NEW APPLICATION ORIGINAL



1

2

4

5

67

8

9

1011

12

1314

15

16

17 18

19

2021

22

2324

25

26

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

2012 MAR 30 P 12: 46

COMMISSIONERS

GARY PIERCE, Chairman BOB STUMP SANDRA D. KENNEDY PAUL NEWMAN BRENDA BURNS AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCKET CONTROL

In the matter of:) DOCK

ALONZO L. RUSSELL, a single man;

A. L. RUSSELL & ASSOCIATES LLC, an Arizona limited liability company;

RE-STAR LLC, an Arizona limited liability company;

RE-STAR HOLDINGS LLC, an Arizona limited liability company; and

LINDA RUSSELL, a single woman;

Respondents.

DOCKET NO. S-20518A-12-0120

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

NOTICE: EACH RESPONDENT HAS 10 DAYS TO REQUEST A HEARING EACH RESPONDENT HAS 30 DAYS TO FILE AN ANSWER

The Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") alleges that respondents ALONZO L. RUSSELL, A. L. RUSSELL & ASSOCIATES LLC, RE-STAR LLC, and RE-STAR HOLDINGS LLC have engaged in acts, practices, and transactions that constitute violations of the Securities Act of Arizona, A.R.S. § 44-1801 et seq. ("Securities Act") and the Arizona Investment Management Act, A.R.S. § 44-3101 et seq. ("IM Act") and a final Commission order dated July 18, 2007, Commission Decision No.

Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED

MAR 3 0 2012

DOCKETED BY

3 4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25 26

investment adviser representative.

The Division further alleges that Respondent RUSSELL directly or indirectly controlled A. L. RUSSELL & ASSOCIATES LLC, RE-STAR LLC, and RE-STAR HOLDINGS LLC within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-1999. RUSSELL is jointly and severally liable with, and to the same extent as these companies, for the companies' violations of the anti-fraud provisions of the Securities Act.

I.

JURISDICTION

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

II.

RESPONDENTS

- 2. Respondent RUSSELL is an individual who at all relevant times resided in Maricopa County, Arizona. At all relevant times, RUSSELL offered and sold the investments and provided the investment advice discussed further below within and from Arizona.
- 3. Linda Russell was the spouse of RUSSELL from November 1989 until November 1, 2011, when the Maricopa County Superior Court issued a Decree of Dissolution of Marriage in case number FC2011-093849, dissolving Linda Russell and RUSSELL's marriage. This Decree was issued in response to Linda Russell's pro se Petition for Dissolution of Marriage filed with the court on August 12, 2011. Linda Russell, who is also referred to as "Respondent Spouse," is included in this action solely to determine the liability of RUSSELL and Linda Russell's marital community pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 44-2031(C) and 44-3291(C).
- 4. Respondent A. L. RUSSELL & ASSOCIATES LLC ("ALRA") is a managermanaged Arizona limited liability company organized by RUSSELL on May 9, 2006. RUSSELL was at all relevant times and currently is the manager of ALRA.
 - 5. ALRA has also not been licensed by the Commission as an investment adviser or

1	
<u> </u>	

- 6. Respondent RE-STAR LLC ("RE-STAR") is a manager-managed Arizona limited liability company organized by RUSSELL on February 13, 2009. ALRA was at all relevant times and currently is the manager of RE-STAR.
 - 7. RE-STAR has not been registered by the Commission as a securities dealer.
- 8. Respondent RE-STAR HOLDINGS LLC ("RS HOLDINGS") is a manager-managed Arizona limited liability company organized by RUSSELL on March 11, 2009. ALRA was at all relevant times and currently is the manager of RS HOLDINGS. RE-STAR is a member.
 - 9. RS HOLDINGS has not been registered by the Commission as a securities dealer.

III.

