

ORIGINAL



0000127570

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

COMMISSIONERS

2011 JUL 15 P 2:06

GARY PIERCE - Chairman
BOB STUMP
SANDRA D. KENNEDY
PAUL NEWMAN
BRENDA BURNS

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NO. S-20600A-08-0340

MARK W. BOSWORTH and LISA A. BOSWORTH, husband and wife;

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

STEPHEN G. VAN CAMPEN and DIANE V. VAN CAMPEN, husband and wife;

JUL 15 2011

MICHAEL J. SARGENT and PEGGY L. SARGENT, husband and wife;

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

ROBERT BORNHOLDT and JANE DOE BORNHOLDT, husband and wife;

MARK BOSWORTH & ASSOCIATES, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company;

3 GRINGOS MEXICAN INVESTMENTS, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company;

NINETEENTH
PROCEDURAL ORDER
(Clarification)

Respondents.

BY THE COMMISSION:

On July 3, 2008, the Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") filed a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing ("Notice") against Mark W. Bosworth and Lisa A. Bosworth, husband and wife; Stephen G. Van Campen and Diane V. Van Campen, husband and wife; Michael J. Sargent and Peggy L. Sargent, husband and wife; Robert Bornholdt and Jane Doe Bornholdt, husband and wife; Mark Bosworth & Associates, LLC ("MBA"); and 3 Gringos Mexican Investments, LLC ("3GMI") (collectively "Respondents"), in which the Division alleged multiple violations of the Arizona Securities Act ("Act") in connection with the offer and sale of securities in the form of notes and investment contracts.

Respondents were duly served with copies of the Notice. Requests for hearing were filed by all Respondents except 3GMI. Subsequent to the filing of these requests for hearing, a number of

1 pre-hearing and status conferences were held.

2 On August 18, 2009, at a status conference, the Division, the Van Campen Respondents, and
3 the Sargent Respondents were present with counsel. Mr. Bosworth was present on his own behalf
4 and indicated Mrs. Bosworth would be retaining her own attorney.¹ After a discussion between the
5 parties, it was determined that an evidentiary hearing would be held after further procedural matters
6 were concluded.

7 On August 21, 2009, by Procedural Order, a hearing was scheduled to start on March 15, 2010.

8 On March 1, 2010, by Procedural Order, a status conference was scheduled to review this
9 matter on March 4, 2010.

10 On March 4, 2010, at the status conference, the Division and Mr. Sargent appeared with
11 counsel. Mr. Bosworth appeared on his own behalf and on behalf of MBA and 3GMI. The parties
12 indicated that there were ongoing discussions to resolve the issues that had been raised in the Notice,
13 but that certain matters needed to be resolved to conclude their possible settlements in this
14 proceeding. It was further indicated that a brief continuance would facilitate the complete resolution
15 of the proceeding by the parties and the submission of proposed Consent Orders for Commission
16 approval. At the conclusion of the status conference, the parties agreed to the proceeding being
17 continued to the agreed upon dates in June, if the proceeding was not settled.

18 On March 5, 2010, by Procedural Order, the proceeding was continued to June 7, 2010.

19 On June 7, 2010, the hearing was convened primarily involving the Sargent Respondents, but
20 the taking of evidence did not begin until June 10, 2010, followed by additional days of hearing.

21 At the conclusion of the hearing on June 25, 2010, the Division and the Sargent Respondents
22 stipulated that the proceeding be continued to August 26, and 27, 2010.

23 On July 8, 2010, by Procedural Order, the proceeding was continued to August 26, 2010,
24 pursuant to the parties' stipulated agreement.

25 On August 23, 2010, the Division filed a Motion to Set Hearing with respect to Respondents
26 Mark and Lisa Bosworth, MBA and 3GMI ("Bosworth Respondents") because a proposed Consent

27 _____
28 ¹ Consent Orders were issued with respect to Respondent, Robert Bornholdt, a single man, in Decision No. 71428
(December 8, 2009) and the Van Campen Respondents in Decision No. 71496 (February 23, 2010).

