

1 **Guttilla Murphy Anderson, P.C.**

Ariz. Firm No. 00133300

2 **Ryan W. Anderson** (Ariz. No. 020974)

4150 West Northern Avenue

Phoenix, Arizona 85051

Email: randerson@gamlaw.com

Phone: (623) 937-2795

Fax: (623) 937-6897

Attorneys for Plaintiff

5 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

6 IN AND FOR MARICOPA COUNTY

7 STATE OF ARIZONA ex rel. THOMAS )  
8 L. WOODS, Superintendent of the )  
Arizona Department of Financial )  
9 Institutions, )

Plaintiff, )

10 v. )

11 LANDMARC CAPITAL & )  
INVESTMENT COMPANY, )

12 Defendant. )

Cause No. CV2009-020595

PETITION NO. 5

PRELIMINARY REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS OF RECEIVER

(Assigned to the Honorable Sam Myers)

13 Thomas L. Woods, the Superintendent of the Arizona Department of Financial  
14 Institutions, as the court-appointed Receiver of Landmarc Capital & Investment Company  
15 Inc., through counsel undersigned submits this *Preliminary Report and Recommendations of*  
16 *the Receiver.*

17 **I. Overview of Landmarc Capital & Investment Company, Inc.**

18 Landmarc Capital & Investment Company, Inc. ("Landmarc") was an Arizona  
19 mortgage banker holding Mortgage Banker's License No. 0906178, issued by the  
20 Superintendent pursuant to A.R.S. §6-941 *et seq.* The sole owner; director; president and  
21

1 “Responsible Individual”<sup>1</sup> for Landmarc was David Crantz. (“Crantz”). Landmarc’s  
2 business operations can be generally described as a “hard money lender”, with Landmarc’s  
3 primary business facilitating investment into deeds of trust by direct lending to Arizona  
4 residents and corporations. At the inception of the Receivership, Landmarc’s loan portfolio  
5 consists of 344 outstanding loans<sup>2</sup>. In general, Landmarc had three types of investors:

6 1. Warehouse Credit Facility Lenders

7 In general, Warehouse Credit Facility Lenders (“WCF Lenders”) entered into written  
8 agreements with Landmarc that enabled Landmarc to have access to capital of the WCF  
9 Lenders to make loans. Pursuant to the written agreements, the WCF Lenders had the ability  
10 to review proposed transactions that were presented to them by Landmarc. Approximately  
11 twenty-five million dollars (25,000,000) was invested by WCF Lenders in Landmarc.  
12 Landmarc, under the terms of their agreements with WCF Lenders, may be liable to the WCF  
13 Lenders for damages arising out of any of the loan transactions with the WCF Lender.

14 2. Loan Participants

15 Landmarc facilitated investments into deeds of trust with private investors who did not  
16 have a Warehouse Credit Facility agreement with Landmarc. (“Loan Participants”). The Loan  
17 Participants, under their agreements with Landmarc, bear the risk of loss with respect to any  
18 investments with Landmarc. There were approximately 90 Loan Participants.

19  
20  
21 

---

<sup>1</sup> A.R.S. § 6-976 requires a mortgage banker to identify a responsible person

<sup>2</sup> Approximately 108 of these loans have already resulted in a foreclosure of the lien under the deed of trust and Landmarc acquiring title or control of the underlying security.

1           3.     Landmarc Capital Partners

2           In addition to the business of facilitating loans to individuals, Landmarc is the  
3 Manager of Landmarc Capital Partners, LLC (“Partners”). Partners was a regulation D  
4 securities offering whereby Landmarc raised approximately twenty-seven million  
5 (\$27,000,000) from private investors nationwide. The purpose of Partners was to establish a  
6 pool of capital that Partners could to use to make or acquire recourse or non-recourse loans to  
7 borrowers, secured by deeds of trust. Partner’s investors purchased from Partners “units or  
8 shares” of participation in Partners which Partners used to fund loans. Many of the investors  
9 in Partners were introduced to Landmarc by independent sales agents or investment advisors.

10           **II.     Institution of Receivership**

11           On January 22, 2009, the Arizona Department of Financial Institutions (“DFI”) began  
12 an examination of Landmarc. DFI discovered that Landmarc was insolvent and a  
13 Receivership was necessary to protect the interest of the investors in Landmarc.

