		FILED
1	COMP JAMES R. STOUT, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 008680	MAR 12 8 32 AM '09
2	4560 S. Decatur Boulevard, Suite 201	JAN 12
3	Las Vegas, Nevada 89103    (702) 794-4411	CLERK OF THE COURT
4	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	CLERK OF THE
5		
6	DISTRICT COURT	
7	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA	
8		
9	ANA VILLAFUERTE, individually and ) HILPOLITO VILLAFUERTE, individually; all )	Case No. 'A 5 8 5 0 2 3
10		Dept. No.
11	Customers 1-2000,	lX
12	Plaintiffs,	ARBITRATION EXEMPT
13	v. )	(Extraordinary Relief; Significant Issues of Public Policy; and Damages in Excess of \$50,000.00)
14	US JUSTICE FOUNDATION, a Nevada )	· ·
15	corporation; JACK FERM an individual; and ROES 1-100,	
16		
17	Defendants. )	
18	COMPLAINT FOR MONEY DAMAGES FOR FRAUD; BREACH OF CONTRACT;	
19	NEGLIGENCE AND NEGLIGENCE PER SE	
20	COME NOW, Plaintiffs ANA and HILPOLITO VILLFUERTE, husband and wife; all	
21	appearing on behalf of the Class of customers of Defendant, the US JUSTICE	
22	FOUNDATION; and DOE customers 1-2000, and hereby complain, plead and allege as	
23	FOUNDATION, and DOL customers 1 2000, and 1 1	
24		
25	JURISDICTION	
26	1. Plaintiffs, ANA VILLAFUENTES and HILPOLITO VILLAFUENTES bring this	
27	action on behalf of themselves as individuals and husband and wife, and on behalf of the class	
28		

of customers of the US JUSTICE FOUNDATION located in Las Vegas, Nevada.

- 2. Plaintiffs, ANA VILLAFUENTES and HILPOLITO VILLAFUENTES (hereinafter referred to as "Class Representatives"), were customers of the US JUSTICE FOUNDATION located in Las Vegas, Nevada.
- 3. The Class Representatives bring this action on behalf of themselves and the other customers of the US JUSTICE FOUNDATION who as to date are not represented by other counsel.
- 4. The Class Representatives are informed and believe that the class is so numerous that joinder of all members in a class is to the benefit of all parties and this Court.
- 5. The Class Representatives are informed and believe and thereon allege, that this action involves questions of law and fact common to each member of the class in that all members of the class have suffered injuries due to either payment of money for services rendered negligently and fraudulently, and the payment not refunded in whole or in part; unauthorized rendering of legal services proximately causing each class member to suffer harm to include the loss of their homes to foreclosure, and other financial loss proximately caused by the Defendants' failure to competently render services to the Plaintiffs.
- 6. The Class Representatives are informed and believe and thereon allege that they can fairly and adequately protect the interests of all members of the class.
- 7. The Class Representatives are informed and believe thereon allege that the claims of the Class Representatives and relief herein sought are typical of the claims and relief which could be prayed for as to each member of the class generally.
- 8. The Class Representatives are informed and believe and thereon allege that questions of law and fact common to the class predominate over questions affecting the individual class members, and the interests of justice and judicial efficiency will best be served by bringing this

action as a class action.

- 9. The Class Representatives are informed and believe and thereon allege that the interests of justice and efficiency will be best served by allowing Class Representatives, after determining liability to claim damages relating to services rendered by the Defendants on behalf of all members suffering from the same damages.
- 10. The proposed Class Members were customers of the Defendants in the County of Clark, State of Nevada.
- 11. Plaintiffs DOE CUSTOMERS 1-2000 are individual customers of the US JUSTICE FOUNDATION. If it is subsequently determined that this action should have been properly brought in the name of each individual Plaintiff, Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this Complaint to include the individual customers.
- 12. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege, that at all relevant times hereto, Defendant, the US JUSTICE FOUNDATION is a Nevada corporation duly registered with the Department of Corporations and has a business license as a document preparation firm.
- 13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege, that Defendant, JACK FERM, an individual, at all time relevant was a resident of Nevada and had a business in Las Vegas known as US JUSTICE FOUNDATION, this business is operating under the laws of the sate of Nevada. JACK FERM acted to the detriment of Plaintiffs in his individual capacity and as an agent of the US JUSTICE FOUNDATION. Both the US JUSTICE FOUNDATION, and JACK FERM were markedly noncompliant in their business and corporate dealings, and holding only the US JUSTICE FOUNDATION liable would be singularly unfair to the Plaintiffs. JACK FERM was acting within the scope of his duties as a corporate officer for part of the time. JACK FERM also acted outside the scope of his corporate function because his actions were illegal and would not be protected under a corporate shield in Nevada.

