	0000107887
A <u>COMMISSIONERS</u> KRISTIN K. MAYES, Chairman GARY PIERCE PAUL NEWMAN	CORPORATION COMMISSION fizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED FEB 2 3 2010 DOCKETED BY NE
In the matter of: MICHAEL C. REYNOLDS, a married man; TANZIA REYNOLDS, a married woman; CASH 2 U, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company; DOS NINAS, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company; PAR 3 MANAGEMENT, LLC, an Arizona	<ul> <li>DOCKET NO. S-20692A-09-0372</li> <li>DECISION NO. 71494</li> <li>ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST, ORDER</li> <li>ORDER TO CEASE AND ORDER FOR</li> <li>ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES</li> <li>DEFAULT BY: MICHAEL C. REYNOLDS,</li> <li>CASH 2 U, LLC, DOS NINAS, LLC, AND</li> <li>PAR 3 MANAGEMENT, LLC; AND</li> </ul>
limited liability company; Respondents.	) ) CONSENT TO SAME BY: TANZIA ) REYNOLDS )

On July 27, 2009, the Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") filed a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing Regarding Proposed Order to Cease and Desist, Order for Restitution, Order for Administrative Penalties and for other Affirmative Action ("Notice") in the matter against Respondents Michael C. Reynolds, Tanzia Reynolds, Cash 2 U, LLC, Dos Ninas, LLC and Par 3 Management, LLC.

Respondents Michael C. Reynolds, Cash 2 U, LLC, Dos Ninas, LLC and Par 3 Management,
LLC were personally served on July 28, 2009. Respondents Michael C. Reynolds, Cash 2 U, LLC,
Dos Ninas, LLC and Par 3 Management, LLC failed to request an administrative hearing within ten
days pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1972 and A.A.C. R14-4-306. Respondents Michael C. Reynolds,

Cash 2 U, LLC, Dos Ninas, LLC and Par 3 Management, LLC failed to file an Answer within 30 days pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-305.

Respondent Tanzia Reynolds ("T. REYNOLDS") was served by certified mail on July 31, 2009. On August 13, 2009, Respondent T. REYNOLDS filed a request for a hearing.

Respondent T. REYNOLDS elects to permanently waive any right to a hearing and appeal under Articles 11 and 12 of the Securities Act of Arizona, A.R.S. § 44-1801 *et seq.* ("Securities Act") with respect to this Order To Cease and Desist, Order for Restitution, and Order for Administrative Penalties ("Order") and Consent to Same. Respondent T. REYNOLDS admits the jurisdiction of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission"); neither admits nor denies the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained in this Order; and consents to the entry of this Order by the Commission.

I.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and the Securities Act.

2. MICHAEL C. REYNOLDS ("REYNOLDS") is an individual who, at all relevant times, resided in Maricopa County, Arizona.

3. At all relevant times, REYNOLDS conducted business as Friendship Finance or Friendship Finance, LLC (collectively "Friendship").<sup>1</sup>

4. TANZIA REYNOLDS ("T. REYNOLDS") is an individual who, at all relevant times, resided in Maricopa County, Arizona.

5. REYNOLDS and T. REYNOLDS are husband and wife. T. REYNOLDS is joined in this action under A.R.S. § 44-2031(C) solely for purposes of determining the liability of the marital community.

25

1

71494

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Friendship Finance, Inc. is an Arizona corporation owned by REYNOLDS' father-in-law and not REYNOLDS.
 Additionally, Friendship Finance is an Arizona registered trade name owned by someone other than any of the Respondents.

6. 1 At all times relevant, REYNOLDS was acting for REYNOLDS' own benefit and for the benefit or in furtherance of REYNOLDS and T. REYNOLDS' marital community. 2 3 7. CASH 2 U, LLC ("CASH") is an Arizona limited liability company organized on June 24, 1999. At all relevant times, CASH had its principal place of business in Maricopa 4 County, Arizona. 5 8. Pursuant to the public records of the Commission, REYNOLDS has been the sole 6 manager of CASH since June 24, 1999. 7 9. DOS NINAS, LLC ("DOS") is an Arizona limited liability company organized on 8 9 November 13, 2003. At all relevant times, DOS had its principal place of business in Maricopa County, Arizona. 10 10. 11 Pursuant to the public records of the Commission, REYNOLDS has been the sole 12 manager of DOS since November 13, 2003. 11. PAR 3 MANAGEMENT, LLC ("PAR 3") is an Arizona limited liability company 13 organized on June 17, 2003. At all relevant times, PAR 3 had its principal place of business in 14 Maricopa County, Arizona. 15 12. Pursuant to the public records of the Commission, REYNOLDS has been the sole 16 manager of PAR 3 since June 17, 2003. 17 13. 18 REYNOLDS, CASH, DOS and PAR 3 may be referred to collectively as "Respondents." 19 2014. In or around 2004 through 2008, the Respondents touted an investment opportunity in payday loan stores ("stores"). 21 15. 22 Respondents represented to the investors that funds would be used to expand the stores in one of two ways. The expansion would occur through increasing the number of stores and 23 offering title loans. 24 25 26