14           On June 24, 2009, upon the *ex parte* application of Felecia A. Rotellini, the  
15 Superintendent of DFI, Landmarc was placed into a temporary Receivership. The temporary  
16 Receivership Order appointed Thomas J. Giallanza, Assistant Superintendent of DFI as the  
17 Deputy Receiver. Soon thereafter, the Receiver obtained control of Landmarc’s business  
18 operations and began to continue to operate Landmarc during the temporary period. During  
19 the interim period, Crantz decided not to contest the Receivership of Landmarc and consented  
20 to the entry of the *Order Appointing Permanent Receiver and Injunction* (“Receivership  
21 Order”). The Receivership Order provides that a preliminary report shall be filed within 90

1 days after the entry of this Order and set forth the identity, location and value of the  
2 Receivership Assets, and any liabilities.

3 On August 28, 2009, Arizona Governor Jan Brewer appointed Thomas L. Wood as  
4 Interim Director of the Arizona Department of Financial Institutions. By this appointment,  
5 Thomas L. Wood is now the Receiver of Landmarc Capital and Investment Company.  
6 Pursuant to Order re: Petition No 3, Thomas L. Wood as acting Superintendent of the Arizona  
7 Department of Financial Institutions was substituted as the Plaintiff and as Receiver in this  
8 action.

9 **III. Report of Receiver**

10 DFI has engaged Gutilla Murphy Anderson, P.C. (“GMA”) to serve as counsel to DFI  
11 as Receiver of Landmarc. DFI has also engaged the services of Lawrence J. Warfield and the  
12 accounting firm Warfield & Company CPAs to serve as a Special Deputy Receiver and  
13 provide accounting services to Landmarc. The Receiver has completed the following:

- 14 • GMA has recorded a copy of the Receivership Order in all Arizona counties  
15 where Receivership Assets may be located to ensure that all persons have  
16 record notice of the Receivership Order and its provisions.
- 17 • The Receiver and his agents have conducted interviews of the employees of  
18 Landmarc and retained employees that the Receiver determined were necessary  
19 to maintain and eventually wind-up due business operations of Landmarc.
- 20 • The Receiver has initiated an examination of Landmarc’s financial condition  
21 and determined that, according to Landmarc’s internal accounting systems, for

1 the first six months of 2009, Landmarc had losses totaling \$427,583.34 or  
2 about \$71,000.00 per month. This accounting data does not include any of the  
3 accrued interest owed WCF Lenders. It appears that the insolvency of  
4 Landmarc discovered by DFI examiners has worsened significantly in 2009.

- 5 • Due to significant unpaid rent obligations, the Receiver determined that it  
6 could not continue to operate Landmarc at its Scottsdale location.

7 Accordingly, during the week of July 21, 2009, the Receiver facilitated a move  
8 of Landmarc's operations to its current location<sup>3</sup>.

9 Upon the successful take over of the operations of Landmarc, the Receiver discovered  
10 a number of apparently independent companies were operating out of Landmarc's offices.  
11 Despite claims by the principles of these "independent" companies that they were "separate"  
12 from Landmarc, the "independent" companies were operated by employees on Landmarc's  
13 payroll and all operational functions of these "independent" businesses were managed by  
14 Landmarc. Specifically, the Receiver discovered the following Landmarc related companies  
15 being operated out of Landmarc's Scottsdale offices:

- 16 • Empire Acceptance Inc.- Empire Acceptance Inc. ("Empire") is an Arizona  
17 corporation. Public records indicate that Empire is managed and owed by  
18 Jeffrey Petersen ("Petersen") who is also a former executive of Landmarc.  
19 Empire's business consists of the purchase of distressed properties in  
20 foreclosure. In most instances, Empire would obtain mortgage loans from

21 <sup>3</sup> Landmarc has been moved to 14555 North Scottsdale Road, #340, Scottsdale, Arizona 85254.

1 Landmarc that were funded by Partners. DFI has examined many of the loans  
2 by Partners to Empire and has determined that the loans were outside  
3 reasonable loan to value ratios. On certain occasions, Empire purchased from  
4 Landmarc certain properties whose mortgages were being serviced by  
5 Landmarc. Many of the Empire properties are currently being utilized as rental  
6 properties. As further evidence of the close relationship between the companies  
7 and their principals, Landmarc's software programs, Tenant Pro and Mortgage  
8 office were utilized to track all payments on Empire properties. The Receiver  
9 has provided Petersen with a copy of all files relating to the operation of  
10 Empire, including all Empire loan files and documents related to the  
11 management of the Empire properties. The Receiver continues to investigate all  
12 transactions involving Landmarc and Empire.

