

**BOUTIN GIBSON DI GIUSTO HODELL INC.**

Chris Gibson, SBN 073353  
Maralee MacDonald, SBN 208699  
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 1500  
Sacramento, California 95814-4603  
Tel. (916) 321-4444

**QUILLING, SELANDER, CUMMISKEY & LOWNDS, P.C.**

Michael J. Quilling (Tex. Bar No. 16432300) – Admitted Pro Hac Vice  
Brent J. Rodine (Tex. Bar No. 24048770) – Admitted Pro Hac Vice  
2001 Bryan Street, Suite 1800  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone: (214) 871-2100  
Facsimile: (214) 871-2111

Attorneys for Michael J. Quilling  
Receiver of Defendants Secure Investment Services, Inc.,  
American Financial Services, Inc., and Lyndon Group, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SACRAMENTO DIVISION

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

SECURE INVESTMENT SERVICES, INC.,  
AMERICAN FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC.,  
LYNDON GROUP, INC., DONALD F.  
NEUHAUS, and KIMBERLY A. SNOWDEN,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-cv-01724 GEB CMK

NOTICE OF RECEIVER’S MOTION  
TO COMPEL PAYMENT OF  
PREMIUM SHARE FROM JIM WEIST  
[DAM-A]

Date: June 22, 2009  
Time: 9:00 a.m.  
Department: 10

TO: THE PARTIES AND ALL COUNSEL OF RECORD:

On June 22, 2009 at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard before the Honorable Garland E. Burrell, Jr., at the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California, 501 I Street, Sacramento, California, Michael J. Quilling, the Receiver appointed in these proceedings, (“Receiver”), will move this the Court to issue an order to compel Jim Weist to pay his share of the premium on the DAM-A policy, and upon failure to pay his share of the





**BOUTIN GIBSON DI GIUSTO HODELL INC.**

Chris Gibson, SBN 073353  
Maralee MacDonald, SBN 208699  
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 1500  
Sacramento, California 95814-4603  
Tel. (916) 321-4444

**QUILLING, SELANDER, CUMMISKEY & LOWNDS, P.C.**

Michael J. Quilling (Tex. Bar No. 16432300) – Admitted Pro Hac Vice  
Brent J. Rodine (Tex. Bar No. 24048770) – Admitted Pro Hac Vice  
2001 Bryan Street, Suite 1800  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone: (214) 871-2100  
Facsimile: (214) 871-2111

Attorneys for Michael J. Quilling  
Receiver of Defendants Secure Investment Services, Inc.,  
American Financial Services, Inc., and Lyndon Group, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SACRAMENTO DIVISION

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

SECURE INVESTMENT SERVICES, INC.,  
AMERICAN FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC.,  
LYNDON GROUP, INC., DONALD F.  
NEUHAUS, and KIMBERLY A. SNOWDEN,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:07-cv-01724 GEB CMK

RECEIVER’S MOTION TO COMPEL  
PAYMENT OF PREMIUM SHARE  
FROM JIM WEIST [DAM-A]

Date: June 22, 2009  
Time: 9:00 a.m.  
Department: 10

TO: THE HONORABLE GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR., UNITED STATES DISTRICT  
JUDGE:

Michael J. Quilling, the Receiver appointed in these proceedings (“Receiver”), files this  
Motion to Compel Payment of Premium Share and in support of such would show the following:

**BACKGROUND FACTS**

1. By Orders dated August 24, 2007 (Dkt. No. 27) and October 30, 2007 (Dkt. No.  
80), the Receiver was appointed by this Court.

1 1. Continuously throughout 2008, the Receiver has been contacting the investors  
2 who hold small fractional ownership interests in the multiple owner policies, of which the DAM-  
3 A policy is one, for the purpose of trying to convince those investors to transfer their ownership  
4 interest to the Receiver. One of the partial owners of the policy is Jim Weist (“Weist”) who,  
5 according to the books and records of the insurance company owns a 2% interest in the policy  
6 and is a beneficiary of the same percentage.