1 Order which was to have been considered for approval by the Commission at its July 8, 2010, Open
2 Meeting with respect to the aforementioned Respondents was pulled from the Commission's Open
3 Meeting agenda. The Consent Order with respect to the Bosworth Respondents was pulled because
4 testimony in the ongoing hearing involving the Sargent Respondents "indicated that the transfer of
5 property contemplated by the 3GMI private party settlement had not yet occurred." As a result, the
6 amount of restitution which had been agreed upon in the Consent Order of the Bosworth Respondents
7 was in need of revision, but the Division and the Bosworth Respondents were unable to reach an
8 agreement for the revision of the proposed Consent Order. The Division further requested a different
9 Administrative Law Judge hear the proceeding involving the Bosworth Respondents.

10 On August 26, 2010, at the hearing, Mr. Bosworth was present on his own behalf. The
11 Division and the Sargent Respondents appeared with counsel. With respect to the Division's Motion
12 to Set Hearing, counsel for the Division argued for a separate proceeding and indicated that testimony
13 utilized in the Sargent portion of the proceeding would not be utilized for any purpose and exhibits,
14 even if the same, would be subject to admission in the separate proceeding to avoid any violation of
15 the due process rights of the Bosworth Respondents. Although Mr. Bosworth indicated that he
16 intended to speak with an attorney, he expressed his willingness to proceed in the instant proceeding.

17 On September 8, 2010, the Sargent Respondents filed their response to the Division's Motion
18 to Set Hearing with respect to the Bosworth Respondents. The Sargent Respondents argued in
19 support of the Division's Motion to Set Hearing for a separate proceeding which involves the
20 Bosworth Respondents pointing out that the Bosworth Respondents were not present for the majority
21 of the hearing as it related to the Sargents, were not familiar with the record and that numerous
22 complications would arise with respect to prior witnesses who had testified previously along with the
23 possibility of the Bosworth Respondents calling numerous witnesses to rebut the allegations which
24 related to them alone.

25 On September 13, 2010, the Bosworth Respondents filed their response to the Division's
26 Motion to Set Hearing arguing that a separate hearing should not be held concerning the allegations
27 which were raised against them in the Notice. The Bosworth Respondents further indicated their
28 willingness to proceed in the instant hearing.

1 On September 16, 2010, the Division filed a reply to the response which had been filed by the
2 Bosworth Respondents and reiterated that its arguments were expressed on the record during the
3 hearing on August 26, 2010.

4 On September 27, 2010, the Bosworth Respondents filed a reply to the response of the
5 Sargent Respondents to the Division's Motion to Set Hearing and further responded to the Division's
6 reply to the Bosworth Respondents' response filed on September 13, 2010. In both of their
7 pleadings, the Bosworth Respondents repeated their vigorous opposition to a separate hearing from
8 the hearing which is in progress.

9 On November 9, 2010, by Procedural Order, it was determined that the instant proceeding go
10 forward and a procedural conference scheduled on November 30, 2010, to review the present status
11 of the proceeding and the manner in which to go forward.

12 On November 30, 2010, at the procedural conference, the Division and the Sargent
13 Respondents were represented by counsel. Mr. Bosworth appeared on behalf of the Bosworth
14 Respondents. The parties discussed the proceeding going forward with active participation by the
15 Bosworth Respondents and the amount of time needed for Mr. Bosworth to review the record in order
16 to resume the hearing. The parties subsequently agreed that they would exchange copies of any
17 further Exhibits and Witness Lists by January 31, 2011, and that an additional procedural conference
18 be scheduled on February 9, 2011.

19 On December 15, 2010, by Procedural Order, a procedural conference was scheduled as
20 agreed on February 9, 2011, and documents ordered exchanged by January 31, 2011.

21 On February 9, 2011, the Division and the Sargent Respondents appeared through counsel.
22 Mr. Bosworth appeared on behalf of the Bosworth Respondents. The parties discussed the re-
23 opening of the evidentiary proceeding and agreed that the hearing resume on June 1, 2011 and that
24 additional days of hearing take place on June 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, 2011.

25 Subsequently, after the procedural conference, a scheduling conflict arose and the week of June
26 6, 2011, was no longer available. As a result, the week of June 13, 2011, was substituted in its place.

27 On May 27, 2011, the Division filed a Motion to Quash a subpoena of its special investigator,
28 Michael Brokaw, who is testifying in the proceeding.

1 On June 1, 2011, the Division and the Sargent Respondents were represented by counsel. Mr.
2 Bosworth appeared on behalf of the Bosworth Respondents. At the onset of the proceeding counsel
3 for the Sargent Respondents disclosed that Mr. Sargent had suffered a heart attack several days
4 earlier and had subsequently undergone an angioplasty procedure. As a result, the Sargent
5 Respondents requested a continuance of the proceeding. After discussion of possible hearing dates
6 and to avoid scheduling conflicts, the parties agreed that the proceeding should be continued until
7 August. The Division's Motion to Quash was granted at the hearing.