- 13 • Remington Construction- Remington Construction ("Remington") is an  
14 Arizona Corporation that holds a suspended contractors license 215822. Public  
15 records indicate that Remington is managed and owned by Petersen who is a  
16 former executive of Landmarc. According to the Arizona Registrar of  
17 Contractors, Malecia Jewel, a former corporate officer of Landmarc, is the  
18 corporate secretary of Remington. During interviews with DFI, Petersen  
19 acknowledged that while Remington was not actively pursuing any construction  
20 projects, Landmarc paid Remington \$299,290.00 since 2006.

- 1           • Landmark Equity Funds I, LLC- Landmark Equity Funds I, LLC, appears to be  
2           a separate company from Landmarc, yet it was operating out of Landmarc’s  
3           offices and utilizing Landmarc’s employees and computer systems to operate.  
4           The Receiver has been advised that according to the corporate records of  
5           Landmark Equity Funds I, LLC, Petersen is the Manager and Member of  
6           Landmark Equity Funds I, LLC. However, the Receiver has been advised that  
7           the issue of who is the manager of Landmark Equity Funds I LLC, is currently  
8           contested and an action has been filed in Maricopa County Superior Court for  
9           declaratory judgment seeking a declaration that Petersen has been removed as  
10          manager. Apparently, Petersen disputes that he has been removed as manager  
11          and has caused a complaint to be filed in which, among other things, seeks  
12          declaratory relief that Mr. Petersen has not been terminated as manager. The  
13          Receiver continues to monitor this litigation and continue his investigation  
14          whether Landmarc funds were utilized by Landmark Equity Funds I LLC.
- 15          • LDM Acceptance and LDM Acceptance Pension Plan - LDM is an acronym for  
16          “Lawrence, David, Marilyn”, the first names of Crantz, his mother, Marilyn  
17          Crantz and deceased father, Lawrence Crantz. Accordingly, LDM is a  
18          collection of family members who appear to have investments in Landmarc.  
19          More specifically, Crantz has allegedly utilized LDM Acceptance and LDM  
20          Acceptance Pension Plan (“LDM”) to make investments in Landmarc loans.  
21          LDM is represented as having an ownership interest in thirty-two (32) loans in

1 the Landmarc portfolio. The Receiver has recently been contacted by legal  
2 counsel for LDM and the Receiver is conducting an investigation to determine  
3 what consideration was paid to Landmarc for the loans in the name of LDM.

- 4 • Hayden Insurance Ltd and Desert Trails Insurance Company Ltd. - Hayden  
5 Insurance Ltd. (“Hayden”) and Desert Trails Insurance Company Ltd. (“Desert  
6 Trails”) are captive insurance companies allegedly licensed and regulated as  
7 insurance companies in the island nation of Anguilla. Hayden and Desert Trails  
8 have never possessed a Certificate of Authority to transact insurance in  
9 Arizona. According to the audited financial statements of Landmarc, it appears  
10 that Desert Trails and Hayden received \$5.4 million dollars from Landmarc  
11 between 2005 and 2007, apparently to pay for insurance premiums for  
12 Landmarc. Despite over five million in premiums, the Receiver has recently  
13 been advised that all insurance coverage for Landmarc has lapsed. While  
14 Landmarc engaged the services of Tribeca Strategic Advisors, LLC to form and  
15 maintain the captives, Crantz controlled both Hayden and Desert Trails.  
16 Confusingly, Crantz appears to have used funds paid to Hayden and Desert  
17 Trails as insurance premiums in direct investments in Landmarc loans. The  
18 Receiver continues to attempt to locate any evidence of any legitimate  
19 consideration paid to Landmarc from Hayden and Desert Trails for its alleged  
20 ownership in Landmarc loans and investigate the multiple transactions  
21 involving Desert Trails and Hayden.



