**ORIGINAL** 

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS SHERMAN DIVISION

SEP 1 4 2nna

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff.

٧.

JOHN K. ADAMS.

Defendant.

DAVID J. MALAND, CLERK DEPUT

COMPLAINT

4:04CV3ZZ

Plaintiff, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, files this Complaint against John K. Adams ("Adams" or "Defendant") and would respectfully show the Court as follows:

#### SUMMARY

- 1. This case concerns Defendant's involvement in the improper recognition of income by Fleming Companies, Inc. ("Fleming").
- 2. Starting in late 2001. Fleming implemented a plan to improperly recognize material amounts of income to compensate for forecasted earnings shortfalls. Adams, an employee of Kraft Foods, Inc. ("Kraft"), a Fleming vendor, provided two side letters, as well as an audit confirmation letter, to Fleming that improperly described \$7.25 million in payments to Fleming.
- 3. Based on the conduct alleged herein, Adams aided and abetted Fleming's violations of Sections 17(a)(2) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 77q(a)(2) and 77q(a)(3)] and Sections 13(a) and 13(b)(2)(A) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78m(a) and 78m(b)(2)(A)], and Rules 12b-20, 13a-1, 13a-13, and 13b2-1, thereunder, [17] C.F.R. §§ 240.12b-20, 240.13a-1, 240.13a-13, and 240.13b2-1].

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 4. The Commission brings this action pursuant to the authority conferred upon it by Section 20(d) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(d)], and Sections 21(d)(3) and 27 of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d)(3) and 78aa].
- 5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action, and venue is proper, pursuant to Sections 20(d) and 22(a) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(d) and 77v(a)], and Sections 21(d)(3) and 27 of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d) and 78aa].
- 6. Defendant, directly or indirectly, made use of the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or of the mails, or of the facilities of a national exchange in connection with the acts, practices, and courses of action alleged herein.
- 7. Venue is proper because Fleming is headquartered in Lewisville, Texas, and certain of the acts and transactions described herein took place in the Eastern District of Texas.

#### **DEFENDANTS**

8. Adams, of Dallas, Texas, was a Region Manager at Kraft during the relevant periods. Fleming was one of Kraft's largest customers, and Adams had responsibility for the Fleming account.

#### OTHER RELEVANT ENTITY

9. **Fleming**, is an Oklahoma corporation headquartered in Lewisville, Texas. Fleming's stock is registered pursuant to Section 12 of the Exchange Act and, prior to filing for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection in April 2003, its stock traded on the New York Stock Exchange. Before bankruptcy, Fleming was the nation's largest grocery wholesaler and a retail grocery operator with approximately 50 distribution centers nationwide and more

than 100 retail stores throughout the Midwestern and Western United States. In 2001, Fleming reported approximately \$15.6 billion in revenues and \$23.3 million in profits. In 2002, the company reported \$15.5 billion in revenues and a net loss of \$84 million.

#### **FACTS**

#### Fleming's improper initiatives to meet earnings expectations

- 10. During 2001 and the first half of 2002, and following a period of poor financial performance, Fleming improperly executed a series of transactions, called "initiatives," to fabricate earnings and "bridge the gap" between actual operating results and Wall Street expectations. In these initiatives, Fleming improperly structured otherwise ordinary transactions in forms that, on paper, would justify and maximize an immediate increase in earnings.
- 11. One of Fleming's frequently used initiatives was accelerating recognition of up-front payments received under forward-looking vendor agreements. Specifically, Fleming persuaded vendors to provide side letters that described up-front payments—that Fleming and the vendors plainly intended to secure future rights and services—as compensating some form of past performance, such as rebates or expenses. Fleming then used these letters to immediately book the entire up-front payment as an offset to expenses, rather than over time as generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP") required.
- 12. As designed, the illicit reduction in expenses by Fleming significantly inflated the company's earnings in the fourth quarter of 2001 and the first two quarters of 2002 and allowed Fleming to meet securities analysts' earnings expectations.

#### Adams' participation in Fleming's inflated earnings

#### The 2001 agreements between Kraft and Fleming

- 13. During 2001, Fleming and Kraft executed two pertinent agreements. In April 2001, the parties entered into a one-year "no-divert" agreement, under which Kraft was to pay \$7.5 million to Fleming in exchange for Fleming's promise to waive certain promotional fees and to refrain from "diverting" Kraft products. "Diverting," disfavored by manufacturers, occurs when a wholesaler overbuys from a vendor at a special discount, and then sells the excess product to buyers other than its normal customers at a higher price.
- 14. In June 2001, the parties agreed to a one-year preferred vendor agreement (the "Kraft PVA"). Under the agreement, Kraft was to pay Fleming \$10.7 million in exchange for Fleming's commitment to eliminate several dysfunctional practices and fees and to cooperate in the resolution of certain disputed deductions made by Fleming. Although these deductions generally declined following this agreement, they nevertheless continued, and by early 2002, amounted to at least \$4 million.

