

2/26/04  
1:30 pm

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF OKLAHOMA COUNTY  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma Department of Securities )  
ex rel. Irving L. Faught, )  
Administrator, )

Plaintiff, )

v. )

Case No. CJ-03-7899

Sunset Financial Group, Inc., an Oklahoma )  
corporation; Vision Services, Inc., an Oklahoma )  
corporation; Amsterdam Fidelity Business Trust, )  
a Nevada limited liability partnership; EASE )  
Corporation, an Oklahoma corporation; Gold Star )  
Properties, Inc., an unincorporated association; )  
Rebates International, Inc., a Nevada corporation; )  
Betty Solomon Brokerage, Inc., an Oklahoma )  
corporation; Emzie Huletty, an individual; )  
Grover H. Phillips, an individual; Nicholas Krug, )  
an individual; Charles E. Elliott, an individual; )  
Terry Mahon, an individual; Denver Large, )  
an individual; Betty G. Solomon, an individual; and )  
Donald J. Wood, an individual, )

Defendants. )

FILED IN THE DISTRICT COURT  
OKLAHOMA COUNTY, OKLA.  
FEB 12 2004  
PATRICIA PRESLEY, COURT CLERK  
by \_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy

MOTION TO SETTLE JOURNAL ENTRY

Plaintiff, Oklahoma Department of Securities ("Department"), respectfully requests this Court settle an apparent controversy surrounding the entry of an order memorializing this Court's ruling on the 10th day of November, 2003, on the Department's application for a temporary injunction. In support of this motion, the Department alleges and states:

1. On November 10, 2003, a hearing was held before this Court on the Department's application for a temporary injunction attached hereto as Exhibit A.

2. On November 10, 2003, an agreed order was entered in the Court's record through a recorded transcript.

3. The Department prepared a proposed Temporary Injunction Against Emzie Huletty memorializing the Court's ruling. The proposed order is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

4. On November 17, 2003, the proposed order and cover letter were mailed to Justin Lowe, counsel of record for Defendant Emzie Huletty. A copy of the letter is attached as Exhibit C.

5. Since November 17, 2003, the Department has made numerous attempts to determine whether counsel for Defendant Emzie Huletty has any objections to the Department's proposed order and has been told by Mr. Lowe, that the transcript of the hearing had been ordered, that the transcript of the hearing was being reviewed, that an order was being prepared that was consistent with the transcript, that Defendant Emzie Huletty was coming in on several occasions to sign the order, and that the transcript and order were being faxed to the Department. To date, the Department has received no comments or proposal from counsel for Defendant Emzie Huletty.


Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, the Department respectfully requests this Court order the relief requested by the Department in its application for temporary injunction against Defendant Emzie Huletty. Further, the Department respectfully requests that this Court order that Defendant Emzie Huletty transfer or deliver possession, custody, and control of the following to the Receiver for purposes of implementing the relief requested herein and as previously ordered in the temporary restraining order:

1. all assets of the Receivership Defendants;
2. all documents of the Receivership Defendants including, but not limited to books, records, tapes, discs, accounting data, checks, correspondence, forms, advertisements, brochures,

manuals, electronically stored data, bank records, customer lists, customer files, telephone records, ledgers, payroll records, including information stored in computer maintained form;

3. all assets belonging to members of the public now held by Defendants; and
4. all keys and codes necessary to gain or to secure access to any assets or documents of the Receivership Defendants including, but not limited to access to their business premises, means of communication, accounts, computer systems, or other property, wherever located.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Patricia A. Labarthe, OBA # 10391  
Oklahoma Department of Securities  
First National Center, Suite 860  
120 North Robinson  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102  
(405) 280-7700

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 12~~1~~ day of February, 2004, a copy of the Motion to Settle Journal Entry has been mailed by first class mail with postage pre-paid to the following:

Justin Lowe  
Michael Arnett  
Arnett Law Firm  
3133 NW 63rd Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73116  
(405) 767-0522

P. David Newsome, Jr.  
Conner & Winters, P.C.  
3700 First Place Tower  
15 East Fifth Street  
Tulsa, OK 74103

Terry D. Kordeliski, II  
Riggs, Abney, Neal, Turpen, Orbison & Lewis  
5801 Broadway Extension  
The Paragon Building, Suite 101  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73118

Mark S. Edmondson  
Miller Dollarhide  
100 Park Avenue, Second Floor  
Oklahoma City, OK 73102

Win Holbrook  
Holbrook & Toffoli  
120 North Robinson, Suite 2200  
Oklahoma City, OK 73102  
(405) 232-3664  
Receiver

  
Patricia A. Labarthe

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF OKLAHOMA COUNTY  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

FILED IN THE DISTRICT COURT  
OKLAHOMA COUNTY, OKLA.