The Respondents raised at least \$3,000,000 from at least 14 investors residing in 16. Arizona through the offer and sale of promissory notes and investment contracts in the form of membership interests in a limited liability company in order to fund the expansion of the stores.

1

# A. PROMISSORY NOTES

17. CASH, DOS, PAR 3, and REYNOLDS issued promissory notes. REYNOLDS, individually, and/or on behalf of CASH, DOS or PAR 3, signed the promissory notes.

18. REYNOLDS, individually and on behalf of CASH, told at least one investor that CASH was a "recession-proof" business.

19. REYNOLDS and CASH promised various interest rates to the investors. Each of the promissory notes had a stated annual rate of return varying from seven and a half percent to 48 percent. Also, each of the promissory notes state interest would be paid monthly, and depending on the promissory note, the terms were from two months to one year.

20. REYNOLDS and PAR 3 promised to pay an investor a monthly interest payment of \$4,500.

REYNOLDS and DOS promised to an investor a return of five and a half percent a 21. month for a term of one year.

22. Some investors received a few interest payments but then the payments stopped or the interest checks were not honored because of insufficient funds. Respondents misrepresented that the investors would receive monthly interest payments until the promissory notes became due and payable.

23. Respondents represented that the repayment of the notes were guaranteed by the use of collateral in the form of a lien against the personal residence of Reynolds or the accounts receivable of his stores.

24. Respondents failed to tell the investors that there was a mortgage on REYNOLDS' residence, that the residence had been pledged as security to other investors, that there was no

4

documentation to allow the investors to exercise their security interest in the collateral and/or that 1 there were no accounts and loans receivable to pledge as security for the notes. 2

# **B. INVESTMENT CONTRACT**

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

25. REYNOLDS and CASH entered into written agreements with at least three investors whereby for an investment of funds the investor would purportedly receive a membership 5 interest in an Arizona limited liability company ("LLC") as well as a percentage interest of the net 6 7 cash flow of a new store that REYNOLDS and CASH would open in Arizona.

26. At least three investors contributed funds to receive the LLC interest and a percentage interest of the net cash flow of a store.

27. REYNOLDS and CASH promised to form an Arizona LLC for each of the new stores that included the investor as a member. In at least two instances, an Arizona LLC was not formed. In another instance, REYNOLDS provided to the investor articles of organization for a limited liability company called G5 Financial, LLC. However, REYNOLDS did not file the requisite paperwork to form G5 Financial, LLC with the investor.

28. REYNOLDS and CASH promised the investors a percent of the net cash flow per month. At least one investor was promised 50 percent of the net cash flow per month. At least two other investors were promised 20 percent of the net cash flow per month. However, none of the investors received a return because the stores did not open.

29. 19 REYNOLDS and CASH promised to contribute their own capital to operate the stores. For at least one investment, they promised to contribute \$150,000. In another instance, 20 21 they promised to contribute 40 percent of the capital plus "supply additional monies on an as-22needed basis to sustain growth." REYNOLDS and CASH failed to supply the amount of capital promised. 23

30. REYNOLDS and CASH promised each of the investors REYNOLDS would 24 provide the requisite license to operate each store. REYNOLDS did not acquire from the 25

5

26

Department of Financial Institutions ("DFI") the required state licensing for the stores. In at least two instances, REYNOLDS did not apply for DFI licensing.

3

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

19

31. REYNOLDS and CASH assigned the roles and responsibility for the investors and REYNOLDS. In at least two instances, REYNOLDS, not the investor, would manage all facets of the stores, including but not limited to providing the licensing, selecting the store location, managing the operations of the business (i.e., daily operations, human resources, accounting, marketing, technology, office management, and record keeping), and obtaining permits and licenses. The investor's sole role was to provide the funding.