FACTS

A. RUSSELL's Misconduct Giving Rise to Commission Decision No. 69706

- 10. In 2001 RUSSELL was a registered securities salesman associated with AIG Financial Services, Inc. ("AIG"), formerly SunAmerica Securities, Inc.
- 11. RUSSELL was also a licensed investment adviser representative associated with the Householder Group, Estate and Retirement Specialists ("Householder").
- 12. In November 2001, RUSSELL directed one of his clients to sell \$50,000 of mutual-fund shares in the customer's AIG account and write a \$50,000 check to "GAA" to be invested in an "equipment fund."
- 13. A few years later, the client complained to AIG. AIG investigated the matter, found that the equipment fund was not an AIG-approved investment fund, and, on April 26, 2006, terminated RUSSELL for violating company policy.
- 14. Based on these same facts, on April 26, 2006, Householder also terminated RUSSELL.
- 15. Upon being terminated, RUSSELL was not associated with a licensed investment adviser or a registered securities broker.

- 16. Consequently, as of April 26, 2006 RUSSELL's investment adviser representative license was automatically suspended per A.R.S. § 44-3158(B) and RUSSELL's securities salesman registration was automatically suspended per A.R.S. § 44-1949.
- 17. At around this same time, the Commission and the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA) (formerly known as the National Association of Securities Dealers), began investigating RUSSELL. FINRA regulates securities brokers and dealers under the authority of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.
- 18. FINRA's investigation resulted in a February 26, 2007 "Letter of Acceptance, Waiver and Consent" barring RUSSELL from association with any FINRA member in any capacity.
- 19. The Commission's investigation resulted in Commission Decision No. 69706 (the "Order"). In the Order, the Commission found that after receiving the check from the client, RUSSELL deposited the \$50,000 into his own Bank of America account and used the money at clothing stores, restaurants and golf courses.
- 20. The Order documents the Commission's permanent revocation of RUSSELL's securities salesman registration and investment adviser representative license. It also includes the Commission's order that RUSSELL permanently cease and desist from selling securities in or from Arizona without being registered as a dealer or salesman.
- 21. In the section of the Order titled "Consent to Entry of Order," executed by RUSSELL, RUSSELL expressly agreed that: (a) he would "not exercise any control over any entity that offers or sells securities or provides investment advisory services within or from Arizona at any time in the future"; and (b) he would "not sell any securities in or from Arizona" and would "not transact business in Arizona as an investment adviser or investment adviser representative in or from Arizona."

4

9

11 12

14

13

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

the effective date of the Order.

- 22. The Order required RUSSELL to pay restitution of \$50,000 and penalties of \$20,000 plus interest at the rate of 10% per annum respectively accruing from the date of purchase and the date of the Order.
- 23. At the time of the Order, RUSSELL paid \$30,000 of damages. He made no further payments.
- 24. The remaining \$20,000 of restitution and \$20,000 of penalties, along with accrued interest, are still outstanding. As noted in the Order, these amounts are to be offset by the \$6,786.66 "interest" payments made by RUSSELL to the customer.

B. RUSSELL's Continued Provision of Investment Advisory Services

- 25. In spite of the Order, RUSSELL continued to advise clients for compensation as to the value of securities, the advisability of investing, purchasing or selling securities and providing financial planning services.
- 26. After AIG and Householder terminated RUSSELL on April 26, 2006, RUSSELL told his existing investment advisory clients that RUSSELL was leaving AIG due to a dispute over commissions that AIG supposedly owed to RUSSELL. RUSSELL explained to his clients that he was going to run his own investment-adviser/consulting business.
- 27. RUSSELL informed clients that, if they wished to continue using him for financial services, they could transfer their AIG accounts to accounts held by Fidelity Investments ("Fidelity").
- 28. RUSSELL persuaded clients to transfer their investment and retirement accounts from AIG's custody to Fidelity to be managed by RUSSELL.
- 29. Beginning in June 2006, and for the next several years, RUSSELL acquired "limited trading authorization" for 147 Fidelity accounts held by 70 different persons (some of which were couples or trusts).
- 30. RUSSELL obtained the limited trading authorization for 30 of these accounts after

