ALKA N. PATEL, Cal. Bar No. 175505

E-mail: patelal@sec.gov DAVID ROSEN, Cal. Bar No. 150880

E-mail: rosend@sec.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission Andrew Petillon, Associate Regional Director 5670 Wilshire Boulevard, 11th Floor Los Angeles, California 90036 Telephone: (323) 965-3998 Facsimile: (323) 965-3908

8 9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

VS.

MICHAEL B. UPTON,

Defendant.

CV07-06180 CAS (AGR. Case No.

**COMPLAINT FOR** VIOLATIONS OF THE FEDERAL SECURITIES

Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") alleges as follows:

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 20(b), 20(d)(1) and 22(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(b), 77t(d)(1) & 77v(a) and Sections 21(d)(1), 21(d)(3)(A), 21(e) and 27 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 78(u)(d)(1), 78u(d)(3)(A), 78u(e) & 78aa. Defendant has, directly or indirectly, made use of the means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange in connection with the transactions, acts, practices and courses of business alleged in this Complaint.

2. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to Section 22(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77v(a), and Section 27 of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78aa, because certain of the transactions, acts, practices and courses of conduct constituting violations of the federal securities laws occurred within this district, and the Defendant resides in this district.

#### **SUMMARY**

- 3. This case involves false and misleading statements to investors by Defendant Michael B. Upton ("Upton"), a registered representative associated with a registered brokerage firm, MCL Financial Group, Inc. ("MCL"). From August 2003 through March 2005, Upton sold various securities of various issuers including G REIT, Inc. ("G REIT") and NNN 2003 Value Fund, LLC (the "Value Fund"). Upton made the following false and misleading statements in connection with these two securities offerings:
- (a) In March and April 2004, Upton sent letters to hundreds of prospective investors that misrepresented that G REIT shares would soon be publicly traded. In one of those letters, Upton stated that G REIT's share price could increase by 30% once they became publicly traded. Upton made these fraudulent statements even though he knew from G REIT's prospectus, and had been specifically advised by G REIT's officers, that it was uncertain if or when G REIT shares would become publicly traded.
- (b) From August 2003 through April 2004, Upton sent letters to up to a thousand prospective investors that misrepresented the risks of an investment in G REIT and Value Fund securities. Again, Upton made these fraudulent statements despite knowing from G REIT's prospectus and the Value Fund's private placement memorandum ("PPM") that G REIT and Value Fund were risky investments.
- 4. From August 2003 through March 2005, Upton also failed to disclose to investors that he was receiving an additional .8% override commission on sales

in the G REIT offering, Value Fund offering, and 25 other offerings sponsored by a privately-held real estate company. Upton received \$287,496 in override commissions from these 27 securities offerings.

#### **DEFENDANT**

5. Michael B. Upton ("Upton"), age 59, resides in Santa Ana, California. During the period discussed in the Complaint, Upton worked as a registered representative for MCL at its office located in Santa Ana, California. Upton holds Series 6 (mutual fund sales/variable annuities contracts), 7 (registered representative), 22 (financial principal), 63 (state securities), and 65 (investment adviser) licenses.

#### **RELATED PARTIES**

- 6. G REIT, Inc., is a Virginia corporation headquartered in Santa Ana, California. G REIT is a real estate investment trust that acquires and operates commercial real estate with federal, state, and local government tenants. From July 2002 through December 2003, through a registration statement filed with the Commission, G REIT conducted its initial public offering for \$200 million, selling 20 million common shares at \$10 per share. Subsequently, from January 2004 through April 2004, through another registration statement filed with the Commission, G REIT raised another \$270 million, selling 27 million common shares at \$10 per share. G REIT has approximately 14,000 shareholders. While G REIT is a public company (i.e., its shares are registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission), its shares are not publicly traded on an exchange or through an over-the-counter market.
- 7. NNN 2003 Value Fund, LLC, is a Delaware limited liability company headquartered in Santa Ana, California. The Value Fund was a blind pool established for commercial real estate investments; however, it did not identify all of the properties to be acquired. From July 11, 2003, through October 2004, the Value Fund sold \$50 million of its securities to approximately 785 investors in a

private placement. The Value Fund is a reporting company (i.e., it files quarterly and annual financial reports with the Securities and Exchange Commission); however, its shares are not publicly traded on an exchange or through an over-the-counter market.

### **UPTON'S FRAUDULENT CONDUCT**

- 8. From August 2003 through March 2005, Upton sold securities of at least 27 issuers, including G REIT and the Value Fund. During this time period, Upton sold approximately \$2 million in shares of G REIT and \$900,000 in securities of the Value Fund.
- 9. Upton misrepresented and omitted to disclose to investors material facts concerning G REIT's shares trading on a public securities exchange, the risks associated with an investment in G REIT and the Value Fund, and undisclosed compensation he received in connection with the 27 securities' offerings.