In another case, the agreement called for the investor and REYNOLDS to share 32. responsibilities. However, in practice, the investor had no input regarding the store other than to provide the funds to open it. REYNOLDS handled all aspects of the store, including selecting the store location and directing the remodeling of the selected site. 12

C. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

Respondents used investor funds to pay personal expenses and to repay investors. 33. Respondents failed to disclose to the investors their funds would be used in this manner.

To at least two investors, REYNOLDS presented himself as the owner of 34. 16 Friendship, an existing payday loan store operator and/or franchisor in Arizona; however, 17 18 REYNOLDS did not have an ownership interest in Friendship.

REYNOLDS provided to at least two investors documents showing REYNOLDS 35. was seeking investments for Friendship. One such document purported to show that Friendship was engaged in a \$5 million capital raising program. The second such document purported to show Friendship seeking short-term funding of \$250,000 to \$500,000 that paid an annual interest rate of 36 percent.

In the Executive Summary of the short-term funding proposal, REYNOLDS stated 36. he has owned five stores and successfully operated them.

6

37. To some investors, REYNOLDS said he currently owned from three to six stores.
 REYNOLDS did not disclose he owned one store located in Mesa, Arizona. Furthermore,
 REYNOLDS did not disclose that he stopped loaning money to customers at the Mesa store.

38. Respondents failed to disclose to the investors the risks of investing, including but not limited to, their limited experience developing their own stores; their operating history which included an open store that stopped loaning out money and a closed store; stores that were purportedly to open with investor funds that did not open; limited resources to operate the stores; and the possibility of customer nonpayment.

9 39. At all times relevant, the Respondents were not registered with the Commission as
10 dealers or salesmen.

11 40. At all times relevant, the promissory notes and investment contracts were not 12 registered with the Commission.

# II.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and the Securities Act.

17 2. Respondents did not request a hearing pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1972 and A.A.C.
18 R14-4-307.

3. Respondents did not answer the Notice pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-305.

20 4. Respondents offered or sold securities within or from Arizona, within the meaning
21 of A.R.S. §§ 44-1801(15), 44-1801(21), and 44-1801(26).

22 5. Respondents violated A.R.S. § 44-1841 by offering or selling securities that were
23 neither registered nor exempt from registration.

6. Respondents violated A.R.S. § 44-1842 by offering or selling securities while
neither registered as a dealer or salesman nor exempt from registration.

26

4

5

6

7

8

13

14

15

16

19

7

1	7. Respondents violated A.R.S. § 44-1991 by (a) employing a device, scheme, or		
2	artifice to defraud, (b) making untrue statements or misleading omissions of material facts, and (c)		
3	engaging in transactions, practices, or courses of business that operate or would operate as a fraud		
4	or deceit. The conduct included:		
5	a. REYNOLDS misrepresented he had an ownership interest in Friendship when he		
6	did not;		
7	b. REYNOLDS misrepresented the number of stores he actually owned when he		
8	owned one store in Mesa, Arizona and that the other stores he purported to own		
9	were either closed or owned by someone else;		
10	c. Respondents misrepresented the use of the funds when the funds were used for		
11	purposes not intended by the investors, such as repaying investors and using it		
12	for personal expenses instead of expanding the stores;		
13	d. Respondents misrepresented that the investors would receive monthly interest		
14	payments when the payments stopped before the promissory notes matured;		
15	e. REYNOLDS and CASH misrepresented to at least three investors that invested		
16	with REYNOLDS and CASH to open a store whereby each investor would hold		
17	a membership interest in an LLC when none of the purported stores were		
18	opened, REYNOLDS and CASH did not provide their promised capital		
19	contributions, REYNOLDS did not file the requisite paperwork for the limited		
20	liability companies and REYNOLDS did not acquire DFI licensing;		
21	f. Respondents failed to disclose to the investors the risks of investing, including		
22	but not limited to, Respondents limited experience developing their own stores;		
23	their operating history which included an open store that rarely loaned out money		
24	and a closed store; stores that were purportedly to open with investor funds that		
25	did not open; limited resources to operate the stores; and the possibility of		
26	customer nonpayment; and		
	8		