8 On June 3, 2011, by Procedural Order, the hearing was continued to August 1, 2011.

9 On June 23, 2011, the Division filed a Motion for Clarification in this matter with respect to
10 Respondent Mark Bosworth's representations that he is representing himself, his wife, Lisa, MBA
11 and 3GMI in this proceeding. The Division stated that Mr. Bosworth's representation is subject to
12 the limitations imposed by the Arizona Supreme Court Rules, Rule 31, with respect to the
13 unauthorized practice of law. He is only able to represent himself, and under limited circumstances,
14 the business entities. The Division cited specific case law which establishes that a familial
15 relationship does not allow a husband to represent his wife in a legal proceeding despite their joint
16 interests in their community property. No responses were filed to the Division's Motion for
17 Clarification.

18 Early in this proceeding, on July 28, 2008, Lisa Bosworth filed a request for a hearing, and
19 Mr. Bosworth later indicated that she was consulting with an attorney. However, an attorney has not
20 appeared to represent her at any subsequent proceeding, and if she is to be represented, counsel
21 should file a Notice of Appearance or she can appear on her own behalf or not appear, if she so
22 chooses.

23 Under the circumstances, pursuant to Rule 31, Mark Bosworth should not represent Lisa
24 Bosworth.

25 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the **hearing** shall be held on **August 1, 2011, at 10:00**
26 **a.m.**, at the Commission's offices, 1200 West Washington Street, **Hearing Room No. 1**, Phoenix,
27 Arizona, as previously ordered.

28 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the **Division and Respondents shall set aside August 2, 3,**

1 4, 8, 9, 10 and September 19, 20, 21 and 22, 2011, for additional days of hearing, if necessary, as
2 previously ordered.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 31, Respondent Mark
4 Bosworth shall not represent Respondent Lisa Bosworth in the proceeding.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Division's Objections to Respondent Bosworth's List
6 of Witnesses and Exhibits together with a Motion to Compel Production of Information shall remain
7 under advisement.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Ex Parte Rule (A.A.C. R14-3-113 – Unauthorized
9 Communications) is in effect and shall remain in effect until the Commission's Decision in this
10 matter is final and non-appealable.

11 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all parties must comply with Rules 31 and 38 of the Rules
12 of the Arizona Supreme Court and A.R.S. § 40-243 with respect to practice of law and admission *pro*
13 *hac vice*.

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that withdrawal of representation must be made in compliance
15 with A.A.C. R14-3-104(E) and Rule 1.16 of the Rules of Professional Conduct (under Rule 42 of the
16 Rules of the Arizona Supreme Court). Representation before the Commission includes the obligation
17 to appear at all hearings and procedural conferences, as well as all Open Meetings for which the
18 matter is scheduled for discussion, unless counsel has previously been granted permission to
19 withdraw by the Administrative Law Judge or the Commission.

20 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Presiding Officer may rescind, alter, amend, or waive
21 any portion of this Procedural Order either by subsequent Procedural Order or by ruling at hearing.

22 Dated this 15TH day of July, 2011.

23
24
25 
26 MARC E. STERN
27 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
28

1 Copies of the foregoing were mailed/delivered
2 this 15th day of July, 2011 to:

3 Mark W. Bosworth
4 MARK BOSWORTH & ASSOCIATES, LLC,
5 3 GRINGOS MEXICAN INVESTMENTS, LLC
6 18094 North 100th Street
7 Scottsdale, AZ 85255

8 Lisa A. Bosworth
9 18094 North 100th Street
10 Scottsdale, AZ 85255

11 Paul J. Roshka
12 Jeffrey D. Gardner
13 Timothy J. Sabo
14 ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC
15 One Arizona Center
16 400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800
17 Phoenix, AZ 85004
18 Attorneys for Respondents Michael J. Sargent and Peggy L. Sargent

19 Matt Neubert, Director
20 Securities Division
21 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
22 1300 West Washington Street
23 Phoenix, AZ 85007

24 ARIZONA REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
25 2200 North Central Avenue, Suite 502
26 Phoenix, AZ 85004-1481

27
28
By: 
Debra Broyles
Secretary to Marc E. Stern