Oklahoma Department of Securities  
ex rel. Irving L. Faught,  
Administrator,

Plaintiff,

v.

Sunset Financial Group, Inc., an Oklahoma  
corporation; Vision Services, Inc., an Oklahoma  
corporation; Amsterdam Fidelity Business Trust,  
a Nevada limited liability partnership; EASE  
Corporation, an Oklahoma corporation; Gold Star  
Properties, Inc., an unincorporated association;  
Rebates International, Inc., a Nevada corporation;  
Betty Solomon Brokerage, Inc., an Oklahoma  
corporation; Emzie Huletty, an individual;  
Grover H. Phillips, an individual; Nicholas Krug,  
an individual; Charles E. Elliott, an individual;  
Terry Mahon, an individual; Denver Large,  
an individual; Betty G. Solomon, an individual; and  
Donald J. Wood, an individual,

Defendants.

SEP 19 2003

PATRICIA PRESLEY, COURT CLERK

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy

Case No.

CJ-2003-7899 1

Hearing has been continued to  
November 17, 2003, at 10:30 a.m.

**PLAINTIFF'S APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING  
ORDER, ASSET FREEZE, ACCOUNTING, AND  
TEMPORARY INJUNCTION AND BRIEF IN SUPPORT**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The Oklahoma Department of Securities ex rel. Irving L. Faught, Administrator ("Department"), respectfully submits this application for a temporary restraining order against Defendants Sunset Financial Group, Inc., Vision Services, Inc., Amsterdam Fidelity Business Trust, EASE Corporation, Gold Star Properties, Inc., Rebates International, Inc., Betty Solomon Brokerage, Inc., Emzie Huletty, Grover H. Phillips, Nicholas Krug, Charles E. Elliott, Terry

Mahon, Denver Large, Betty G. Solomon and Donald J. Wood (collectively, "Defendants"), an order freezing assets of Defendants, an order for an accounting of Defendants, and an order appointing a receiver for Defendants Sunset Financial Group, Inc., Vision Services, Inc., Amsterdam Fidelity Business Trust, EASE Corporation and Betty Solomon Brokerage, Inc. (collectively, "Receivership Defendants"), pursuant to Section 406.1 of the Oklahoma Securities Act ("Act"), Okla. Stat. tit. 71, §§ 1-413, 501, 701-703 (2001 & Supp. 2002).

The Department petitions this Court to halt further violations of the Act, to protect the rights of the Department in its obligation to safeguard the public interest, to prevent any dissipation or loss of investor funds and property and to remedy actions that Defendants have already committed.

The Department moves this Court for a temporary restraining order, order freezing assets, order appointing receiver, and an order for an accounting to issue *instanter* against Defendants until the Court may afford the parties a hearing, and additionally moves for the entry of a temporary injunction at such hearing against Defendants. The entry of such orders are necessary for the reasons set forth below, to preserve the *status quo* and to protect the Department's rights in enforcing the Act.

## II. THE DEFENDANTS

Sunset Financial Group, Inc. ("Sunset") is an Oklahoma corporation with its principal place of business in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. At all times material hereto, Sunset issued, offered and/or sold securities in and/or from Oklahoma.

Vision Services, Inc. ("Vision Services") is an Oklahoma corporation with its principal place of business in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. Vision Services was suspended by the Oklahoma Secretary of State on June 21, 2001, but was reinstated on March 13, 2002. At all

times material hereto, Vision Services issued, offered and/or sold securities in and/or from Oklahoma.

Amsterdam Fidelity Business Trust ("Amsterdam") is a Nevada limited liability partnership with its principal place of business in Stillwater, Oklahoma. At all times material hereto, Amsterdam issued, offered and/or sold securities in and/or from Oklahoma.

Gold Star Properties, Inc. ("Gold Star") is an unincorporated association with its principal place of business in Henderson, Arkansas. At all times material hereto, Gold Star offered and sold securities in and/or from Oklahoma.

EASE Corporation ("EASE") is an Oklahoma corporation with its principal place of business in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. At all times material hereto, EASE offered and sold securities in and/or from Oklahoma.

Rebates International, Inc. ("Rebates") is a Nevada corporation with its principal place of business in Hollister, Missouri. At all times material hereto, Rebates offered and sold securities in and/or from Oklahoma.

Betty Solomon Brokerage, Inc. ("Solomon Brokerage") is an Oklahoma corporation with its principal place of business in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. At all times material hereto, Solomon Brokerage issued, offered and/or sold securities in and/or from Oklahoma.