14. The identities of ROES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiffs who therefore sue said Defendants by said fictitious names. Plaintiffs believe that each of the Defendants designated as a ROE Defendant is responsible in some manner for the events and happenings described in the Complaint which proximately caused or contributed to the damages to Plaintiffs as alleged herein. Plaintiffs will seek leave of Court to amend the Complaint to insert the true names and capacities of the ROE Defendants and state appropriate charging allegations at such time that the true identities of these Defendants becomes known or ascertained.

#### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 15. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that the US JUSTICE FOUNDATION consists of a Nevada corporation owned and operated by JACK FERM [hereinafter Defendants, US JUSTICE FOUNDATION and JACK FERM are collectively referred to as "Defendants"].
- 16. Plaintiffs are informed and believe the Defendants provided certain legal services to the Plaintiffs.
- 17. Plaintiffs are informed and believe the Defendants advertised and represented to the Plaintiffs that they would assist them with their trust deeds or mortgages for their homes for which Plaintiffs were facing or in foreclosure, or who had issues with their trust deeds or mortgages. Plaintiffs were seeking foreclosure help and/or loan modification help.
- 18. Plaintiffs are informed and believe the Defendants communicated to the Plaintiffs representations and promises that Defendants would "prepare litigation" and represented to the Plaintiffs that the Defendants had "counsel in your area as needed to represent you".
- 19. Plaintiffs are informed and believe in exchange for, and in reliance on these and other promises and representations, the Plaintiffs enlisted the services of the Defendants to assist the Plaintiffs with their home foreclosure, mortgage and/or trust deed problems.

20. Plaintiffs paid money to Defendants in various amounts for approximately an average range \$2,000 - \$4,000 which was received and kept by the Defendants as consideration for services promised to be rendered by the Defendants to the Plaintiffs. Defendants also entered into "Retainer Agreements" with Plaintiffs wherein Plaintiffs would pay an upfront retainer and make monthly installments to Defendants.

- 21. Plaintiffs duly carried out their obligations and performed all terms and conditions pursuant to the agreement between Plaintiffs and Defendants.
- 22. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that JACK FERM communicated to Plaintiffs that he was affiliated with Defendant, US JUSTICE FOUNDATION, including advising Plaintiffs he was the president, CEO and owner of Defendant, US JUSTICE FOUNDATION.
- 23. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendant, JACK FIRM on behalf of the US JUSTICE FOUNDATION engaged in the unauthorized practice of law in violation of NRS 7.285.

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Fraud)

- 24. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege and incorporate by reference, the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 25. Based upon the foregoing conduct by Defendants and each of them, Defendants have engaged in a pattern of fraudulent and oppressive conduct toward Plaintiffs, including but not limited to misrepresentations regarding Defendants' intentions to fulfill the terms of the agreement in good faith, misrepresentations regarding the services that Defendants had performed and intended to perform. Defendants' efforts were designed to benefit Defendants for pecuniary gain at Plaintiffs' expense.
- 26. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that the Defendants promised and represented to the Plaintiffs that they would prepare pleadings and instructions on litigating, including filing a

lawsuit and lis pendens against the mortgage company, holder of the mortgage note or trust deed, servicer of the mortgage or other potentially responsible entities to stop the foreclosure process and/or modify Plaintiffs' home loan.