- 31. The assets in these accounts consisted of mutual funds, stocks, bonds and other securities.
- 32. As stated in Fidelity's authorization forms, "Limited trading authorization" allowed RUSSELL "to inquire in, trade, buy, sell (including short sales), exchange, convert, tender, trade or otherwise acquire or dispose of stocks, bonds, securities, and other investments, on margin or otherwise, including the purchase and/or sale of option contracts, for and at [the account holder's] risk."
- 33. RUSSELL used this authorization to, among other things, invest his clients' funds in the above-described securities and control the purchase and sale orders of securities in each client's Fidelity account(s).
- 34. As an integral part of RUSSELL's business, RUSSELL and ALRA would send each client quarterly invoices on ALRA stationary. The invoices were labeled "Financial Planning Service Fee Invoice."
- 35. Each invoice displayed the value of that respective client's asset portfolio under RUSSELL's management.
- 36. The invoices also included the fees RUSSELL charged his clients for the investment advisory services he provided.
- 37. The compensation that a client paid to RUSSELL consisted of a quarterly fee equal to one quarter of one percent (0.25%) of the value of the total assets that RUSSELL managed for the client; for total annual compensation of 1% of the value of the assets over which RUSSELL had trading authority.
- 38. The asset value used in the invoices was the value of the assets at the beginning of the respective quarter.
- 39. The invoices included instructions telling clients they could pay by check, credit card or account bill pay.

- 40. In 2006 and 2007, invoices instructed clients to make the payments to "General Administration and Accounting, LLC, our accounting firm"; this entity is a manager-managed Arizona limited liability company managed by RUSSELL. By 2008, the invoices instructed clients to make the payments to ALRA.
- 41. For the period beginning June 2006 and ending December 2010 (when Fidelity removed RUSSELL's trading authorization from client accounts), RUSSELL billed clients for managing the clients' Fidelity accounts a total of at least \$530,525.
- 42. RUSSELL also billed 19 persons—18 of whom were his investment advisory clients—a management fee for the value of each client's investment in RUSSELL's house-resale business (described in more detail below). These 19 persons purchased membership interests in RE-STAR and RS HOLDINGS (the "Membership Interests").
- 43. There was no written agreement between these 19 persons to pay RUSSELL or ALRA a commission for "management" of the Membership Interests. Rather, the only payment terms disclosed to Membership Interest holders were contained in RE-STAR's operating agreement, which described a fixed compensation that RE-STAR (not the company members) would pay to the manager(s).
- 44. Under RE-STAR's operating agreement, RE-STAR members were not required to make additional capital contributions. In spite of this, RUSSELL and ALRA charged each Membership Interest holder a quarterly management fee of .25% of the value of that person's Membership Interest.
- 45. This fee was billed on invoices that ALRA sent to the Re-Star Investors; the Re-Star Investors' quarterly payments went to ALRA, not RE-STAR.
- 46. For the 18 Re-Star Investors who were also RUSSELL/ALRA clients, the quarterly invoices that ALRA sent to these 18 Re-Star Investors for RUSSELL's advisory services showed the value of the Membership Interest along with the value of the other accounts

managed by RUSSELL. And the fee for management of the Membership Interest was included in the total fee due for all services provided by RUSSELL and ALRA.

47. For the eight-quarter period beginning July 1, 2009 and ending March 31, 2011 RUSSELL billed clients for managing the client's Membership Interests in RE-STAR a total of at least \$31,045.

C. Material Omissions and Misrepresentations in the Provision of Investment Advisory Services

- 48. RUSSELL did not truthfully inform his existing clients of the conduct giving rise to his termination from AIG and Householder and the FINRA and Commission proceedings against RUSSELL as set forth in the Order.
- 49. Rather, RUSSELL told clients that he left AIG due to a dispute over commissions with AIG.
- 50. RUSSELL did not inform clients that ALRA was not a licensed investment adviser and that, after his termination from Householder, RUSSELL was not a licensed investment adviser representative and he was not associated with a licensed investment adviser.
- 51. RUSSELL did not inform his existing clients of the FINRA action barring RUSSELL from association with FINRA members.
 - 52. RUSSELL did not inform his existing clients of the Order.
- 53. RUSSELL also acquired clients after the FINRA action and after the Commission issued its Order. RUSSELL did not inform these clients of the FINRA action or the Order prior to entering into an agreement to provide investment advisory services for these clients.
- 54. RUSSELL and ALRA charged clients a management fee after RUSSELL was suspended from transacting investment advisory business and continued providing investment advisory services for compensation after the Order expressly barred him from transacting business as an investment adviser or investment adviser representative.