Emzie Huletty ("Huletty") is an individual who, at all times material hereto, was a resident of Oklahoma doing the acts complained of in his own name and/or in the name of Sunset, Vision Services and EASE. At all times material hereto, Sunset, Vision Services and EASE acted through and under the control of Huletty.

Grover H. Phillips ("Phillips") is an individual who, at all times material hereto, was a resident of Oklahoma doing the acts complained of in his own name and/or in the name of

Amsterdam. At all times material hereto, Amsterdam acted through and under the control of Phillips.

Nicholas Krug ("Krug") is an individual who, at all times material hereto, was a resident of Arkansas doing the acts complained of in his own name and/or in the name of Gold Star. At all times material hereto, Gold Star acted through and under the control of Krug.

Charles E. Elliott ("Elliott") is an individual who, at all times material hereto, was a resident of Arkansas doing the acts complained of in his own name and/or in the name of Gold Star. At all times material hereto, Gold Star acted through and under the control of Elliott.

Terry H. Mahon ("Mahon") is an individual who, at all times material hereto, was a resident of Missouri doing the acts complained of in his own name and/or in the name of Rebates. At all times material hereto, Rebates acted through and under the control of Mahon.

Denver Large ("Large") is an individual who, at all times material hereto, was a resident of Missouri doing the acts complained of in his own name and/or in the name of Rebates. At all times material hereto, Rebates acted through and under the control of Large.

Betty G. Solomon ("Solomon") is an individual who, at all times material hereto, was a resident of Oklahoma doing the acts complained of in her own name and/or in the name of Solomon Brokerage. At all times material hereto, Solomon Brokerage acted through and under the control of Solomon.

Donald J. Wood ("Wood") is an individual who, at all times material hereto, was a resident of Oklahoma doing the acts complained of in his own name and/or in the name of EASE. At all times material hereto, EASE acted through and under the control of Wood.

### III. NATURE OF THE CASE

Beginning in or around January, 2001, Defendants offered and sold interests in a fraudulent scheme characterized as an international or domestic high-yield investment program ("Investment Program") in and/or from the state of Oklahoma to investors ("Investors"). Defendants worked in association with one another, and each Defendant played a separate role for which they each received a separate fee.

Defendants offered the interests in the Investment Program in connection with their residential and commercial loan services. Investors were required to pay at least seventeen percent (17%) of the appraised or market value of the real estate or business to be financed. Defendants represented that the fees would be held in trust by Defendant Amsterdam and invested in the Investment Program. It was further represented that Defendants would return to the Investors one hundred percent (100%) of the principal value of the loan at the end of five (5) years. The promise of the future payment was evidenced by a "Cash-Back" Rebate Coupon Certificate issued by Defendant Rebates.

Defendants represented to Investors that their money would be invested in or through "G7 Qualified Investment Banks" and the "top 100 banks in the world." Defendants promised high, unrealistic returns.

Defendants represented that the investment was guaranteed by Defendants Rebates and Amsterdam, that there was no risk of loss and that certain Defendants were bonded and/or insured.

Defendants' representations were made through the use of oral communications and written sales materials.

Investors had no control over or responsibility for their funds once the funds were provided to the Defendants.

From at least January, 2001, Defendants received substantial sums of money from the Investors including residents of Oklahoma County, Oklahoma, for the purported purchase of the interests in the Investment Program.

#### **IV. VIOLATIONS OF THE OKLAHOMA SECURITIES ACT**

##### **A. Violation of Section 301 of the Act: Failure to Register Securities**

The Investment Program interests are securities as defined by Section 2 of the Act.

The securities offered and sold by Defendants are not and have not been registered under the Act as required by Section 301 of the Act. See Affidavit attached as Exhibit C. The securities have not been offered or sold pursuant to an exemption from registration pursuant to Section 401 of the Act. See Affidavit attached as Exhibit C.

By reason of the foregoing, Defendants violated, are violating, and unless enjoined, will continue to violate, Section 301 of the Act.

##### **B. Violation of Section 201 of the Act: Failure to Register as Broker-Dealer and Agents and Employing Unregistered Agents**

Defendants are not registered under the Act as broker-dealers, broker-dealer agents, or issuer agents under Section 201 of the Act. See Affidavits attached as Exhibits D and E.

Defendants Sunset, Vision Services, Amsterdam and Solomon Brokerage are issuers as defined in Section 2 of the Act. Defendants Sunset, Vision Services, Amsterdam and Solomon Brokerage employed agents who were not registered under the Act to offer or sell securities.