1 **IV. Review of Loan Portfolio**

2 Since Landmarc is insolvent and will ultimately be liquidated, the Receiver has  
3 concluded that where possible loans that are being serviced by Landmarc and in which the  
4 Receiver is not aware of clouds on the title of the beneficial owners or other potential  
5 litigation claims by Landmarc against the beneficial owners, should be transferred out of the  
6 receivership to qualified third party loan servicers or to the beneficial owners of the loans. To  
7 this end the Receiver established a loan review committee of former Landmarc employees  
8 and qualified title and legal personnel to review all of the loans held for servicing by  
9 Landmarc. That review is substantially completed. To date the Receiver has identified  
10 approximately 90 loans in which the records of Landmarc and a limited title check does not  
11 disclose clouds or defects in the title of the beneficial owners. To release these some of these  
12 loans from the Receivership, the Receiver has filed his Petition No 4.- *Petition for Order*  
13 *Approving Procedures for Disposing of Certain Loans Where Ownership by Third Parties is*  
14 *not in Doubt*. The Receiver intends to file similar petitions regarding the release of  
15 Receivership Assets in the form of Real Estate Owned (“REO”) and loans relating to  
16 Landmarc Capital Partners. The Receiver and the Landmarc loan review committee is  
17 currently reviewing loans that appear to have clouds or defects in the title of the beneficial  
18 owners in an attempt to resolve any discrepancies between recorded documents, internal  
19 Landmarc accounting records and other Landmarc documents to resolve potential clouds on  
20 title to the subject property. It is contemplated that many of these loans may require a Court  
21 Order to resolve clouds or defects in the title of the beneficial owners.

1           **V.     Status of Pending Litigation**

2           Upon his appointment, The Receiver discovered that Landmarc is the defendant in  
3 seven (7) lawsuits in various Justice and Superior Courts. Pursuant to the Receivership Order,  
4 the Receiver has sought or obtained a stay of litigation in the ancillary litigation. The pending  
5 lawsuits against Landmarc and the current status of the cases are as follows:

6           1.     *Lazy 3 LLC et al v Landmarc Capital et al*, CV2008-032264 - Stay has been  
7 entered.

8           2.     *Consumer Protection Corp. v Landmarc Capital*, CV2008-032383 - the  
9 Receiver has filed a motion to Stay this litigation.

10          3.     *Casa Tierra Community Association v. Landmarc Capital*, CC2009 414634SC-  
11 Stay of litigation has been entered.

12          4.     *Thompson v. Landmarc Capital et al*, CV2009- 050052- the Receiver has filed  
13 a motion to stay this litigation.

14          5.     *La Place Du Sommet v. Landmarc Capital et al*, CC2009-372787. Stay of  
15 litigation has been entered.

16          6.     *Hyatt v. Bennett et al*. CV 2009-091456. Stay of litigation has been entered as  
17 to Landmarc.

18          7.     *Quality Ready Mix v. Scot Miesel et al*, CV2009-0502- The Receiver has filed a  
19 motion to stay this litigation.

20  
21

1 The Receiver continues to actively monitor all bankruptcy cases where Landmarc is a  
2 creditor and continues to seek relief from the automatic stay in circumstances where it is  
3 necessary to complete a foreclosure of any interest of the Receivership estate.

#### 4 **VI. Receivership Assets**

5 The Receivership Assets are defined in the Receivership Order as:

6 ... assets, money, security, causes in action, and property, real and  
7 personal, tangible and intangible, of whatever kind and  
8 description, wherever situated, of Landmarc and all such assets  
9 that Landmarc acquired from the customers, investors and other  
10 persons doing business with Landmarc. (See Receivership Order  
11 ¶2.)

12 In the Receiver's experience, the principals of Landmarc and others frequently hold  
13 title to Receivership Assets in the names of other persons, corporations, or under fictitious  
14 names (referred to hereinafter as "affiliates"). Often, the assets held by these affiliates are  
15 derived from investor funds. Accordingly, the Receiver anticipates that during the course of  
16 the Receivership, he may identify Affiliates, the assets of which may need to be added to the  
17 Receivership.

18 The Receiver has custody of the following Receivership Assets:

- 19 a. The sum of \$2,703,269.14 located in Landmarc's Trust Impound Account trust  
20 account at JP Morgan Chase.
- 21 b. The sum of \$17,727.42 located in Landmarc's General Operating Account at JP  
Morgan Chase.
- c. The sum of \$201,170.21 located in Capital Partners Trust Account at JP  
Morgan Chase.

1           d.     The amount of \$3,400.64 held in an account for the benefit of Rockford Realty  
2                     or Landmarc, as these funds represent cash deposits for rent to properties that  
3                     may be managed by Landmarc or Rockford.

4           e.     Furniture and other related office equipment located at the original offices of  
5                     Landmarc.

