```
DEBRA A. VALENTINE
 1
    General Counsel
 2
    JOHN D. JACOBS
    (Calif. Bar No. 134154)
 3
    Federal Trade Commission
    10877 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 700
 4
   Los Angeles, California
    (310) 824-4360 voice
 5
    (310) 824-4380 fax
 6
    Attorneys for Plaintiff
 7
    Federal Trade Commission
 8
 9
                    IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10
                  FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11
                                        Case No.
12
    FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
13
                                        COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION AND
                   Plaintiff,
                                        OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF
14
                v.
15
   AUCTIONSAVER, LLC;
    RICHARD PHIM;
    CARMAN LEE CALDWELL;
16
    SHADE DELMER,
17
      aka SHANE DELMER; and
    NAOMI RUTH ANDERSON,
18
                   Defendants.
19
20
         Plaintiff, the Federal Trade Commission ("Commission"), by
21
22
    its undersigned attorneys, alleges:
23
         1.
              This is an action under Sections 13(b) and 19 of the
    Federal Trade Commission Act ("FTC Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 53(b) and
24
25
    57b, to secure preliminary and permanent injunctive relief,
   rescission of contracts, restitution, disgorgement, and other
26
```

equitable relief for Defendants' violation of Section 5(a) of the

FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), and Defendants' violations of the

27

FTC's Trade Regulation Rule entitled "Mail or Telephone Order Merchandise Rule" (the "Rule"), 16 C.F.R. Part 435, in connection with the sale of computers, computer hardware, computer peripherals, computer software, and consumer electronics over the Internet.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §§ 45(a), 53(b), 57b, and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1337(a) and 1345.
- 3. Venue in the United States District Court for the Central District of California is proper under 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c).

PLAINTIFF

4. Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission is an independent agency of the United States Government created by statute.

15 U.S.C. §§ 41-58. The Commission enforces Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), which prohibits unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce. The Commission also enforces the Mail or Telephone Order Merchandise Rule, 16 C.F.R. Part 435. The Commission may initiate federal district court proceedings by its own attorneys to enjoin violations of the FTC Act and the Rule and to secure such equitable relief as may be appropriate in each case, including restitution for injured consumers. 15 U.S.C. §§ 53(b) and 57b.

DEFENDANTS

5. Defendant Auctionsaver, LLC ("Auctionsaver")is a California limited liability company with its offices and principal place of business located at 9630 Black Mountain Road,

Suite K, San Diego, California. Auctionsaver transacts or has transacted business in the Southern District of California.

- 6. Defendant Richard Phim is an individual who has done business under, or has managed or controlled companies that have done business under, the names "Tarian Computers," "Tarian Enterprises," "Auction Saver," "Auctionsaver," "Tec Computers," and "Tecresale." Defendant Phim is a general partner of Defendant Auctionsaver. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, he has formulated, directed, controlled, or participated in the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. Defendant Phim resides in and transacts or has transacted business in the Southern District of California.
- 7. Defendant Carman Lee Caldwell is an individual who has done business under, or has managed or controlled companies that have done business under, the names "Tarian Computers," "Tarian Enterprises," "Auction Saver," "Auctionsaver," "Tec Computers," and "Tecresale." Defendant Caldwell is a general partner of Defendant Auctionsaver. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, he has formulated, directed, controlled, or participated in the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. Defendant Caldwell resides in and transacts or has transacted business in the Southern District of California.
- 8. Defendant Delmer is an individual who has done business under, or has managed or controlled companies that have done business under, the names "Tarian Computers," "Tarian Enterprises," "Auction Saver," "Auctionsaver," "Tec Computers," and "Tecresale." At all times material to this Complaint, acting

alone or in concert with others, he has formulated, directed, controlled, or participated in the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. Defendant Delmer resides in and transacts or has transacted business in the Southern District of California.

9. Defendant Anderson is an individual who has worked with and for the other Defendants. She has handled calls from consumers and made misrepresentations as alleged below. At all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, she has formulated, directed, controlled, or participated in the acts and practices set forth in this Complaint. Defendant Anderson resides in and transacts or has transacted business in the Southern District of California.

COMMERCE

10.

advertise the goods and services they seek to sell. Auctions are conducted on the auction house's web site with would-be buyers sending bids through electronic mail to the web site. At the conclusion of the auction, buyers and sellers typically communicate with each other via electronic mail about the terms of payment and delivery and then complete their commercial transactions through the U.S. mail system.

- 13. Defendants have placed advertisements offering computerrelated products on the websites of Internet auction houses.