Defendants Huletty, Phillips, Krug, Elliott, Mahon, Large, Solomon and Wood, by virtue of their efforts and activities in this state in effecting transactions in securities for the account of others or for their own account are issuer agents, as defined in Section 2 of the Act. Defendants Huletty, Phillips, Krug, Elliott, Mahon, Large, Solomon and Wood transacted business in this state as issuer agents without benefit of registration under the Act.

By reason of the foregoing, the Defendants violated, are violating, and unless enjoined, will continue to violate, Section 201 of the Act.

**C Violation of Section 101 of the Act:  
Untrue Statements of Material Fact and Omissions of Material Fact  
in Connection with Investment Program Interests**

From at least January, 2001, and continuing to the present, Defendants, in connection with the offer, sale or purchase of interests in the Investment Program, directly and indirectly, made untrue statements of material fact and omitted to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading. The untrue statements include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. that there was no risk of losing the investment;
- b. that the Investment Program is not a security;
- c. that the rebate coupon is a "gift" when the purchase of an interest in the Investment Program is required to receive the coupon;
- d. that Investor funds would be forwarded to the "G7 Qualified Investment Banks"; and
- e. that one or more mortgage companies had endorsed the use of the Investment Program for use by their customers.

The omissions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. that on April 9, 2001, Oklahoma Department of Consumer Credit revoked the mortgage broker license of Truth Financial Services, Inc., a company for which Defendant Huletty was an officer and the representative, for violations of Oklahoma law including fraudulent loan documentation;
- b. that on October 20, 2000, Truth Financial Services, Inc. and its founder and chief executive officer, Defendant Huletty, were ordered by the Arkansas Securities Commissioner, State of Arkansas Securities Department, to cease and desist from further actions in the state of Arkansas in connection with the business of mortgage loans and loan brokering until such time as they were properly registered or exempted from registration;
- c. that on March 9, 2001, Defendant Large was convicted, in the Circuit Court of Pearl River County, State of Mississippi, of seventy-eight (78) counts of sales of unregistered securities, securities fraud by misrepresentation, and violation of the Mississippi RICO Act; was ordered to pay restitution to his victims in the sum of \$562,000.00; and was sentenced to a suspended term of seventy-eight (78) years in prison, subject to certain terms and conditions;
- d. that as a condition of his suspension, Defendant Large was prohibited from engaging in the sale of securities, real property, time shares or other interests in real property;
- e. that the Investment Program interests are securities;
- f. that the Investment Program interests were not registered as securities under the Act nor were they exempt from registration;

- g. specific information about Defendants' uses of Investor funds;
- h. an explanation of how Investor returns are earned and calculated; and
- i. that Investors might not get the profit promised by Defendants.

By reason of the foregoing, Defendants, directly and indirectly, violated, are violating, and unless enjoined, will continue to violate Section 101(2) of the Act.

**D. Violation of Section 101 of the Act:  
Engaging in any Act, Practice, or Course of Business that Operates  
or Would Operate as a Fraud or Deceit upon any Person**

Defendants, in connection with the offer, sale or purchase of securities, and through the use of the untrue statements of material fact and the omissions of material facts described above, engaged in an act, practice, or course of business that operated as a fraud or deceit upon Investors.

By reason of the foregoing, Defendants, directly and indirectly, violated, are violating, and unless enjoined, will continue to violate Section 101(3) of the Act.

**E. Violation of Section 402 of the Act:  
Unlawfully Distributing Sales Literature**

Defendants, in connection with the offer and/or sale of securities, distributed sales literature to Investors without filing such sales literature with the Department.

By reason of the foregoing, Defendants, directly and indirectly, violated, are violating, and unless enjoined, will continue to violate Section 402 of the Act.

## V. NEED FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER, ASSET FREEZE, APPOINTMENT OF A RECEIVER AND TEMPORARY INJUNCTION

### A. Temporary Restraining Order

Section 406.1 of the Act provides in part:

- (a) Upon a showing by the Administrator that a person has violated or is about to violate the Oklahoma Securities Act, except under the provisions of Section 202.1 or 305.2 of this title, or a rule or order of the Administrator under the Oklahoma Securities Act or that a person has engaged or is about to engage in dishonest or unethical practices in the securities business, the Administrator, prior to, concurrently with, or subsequent to an administrative proceeding, may bring an action in the district court of Oklahoma County or the district court of any other county where service can be obtained on one or more of the defendants and **the district court may grant or impose one or more of the following appropriate legal or equitable remedies:**
  - (1) Upon a showing of a violation of the Oklahoma Securities Act or a rule or order of the Administrator under the Oklahoma Securities Act or conduct involving dishonest or unethical practices in the securities business:
    - (i) a temporary restraining order, permanent or temporary prohibitory or mandatory injunction, or a writ of prohibition or mandamus;
    - (ii) a civil penalty up to a maximum of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000.00) for a single violation or of Fifty Thousand (\$50,000.00) for multiple violations in a single proceeding or a series of related proceedings;
    - (iii) a declaratory judgment;
    - (iv) restitution to investors;
    - (v) the appointment of a receiver or conservator for the defendant or the defendant's assets, and
    - (vi) other relief the court deems just (emphasis added).

