## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

SECURITIES AND EXCOMMISSION	XCHANGE	)
	Plaintiff,	) CASE NO. 04-60573 MORENO/GARBER
v. • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		)
MUTUAL BENEFITS	CORP. et. al.,	)
	Defendants,	)
VIATICAL BENEFACTORS, LLC, et. al.,		
	Relief Defendants.	)
		,

# DEFENDANTS' AND RELIEF DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO RECEIVER'S MOTION FOR AUTHORITY TO CONTINUE TO PAY PREMIUMS, ADDRESS OTHER OPERATIONAL ISSUES, AND COMMENCE COLLECTION LITIGATION AND SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM

Defendants and Relief Defendants respectfully request that this Court deny the portion of the Receiver's Motion for Authority to Continue to Pay Premiums, Address Other Operational Issues, and Commence Collection Litigation that requests authority to commence collection litigation and in support state as follows:

1. The Receiver's instant request to commence collection litigation against one individual and two entities against whom the SEC has alleged no wrongdoing – Steven Steiner, a Vice President of Mutual Benefits who is not a party to the action, Steiner's company, former Relief Defendant SKS Consulting, Inc. ("SKS"), and current Relief Defendant Camden Consulting, Inc. ("Camden") – is an improper attempt by the Receiver to assist the SEC in its prosecution of this action and is not designed to maintain the status quo of Mutual Benefits. Thus, the request must be denied.

- 2. The SEC makes zero allegations of wrongdoing against Steiner, SKS or Camden in its Complaint and simply names SKS and Camden as Relief Defendants. See generally Complaint (attached as Exhibit A). On June 25, 2004, the Court dismissed SKS as a Relief Defendant, finding that SKS had a legitimate claim to the funds sought by the SEC. See Order Granting Emergency Motion to Dismiss SKS and Lift Asset Freeze (attached as Exhibit B). Nonetheless, one business day after the Court dismissed SKS from the action, the Receiver filed the instant Motion seeking permission to bring suit against SKS, its sole shareholder, Steiner, and Camden, the company of Steiner's life partner.
- 3. The Receiver specifically requests permission to commence litigation against Steiner, the sole shareholder of SKS, to collect a promissory note. *See* Receiver Motion at 10. In addition, the Receiver states that "he [the Receiver] may have a cause of action against each of Camden Consulting, Inc. and SKS Consulting, Inc. to recover payments of over \$13,000,000 that *may be* subject to recovery as fraudulent conveyances or otherwise." *See* Receiver Motion at 10 (emphasis added).
- 4. The Receiver's request to bring a collection action against Steiner, SKS and Camden is, at best, premature. See SEC v. Elliott, 953 F.2d 1560, 1567-68 (11th Cir. 1992) (receiver allowed to pursue assets that were the result of fraudulent transfer only after entry of permanent injunction and subjects of the fraudulent transfer action were given the opportunity to be heard); SEC v. Antar, 2002 WL 1774063, 1-5 (3rd Cir. August 2, 2002) (fraudulent transfer action against relief defendants proper only after defendants found liable), SEC v. Coates, 1996 WL 476897, \* 5-9 (S.D.N.Y. August 21, 1996) (special master permitted to proceed with fraudulent transfer action after parties entered into consent decree).

- 5. The Receiver has not provided any reason why the proposed collection litigation is proper or necessary at this stage of the litigation. In fact, there has been no finding of fraud or any other wrongdoing by any party involved in this action. No preliminary injunction has been entered. Thus, the only possible basis for the Receiver's rush to judgment is the *ex parte* mischaracterizations and misrepresentations made by the SEC in support of their request for an *ex parte* TRO on May 3, 2004 that Defendants and Relief Defendants are only now having the opportunity to rebut. *See* May 3, 2004 SEC *Ex Parte* Motion for TRO.
- 6. Moreover, the Receiver's premature request to commence litigation against a Vice President of Mutual Benefits, a former Relief Defendant and a current Relief Defendant runs afoul of the Receiver's responsibility to act as a neutral stakeholder throughout these proceedings. See Sterling v. Stewart, 158 F.3d 1199, 1202 (11th Cir. 1998) ("[a] receiver is a neutral court officer"); SEC v. Elfindepan, S.A., 169 F.Supp.2d 420, 424 (M.D.N.C. 2001) (receiver is not appointed for benefit of either party); Canney v. City of Chelsea, 925 F.Supp. 58, 65 (D.Mass. 1996) ("[i]t is well established at common law that a receiver is not the exclusive agent or representative of either party to the suit in which he is appointed); Suleiman v. Lasher, 739 P.2d 712, 716 (Wash. App. 1987) ("the general rule is that a receiver is not the exclusive agent or representative of either party to the suit in which he is appointed, and the receiver is not appointed for the benefit of any party").
- 7. Engaging in separate, adversarial litigation with a Vice President of Mutual Benefits, a former Relief Defendant and a current Relief Defendant prior to any finding that the monies sought are the fruits of fraud or that any of the parties have engaged in any wrongdoing is not consistent with the Receiver's role as a neutral stakeholder. The Receiver has cited zero authority in support of his proposition that he is allowed, as a neutral stakeholder, to act as a co-

