph forty-seven, Respondents deny said paragraph and aver that  
5 the email referenced in paragraph forty-seven speaks for itself.

6           48.     Answering paragraph forty-eight, Respondents deny said paragraph. Upon  
7 Respondents' information and belief, someone executed an Amendment to Escrow Instructions  
8 dated March 13, 2009 and signed Ms. Marguerite Gerhart's forged signature authorizing the  
9 distribution of funds to three different parties.

10           49.     Answering paragraph forty-nine, Respondents admit that the Second CMO is not  
11 titled in either MJG's or Mr. Boscarino's names. Respondents aver that, on information and belief,  
12 the CMO is being held in a trust, but deny each and every other allegation of said paragraph.

13           50.     Answering paragraph fifty, Respondents admit the existence of a JV Agreement,  
14 which speaks for itself, but deny each and every other allegation of said paragraph.

15           51.     Answering paragraph fifty-one, Respondents deny said paragraph and aver that the  
16 Agreement referenced in paragraph fifty-one speaks for itself.

17           a.     Answering paragraph a, Respondents deny said paragraph and aver that the  
18 Agreement referenced in paragraph fifty-one speaks for itself.

19           b.     Answering paragraph b, Respondents deny said paragraph and aver that the  
20 Agreement referenced in paragraph fifty-one speaks for itself.

21           c.     Answering paragraph c, Respondents deny said paragraph and aver that the  
22 Agreement referenced in paragraph fifty-one speaks for itself.

1 d. Answering paragraph d, Respondents deny said paragraph and aver that the  
2 Agreement referenced in paragraph fifty-one speaks for itself.

3 e. Answering paragraph e, Respondents deny said paragraph and aver that the  
4 Agreement referenced in paragraph fifty-one speaks for itself.

5  
6 52. Answering paragraph fifty-two, Respondents admit that neither MJG nor Mr.  
7 Boscarino received a return on the invested funds or its principal from the purchase of either the  
8 First CMO or the Second CMO.

9 53. Answering paragraph fifty-three, Respondents deny said paragraph.

10 54. Answering paragraph fifty-four, Respondents admit that no profits were made from  
11 the CMO purchases, but deny each and every other allegation of said paragraph. Respondents  
12 further aver that other culpable parties not named by the Division made such representations as  
13 contained in paragraph fifty-four and have defrauded MJG and the other participating investors.

14  
15 55. Answering paragraph fifty-five, Respondents deny said paragraph.

16 56. Answering paragraph fifty-six, Respondents deny said paragraph.

17 57. Answering paragraph fifty-seven, Respondents deny said paragraph and aver that  
18 other culpable parties not named by the Division made such representations as contained in  
19 paragraph fifty-seven and have defrauded MJG and the other participating investors.

20  
21 **D. PING PROGRAM**

22 58. Answering paragraph fifty-eight, Respondents deny said paragraph. To the extent  
23 the email referenced in paragraph fifty-eight exists, it speaks for itself.

24 59. Answering paragraph fifty-eight, Respondents deny said paragraph. To the extent  
25 the statements and quotations contained in paragraph fifty-eight were taken from an email or  
26 document, such email or document speaks for itself.



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

**(Offer and Sale of Unregistered Securities)**

- 67. Answering paragraph sixty-seven, Respondents deny said paragraph.
- 68. Answering paragraph sixty-eight, Respondents deny said paragraph.
- 69. Answering paragraph sixty-nine, Respondents deny said paragraph.

**V. VIOLATIONS OF A.R.S. § 44-1842**

**(Transactions by Unregistered Dealers or Salesmen)**

- 70. Answering paragraph seventy, Respondents deny said paragraph.
- 71. Answering paragraph seventy-one, Respondents deny said paragraph.

**VI. VIOLATIONS OF A.R.S. § 44-1991**

**(Fraud in Connection with the Offer and Sale of Securities)**

- 72. Answering paragraph seventy-two, Respondents deny said paragraph.
  - a. Answering paragraph a, Respondents deny said paragraph.
  - b. Answering paragraph b, Respondents deny said paragraph.
  - c. Answering paragraph c, Respondents deny said paragraph.
  - d. Answering paragraph d, Respondents deny said paragraph.
  - e. Answering paragraph e, Respondents deny said paragraph.
  - f. Answering paragraph f, Respondents deny said paragraph.
  - g. Answering paragraph g, Respondents deny said paragraph.
- 73. Answering paragraph seventy-three, Respondents deny said paragraph.
- 74. Answering paragraph seventy-four, Respondents deny said paragraph.
- 75. Answering paragraph seventy-five, Respondents deny said paragraph.