A temporary restraining order (TRO) has the object of preserving the *status quo*, in order to prevent irreparable injury until such time as the Court may determine Plaintiff's application for temporary injunction. *Granny Goose Foods, Inc. v. Brotherhood of Teamsters*, 415 U.S. 423, 439, 94 S.Ct. 1113, 1124 (1974); *Morse v. Earnest, Inc.*, 547 P.2d 955 (Okla. 1976). Issuing a

TRO is in the public interest because the failure to grant this relief allows dishonest businesses and individuals to take advantage of vulnerable Investors. The protection of the public interest is paramount in this matter, as is the Department's right to safeguard the public interest.

Defendants have engaged in acts and practices in violation of the Act and have, as a result of these activities, received a substantial amount of money from numerous Investors. A danger exists that the money received from the Investors and/or held by Defendants will be lost, removed or transferred. A temporary restraining order to issue instanter against Defendants is necessary to preserve these funds, securities, and the records relating thereto, and to prevent further violations of the Act.

In addition, no injury will befall Defendants by granting such relief since Defendants have no right to act in the state of Oklahoma in violation of the Act, or to engage in fraudulent conduct in connection with securities activities. The interference with Defendants' rights by granting the temporary restraining order will be minimal, if any, while protecting the public from immediate and irreparable injury or loss.

### **B. Asset Freeze and Accounting**

Section 406.1 of the Act specifically grants this Court the power to fashion appropriate equitable relief to provide effective enforcement of the Act. Once the equity powers of the court are invoked, the court possesses the power to fashion appropriate interim remedies. *SEC v. Manor Nursing Centers*, 458 F. 2d 1082, 1103 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1972). Within this power is the authority to grant effective equitable relief by temporarily freezing specific assets. *SEC v. General Refractories Co.*, 400 F.Supp. 1248, 1259 (D.D.C. 1975); *SEC v. International Swiss Investments Corp.*, 895 F.2d 1272, 1276 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990); *SEC v. Manor Nursing Centers*, 458 F.2d at 1105-06 (upholding district court's order freezing assets in part because "...at the time

the court's order was entered, a great deal of uncertainty existed with respect to the total amount of proceeds received and their location.") Within the equity power of the court is the authority to order an accounting. *SEC v. R.J. Allen & Associates*, 386 F. Supp. 866, 880. (S.D.N.Y. 1974); *SEC v. Manor Nursing Centers*, *supra* at 1103, 1104.

Defendants made use of untrue statements of material fact and omitted to state material facts as alleged in Plaintiff's verified petition, in violation of Section 101 of the Act. The whereabouts of the money raised from violations of the Act is not known at this time. These circumstances make it necessary that the court freeze specific assets to preserve the status quo by preventing the dissipation of assets and to account for the money raised from violations of the Act so as to protect Investors and to provide effective relief.

### **C. Appointment of a Receiver**

The violations of the Act, as described above, give the Department the right to seek one or more of the remedies available by statute and in equity. *Oklahoma Securities Commission v. CFR International, Inc.*, *supra*. One such remedy is that of the appointment of a receiver. In *SEC v. American Bd. Of Trade, Inc.*, 830 F.2d 431 (2d Cir. 1987), the court, quoting *SEC v. Manor Nursing Centers, Inc.* 458 F.2d 1082, 1105 (2d. Cir, 1972), stated that the primary purpose of the appointment of a receiver is to help "preserve the status quo while the various transactions were unraveled" so that an accurate picture of what happened could be formulated. *Id.* at 436.