prosecutor by filing actions against individuals and companies the SEC chose not to bring claims against such as Steiner, SKS and Camden.

- 8. The Receiver's request to commence litigation against Steiner, SKS and Camden also violates the Receiver's duty to preserve the status quo of the company as he found it when he was first appointed. See SEC v. First Financial Group of Texas, 645 F.2d 429, 438 (5th Cir. 1981) (receiver is appointed to preserve status quo by maintaining the assets of the company); SEC v. R.J. Allen and Associates, 386 F.Supp. 866, 878 (S.D. Fla. 1974) (appointment of receiver is only appropriate to "prevent diversion or waste of assets"); Los Angeles Trust Deed Mortgage Exchange v. SEC, 285 F.2d 162, 181 (9th Cir. 1961) (in SEC action, district court had power "to appoint receiver to maintain in status quo the assets" of defendants and purchasers); SEC v. Manor Nursing Centers, Inc., 458 F.2d 1082, 1105 (2d Cir. 1972) (trustee appointed to preserve status quo); SEC v. American Board of Trade, Inc., 803 F.2d 431, 436-37 (2d Cir. 1987) (purpose of appointment of receiver is to preserve status quo and estate).
- 9. Maintaining the status quo does not include spending corporate assets to commence premature and costly litigation to collect monies which have not yet been connected to any fraudulent behavior. In fact, the Receiver does not offer an explanation, because there is none, of how the proposed collection litigation relates to preserving the status quo of Mutual Benefits.
- Thus, the Receiver's request to commence collection litigation against Steiner, SKS and Camden must be denied because the request is just another improper attempt by the Receiver to assist the SEC in prosecuting its action and does not fall within the legitimate powers of a status quo receiver.

WHEREFORE, Defendants and Relief Defendants request that the Court deny the portion of the Receiver's Motion for Authority to Continue to Pay Premiums, Address Other Operational Issues, and Commence Collection Litigation that requests authority to commence collection litigation.

### RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED BY:

BRUCE A. ZIMET, ESQ.

Bruce A. Zimet, P.A.

COUNSEL FOR LESLIE STEINGER AND RELIEF DEFENDANTS

 $RAINY\,AND\,\,TWIN\,\,GROVES$ 

One Financial Plaza, Suite 2612 Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33394

Phone: (954) 764-7081 Fax: (954) 760-4421

Bγ:

BRUCE A. ZIMET, ES O. Florida Bar No. 225052

JON A. SALE, ESQ. BEN KUEHNE, ESQ. Sale & Kuehne, P.A.

COUNSEL FOR PETER LOMBARDI AND RELIEF DEFENDANT PJL CONSULTING

100 S.E. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Suite 3550

Miami, FL 33131-2154 Phone: (305) 789-5989 Fax: (305) 789-5987

By:

JON A. SALE, ESQ. Elorida Bar No. 246387 BEN KUEHNE, ESQ. Florida Bar No. 233293

Dated this 2nd day of July, 2004

RICHARD BEN-VENISTE, ESQ.

LEE RUBIN, ESQ.

Mayer Brown Rowe & Maw

COUNSEL FOR JOEL STEINGER

AND RELIEF DEFENDANT KENSINGTON

1909 K. Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Phone: (202) 263-5333

Fax: (202) 263-3333

RICHARD BEN-VENIS

JOHN HOGAN, ESQ. Holland & Knight LLP

COUNSEL FOR JOEL STEINGER

701 Brickell Avenue, 30<sup>th</sup> Floor

Miami, Florida 33131 Phone: (305) 789-7693 Fax: (305) 789-7799

JOHN HOGAN, ESQ.