- 27. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants promised Plaintiffs that they would prepare legal documents and file them with the court and/or Clark County Recorder's Office; and that "all Pleadings are prepared by Attorneys Licensed to Practice in the Practice area, or Paralegals under their supervision".
- 28. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants, on behalf of Plaintiffs made the following oral and written, specific and particular promises at Defendants place of business in Las Vegas, Nevada between August 1, 2008 and March 1, 2009:
  - a. Promised to draft legal documents including Complaints, Lis Pendens,
     Application for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunctions;
  - b. Oppose all motions from your adversary;
  - c. Prepare all discovery necessary to establish your claims; and
  - d. To prepare "if necessary" answers and motions in an Unlawful Detainer; and to prepare Motions as necessary to Compel discovery and for Summary Judgment or any other motion required by or for the case.
  - 29. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants verbally communicated and thus, promised directly to Plaintiffs, that Defendants would provide counsel at court hearings; but Defendants would fail to provide counsel, and as a result, either no one would show up for the hearing, or the Plaintiffs would attend in pro per, all to the detriment of Plaintiffs.
  - 30. Defendants represented to Plaintiffs that Defendants have an 80% success rate for helping their customers.
    - 31. Defendants had the intent and knowledge that their acts, omissions and

representations are and were false, fraudulent and intended to and did in fact, induce reliance by Plaintiffs, at the time of making the aforementioned representations and promises had no intention to carry out those promises.

- 32. Plaintiffs were severely damaged by Defendants' fraudulent acts, including loosing their homes to foreclosure. The conduct of Defendants is so egregious as to warrant punitive and exemplary damages to notify and set an example to other similarly situated loan modification or foreclosure assistance companies of the dire consequences of their failure to carry out their services legally and with due care.
- 33. Plaintiff has been required to retain the services of an attorney in order to prosecute this action and therefore is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Breach of Contract)

- 34. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege and incorporate by reference, the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 35. There existed a contractual relationship between each Plaintiff and Defendants wherein Defendants agreed to provide legal services to Plaintiffs from the beginning to the end of each Plaintiff's case, as evidenced by the agreements between each Plaintiff and Defendants.
- 36. Plaintiffs duly, faithfully and in reliance upon all representations made by Defendants performed all conditions precedent to Defendants' performance and fulfilled the obligations on Plaintiffs under the contract between each Plaintiff and Defendants.
- 37. Defendants completely, intentionally, fraudulently and maliciously breached its obligations under the contract(s) between the parties and has refused to provide the promised services.
- 38. As a direct and proximate cause of the breach and/or repudiation of the agreement, Plaintiffs have been damaged in an amount in excess of \$50,000.00, subject to proof at trial.

39. Plaintiffs have been required to retain the services of an attorney in order to prosecute this action and therefore are entitled to reasonable attorneys fees and costs.

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (Negligence)

- 40. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege and incorporate by reference the foregoing Paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 41. Defendants owed a duty of due care to Plaintiffs and had a legal obligation to act in a prudent manner under the circumstances so as not to cause an undue risk of harm or actual harm to Plaintiffs.
- 42. Defendants, through their negligence and/or lack of due care, negligently made a series of misrepresentations and untruths to Plaintiffs, and acted in a negligent, reckless and unsafe matter, and thereby breached their duties to Plaintiffs, including but not limited to misrepresentations regarding Defendants' intentions to fulfill the terms of the aforementioned agreements in good faith, to properly prepare and file legal pleadings, to appear for court appearances, to properly modify the Plaintiffs' loans, and exercise the skill, experience and wherewithal to fulfill the terms of the agreements.
- 43. Defendants' breach of their duty of care proximately and legally caused damages to Plaintiffs in excess of \$50,0000.
- 44. Plaintiffs have been required to retain the services of an attorney in order to prosecute this action and therefore are entitled to reasonable attorneys fees and costs.

# FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Negligence Per Se)

- 45. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege and incorporate by reference the foregoing Paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth at length herein.
  - 46. Defendants violated NRS 7.285 and in so doing, pre se breached their duty of care to