7 2. The Receiver is pleased to report to the Court that as of the filing of this motion,  
8 all of the investors have executed forms transferring their ownership interests in the DAM-A  
9 policy to the Receiver. However, despite repeated efforts, the Receiver has been unable to get  
10 Weist to transfer his interest. Therefore, the Receiver can only assume Jim Weist refuses to  
11 transfer his interest.

12 3. Jim Weist’s share of the premium on the DAM-A Policy since the time the  
13 Receiver was appointed is \$432.00 and will be \$432.00 per quarter in the future.

14 4. Accordingly, the Receiver seeks an order from this Court compelling Jim Weist,  
15 to pay the Receiver \$432.00 for his share of the premiums plus his percentage share of all  
16 additional premiums as they become due. Should Weist fail to do so, the Receiver seeks an  
17 order forfeiting Weist’s ownership and beneficial interest in the DAM-A Policy to the  
18 receivership estate.

19 **ARGUMENT AND AUTHORITIES**

20 5. It is well-settled that District Courts have broad powers and wide discretion to  
21 determine appropriate relief for federal equity receiverships. *Securities & Exchange Comm’n v.*  
22 *Elliott*, 953 F.2d 1560, 1569-70 (11th Cir. 1992); *see also Securities & Exch. Comm’n v. Hardy*,  
23 803 F.2d 1034, 1037 (9th Cir.1986). In applying equitable principles, courts in this district often  
24 use the theories of unjust enrichment and quasi-contract to achieve equity when one party has  
25 paid obligations benefiting another.  
26  
27  
28

1           6.       Unjust enrichment is not an independent cause of action, but a general principle  
2 supporting various equitable remedies. *Mauro v. General Motors Corp.*, 2008 WL 2775004, \*6  
3 (E.D. Cal. Jul. 15, 2008); *Walker v. USAA Cas. Ins. Co.*, 474 F.Supp.2d 1168, 1174 (E.D. Cal.  
4 2007). The elements supporting unjust enrichment are (1) the receipt of a benefit and (2) the  
5 unjust retention of it at another's expense. *Weststyn Dairy 2 v. Eades Commodities Co.*, 280  
6 F.Supp.2d 1044, 1057 (E.D. Cal. 2003). A "benefit" includes any advantage obtained by the  
7 recipient or expenses paid on his behalf. *Ghirardo v. Antonioli*, 924 P.2d 996, 1003, 14 Cal.4th  
8 39, 51 (Cal. 1996); *see also Process Specialties, Inc. v. Sematech, Inc.*, 2001 WL 36105562, \*20  
9 (E.D. Cal. 2001).

10           7.       Courts often redress unjust enrichment under the theory of quasi-contract or  
11 quantum meruit. Such relief does not require a contract and exists independent of the parties'  
12 privity, intent, or promises. *Fid. & Deposit Co. of Md. v. Harris*, 360 F.2d 402, 409 (9th Cir.  
13 1966); *McBride v. Boughton*, 123 Cal. App. 4th 379, 388 n.6 (2004). Courts will imply an  
14 obligation to pay when one party, in equity and good conscience, should not be permitted to keep  
15 a benefit without paying for it. *U.S. v. Healy Tibbitts Const. Co.*, 607 F.Supp. 540, 542 (N.D.  
16 Cal. 1985) (citing DOBBS, REMEDIES 224 (West 1973); 66 Am.Jur.2d, §§ 2, 3). Equity will  
17 typically require payment as measured by the benefit received. *Davis v. Leal*, 43 F.Supp.2d  
18 1102, 1112 (E.D. Cal. 1999).

19           8.       To prevent unjust enrichment, courts have upheld the right of one party to pay an  
20 obligation for another and seek restitution for that amount. For example, in *Page v. Podol*, 4  
21 Cal.App.2d 229 (1935), a separated couple held property together as joint tenants. When that  
22 property was sold, both parties became liable for the tax obligation. Plaintiff paid the entire tax  
23 obligation and filed a suit in equity to recover defendant's proportional share. The court noted  
24 that "[t]he soundness of this doctrine has been upheld by innumerable decisions of courts of the  
25 highest authority in many jurisdictions, and it is so obviously just and reasonable that it is matter  
26 of wonder that it should ever have been called in question." *Id.* The court reversed the decision  
27  
28

1 below and awarded plaintiff the right to recover a proportional share of the obligation owed by  
2 defendant.