8

1	g. Respondents failed to tell the investors that there was a mortgage on			
2	REYNOLDS' residence, that the residence had been pledged as security to other			
3	investors, that there was no documentation to create a security interest in the			
4	collateral, and/or that there were no accounts and loans receivable to pledge as			
5	security for the promissory notes.			
6	8. REYNOLDS directly or indirectly controlled persons within the meaning of			
7	A.R.S. § 44-1999, including but not limited to CASH 2 U, LLC, DOS NINAS, LLC, and PAR 3			
8	MANAGEMENT, LLC. Therefore, REYNOLDS is jointly and severally liable under A.R.S. § 44-			
9	1999 to the same extent as CASH 2 U, LLC, DOS NINAS, LLC, and PAR 3 MANAGEMENT, LLC			
10	for its violations of A.R.S. § 44-1991.			
11	9. Respondents' conduct is grounds for a cease and desist order pursuant to			
12	A.R.S. § 44-2032.			
13	10. Respondents' conduct is grounds for an order of restitution pursuant to			
14	A.R.S. § 44-2032.			
15	11. Respondents' conduct is grounds for administrative penalties under			
16	A.R.S. § 44-2036.			
17	12. REYNOLDS' conduct was for the benefit or in furtherance of REYNOLDS and T.			
18	REYNOLDS' marital community and, pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 25-214 and 25-215, this Order of			
19	restitution and administrative penalties is a debt of the community.			
20	III.			
21	ORDER			
22	THEREFORE, on the basis of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the			
23	Commission finds that the following relief is appropriate, in the public interest, and necessary for the			
24	protection of investors:			
25				
26				
	9 Decision No. 71494			

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

IT IS ORDERED that T. REYNOLDS comply with the attached Consent to Entry of 4 Order. 5

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032, that Respondents and the marital community of REYNOLDS and T. REYNOLDS shall, jointly and severally, pay restitution to the Commission in the amount of \$2,993,755. Payment shall be made in full on the date of this Order. Any amount outstanding shall accrue interest at the rate of 10% per annum 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 14 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, 16 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 18 19 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 Respondents and the 20 marital community of REYNOLDS and T. REYNOLDS shall, jointly and severally, with pay an 21 administrative penalty in the amount of \$150,000. 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

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

17

10

due and payable only after restitution payments have been paid in full or upon Respondents'
 default with respect to Respondents' restitution obligations.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

. . .

• • •

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

• • •

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

•••

• • •

...

. . .

. . .

...

. . .

. . .

For purposes of this Order, a bankruptcy filing by Respondents or T. REYNOLDS shall be an act of default. If Respondents or T. REYNOLDS does not comply with this Order, any outstanding balance may be deemed in default and shall be immediately due and payable.

Decision No.

71494

11

1	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order shall become effective immediately.			
2	BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION			
3	$\sim$			
4	am Juin			
5	CHAIRMAN COMMISSIONER			
6	$\cap$ $\cap$ $\cap$ $\cap$ $\cap$ $\cap$			
7	Roullon 6/ Mp Lendin & Grande			
8	COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER			
9				
10	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, ERNEST G. JOHNSON,			
11	Executive Director of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have hereunto set my hand and caused the			
12	official seal of the Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix, this <u>23</u> day of			
13	February, 2010.			
14				
15	Commenter Marine			
16	ERNÈST G. JOHNSON EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR			
17				
18 19	DISSENT			
20				
20	DISSENT			
22	This document is available in alternative formats by contacting Shaylin Bernal, ADA Coordinator, voice phone number 602-542-3931, e-mail <u>sbernal@azcc.gov.</u>			
23				
24	(AV)			
25				
26				
	- 12 Decision No. 71494			

## **CONSENT TO ENTRY OF ORDER**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1. Respondent TANZIA REYNOLDS ("T. REYNOLDS") admits the jurisdiction of the Commission over the subject matter of this proceeding. T. REYNOLDS acknowledges that T. REYNOLDS has been fully advised of her right to a hearing to present evidence and call witnesses and T. REYNOLDS knowingly and voluntarily waives any and all rights to a hearing before the Commission and all other rights otherwise available under Article 11 of the Securities Act and Title 14 of the Arizona Administrative Code. T. REYNOLDS acknowledges that this Order to Cease and Desist, Order for Restitution and Order for Administrative Penalties ("Order") and Consent to Same constitutes a valid final order of the Commission.

2. T. REYNOLDS knowingly and voluntarily waives any right under Article 12 of the Securities Act to judicial review by any court by way of suit, appeal, or extraordinary relief resulting from the entry of this Order.

3. T. REYNOLDS acknowledges and agrees that this Order is entered into freely and voluntarily and that no promise was made or coercion used to induce such entry.

4. T. REYNOLDS acknowledges that T. REYNOLDS has been represented by an
attorney in this matter, she has reviewed this Order with her attorney, Jess Lorona, Esq., and
understands all terms it contains.