#### The December 2001 side letter

15. As the 2001 fiscal year was ending, Fleming sought ways to meet an impending earnings shortfall. In December 2001, Fleming contacted Adams and requested that Kraft accelerate \$1.65 million payable under the no-divert agreement. Although these funds were not due until the first quarter of 2002 under the terms of the no-divert agreement and were subject to other performance criteria, Kraft agreed to make the requested payment in December 2001.

- 16. Simultaneous with the \$1.65 million payment, Adams also signed a Fleming-prepared letter which represented that Kraft was willing to pay Fleming \$1.65 million to "offset the administrative costs associated with" the no-divert agreement. Neither the no-divert agreement nor Fleming's records, however, indicated that any "administrative costs" were owed. Instead, Fleming desired the letter solely to justify recording the entire \$1.65 million in the fourth quarter of 2001, which overstated Fleming's earnings for the quarter by approximately 12%.
- 17. Fleming included these misstated earnings in its 2001 Form 10-K, and in publicly disseminated press releases.
- 18. In February 2002, Adams also signed and returned an audit confirmation letter stating that Fleming was entitled to \$1.65 million to offset the administrative costs incurred in the period April 2001 to December 2001.

#### The April 2002 side letter

- 19. In early 2002, Kraft and Fleming began negotiations to extend the no-divert agreement, set to expire in April 2002. In mid-April 2002, just before Fleming's fiscal first quarter ended, Kraft agreed to pay \$5.6 million to extend the no-divert agreement to December 31, 2002.
- 20. Fleming, however, needed to recognize the \$5.6 million payment immediately to help meet analysts' first quarter earnings targets. Fleming asked Adams to sign a Fleming-dictated letter describing the \$5.6 million as payment of a purported "shortfall" under the Kraft PVA. Although no shortfall existed, Adams signed the letter.
- 21. Fleming then used the letter to justify booking the entire \$5.6 million in the first quarter of 2002, which provided approximately \$.06 of the company's reported \$.52

per share quarterly earnings. Fleming included these figures in its Form 10-Q for the first fiscal quarter ended April 20, 2002, and in publicly disseminated press releases. Fleming further incorporated the first quarter Form 10-Q into registration statements on Forms S-3, S-8 and S-4 filed during the summer of 2002.

22. Fleming's recognition of the entire \$5.6 million in its first quarter 2002 financial statements violated GAAP. The payment was express consideration for extending the no-divert agreement, and Kraft would not have made the payment but for that extension. Thus, Fleming was required under GAAP to recognize the payment ratably over the extension's term.

#### **FIRST CLAIM**

## Aiding and Abetting Fleming's Violations of Sections 17(a)(2) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act

- 23. Paragraphs 1 through 22 are realleged and incorporated by reference.
- 24. Based on the conduct alleged herein, Fleming violated Sections 17(a)(2) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 77q(a)(2) and 77q(a)(3)].
- 25. Defendant Adams, acting alone or in concert with others, in the manner set forth above, provided substantial assistance to Fleming in connection with its violations of Sections 17(a)(2) and 17(a)(3) as alleged herein.
- 26. By reason of the foregoing, Adams aided and abetted Fleming's violations of Sections 17(a)(2) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 77q(a)(2) and 77q(a)(3)].

#### SECOND CLAIM

# Aiding and Abetting Fleming's Violations of Sections 13(a) and 13(b)(2)(A)of the Exchange Act and Rules 12b-20, 13a-1, 13a-13 and 13b2-1 Thereunder

- 27. Paragraphs 1 through 22 are realleged and incorporated by reference.
- 28. Based on the conduct alleged herein, Fleming violated Sections 13(a) and 13(b)(2)(A) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78m(a) and 78m(b)(2)(A)] and Rules 12b-20, 13a-1 and 13b2-1 thereunder [17 C.F.R. §§ 240.12b-20, 240.13a-1, 240.13a-13 and 240.13b2-1].
- 29. Defendant Adams, acting alone or in concert with others, in the manner set forth above, aided and abetted Fleming, as an issuer of a security registered pursuant to Section 12 of the Exchange Act, in its failing to file with the Commission, in accordance with rules and regulations the Commission has prescribed, information and documents required by the Commission to keep reasonably current the information and documents required to be included in or filed with an application or registration statement filed pursuant to Section 12 of the Exchange Act and annual reports and quarterly reports as the Commission has prescribed.
- 30. Defendant Adams, acting alone or in concert with others, in the manner set forth above, provided substantial assistance to Fleming, who, directly or indirectly, failed to make and keep books, records, and accounts, which, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflected Fleming's transactions and dispositions of its assets.
- 31. By reason of the foregoing, Adams aided and abetted Fleming's violations of Sections 13(a) and 13(b)(2)(A) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78m(a) and 78m(b)(2)(A)] and Rules 12b-20, 13a-1, 13a-13, and 13b2-1 thereunder [17 C.F.R. §§ 240.12b-20, 240.13a-1, 240.13a-13, and 240.13b2-1].

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

The Commission respectfully requests that the Court:

ſ.

Enter an order directing Adams to pay a \$25,000 civil money penalty pursuant to Section 21(d)(3) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(3)] and Section 20(d) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(d)].

II.