6           The Receiver has also taken constructive possession of the following Receivership

7   Assets<sup>4</sup>:

8           a.     Approximately 93 parcels of real property as REO;<sup>5</sup>

9           b.     A condominium in Costa Rica;

10          c.     Stock in a bank called “NABB” with a valuation provided by Landmarc of  
11          \$100,000;

12          d.     Automobiles in the possession of previous Landmarc employees and principles;

13   and

14          e.     A single family home located in Idaho.

15           **VII.   Receivership Records**

16           The Receiver has obtained all of the known records of Landmarc. Specifically, the  
17   Receiver has taken custody of approximately 200<sup>6</sup> boxes of documents that mostly include  
18   files related to Landmarc’s loans and electronic records that contain standard books of

19   \_\_\_\_\_

20   <sup>4</sup> Many of these assets are still being investigated by the Receiver. However, these assets were at one time identified as  
assets of Landmarc on its financial statements and the Receiver will categorize these items as Assets of the Receivership  
until an investigation into each asset is complete.

21   <sup>5</sup> REO is a term for real estate owned. Typically, financial institutions categorize properties that have been foreclosed  
upon as REO.

<sup>6</sup> The Receiver is also in control of approximately 250 to 300 boxes of old Landmarc records held at an offsite storage  
facility.

1 original entry and similar accounting records reflecting the financial transactions of  
2 Landmarc and its principals. The Receiver has yet to determine if it will be necessary to  
3 subpoena any records to reconstruct any financial transactions of Landmarc. Since the  
4 Receiver has not has not had sufficient time to review all of Landmarc's records, he expects  
5 that the Landmarc records may disclose additional assets and liabilities of Landmarc.

6 **VIII. Receivers Recommendation regarding Bankruptcy**

7 Pursuant to the Receivership Order, in his preliminary report, the Receiver shall  
8 recommend to the court whether, in his opinion, based upon his initial investigation, that  
9 claims against Landmarc, should be adjudged in Bankruptcy Court. After providing  
10 interested parties an opportunity to be heard, this Court is to determine whether to accept the  
11 Receiver's recommendation and, if appropriate, issue an order authorizing the Receiver to  
12 commence a bankruptcy proceedings. (See Receivership Order ¶6c.)

13 The Receiver recommends against filing a petition of bankruptcy for Landmarc. In  
14 making this recommendation, the Receiver has carefully considered the most significant  
15 advantages to a bankruptcy proceeding, the avoidance powers provided under the bankruptcy  
16 code and the mechanisms established for the protection of creditors. Neither of these  
17 advantages, in the Receiver's opinion, outweighs the benefits of a state court receivership.  
18 The corporate defendant's principal purpose appears to be soliciting investments into Partners  
19 and managing investments in loans made by Landmarc and its clients. As such, the corporate  
20 defendants do not need to be reorganized. Instead, the assets of the corporate defendants

21

1 need to be recovered by the Receiver and distributed to the investors. *See Commodities*  
2 *Future Trading Com'n v. FITC, Inc.*, 52 B.R. 935, 938 (N.D. Cal. 1985)

3           When making the recommendation against filing a petition in bankruptcy, the Receiver  
4 discovered two potential preferences that may be avoidable under 11 U.S.C §574. However  
5 each of these potential preferences can also be recovered through state court litigation and the  
6 provisions of the Receivership Order. Specifically:

- 7           • \$1.1 M payment to SEM Investments on May 19, 2009.

8 In December of 2008, a lawsuit was filed against Landmarc by Lazy E, LLC; Stoneman  
9 Properties, LLC; and SEM Investments, LLC. The Plaintiff's allegedly loaned funds to  
10 Landmarc's borrowers and their loans are in default. The loans were secured by assignments  
11 of interest in the deeds of trust that were funded by Landmarc but there are no cross-default  
12 or cross-collateralization provisions. One of the loans by SEM Investments was personally  
13 guaranteed by Landmarc executives Crantz and Petersen. In May of 2009, Landmarc  
14 assembled enough cash to pay off the SEM Investments loan. Since this loan was the only  
15 obligation that was personally guaranteed by Crantz and Petersen, Landmarc tendered  
16 payment of \$1,109,217.80 to counsel for SEM Investments, on May 19, 2009. As of the date  
17 of the Receivership it was unclear if SEM Investments LLC negotiated the check<sup>7</sup>. It is  
18 undisputed that SEM Investments was advised of the Receivership on June 26, 2009, and any  
19 attempt to negotiate the check would be in violation of the Receivership Order. SEM  
20  
21

---

<sup>7</sup> The Receiver is currently investigating the date the check was negotiated and by whom.