- 55. RUSSELL did not disclose to the 18 Re-Star Investors who were also investment advisory clients the commission payment structure for management of each client's Membership Interest, much less any conflicts of interest created by such commission payment structure.
- 56. This commission consisted of RUSSELL charging the Re-Star Investors quarterly management fees for managing the Membership Interests equal to .25% of the value of the Membership Interests. RUSSELL was responsible for determining the value of the Membership Interests reported by RUSSELL to the Re-Star Investors. These values, as shown in invoices sent to Re-Star Investors and the Valuation Statement (described below), showed the principal value of the Membership Interests increased by 11-17.7% in 2009 (before the business had sold a single property) and by 14-19% in 2010.
- 57. These reported value increases, in turn, determined RUSSELL's management fee for the Membership Interests. As a result, RUSSELL had an economic incentive to overstate the value of the Membership Interests.
- 58. RUSSELL did not inform his clients who were RE-STAR Investors of the conflict of interest created by this commission payment.

D. Sale of LLC Membership Interests

- 59. Beginning in early 2009, RUSSELL approached several of his existing clients about investing in a house-flipping venture—i.e. purchasing, rehabilitating and selling residential properties. The venture would be managed by RUSSELL.
- 60. To raise a pool of capital to fund his house-flipping business, RUSSELL sold the Membership Interests within and from Arizona.
- 61. By July 2009, 19 persons—18 of whom were existing clients—had invested \$1,430,000 by purchasing Membership Interests in RE-STAR and RS HOLDINGS (these 19 persons, the "Re-Star Investors").
- 62. In exchange for their investment, RUSSELL prepared and caused to be provided to Re-Star Investors an operating agreement titled "Re-Star Operating Agreement" dated

February 1, 2009 (the "Operating Agreement"). The Operating Agreement vested exclusive authority to manage the business in the Manager, i.e., RUSSELL.

- 63. RUSSELL controlled RE-STAR, RS HOLDINGS and their business. The Re-Star Investors did not participate in the business and the Re-Star Investors depended on the efforts of RUSSELL to make the house-flipping business successful and to realize a return on their investments.
- 64. RUSSELL selected the properties to be purchased and rehabilitated, controlled the rehabilitation, and controlled the sale of the properties.
- 65. From April 24 through July 29, 2011, RE-STAR and its related entity, Re-Star Properties, purchased seven properties—six in Maricopa County and one in Pinal County.
- 66. To purchase these properties and conduct its business, RE-STAR pooled investor funds. Five Re-Star Investors invested amounts that were insufficient to purchase even the lowest-priced home purchased by RE-STAR in 2009, with a purchase price of \$42,500. Additionally, no single investor invested enough to purchase the two homes with the highest purchase prices: \$160,125 and \$204,750.
- 67. In early 2010, RUSSELL provided Re-Star Investors with a document containing a valuation of Membership Interests for the fourth quarter of 2009 showing a 17.7% increase in value of the Membership Interests.
- 68. Additionally, in the invoices sent to clients for RUSSELL's management fee of the Membership Interests, RUSSELL showed increases in value that varied from 11% to 19%.
- 69. Other than these purported increases, no RE-STAR Investors have realized an increase in value on their Membership Interests.
- 70. Only one RE-STAR Investor, after hiring an attorney and threatening to sue, received a return of a \$125,000 investment.
 - 71. No other Re-Star Investors have received any returns on their investment.