Grant such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

TIMOTHY . DAVIS
(Attorney in charge)

Texas Bar No. 00798134

Attorney for Plaintiff
Securities and Exchange Commission
Burnett Plaza, Suite 1900
801 Cherry Street, Unit #18
Fort Worth, TX 76102-6882
(817) 978-6438
(817) 978-4927 (fax)

E-Mail: davistp@sec.gov

#### Of Counsel:

SPENCER C. BARASCH D.C. Bar No. 388886 DAVID L. PEAVLER Texas Bar No. 00784738 JAMES E. ETRI Texas Bar No. 24002061

JS 44(Rev. 3/99)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by local rules of court. This form approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of

law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTION PLAINTIFF								
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION					JOHN K. ADAMS			
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF (U.S. DISTRIC) COLUMN (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)					County of Residence of First Listed Defendant: DALLAS, TX (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) ATTORNEY (FIRM NAME, A Timothy P. Davis, Esq SECURITIES & EXCH Burnett Plaza, Suite 1 801 Cherry Street, Un Fort Worth, TX 76102 817/978-6438	I. ANGE COMMISSIO 1900 It #18		2004 XF TY	XAB .	ATTORNEYS (IF K See attached	listing		
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)				III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES  (For Diversity Cases Only)  PTF PTF  (PLACE AN 'X' IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR PARTIES  PEFENDANT)  PTF PTF  PTF PTF				
☑ 1 U.S. Government	3 Federal Question		Citi	zen of This St	ate 🔲 1 🗆	1 Incorporated or Prince		
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government No	t a Party)	Cit.	zon of Anoth -	r State ☐ 2 ☐	of Business in This	State	
☐ 2 U.S. Government  Defendant						Incorporated and Principal Place ☐ 5 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 of Business in Another State		
V. NATURE OF SUIT (PI	LACE AN "X" IN ONE	BOX ONLY)				Foreign Nation	□6 □6	
CONTRACT		TORTS			URE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane  1315 Airplane Produc  Liability  320 Assault, Libel &  Slander  330 Federal	☐ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability ☐ 368 Asbestos Person	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 630 Liquor Laws  ☐ 640 R.R. & Truck  ☐ 650 Airline Regs. ☐ 660 Occupational Safety/Health		er Food & Drug g Related Seizure of erty 21 USC 881 or Laws	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 156 ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  PROPERTY RIGHTS	□ 400 State Reapprotionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 810 Selective Service ☑ 850 Securities Commodities/ Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge □ 12 USC 3410 □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery OF Overpayment	Employers' Liability  340 Marine  345 Marine Product Liability  350 Motor Vehicle	Injury Product Liabili PERSONAL PROPERT 370 Other Fraud 571 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal			pational Safety/Health er	□ 820 Copy rights □ 830 Patient □ 840 Trademark  SOCIAL SECURITY		
of Veteran's Benefits  160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal	Property Damage  385 Property Damage Product Liability		☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act ☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations		□ 861 HIA (1395FF) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))		
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIOI	NS			☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	☐ 893 Environmental Matters	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 441 Voting	510 Motions to Vacate		740 Railw	sure Act ay Labor Act	☐ 865 RSi (405(g))  FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act☐ 895 Freedom of	
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare 440 Other Civil	Sentence Habeas Corpus:  530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights		☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act		□ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS - Third Party 26 USC 7609	Information Act  900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes  890 Other Statutory Actions	
/. ORIGIN		(PLACE AN "X" IN ON	IE BC	OX ONLY)				
		temanded from		stated or (	☐ 5 Transferred from another district (Specify)	☐ 6 Multidistrict [ Litigation	☐ 7 Appeal to District  Judge from Magistrate  Judge	
CAUSE OF ACTION (CITE DIVERSITY.) Sections 17(a)(2) Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exch 140.13a-1, 240.13a-13 & 240	& (3) of the Securities ange Act") [15 U.S.C.	Act of 1933 ("Securitie	s Act	t") [15 U.S.C	C. §§ 77q(a)(2) & (3	3)]; Sections 13(a) & 13(b)(2	)(A) of the Securities	
/II. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION  UNDER F.R.C.P. 23			DEMAND \$		CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:  JURY DEMAND □ YES ☒ NO		
/III. RELATED CASE(S) (See Instructions): 4 other related cases simultaneously filed: see attached listing.  IF ANY  JUDGE  DOCKET NUMBER								
ATE 9/14/2004 OR OFFICE USE ONLY	SIGN	ATURE OF ANTORNEY OF RE	E GOR	t				
THE PROPERTY OF THE				11.15.00	_	MAG IUDOE		

### I.(c.) - COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS

C. W. Flynn, IV, Esq.
Bradley W. Foster, Esq.
LOCKE LIDDELL & SAPP, LLP
2200 Ross Avenue
Suite 2200
Dallas, TX 75201-6776
214/740-8664
Counsel for Defendant John K. Adams

#### VIII. - RELATED CASES:

SEC v. Bruce Keith Jensen

SEC v. Kemps LLC, f/k/a Marigold Foods LLC, James Green and Christopher Thorpe

SEC v. Digital Exchange Systems, Inc., Rosario Coniglio & Steven Schmidt

SEC v. Dean Foods Company and John D. Robinson