3 9. Through this motion, the Receiver asks the Court to exercise its equitable powers  
4 in a similar manner and compel Weist to pay his proportional share of premiums for the DAM-A  
5 policy. To date, the Receiver has paid 100% of those premiums since September 7, 2007, for a  
6 total of \$21,600.00. While other joint owners of that policy have agreed to transfer their interest  
7 to the Receiver in exchange for the Receiver's payment of the premiums and a claim against the  
8 estate, Weist has not. Accordingly, Weist has unjustly benefited by maintaining his 2%  
9 ownership without paying a proportional share of the premiums. *See* CAL. CIV. CODE § 3521  
10 ("No person can be permitted to enjoy the benefits of a transaction while rejecting the burdens of  
11 it.").

12 10. To avoid unjust enrichment, the Court should compel Weist to pay (1) \$432.00 to  
13 the Receiver for Weist's 2% share of the premiums paid to date and (2) Weist's proportional  
14 share of all future premiums on a quarterly basis as invoiced by the Receiver.<sup>1</sup> Should Weist fail  
15 to pay these obligations in a timely manner, the Court should order his ownership interest in the  
16 DAM-A policy forfeited to the receivership estate. In the event of forfeit, the Receiver would  
17 replace Weist's ownership interest in the DAM-A policy with an allowed claim against the  
18 receivership estate in the amount of \$20,000.00 (the amount of the original investment).

19 11. As noted above, the Court has "broad powers and wide discretion to determine the  
20 appropriate relief in an equity receivership." *Elliott*, 953 F.2d at 1569-70. This includes the  
21 discretionary authority to deny Weist's ordinary contract rights when they are "inimical to  
22 receivership purposes." *See U.S. v. Vanguard Inv. Co., Inc.*, 6 F.3d 222, 226 (4th Cir. 1993).  
23 That is exactly what the Receiver asks the Court to do here. Weist currently has a contractual  
24 right to 2% of death benefits from the DAM-A policy even if the Receiver pays all of the  
25

---

26 <sup>1</sup> Weist's share of the next premium payment will be \$432.00. That amount, however, will increase in the future  
27 since premium obligations for the DAM-A policy are scheduled to increase annually. At this time, the Receiver  
28 does not know how much those future premium obligations will be and, therefore, would give Weist advance notice  
by an invoice.

1 premiums for that policy. This Court should impose upon Weist an equitable obligation to pay  
2 his share of the premiums or else forfeit his ownership interest to the receivership estate in  
3 exchange for an allowed claim for \$20,000.00. Doing so would both serve the interests of equity  
4 and keep the DAM-A policy in force for the benefit of all defrauded investors.

5 12. Given the fact that Weist will not respond and would not be in position to protect  
6 the policy from lapsing if the Receiver requests permission from the court to abandon the policy  
7 and does not pay the premium, one can certainly argue that Weist would be better off by a  
8 forfeiture and allowance of a claim. At least that way he would have something – a claim – if he  
9 or another person representing Weist ever surfaces.

10 WHEREFORE, premises considered, the Receiver requests that upon final hearing and  
11 consideration of this matter, that the Court issue an order compelling Jim Weist to pay \$432.00  
12 to the Receiver plus his share of all future premiums as they become due on pain of forfeiture of  
13 his ownership interest, and for such other and further relief, general or special, at law or in  
14 equity, to which the Receiver may show himself justly entitled.

15 Submitted this 21st day of May, 2009.

16 Respectfully submitted,

17 /s/ Michael J. Quilling

18 MICHAEL J. QUILLING (Tex. Bar No. 16432300)  
19 BRENT J. RODINE (Tex. Bar No. 24048770)  
20 QUILLING, SELANDER, CUMMISKEY  
& LOWNDS, P.C.

21 Chris Gibson, SBN 073353  
22 Maralee MacDonald, SBN 208699  
23 BOUTIN GIBSON DI GIUSTO HODELL INC.  
24 Attorneys for Receiver  
25  
26  
27  
28