72. At present, the business does not own any properties and does not appear to be operational.

Material Misstatements and Misrepresentations in the Offer and Sale of the **Membership Interests**

- 73. In obtaining investor funds, RUSSELL failed to disclose the Commission's Order to the Re-Star Investors.
- 74. RUSSELL also failed to disclose the conduct leading to his termination from Householder and AIG.
- 75. As found in the Order, the conduct leading to RUSSELL's termination involved dishonesty and misappropriation of client funds.
- 76. In the Operating Agreement, RE-STAR's would pay RE-STAR's managers salaries and compensation fixed by the managers, "as long as such compensation is fair and reasonable for the duties performed." Neither the Operating Agreement, nor any other document given to the Re-Star Investors, required any additional capital contributions from members, required members to pay the managers, or disclosed any commission payments based on the value of the Membership Interests.
- 77. In spite of this, RUSSELL and ALRA billed Re-Star Investors for a quarterly commission equal to .25% of the Membership Interests value; the Re-Star Investors paid these fees to ALRA.
- 78. RUSSELL was responsible for determining the reported value of the Membership Interests and had an economic incentive to overstate the value. RUSSELL failed to disclose this method of payment and the conflict of interest created by it.

IV. 1 VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-3151 2 (Transactions by Unlicensed Investment Advisers 3 or Investment Adviser Representatives) 4 5 [RUSSELL and ALRA] 79. Respondents RUSSELL and ALRA transacted business in Arizona as investment 6 7 advisers or investment adviser representatives while not licensed or in compliance with Article 4 of the IM Act. 8 80. This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-3151. 9 V. 10 VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-3241 11 12 (Fraud in the Provision of Investment Advisory Services) 13 [RUSSELL and ALRA] 81. Respondents RUSSELL and ALRA engaged in a transaction or transactions within 14 or from Arizona involving the provision of investment advisory services in which Respondents, 15 directly or indirectly: (i) employed a device, scheme, or artifice to defraud; (ii) made untrue 16 statements of material fact or omitted to state material facts that were necessary in order to make the 17 statements made not misleading in light of the circumstances under which they were made; (iii) 18 19 misrepresented professional qualifications with the intent that the client rely on the misrepresentation; or (iv) engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business that operated or 20 21 would operate as a fraud or deceit. Respondents' conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following: 22 Violating A.C.C. R14-6-209 by failing to disclose to clients or prospective 23 a) 24 clients the Order and the FINRA order against Russell; and

and compensation from RE-STAR for managing the Membership Interests not misleading

Failing to make the statement that RUSSELL was receiving fixed salary

b)

25

	[]			
1	by omitting to inform clients who were Re-Star Investors that RUSSELL and ALRA were			
2	receiving quarterly commission payments equal to .25% of the value of the Membership			
3	Interes	ets from Re-Star Investors. RUSSELL further failed to disclose the conflict of		
4	interes	t created by his responsibility to determine the value of the Membership Interests		
5	and his	s economic incentive to overstate the value of the Membership Interests.		
6	82.	This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-3241.		
7		VI.		
8		VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1841		
9		(Offer or Sale of Unregistered Securities)		
10		[RUSSELL, RE-STAR and RS HOLDINGS]		
11	83.	From on or about March 3, 2009, Respondents RUSSELL, RE-STAR and RS		
12	HOLDINGS o	offered or sold securities in the form of investment contracts, within or from Arizona.		
13	84.	The securities referred to above were not registered pursuant to Articles 6 or 7 of the		
14	Securities Act.			
15	85.	This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1841.		
16		VII.		
17		VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1842		
18	(Transactions by Unregistered Dealers or Salesmen)			
19		[RUSSELL, RE-STAR and RS HOLDINGS]		
20	86.	Respondents RUSSELL, RE-STAR and RS HOLDINGS offered or sold securities		
21	within or fror	m Arizona while not registered as dealers or salesmen pursuant to Article 9 of the		
22	Securities Act.			
23	87.	This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1842.		
24				
25				
26				

4	
ı	
1	

VIII.

VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1991

(Fraud in Connection with the Offer or Sale of Securities)

[RUSSELL, RE-STAR and RS HOLDINGS]

- 88. In connection with the offer or sale of securities within or from Arizona, Respondents RUSSELL, RE-STAR and RS HOLDINGS directly or indirectly: (i) employed a device, scheme, or artifice to defraud; (ii) made untrue statements of material fact or omitted to state material facts that were necessary in order to make the statements made not misleading in light of the circumstances under which they were made; or (iii) engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business that operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon offerees and investors. Respondents' conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:
 - a) Failure to disclose FINRA's and the Commission's actions against RUSSELL;
 - b) Failure to disclose that RUSSELL had been barred from selling securities and the conditions leading to his bar; and
 - c) Failure to disclose that Re-Star Investors would pay commission payments to RUSSELL and ALRA equal to .25% of the reported value of the Membership Interests.
 - 89. This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1991.
- 90. RUSSELL directly or indirectly controlled Respondents RE-STAR and RS HOLDINGS within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-1999. As a result, RUSSELL is jointly and severally liable with, and to the same extent as these entities for their violations of the anti-fraud provisions of the Securities Act set forth above.

IX.

REQUESTED RELIEF

The Division requests that the Commission grant the following relief:

1. Order Respondents to permanently cease and desist from violating the Securities Act pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032 and the IM Act pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-3292.

- 2. Order Respondents to take affirmative action to correct the conditions resulting from Respondents' acts, practices, or transactions, including a requirement to make restitution pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032 & 44-3292;
- 3. Order Respondents to pay the state of Arizona administrative penalties of up to five thousand dollars (\$5,000) for each violation of the Securities Act, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2036.
- 4. Order Respondents to pay the state of Arizona administrative penalties of up to one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each violation of the IM Act, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-3296.
- 5. Order that the marital communities of Respondents and Respondent Spouses be subject to any order of restitution, rescission, administrative penalties, or other appropriate affirmative action pursuant to A.R.S. § 25-215; and
 - 6. Order any other relief that the Commission deems appropriate.

X.

HEARING OPPORTUNITY

Each respondent (including Respondent Spouse) may request a hearing pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1972 and A.A.C. R14-4-306. If a Respondent or Respondent Spouse requests a hearing, the requesting respondent must also answer this Notice. A request for hearing must be in writing and received by the Commission within 10 business days after service of this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing. The requesting respondent must deliver or mail the request to Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington St., Phoenix, Arizona 85007. Filing instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602) 542-3477 or on the Commission's Internet web site at http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/hearings/docket.asp.

If a request for a hearing is timely made, the Commission shall schedule the hearing to begin 20 to 60 days from the receipt of the request unless otherwise provided by law, stipulated by the parties, or ordered by the Commission. If a request for a hearing is not timely made the

Commission may, without a hearing, enter an order granting the relief requested by the Division in this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing.

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation such as a sign language interpreter, as well as request this document in an alternative format, by contacting Shaylin A. Bernal, ADA Coordinator, voice phone number (602) 542-3931, e-mail sabernal@azcc.gov. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation. Additional information about the administrative action procedure may be found at http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/securities/enforcement/AdministrativeProcedure.asp

XI.

ANSWER REQUIREMENT

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-305, if a Respondent or Respondent Spouse requests a hearing, the requesting respondent must deliver or mail an Answer to this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing to Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, within 30 calendar days after the date of service of this Notice. Filing instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602) 542-3477 or on the Commission's Internet web site at http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/hearings/docket.asp.

Additionally, the answering respondent must serve the Answer upon the Division. Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-303, service upon the Division may be made by mailing or by hand-delivering a copy of the Answer to the Division at 1300 West Washington, 3rd Floor, Phoenix, Arizona, 85007, addressed to Ryan J. Millecam.

The Answer shall contain an admission or denial of each allegation in this Notice and the original signature of the answering respondent or respondent's attorney. A statement of a lack of sufficient knowledge or information shall be considered a denial of an allegation. An allegation not denied shall be considered admitted.

When the answering respondent intends in good faith to deny only a part or a qualification of an allegation, the respondent shall specify that part or qualification of the allegation and shall admit the remainder. Respondent waives any affirmative defense not raised in the Answer.

The officer presiding over the hearing may grant relief from the requirement to file an Answer for good cause shown.

Dated this 30th day of March, 2012.

Matthew J. Neubert