In circumstances of egregious fraud where the interests of public investors are in substantial jeopardy, it has been recognized that the appointment of a receiver is necessary to prevent "diversion or waste of assets to the detriment of those for whose benefit, in some measure, the injunction action is brought." *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Capital*

*Counsellors, Inc.*, 332 F.Supp. 291, 304, (S.D.N.Y., 1971). The form and quantum of evidence required is a matter of judicial discretion. *U.S. v. O'Connor*, 291 F.2d 520 (2d Cir. 1961); *Haase v. Chapman*, 308 F.Supp. 399 (W.D.Mo.1969). Here, the evidence is admissible and compelling that Defendants have engaged in a fraudulent course of business to induce the public to purchase unregistered securities. It is critical that a receiver be appointed to prevent dissipation of Investor assets and to prevent continued violations of the law. There is no definitive list of facts by which the Court must abide; however, the Sixth Circuit in *Tennessee Pub. Co. V. Carpenter*, 100 F.2d 728, 732 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1938), identified factors which can be considered, each of which is applicable here and justify the appointment of a receiver for the Receivership Defendants:

“Factors typically influencing the district court’s exercise of discretion include the existence of a valid claim by the moving party; the probability that fraudulent conduct has occurred or will occur to frustrate the claim; imminent danger that property will be lost, concealed, or diminished in value; inadequacy of legal remedies, lack of a less drastic equitable remedy; and the likelihood that appointment of a receiver will do more harm than good.”

#### **D. Temporary Injunction**

Once the plaintiff has shown the Defendants’ past conduct is in violation of the Act, the proper test for the issuance of a statutory injunction is where there is a reasonable expectation of future violations by Defendants. *SEC v. Manor Nursing Centers, Inc.*, 458 F.2d 1082 (2d Cir. 1975); *SEC v. Culpepper*, 270 F.2d 241, 249 (2d Cir. 1959). In considering this issue, past illegal conduct is strong support for the likelihood of future violations. *Oklahoma Securities Commission v. CFR International, Inc.*, 622 P.2d 293, 295 (Okla. Ct. App. 1980). Here, the Defendants have violated the Act which created a presumption of likelihood of future violations. Because the Plaintiff has conclusively demonstrated the existence of past violations, injunctive relief is appropriate and the burden of showing there is no reasonable expectation of future

violations will shift to the Defendants and their burden "is a heavy one." *SEC v. Culpepper*, 270 F.2d 241, 249 (2d Cir. 1959); *Oklahoma Securities Commission v. CFR International, Inc.*, 622 P.2d 293, 295 (Okla. Ct. App. 1980).

Unlike private actions for injunctions, the Department's action is based on statute and no showing of irreparable injury or the inadequacy of other remedies is required. *Oklahoma Securities Commission v. CFR International, Inc.*, 622 P.2d 293, 295 (Okla. Ct. App. 1980) (citing *Bradford v. SEC* 278 F.2d 566 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1960)). Although not required, the Department has also shown that the public will suffer irreparable injury if Defendants are not enjoined from further violations of the Act.

#### **E. An Ex Parte Order Should be Issued**

While Courts have been cautious with the use of ex parte orders, they are approved in appropriate cases. *Covington, Knox, Inc. v. Texas*, 577 S.W. 2d 323 (Tex. App. Houston [14<sup>th</sup> Dist.] 1979, no writ). The Department alleges facts that demonstrate a strong likelihood of ongoing violations of the Act by Defendants.

In addition, there is a great risk that Defendants will take measures to dissipate assets if provided notice of this action before a temporary restraining order is issued and a receiver is appointed. Providing notice of this action to Defendants would lead to loss of Investor funds, and consequently cause irreparable injury to the Department's ability to safeguard the public interest by providing monetary redress and by preventing irreparable loss and injury to potential Investors. The issuance of a temporary restraining order instant, an asset freeze, an order for an accounting and the appointment of a receiver *pendente lite* will help maximize the relief to Investors.

## VI. Conclusion

The Department, pursuant to Section 405 of the Act, conducted an investigation into Defendants' activities in and/or from the state of Oklahoma. The investigation produced evidence that clearly indicates Defendants issued, offered and/or sold unregistered securities, acted as unregistered agents and/or employed unregistered agents. The investigation also revealed that Defendants, in connection with the offer, sale and/or purchase of securities: (1) made untrue statements of material fact; (2) omitted to state certain material facts; and (3) engaged in a course of business which has operated as a fraud or deceit upon Investors. Defendants have engaged in substantial violations of the Act, including fraudulent practices. The Department submits that the evidence firmly establishes a prima facie case for the issuance of a temporary restraining order, an asset freeze, the appointment of a receiver, an accounting, and a temporary injunction.

In light of the facts presented and the authorities cited, the Department respectfully requests that this Court issue a temporary restraining order, an order freezing the assets of Defendants, an order appointing a receiver for the Receivership Defendants, and an order for an accounting, until such time as the Court may afford the parties a hearing on the Plaintiff's motion for temporary injunction, all to halt Defendants' unlawful practices and to provide effective relief to Investors and to the Department.