1 Investments did not respond to this letter and only recently advised that the check was  
2 negotiated, but unsure of the exact date.

3 Under bankruptcy law it is possible that this transfer could be determined to be a  
4 preference under 11 U.S.C §574, however, there are potential defenses in bankruptcy to  
5 potential preference action and state law claims that would be just as effective to recover  
6 these funds, especially since the payment to SEM Investments may have been negotiated in  
7 violation of the Receivership Order. The Receiver continues to investigate this transaction.

- 8 • Recordation of Security Interests by Landmarc Investors

9 The avoidance powers of the bankruptcy court can be utilized to set aside any  
10 action by any parties to create a security interest or lien in property of Landmarc within 90  
11 days of Landmarc filing bankruptcy. The Receiver believes that at least one investor may  
12 have recorded certain security interests in Landmarc loans within the preference period. More  
13 investigation would need to be conducted to determine the exact nature and timing of the  
14 recordation and Landmarc's role, if any, in causing a delay in the recordation of security  
15 interests on behalf of investors. 11 U.S.C §574 does provide that a debtor can avoid security  
16 interests in property of Landmarc that we acquired within 90 days of the bankruptcy, but 11  
17 U.S.C §574 also provides a litany of potential defenses to these claims. While the Receiver  
18 reports that there may be these potential preference claims, the Receiver believes that if an  
19 investigation determines that a security interest was filed against the property of Landmarc  
20 inappropriately, the Receivership Court can adjudicate the merits of any dispute as effectively  
21 as the Bankruptcy Court.

1 Finally, it can not be disputed that the professional fees incurred in a Landmarc  
2 bankruptcy would be significant and likely in excess to the assets of Landmarc. As the Court  
3 may be aware, another “hard money lender”, was put into bankruptcy by creditors.<sup>89</sup> The  
4 Mortgages Ltd Chapter 11 proceedings in bankruptcy have been monitored by DFI and  
5 despite a recent confirmation of a plan of liquidation, the professional fees appear to be in  
6 excess of 12 million dollars.<sup>10</sup> In contrast to a bankruptcy case, a DFI receivership can seek to  
7 pay its professional fees from the Arizona Receivership revolving fund, pursuant to A.R.S.  
8 §6-135 et seq. While DFI can be reimbursed for its expenses from the assets of Landmarc, the  
9 administration of the case is not directly on the backs of the investors of Landmarc.

10 **IX. Conclusion**

11 Accordingly, the Receiver requests the Court enter an order approving the Receiver’s  
12 Preliminary Report and Recommendations.

13 Respectfully submitted this 8th day of October, 2009.

14 GUTTILLA MURPHY ANDERSON, P.C.

15  
16  
17 /s/Ryan W. Anderson  
18 Ryan W. Anderson  
19 Attorneys for the Plaintiff

20 <sup>8</sup> The Mortgages Ltd bankruptcy case started as an involuntary chapter 7 case that was automatically converted to a Chapter 11 case. Mortgages Ltd was a hard money lender about four times the size of Landmarc.

<sup>9</sup> At the time Mortgages Ltd was placed into bankruptcy, DFI was completing its examination.

21 <sup>10</sup> Dozens of fee requests and objections have been filed in the Mortgages Ltd case. It is difficult to accurately ascertain which fee requests are legitimate. One thing is clear, the Mortgages Ltd Bankruptcy case was an extremely expensive bankruptcy case and legitimate professional fees, as administrative expenses in the bankruptcy will be paid before any investor in Mortgages Ltd.



1 Original of the foregoing electronically  
filed this 8th day of October, 2009 with:

2  
3 Clerk of the Court  
4 Maricopa County Superior Court  
201 West Jefferson, Fourth Floor  
Phoenix, AZ 85003

5 Copy of the foregoing mailed or emailed  
this 8th day of October, 2009 to:

6  
7 All Parties listed on the attached  
Master Service List

8 By /s/Jeanie Knaack  
1157-001(86387)

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

## MASTER SERVICE LIST

*State of Arizona ex rel. v. Landmarc Capital & Investment Company*  
IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
CV2009-020595  
(Rev. 09-29-2009)