5. T. REYNOLDS neither admits nor denies the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of
Law contained in this Order; and consents to the entry of this Order by the Commission the
Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained in this Order. T. REYNOLDS agrees that she
shall not contest the validity of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained in this
Order in any present or future administrative proceeding before the Commission.

6. By consenting to the entry of this Order, T. REYNOLDS agrees not to take any
action or to make, or permit to be made, any public statement denying, directly or indirectly, any
Finding of Fact or Conclusion of Law in this Order or creating the impression that this Order is
without factual basis.

13

7. While this Order settles this administrative matter between T. REYNOLDS and the
 Commission, T. REYNOLDS understands that this Order does not preclude the Commission from
 instituting other administrative or civil proceedings based on violations that are not addressed by
 this Order.

8. T. REYNOLDS understands that this Order does not preclude the Commission from
referring this matter to any governmental agency for administrative, civil, or criminal proceedings
that may be related to the matters addressed by this Order.

9. T. REYNOLDS understands that this Order does not preclude any other agency or officer of the state of Arizona or its subdivisions from instituting administrative, civil, or criminal proceedings that may be related to matters addressed by this Order.

10. T. REYNOLDS agrees that T. REYNOLDS will continue to cooperate with the Securities Division including, but not limited to, providing complete and accurate testimony at any hearing in this matter and cooperating with the state of Arizona in any related investigation or any other matters arising from the activities described in this Order. This provision shall not constitute a waiver of T. REYNOLDS' state and federal rights against self-incrimination.

16 11. T. REYNOLDS acknowledges that any restitution or penalties imposed by this
17 Order is an obligation of the marital community of REYNOLDS and T. REYNOLDS.

12. T. REYNOLDS consents to the entry of this Order and agrees to be fully bound by its terms and conditions.

13. T. REYNOLDS acknowledges and understands that if T. REYNOLDS fails to comply with the provisions of the order and this consent, the Commission may bring further legal proceedings against T. REYNOLDS, including application to the superior court for an order of contempt.

14. T. REYNOLDS understands that default shall render T. REYNOLDS liable to the Commission for its costs of collection and interest at the maximum legal rate.

25 26

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

14

1	15. T. REYNOLDS agrees and understands that if T. REYNOLDS fails to make any		
2	payment as required in the Order, any outstanding balance shall be in default and shall be		
3	immediately due and payable without notice or demand. T. REYNOLDS agrees and understands		
4	that acceptance of any partial or late payment by the Commission is not a waiver of default by		
5	Commission.		
6			
7			
8	TANZIA REYNOLDS		
9	STATE OF ARIZONA )		
10	) ss County of		
11			
12	SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE me this 18 day of February, 2010.		
13	Jann Dar Ron Main		
14	NOTARY PUBLIC		
15	My commission expires:		
16	JENNIFER C. BAFFORD		
17	PINAL COUNTY My Comm. Expires July 9, 2012		
18	My commission expires:		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
	15		

.

Docket No. S-20692A-09-0372

1	SERVICE LIST FOR:	ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST, ORDER FOR RESTITUTION, ORDER FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES	
2			
3		DEFAULT BY: MICHAEL C. REYNOLDS, CASH 2 U, LLC, DOS NINAS, LLC, AND PAR 3 MANAGEMENT, LLC; AND	
4 5		CONSENT TO SAME BY: TANZIA REYNOLDS	
6	DOCKET NO.:	S-20692A-09-0372	
7			
8	Jess Lorona, Esq.		
9	LORONA STEINER DUCAR, LTD		
10	3003 N. Central Ave., Suite 1500 Phoenix, AZ 85012		
11	Attorney for Respondent Tanzia Reynolds		
12	Joe Keilp, P.C. 1440 East Washington #100		
13	Phoenix, Arizona 85034 Attorney for Respondent Michael C. Reynolds		
14	Joe Keilp, P.C.		
15	1440 East Washington #100 Phoenix, Arizona 85034		
16 17	Attorney for Respondent Michael C. Reynolds, c/o Michael C. Reynolds, member of Cash 2 U, LLC, Dos Ninas, LLC and Par 3 Management, LLC		
18			
19	Cash 2 U, LLC 23802 N. 85 <sup>th</sup> St. Scottsdale, AZ 85255		
20	Par 3 Management, LLC		
21	19275 N. 88 <sup>th</sup> Way		
22	Scottsdale, AZ 85255		
23	Dos Ninas, LLC 19275 N. 88 <sup>th</sup> Way		
24	Scottsdale, AZ 85255		
25			
26			
		16	
	-	Decision No. 71494	