Respectfully submitted,



Patricia A. Labarthe OBA #10391  
Oklahoma Department of Securities  
120 North Robinson, Suite 860  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102  
Telephone (405) 280-7700  
Fax (405) 280-7742

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF OKLAHOMA COUNTY  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma Department of Securities )  
ex rel. Irving L. Faught, )  
Administrator, )  
 )  
Plaintiff, )

v. )

Case No. CJ-03-7899

Sunset Financial Group, Inc., an Oklahoma )  
corporation; Vision Services, Inc., an Oklahoma )  
corporation; Amsterdam Fidelity Business Trust, )  
a Nevada limited liability partnership; EASE )  
Corporation, an Oklahoma corporation; Gold Star )  
Properties, Inc., an unincorporated association; )  
Rebates International, Inc., a Nevada corporation; )  
Betty Solomon Brokerage, Inc., an Oklahoma )  
corporation; Emzie Huletty, an individual; )  
Grover H. Phillips, an individual; Nicholas Krug, )  
an individual; Charles E. Elliott, an individual; )  
Terry Mahon, an individual; Denver Large, )  
an individual; Betty G. Solomon, an individual; and )  
Donald J. Wood, an individual, )  
 )  
Defendants. )

**TEMPORARY INJUNCTION AGAINST EMZIE HULETTY**

This matter came on for hearing this 10th day of November, 2003, before the undersigned Judge of the District Court in and for Oklahoma County, State of Oklahoma, upon application of Plaintiff for temporary injunction and to allow any defendant to seek dissolution of the Temporary Restraining Order, Order Appointing Receiver, Order Freezing Assets and Order for Accounting ("Order") entered in this matter on September 19, 2003.

The Oklahoma Department of Securities appears through its attorneys Patricia A. Labarthe and Melanie Hall. Defendant Emzie Huletty ("Huletty") appears in person and through his attorneys Justin Lowe and Michael Arnett.

By agreeing to the entry of this order, Defendant Huletty waives no defenses in this case or the allegations made herein and makes no admissions with respect to the allegations in Plaintiff's Petition for Permanent Injunction and Other Equitable Relief ("Petition") and its Application for Temporary Order, Asset Freeze, Accounting, and Temporary Injunction and Brief in Support filed herein.

The Court, having reviewed all pleadings and submissions of the parties, finds that the Temporary Injunction should be and is hereby issued by agreement of the parties and, therefore:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Defendant Huletty, his agents, employees, attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with him, be and hereby are, until further notice of this Court, temporarily enjoined from:

1. offering or selling any security as defined in Section 2 of the Oklahoma Securities Act ("Act"), Okla. Stat. Ann. tit. 71, §§1-413, 501, 701-703 (West 2003), in and/or from this state;
2. transacting business in this state as a broker-dealer, agent, investment adviser or investment adviser representative;
3. directly or indirectly, making any untrue statements of material fact or omitting to state material facts necessary in order to make statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they are made, not misleading, in connection with the offer, sale, and/or purchase of securities in and/or from this state;
4. directly or indirectly, engaging in any act, practice, or course of business which operates or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon any person in and/or from this state in connection with the offer, sale and/or purchase of securities; and
5. unlawfully distributing sales literature in and/or from this state in connection with the offer, sale and/or purchase of securities.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Defendant Huletty immediately cease the offer and/or sale of any interest in an international or domestic high-yield investment program, rebate program, coupon program or any other similar program described in the Plaintiff's Petition ("Program"), that Defendant Huletty immediately cease the use of the internet to offer and/or sell an interest in any Program in and/or from this state, and that Defendant Huletty immediately cease the use of Oklahoma addresses and phone numbers in any written materials or oral communications or on any website.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Defendant Huletty immediately cease use of the business name EASE Corporation in any manner in and/or from this state.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the funds of Defendant Huletty derived to any extent from the Program continue to be frozen and subject to the Receiver's custody and control.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Win Holbrook ("Receiver") shall continue as Receiver for all funds of Sunset Financial Group, Inc., Vision Services, Inc. and EASE Corporation ("Receivership Defendants") derived to any extent from the activities alleged in Plaintiff's petition ("Assets"), directly or indirectly owned, beneficially or otherwise, including funds on deposit with any and all financial institutions. The Receiver is given directions and authority to continue to accomplish the following with regard to Receivership Defendants:

1. to take custody, control and possession of all funds and documents of, or in the possession or custody, or under the control of, the Receivership Defendants, including those funds of Receivership Defendants in the possession or custody, or under the control of, Defendant Huletty, wherever situated. The Receiver shall have full power to divert mail and to

sue for, collect, receive, take possession, hold, and manage all funds and documents of the Receivership Defendants;