Thomas L. Wood, Receiver  
Department of Financial Institutions  
TWood@azdfi.gov  
2910 N. 44th Street, Suite 310  
Phoenix, AZ 85018

Thomas J. Giallanza, Deputy Receiver  
Department of Financial Institutions  
TGiallanza@azdfi.gov  
2910 North 44th Street, Suite 310  
Phoenix, AZ 85018

Lawrence J. Warfield, Special Deputy  
Receiver  
LWarfield@warfieldcpas.com  
14555 North Scottsdale Road, #340  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85254

Craig Raby  
Arizona Attorney General  
1275 West Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Patrick M. Murphy  
Guttilla Murphy Anderson, P.C.  
PMurphy@gamlaw.com  
4150 West Northern Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85051-5765  
Attorneys for the Receiver

Howard Meyers  
Burch & Cracchiolo, PA  
702 E. Osborn Rd. #200  
P.O. Box 16882  
Phoenix, Arizona 85014-5281

Lawrence Field  
Field Lawdahl, PLLC  
LField@fieldlawdahl.com  
One East Camelback Road, Suite 860  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012

John G. Ryan  
Ryan Rapp & Underwood, P.L.C.  
3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1600  
Phoenix, AZ 85012-2681  
Attorney for David Wolfswinkel, Penny  
Wolfswinkel, Ed Humphreys, Kathy  
Aleman, H. R. Cohen, Inc., Victoria  
Cohen, TBM Associates, LLC, Eugene  
and Lenore Schupak Family Trust, dated  
April 4, 1991, Mark A. Greenberg, Dr.  
Russell P. Chick, Geoff & Katie Ball,  
Lydia Ball c/o Dr. Richard Ball, Deborah  
Ball

Robert N. Brier  
Brier Irish Hubbard & Erhart PLC  
2400 E. Arizona Biltmore Cir., # 1300  
Phoenix, AZ 85016-2115  
Attorney for Scottsdale Financial Centers  
Investors, LLC

Neal H. Bookspan  
Jaburg & Wilk, P.C.  
nhb@jaburgwilk.com  
3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2000  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
Attorney for J.D. Mellberg Financial and  
Josh Mellberg

Todd E. Schwartz  
Carr Schwartz Butterfield, LLC  
tschwartz@csb-llc.com  
155 B. Avenue, Suite 240  
P.O. Box 249  
Lake Oswego, OR 97034  
Attorneys for J.D. Mellberg Financial

Alan Baskin  
Bade & Baskin  
80 E. Rio Salado Pkwy, Suite 511  
Tempe, AZ 85281  
Attorneys for David Crantz

David N. Ramras  
Ramras Law Offices, PC  
David@ramraslaw.com  
5060 North 40th Street  
Suite 103  
Phoenix, Arizona 85018-2140  
Attorneys for Oxford Investors

Daniel R. Price  
Law Offices of Dan Price  
[dan@dpricelaw.com](mailto:dan@dpricelaw.com)  
200 Page Mill Road, Suite 150  
Palo Alto, California 94306  
Attorneys for Oxford Investment Partners,  
LLC.

1157-001(85963)

## Jeanie Knaack

---

**From:** COSC eFiling [efiling@cosc.maricopa.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 08, 2009 2:20 PM  
**To:** Jeanie Knaack  
**Cc:** efiling@cosc.maricopa.gov  
**Subject:** COSC E-Filing Accepted (CV2009-020595, Filing ID: 439024)

The following eFiling has been Accepted by the Maricopa County Clerk of Superior Court eFiling system.

**Filing Date:** 10/8/2009 2:14:22 PM

**Filing ID:** 439024

**Case Number:** CV2009-020595

**Filed By:**

Jeanie Knaack  
Guttilla & Murphy, P.C.  
4150 West Northern Avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85051  
6239372795 / [jknaack@gamlaw.com](mailto:jknaack@gamlaw.com)

**Authorizing Attorney:**

020974 (AZ)  
Randerson@gamlaw.com

**Document(s) Filed:**

1. Title: Petition No. 5 - Preliminary Report and Recommendations of Receiver / Type: Petition  
**Document Status:** Accepted
2. Title: Order Re: Petition No. 5 / Type: Proposed Order  
**Document Status:** Accepted

Should you have any questions about your filing, please contact us:

**Clerk of Court Address**

201 West Jefferson  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

**eFiling Support Phone:** 602-506-2565

**Clerk of Court Web Site**

<http://clerkofcourt.maricopa.gov>