# <u>Upton's Misrepresentations Regarding G REIT's Listing of its Shares on a Stock Exchange</u>

- 10. G REIT's \$270 million offering was conducted from January through April 2004. In the last two months of the offering, Upton sent three separate letters in mass mailings to clients of MCL's Santa Ana office representing that G REIT's shares would shortly be trading publicly. These letters stated, in part:
  - "The Board of Directors [of G REIT] plans [to list G REIT's shares on a national securities exchange] soon thereafter. . . . The attachments [referring to a newspaper article] support that similar IPOs have enjoyed a 30% 'pop."
  - "I sent you a notice that G REIT is *closing* to new funds on April 30, 2004 to prepare for [listing on an exchange] later this year . . . I gave this opportunity my highest recommendation . . . It is rare that individual investors get a shot at pre-[exchange listed] shares." (emphasis in original)
  - "I give G REIT my highest recommendation . . . with the lowest real estate risk and, after the [exchange listing], liquidity."

- 11. MCL sold \$5.6 million of its total sales of \$5.8 million in G REIT securities after Upton sent his letters.
- 12. Upton's representations contained in the letters were false and misleading based upon the disclosure in G REIT's prospectus, dated January 23, 2004. Specifically, G REIT's prospectus stated: "we are currently considering the possibility of . . . the listing of our common stock on a national securities exchange." Further, G REIT emphasized to prospective investors that it was uncertain if, or when, G REIT's shares would be publicly traded. The prospectus stated "[w]e are only in the early stages of assessing this type of transaction and cannot guarantee that we will enter into such a transaction in the near future or at all." Upton read and understood these statements in the prospectus at the time he was selling the securities.
- 13. Upton's misrepresentations were material because a reasonable investor would have considered them significant in making their investment decision. Specifically, while G REIT was a "public company," its shares were not publicly traded on an exchange or through an over-the-counter market. Consequently, G REIT shares were illiquid. In addition, the real estate market in general, and REITs in particular, have out performed the general stock market since 2000. Thus, the possibility of G REIT's shares trading in a public market enhanced its attractiveness as an investment and was therefore material. Moreover, the large amount of sales of G REIT's to investors after receipt of the letters demonstrates the significant that investors placed upon Upton's representations.
- 14. In addition, G REIT's officers orally and in writing communicated this uncertainty to Upton. Also, in connection with these conference calls, Upton's supervisor repeatedly cautioned Upton not to emphasize the likelihood of G REIT's shares trading publicly because it was unclear if, or when, G REIT's shares would trade publicly. To date, G REIT's shares have never traded publicly.

15. Therefore, Upton knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that his representations about G REIT's shares listing on a public exchange were materially false and misleading.

## <u>Upton Misrepresentation Regarding the Risks Associated with an Investment in G REIT and the Value Fund</u>

- 16. Upton sent six separate letters in mass mailings to clients of MCL's Santa Ana office representing that an investment in G REIT and the Value Fund were safe. These letters stated, in part:
  - "Whether for an IRA or conservative, hard-asset investment for both income and growth, I know of nothing better."
  - "Risk of '3' . . . on a scale of 1 = low to 10 = high."
  - "On a risk scale from 1 (low) to 10 (high) G REIT is viewed as being a '3'."
  - "GREIT IS IDEAL FOR RETIREMENT PLANS. It is also attractive for investors looking for low-risk [investments]." (emphasis in original)
  - "GREIT IS IDEAL FOR IRAS, ETC." (emphasis in original)
  - "I give GREIT my highest recommendation . . . with the lowest real estate risk."
  - "On a scale of 1 (low risk)-to-10, I regard . . . the Value Fund a '4'."
  - "Risk of '4' = Value Fund, LLC." (emphasis in original)
- 17. Upton's representations contained in these letters were false and misleading based upon the disclosure in G REIT's prospectus, dated January 23, 2004. Specifically, the G REIT prospectus repeatedly warned of the high risk of loss associated with an investment in G REIT shares throughout the prospectus. For example, the cover page stated, "This investment involves a high degree of risk. You should purchase shares only if you can afford a complete loss." Additionally, the prospectus contained a detailed 13-page "Risk Factors" section outlining the risks associated with the offering including (a) management's limited

experience in managing a public REIT; (b) G REIT's reliance on its advisor; and (c) G REIT's limited operating history. Upton read the prospectus and understood its contents, including the Risk Factors section, before selling the securities.