 Examples of such products include hard disk drives, DVD drives,
 chips, video cards, monitors, software, digital cameras, digital
 camcorders, and digital stereo receivers. Defendants have placed
 these advertisements under various company names, including but
 not limited to Tarian Computers, Tarian Enterprises, Auction
 Saver, Auctionsaver, Tec Computers, and Tecresale.
- 14. Consumers have placed bids for Defendants' merchandise which Defendants have accepted. Defendants have further accepted payment from those consumers who have successfully bid for the goods Defendants offered for sale on the Internet at auction house web sites. In a number of instances, Defendants have failed to

VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 5 OF THE FTC ACT

COUNT I

- 15. In the course of offering computer-related products for sale via Internet auction houses, Defendants have represented, expressly or by implication, that the consumers who offered the highest bids and sent Defendants the agreed-on payment for the merchandise pursuant to those bids would receive the promised merchandise.
- 16. In truth and in fact, in a number of instances, the consumers who offered the highest bids and sent Defendants the agreed-on payment for the computer-related products pursuant to those bids did not receive the promised merchandise.
- 17. Therefore, Defendants' representations set forth in Paragraph 15 were and are false and misleading and constitute deceptive acts or practices in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a).

THE MAIL OR TELEPHONE ORDER MERCHANDISE RULE

- 18. The FTC promulgated the Mail or Telephone Order Merchandise Rule, 16 C.F.R. Part 435, on October 22, 1975, and revised the Rule on September 21, 1993. The revised Rule became effective on March 1, 1994, and has remained in full force and effect since that time.
- 19. The Rule applies to sales in which the buyer has ordered merchandise from the seller by mail or directly or indirectly by telephone, such as by fax machines and computers. 16 C.F.R. §§ 435.1 and 435.2(a) and (b).
- 20. The Rule prohibits a seller from soliciting any order for the sale of merchandise to be ordered by the buyer through the

mail or telephone, unless, at the time of the solicitation, the seller has a reasonable basis to expect that it will be able to ship any ordered merchandise to the buyer within the time stated on the solicitation, or, if no time is stated, within thirty days of the completion of the order. 16 C.F.R. § 435.1(a)(1).

21. The Rule requires that the seller follow certain procedures if merchandise ordered through the mail or by telephone will not be shipped within the applicable time limit.

DEFENDANTS' VIOLATIONS OF THE MAIL OR TELEPHONE ORDER MERCHANDISE RULE

COUNT II

24. In a number of instances, Defendants have solicited orders for the sale of merchandise to be ordered by the buyer indirectly through the telephone without a reasonable basis to expect that they would be able to ship any ordered merchandise to the buyer within the time stated in the solicitation, or, if no time was clearly and conspicuously stated, within thirty days of receipt of a properly completed order, thereby violating 16 C.F.R. § 435.1(a)(1).

COUNT III

25. In a number of instances, after soliciting orders for the sale of merchandise ordered by the buyer indirectly through the telephone and being unable to ship merchandise within the applicable time as set out in Section 435.1(a)(1) of the Rule, Defendants have violated the Rule by failing to offer to the buyer, clearly and conspicuously and without prior demand, an option either to consent to a delay in shipping or to cancel the order and receive a prompt refund, thereby violating 16 C.F.R. § 435.1(b)(1).

COUNT IV

26. In a number of instances, Defendants have failed to make a "prompt refund," as that term is defined in 16 C.F.R. § 435.2(f), to buyers when such refunds were required by Section 435.1(c) of the Rule, thereby violating 16 C.F.R. § 435.1(c).

CONSUMER INJURY

27. Consumers throughout the United States have suffered substantial monetary loss as a result of Defendants' unlawful acts or practices. In addition, Defendants have been unjustly enriched as a result of their unlawful practices. Absent injunctive relief by this Court, Defendants are likely to continue to injure consumers and harm the public interest.

THIS COURT'S POWER TO GRANT RELIEF

- 1. Section 13(b) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), empowers the Court to grant injunctive and other equitable ancillary relief, including consumer redress, disgorgement, and restitution, to prevent and remedy violations of any provision of law enforced by the Commission.
- 2. Section 19 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 57b, authorizes this Court to award such relief as is necessary to redress the injury to consumers or others resulting from Defendants' violations of the Mail or Telephone Order Merchandise Rule, including the rescission and reformation of contracts and the refund of monies.
- 3. The Court, in the exercise of its equitable jurisdiction, may award other ancillary relief to remedy injury caused by Defendants' violations.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff requests that this Court, as authorized by Sections 13(b) and 19 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 53(b) and 57b, and pursuant to its own equitable powers:

- 1. Permanently enjoin Defendants from violating the FTC Act and the Mail or Telephone Order Merchandise Rule, as alleged herein;
- 2. Award such relief as the Court finds necessary to redress injury to consumers resulting from Defendants' violations of the FTC Act and the Mail or Telephone Order Merchandise Rule,