1           87.     Respondents allege that they did not know, nor could they have known through the  
2 exercise of reasonable care, of any alleged untrue statements or material omissions as alleged in the  
3 Notice.

4           88.     Respondents allege that they have not acted with the requisite scienter.

5           89.     Respondents allege that they have not employed a device, scheme or artifice to  
6 defraud in connection with the offer, purchase, or sale of any security.  
7

8           90.     Respondents allege that the alleged investors have suffered no injuries or damages as  
9 a result of the Respondents' acts.

10          91.     Respondents allege that they have not made any misrepresentations or omissions,  
11 material or otherwise.

12          92.     Respondents allege that they acted in good faith and did not directly or indirectly  
13 induce the conduct at issue.  
14

15          93.     Respondents allege that they have caused no damages.

16          94.     Respondents allege that the investors relied on other culpable parties, not named by  
17 the Commission in this action, in connection with the matters at issue in this Notice.

18          95.     Respondents allege that restitution is barred because the damages, if any, were  
19 caused by the investors' own acts or omissions and/or by the investors' failure to mitigate their  
20 damages.  
21

22          96.     Respondents allege that the claims in the Notice are barred, in whole or in part,  
23 because investors' damages, if any, were caused by the acts of others over whom Respondents have  
24 no control, and for whose acts Respondents are not legally answerable.

25          97.     Respondents allege that the claims in the Notice are barred, in whole or in part,  
26 because investors' damages, if any, were caused by the intervening and superseding acts of others  
27  
28

1 over whom Respondents have no control, and for whose acts Respondents are not legally  
2 answerable.

3 98. Respondents allege that the claims in the Notice are barred, in whole or in part,  
4 because of mutual mistake.

5 99. Respondents allege that the claims in the Notice are barred, in whole or in part,  
6 because of payment, accord, and satisfaction.

7 100. Respondents allege that the claims in the Notice are precluded, in whole or in part,  
8 by offsets.

9 101. Respondents allege that the claims in the Notice are barred, in whole or in part,  
10 because investors acted in bad faith.

11 102. Further investigation and discovery in this matter may reveal the existence of  
12 additional affirmative defenses. Respondents, therefore, reserve as possible defenses all remaining  
13 defenses set forth in the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure

14 103. Respondents reserve the right to amend this Answer to assert additional defenses  
15 after completion of investigation and discovery.

16 WHEREFORE, having fully answered the Notice, there is no basis for the imposition of  
17 liability of any kind or nature, that there should be no order of any kind or nature against the  
18 Respondents, and that the action should be dismissed with respect to Respondents in its entirety.

19 Respondents have previously requested a hearing in this matter and continue to request a  
20 hearing in this matter.

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

DATED this 15th day of December, 2009.

MITCHELL & ASSOCIATES  
A Professional Corporation


By Julie Beauregard  
Robert D. Mitchell  
Julie M. Beauregard  
Sarah K. Deutsch  
Viad Corporate Center, Suite 1715  
1850 North Central Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
Counsel for the Respondents

1 ORIGINAL of the foregoing filed on or  
2 about this 15th day of December, 2009 with:

3 Docket Control  
4 Arizona Corporation Commission  
5 1200 W. Washington Street  
6 Phoenix, AZ 85007

7 COPIES of the foregoing e-mailed and/or regular mailed  
8 on or about 15th day of December, 2009 to:

9 Aikaterine Vervilos, Esq.  
10 Arizona Corporation Commission  
11 Securities Division  
12 1300 W. Washington Street, Third Floor  
13 Phoenix, AZ 85007

14   
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 mlg enterprises/pldgs/answer.doc

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
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

VERIFICATION

STATE OF ARIZONA            )  
  ) ss.  
County of Maricopa         )

I, Anthony M. Boscarino, do hereby swear under oath as follows:

I am one of the Respondents named in the above-captioned matter. I have read the foregoing Answer in its entirety, know the contents thereof, and the same are true to the best of my knowledge and belief except as to those matters alleged on information and belief, and as to those I believe them to be true.

DATED this 14 day of December, 2009.

  
Anthony M. Boscarino