- 18. Similarly, the Value Funds' July 2003 PPM also repeatedly warned of the high risk of loss associated with an investment. For example, the PPM's introductory section stated that "THE PURCHASE OF INVESTOR UNITS INVOLVES SIGNIFICANT RISKS." (emphasis in original). The 12-page "Risk Factors" section opened with the statement that "INVESTORS SHOULD BE AWARE THAT INVESTOR UNITS ARE SPECULATIVE AND INVOLVE A HIGH DEGREE OF RISK. INVESTORS SHOULD CAREFULLY READ THIS MEMORANDUM PRIOR TO MAKING AN INVESTMENT AND SHOULD BE ABLE TO BEAR THE COMPLETE LOSS OF THEIR INVESTMENT." (emphasis in original) In addition, the "Risk Factors" section outlined the risks that could cause an investment loss including: (a) real estate risk; (b) risk of operating deficits; and (c) lack of liquidity.
- 19. According to the officers and directors of G REIT and the Value Fund: (a) Upton's statements regarding the risk profile of G REIT and the Value Fund were false and misleading in that they were speculative investments that involved substantial risk as detailed in the prospectus and the PPM; and (b) Upton's risk scale was highly inappropriate in light of the risk disclosure contained in the prospectus and the PPM.
- 20. Upton's misrepresentations were material because a reasonable investor would have considered them significant in making their investment decision. Specifically, Upton's false statements were material because he misrepresented the potential for a risk of loss to investors.
- 21. Upton knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that his representations about the risks associated with an investment in G REIT and the Value Fund were materially false and misleading.

///

///

///

///

///

///

## **Upton's Material Omissions About His Additional Compensation**

- 22. In connection with the 27 offerings (G REIT, the Value Fund, and 25 other private placements), Upton did not disclose to the investors that he would receive compensation over and above that described in the offering materials. Specifically, the offering documents disclosed that Upton, through MCL, would receive approximately 7%-8% in sales commissions and an additional 1%-1.5% for marketing and due diligence expenses. Between August 2003 and March 2005, Upton received an .8% commission override for his own sales and the sales of the other registered representatives in MCL's Santa Ana office on the 27 offerings, which amounted to \$287,496 in additional compensation.
- 23. Upton read either the prospectus or private placement memorandum for the 27 offerings before selling the securities.
- 24. Upton negotiated the agreements for the override commissions, which he was aware were not disclosed in the offering documents. Moreover, the override payments were specifically prohibited by the offering documents.
- 25. Upton's omissions were material because a reasonable investor would have considered them significant in making their investment decision.

  Specifically, investors would have considered Upton's compensation a significant factor in weighting the credibility of his investment advice and his personal integrity in making their investment decisions.
- 26. Upton knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that the additional undisclosed compensation to investors in the 27 offerings was a material omission.

#### FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

#### FRAUD IN THE OFFER OR SALE OF SECURITIES

### Violations Of Section 17(a) Of The Securities Act

- 27. The Commission realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 26 above.
- 28. Defendant Upton by engaging in the conduct described above, directly or indirectly, in the offer or sale of securities by the use of means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails:
  - a. with scienter, employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud;
  - b. obtained money or property by means of untrue statements of a material fact or by omitting to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; or
  - c. engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser.
- 29. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendant Upton violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77q(a).

## SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

## FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH THE PURCHASE OR SALE OF SECURITIES

## Violations Of Section 10(b) Of The Exchange Act And Rule 10b-5 Thereunder

- 30. The Commission realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 26 above.
- 31. Defendant Upton by engaging in the conduct described above, directly or indirectly, in connection with the purchase or sale of a security, by the use of

means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange, with scienter:

- a. employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud;
- made untrue statements of a material fact or omitted to state a
  material fact necessary in order to make the statements made,
  in the light of the circumstances under which they were made,
  not misleading; or
- engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon other persons.
- 32. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendant Upton violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court:

I.

Issue findings of fact and conclusions of law that Defendant Upton committed the alleged violations.

II.

Issue judgments, in a form consistent with Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d), temporarily, preliminarily and permanently enjoining Defendant Upton and his officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them, who receive actual notice of the judgment by personal service or otherwise, and each of them, from violating 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §77q(a), and Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5.

III.

Order Defendant Upton to disgorge all ill-gotten gains from his illegal conduct, together with prejudgment interest thereon.

IV.

Order Defendant Upton to pay a civil penalty under Section 20(d) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77t(d), and Section 21(d)(3) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(3).

V.

Retain jurisdiction of this action in accordance with the principles of equity and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in order to implement and carry out the terms of all orders and decrees that may be entered, or to entertain any suitable application or motion for additional relief within the jurisdiction of this Court.

VI.

Grant such other and further relief as this Court may determine to be just and necessary.

DATED: September 24, 2007

DAVID M. ROSEN Attorney for Plaintiff

Securities and Exchange Commission