2. to conserve, hold and manage all funds and the business of Receivership Defendants pending further action by this Court in order to prevent any irreparable loss, damage or injury to investors; to conserve and prevent the withdrawal or misapplication of funds entrusted to Receivership Defendants, their agents, employees, officers, directors, principals, distributors, sales representatives and/or attorneys; and to prevent violations of the Act by Receivership Defendants;

3. to make such payments and disbursements as may be necessary and advisable for the preservation of the Assets of Receivership Defendants and as may be necessary and advisable in discharging his duties as Receiver;

4. to retain and employ attorneys, accountants, computer consultants and other persons as the Receiver deems advisable or necessary in the management, conduct, control or custody of the affairs of Receivership Defendants and of the funds thereof and otherwise generally to assist in the evaluation of such Assets. Receiver may immediately retain or employ such persons, and compensate such persons, all subject to filing as soon as practicable with this Court an application seeking approval of the employment;

5. to institute, prosecute and defend, compromise, adjust, intervene in or become party to such actions or proceedings in any state court, federal court or United States bankruptcy court as may in Receiver's opinion be necessary or proper for the protection, maintenance and preservation of the Assets of Receivership Defendants, or the carrying out of the terms of this Order, and likewise to defend, compromise, adjust or otherwise dispose of any or all actions or proceedings now pending in any court by or against Receivership Defendants where such prosecution, defense or other disposition of such actions or proceedings will, in the judgment of

the Receiver, be advisable or proper for the protection of the Assets of Receivership Defendants;  
and

6. to take all steps necessary to secure the Assets of Receivership Defendants and to exercise those powers necessary to implement his conclusions with regard to disposition of this receivership pursuant to the orders and directives of this Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Defendant Huletty will direct all telephone communications and correspondence directed or addressed to Sunset Financial Group, Inc., Vision Services, Inc., EASE Corporation, Betty Solomon Brokerage, Inc., and Amsterdam Fidelity Business Trust that relates to the Program to the Receiver.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Defendant Huletty, his agents, employees, attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with him, be and hereby are temporarily enjoined from, directly or indirectly, tampering with, altering, concealing, removing, destroying or otherwise disposing of in any manner, any and all books, records, documents, files, correspondence, computer disks or computer generated data of any type, however created or stored, pertaining to Defendants, or any financial or securities transaction by Defendants.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Defendant Huletty shall transfer or deliver all financial records, bank statements and tax returns of the Receivership Defendants to the Receiver.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that custody and control of the premises at 6412 North Santa Fe, Suite B-2, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, be given to Defendant Huletty, and that Defendant Huletty shall, upon request, allow representatives of the Oklahoma Department of Securities and the Receiver access to any and all documents relating to the sales of interests in any international or domestic high-yield investment program and the

business of Defendants, their subsidiaries, officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, assigns, attorneys, and all persons acting on their behalf, under their direction and control, and/or in active concert or participation with them, including, but not limited to, books, records, tapes, discs, accounting data, checks, correspondence, forms, advertisements, brochures, manuals, electronically stored data, bank records, customer lists, customer files, telephone records, ledgers, payroll records, financial records and tax returns.

THIS ORDER IS ENTERED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of November, 2003.

---

OKLAHOMA COUNTY DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

Approved as to form and substance:

---

Patricia A. Labarthe, OBA #10391  
Melanie Hall, OBA #1209  
Oklahoma Department of Securities  
120 North Robinson, Suite 860  
Oklahoma City, OK 73102  
(405) 280-7700  
Attorney for Plaintiff

---

Justin Lowe  
Michael Arnett  
Arnett Law Firm  
3133 NW 63rd Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73116  
(405) 767-0522  
Attorneys for Defendant Emzie Huletty

---

Win Holbrook  
Holbrook & Toffoli  
120 North Robinson, Suite 2200  
Oklahoma City, OK 73102  
(405) 232-3664  
Receiver

---

Emzie Huletty

IRVING L. FAUGHT  
ADMINISTRATOR



BRAD HENRY  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF OKLAHOMA  
DEPARTMENT OF SECURITIES  
November 17, 2003

Justin Lowe  
Arnett Law Firm  
3133 NW 63rd Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73116

RE: Oklahoma Department of Securities ex rel. Irving L. Faught v.  
Sunset Financial Group, Inc., et al.  
CJ-03-7899

Dear Justin:

Enclosed is the draft of the order of temporary injunction entered on November 10, 2003. After you have reviewed the order, please return the executed copy to me for filing. If you have any comments, please call me.

Thank you for your help in resolving this matter.

Sincerely,

*Patricia A. Labarthe*

Patricia A. Labarthe  
Enforcement Attorney

EXHIBIT "C"