/ Florida Bar No. 238082

FAITH E. GAY, ESQ.

White & Case LLP

COUNSEL FOR CAMDEN CONSULTING

200 South Biscayne Blvd., Suite 4900

Miami, Florida 33131-2352

Phone: (305) 995-5218

Fax: (305) 358-5744

Ву:

FAITH E. GAY, ESQ.

Florida Bar No. 129593

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was sent via facsimile and U.S. Mail this 2nd day of July, 2004 to all individuals named on the attached Service List.

Angela D. Daker

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION v. MUTUAL BENEFITS CORP., et al. USDC, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA (Miami)
Case No. 04-60573-CIV-Moreno

### SERVICE LIST Updated July 1, 2004

### <u>COUNSEL FOR ECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSON:</u>

ALISE M. JOHNSON, ESQ. Assistant Regional Director U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission 801 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1800 Miami, Florida 33131 Phone: (305) 982-6300 Fax: (305) 536-4154

#### COUNSEL FOR LESLIE STEINGER AND RELIEF DEFENDANTS RAINY AND TWIN GROVES

BRUCE A. ZIMET, ESQ. Bruce A. Zimet, P.A. One Financial Plaza, Suite 2612 Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33394 Phone: (954) 764-7081 Fax: (954) 760-4421

# COUNSEL FOR ROBERTO MARTINEZ, (RECEIVER FOR MUTUAL BENEFITS CORP. AND RELIEF DEFENDANTS VIATICAL BENEFACTORS LLC AND VIATICAL SERVICES, INC.)

DAVID MILIAN, ESQ.
Kozyak, Tropin & Throckmorton,
P.A.
2800 First Union Financial Bldg.
200 South Biscayne Blvd.
Miami, FL 33131-2335
Phone: (305) 377-0663
Fax: (305) 372-3508

MARC COOPER, ESQ. Colson Hicks Eidson 255 Aragon Avenue, Second Floor Coral Gables, Florida 33134 Phone: (305) 476-7400 Fax: (305) 476-7444

#### COUNSEL FOR JOEL STEINGER AND RELIEF DEFENDANT KENSINGTON

JOHN HOGAN, ESQ. Holland & Knight LLP 701 Brickell Avenue, 30th Floor Miami, Florida 33131 Phone: (305) 789-7693 Fax: (305) 789-7799

RICHARD BEN-VENISTE, ESQ. LEE RUBIN, ESQ. Mayer Brown Rowe & Maw 1909 K. Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 Phone: (202) 263-3000 Fax: (202) 263-3300

# COUNSEL FOR PETER LOMBARDI AND RELIEF DEFENDANT PJL CONSULTING

JON A. SALE, ESQ. BENEDICT P. KUEHNE, ESQ. Sale & Kuehne, P.A. BankAmerica Tower, Suite 3550 100 S.E. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Miami, FL 33131-2154 Phone: (305) 789-5989 Fax: (305) 789-5987

# COUNSEL FOR RELIEF DEFENDANTS CAMDEN CONSULTING, INC.

FAITH E. GAY White & Case LLP 200 Biscayne Boulevard, 47th Fl. Miami, Florida 33131 Phone: (305) 371-2700 Fax: (305) 358-5744

# COUNSEL FOR FIRST AMERICAN TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY

William Berger, Esquire Chad J. Tamaroff, Esquire Greenspoon, Marder, Hirschfeld, Rafkin, Ross & Berger, P.A. 100 West Cypress Creek Road, Suite 700 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309 Phone: (888) 491-1120 Fax: (954) 771-9264

### COUNSEL FOR VALLEY FORGE LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY

JOSEPH D'AMBROSIO, ESQ. Miller, Kagan, Rodriguez and Silver, P.A. One Boca Place 2255 Glades Road, Suite 236W Boca Raton, FL 33431 Phone: (561) 989-8878 Fax: (561) 989-8877

STEPHEN C. BAKER, ESQ. JASON P. GOSSELIN, ESQ. JOHN C. DEMPSEY, ESQ. Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP One Logan Square 18th & Cherry Street Philadelphia, PA 19103-6996 Phone: (215) 988-2769 Fax: (215) 988-2757