

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2 BUSINESS, CONSUMER SERVICES AND HOUSING AGENCY
3 DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS OVERSIGHT

4 TO: Campus Decision Support System Inc.
5 Campus DSS
6 EDUjudicate
7 Ejudicate
8 Saman Francis Seneviratne
9 Paul M. Hanley

10 4575 Rudisill Street
11 Montclair, CA 91763

12 214 Main Street, Suite 274
13 El Segundo, CA 90245

14 **DESIST AND REFRAIN ORDER**

15 **(For violations of section 25401 of the Corporations Code)**

16 The Commissioner of Business Oversight finds that:

17 1. At all relevant times, Campus Decision Support System Inc. also known as Campus
18 DSS, EDUjudicate, and Ejudicate (Campus DSS) was a California corporation and maintained a
19 website at <https://edujudicate.com>. Campus DSS maintained addresses located at: 4575 Rudisill
20 Street, Montclair, CA 91763 and 214 Main Street, Suite 274, El Segundo, CA 90245.

21 2. Campus DSS purported to have created a data support system to assist law
22 enforcement and campus officials prevent violence on university campuses.

23 3. At all relevant times, Saman Francis Seneviratne also known as Sam Francis Senev
24 and Sam Senev (Seneviratne) was a control person of Campus DSS.

25 4. At all relevant times, Paul M. Hanley (Hanley) was the Chief Executive Officer and
26 Director of Campus DSS.

27 5. Beginning on or about July 2014, Campus DSS through Seneviratne and Hanley,
28 offered and sold securities in the form of investment contracts through in-person solicitations.

///

///

1 6. In connection with the offer and sale of these securities, Campus DSS, Seneviratne,
2 and Hanley made, or cause to be made, misrepresentations of material fact or omitted to state
3 material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under
4 which they were made, not misleading. These misrepresentations and omissions included, but are not
5 limited to the following:

6 (a) Campus DSS, Seneviratne, and Hanley misrepresented to investors that they
7 would receive written investment contracts, company financial statements, and records showing proof
8 of investments in Campus DSS.

9 (b) Campus DSS, Seneviratne, and Hanley failed to disclose to investors that a
10 judgment was entered against Seneviratne in *Stotsenberg Foundation v. Sam Seneviratne*, case
11 number cv 13-07744, in the United States District Court, Central District of California on June 11,
12 2014. The court's order awarded Stotsenberg its costs, \$12,835.00 in attorneys' fees, and recovery of
13 \$154,054.80 in damages and pre-judgement interest against Seneviratne.

14 (c) Campus DSS, Seneviratne, and Hanley failed to disclose to investors that the
15 United States Bankruptcy Court, Central District of California, entered an Order Granting Motion for
16 Default Judgment Under LBR 7055-1 against Seneviratne in *In re: Jack A. Harriman*, case number
17 2:11-bk-33451-PC on November 27, 2013.

18 Based on the foregoing findings, the Commissioner of Business Oversight is of the opinion
19 that the securities offered by Campus Decision Support System Inc. a.k.a. Campus DSS,
20 EDUjudicate, and Ejudicate, Saman Francis Seneviratne a.k.a. Sam Francis Senev and Sam Senev,
21 and Paul M. Hanley were offered in this state by means of written or oral communications that
22 included untrue statements of material fact or omitted to state material facts necessary in order to
23 make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not
24 misleading, in violation of section 25401 of the Corporate Securities Law of 1968.

25 Pursuant to section 25532 of the Corporate Securities Law of 1968, Campus Decision Support
26 System Inc. a.k.a. Campus DSS, EDUjudicate, and Ejudicate, Saman Francis Seneviratne a.k.a. Sam
27 Francis Senev and Sam Senev, and Paul M. Hanley, are hereby ordered to desist and refrain from
28 offering or selling or buying or offering to buy any security in the State of California, including but

1 not limited to, investment contracts in Campus Decision Support System Inc. a.k.a. Campus DSS,
2 EDUjudicate, and Ejudicate, by means of any written or oral communication which includes an
3 untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state a material fact necessary in order to make the
4 statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.

5 This Order is necessary, in the public interest, for the protection of investors and consistent
6 with the purposes, policies, and provisions of the Corporate Securities Law of 1968.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: July 24, 2017
Los Angeles, California

JAN LYNN OWEN
Commissioner of Business Oversight

By: _____
MARY ANN SMITH
Deputy Commissioner
Enforcement Division