

05 JUN -7 PM 11:51
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

1 Joel Held, TX State Bar No. 09389800
joel.held@bakernet.com
2 Laura J. O'Rourke, TX State Bar No. 24037219
laura.j.orourke@bakernet.com
3 Maricela Siewczynski, TX State Bar No. 24032753
maricela.siew@bakernet.com
4 **BAKER & McKENZIE LLP**
2001 Ross Avenue, Ste. 2300
5 Dallas, TX 75201
Telephone: +1 214 978 3000
6 Facsimile: +1 214 978 3099
Application to Appear *Pro Hac Vice* Pending

7 Christopher Van Gundy, CA State Bar No. 152359
christopher.vangundy@bakernet.com
8 **BAKER & McKENZIE LLP**
9 Two Embarcadero Center, 24th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3909
10 Telephone: +1 415 576 3000
Facsimile: +1 415 576 3099

11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
12 Consolidated Management Group, LLC
13 Consolidated Leasing Anadarko Joint Venture
Consolidated Leasing Hugoton Joint Venture #2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

JSW

C 06 4203

18 Consolidated Management Group, LLC, a
19 Kansas limited liability company,
20 Consolidated Leasing Anadarko Joint Venture, a
21 Kansas general partnership, and Consolidated
Leasing Hugoton Joint Venture #2, a Kansas
22 general partnership,

Plaintiffs,

v.

23 Preston DuFauchard, California Corporations
24 Commissioner
25 and
California Department of Corporations,

Defendants.

Case No. _____

**VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR
VIOLATIONS OF 42 U.S.C. § 1983
AND THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE
AND FOR INJUNCTIVE AND
DECLARATORY RELIEF**

1 Plaintiffs, Consolidated Management Group, LLC, Consolidated Leasing Anadarko Joint
2 Venture, and Consolidated Leasing Hugoton Joint Venture #2 ("Plaintiffs"), hereby allege as
3 follows:

4 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5 1. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
6 § 1331 because this matter involves a federal question arising under the Supremacy Clause and
7 federal statutes enacted by Congress, including 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 42 U.S.C. § 1343(a)(3).
8 Abstention from jurisdiction under *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971) is not appropriate in this
9 case, because it is "readily apparent" that the Commissioner's actions in issuing the D&R are
10 preempted by NSMIA, and, therefore, "no significant state interest [would be] served" by abstention.
11 *See Bud Antle, Inc. v. Barbosa*, 45 F.3d 1261, 1266 (9th Cir. 1994) (reversing dismissal of Plaintiff's
12 complaint for injunctive relief against a California agency because it was "readily apparent" that the
13 agency was acting beyond its authority, and therefore, abstention was not appropriate).

14 2. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Northern District of
15 California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because this civil action is not founded on diversity of
16 citizenship, both Defendants reside in this district, and a substantial part of the events giving rise to
17 the claims alleged in this Complaint occurred in this district. The California Department of
18 Corporations is a State agency, and Preston DuFauchard as California Corporations Commissioner is
19 an official with that agency, both of which are deemed to reside in the district(s) where their official
20 duties are performed. *See Florida Nursing Home Ass'n v. Page*, 616 F.2d 1355, 1360 (5th Cir.
21 1980), *rev'd on other grounds*, 450 U.S. 147 (1981); *see also Straus Family Creamery v. Lyons*, 219
22 F. Supp. 2d 1046, 1048 (N.D. Cal. 2002). Both the California Corporations Commissioner and the
23 Department of Corporations perform their official duties and have offices in the Northern District of
24 California, and the events giving rise to the claims asserted herein occurred in this district.

25 THE PARTIES

26 3. Plaintiff Consolidated Management Group, LLC ("Consolidated") is a limited
27 liability company organized and existing under the laws of Kansas with its principal place of
28 business located at 410 Urban Drive, Hutchinson, Kansas 67501.

1 4. Consolidated Leasing Anadarko Joint Venture (“Anadarko Joint Venture”) is a
2 general partnership formed under and pursuant to the laws of Kansas with its principal place of
3 business located at 410 Urban Drive, Hutchinson, Kansas 67501.

4 5. Consolidated Leasing Hugoton Joint Venture #2 (“Hugoton Joint Venture”) is a
5 general partnership formed under and pursuant to the laws of Kansas with its principal place of
6 business located at 410 Urban Drive, Hutchinson, Kansas 67501.

7 6. Defendant Preston DuFauchard is the California Corporations Commissioner and is
8 sued in his official capacity. Defendant DuFauchard conducts business out of and can be served
9 with process at any of the four offices of the Department of Corporations in the State of California,
10 including the office located at 1515 K Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814-4052.

11 7. Defendant California Department of Corporations is an executive department of the
12 state of California. The Department of Corporations, of which the Commissioner of Corporations is
13 the chief officer, is a division of the California Business and Transportation Agency. *See* Cal. Corp.
14 Code § 25600 (Deering 2006). The Department of Corporations can be served at 1515 K Street,
15 Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814-4052.

16 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL BACKGROUND**

17 8. Consolidated is a Kansas limited liability company, formed in 2003 for the purpose
18 of, among other things, acting as managing venturer of partnerships, joint ventures, and other entities
19 formed by Consolidated in connection with the oil and gas industry. More specifically, Consolidated
20 sponsors and acts as managing venturer for joint ventures (general partnerships) that purchase and
21 lease drilling and other heavy-duty equipment utilized in the oil and gas industry.

22 9. In approximately August of 2005, Consolidated sponsored the offer and sale of
23 interests in the Hugoton Joint Venture. The Hugoton Joint Venture is a Kansas general partnership,
24 formed for the purpose of acquiring and leasing energy-related service equipment. In connection
25 with the proposed offer and sale of joint venture interests in the Hugoton Joint Venture,
26 Consolidated (as managing venturer) filed with the United States Securities and Exchange
27 Commission (“SEC”) a Form D, Notice of Sale of Securities Pursuant to Regulation D (Rules 501 –
28 508 [17 C.F.R. 230.501 et seq.]) promulgated pursuant to the Securities Act of 1933, as amended

1 [15 U.S.C. § 77a et seq.] (the "Securities Act")). Specifically, Consolidated and the Hugoton Joint
2 Venture took advantage of the safe harbor provisions (exemption from registration) pursuant to Rule
3 506 [17 C.F.R. 230.506] of Regulation D.¹

4 10. Also in August of 2005, Consolidated filed and served with the California
5 Corporations Commissioner ("the Commissioner"), Department of Corporations, two copies of the
6 Form D filed with the SEC for the Hugoton Joint Venture, two copies of the U-2 Uniform Consent
7 to Service of Process, and the \$300.00 notice filing fee required under California Corporations Code
8 Section 25102.1(d). It is undisputed that Consolidated filed the referenced materials with the
9 Department of Corporations on behalf of the Hugoton Joint Venture.

10 11. In approximately November of 2005, Consolidated sponsored the offer and sale of
11 interests in the Consolidated Leasing Anadarko Joint Venture. The Anadarko Joint Venture is a
12 Kansas general partnership, formed for the purpose of acquiring and leasing energy-related service
13 equipment. In connection with the proposed offer and sale of joint venture interests in the Anadarko
14 Joint Venture, Consolidated (as managing venturer) filed with the SEC a Form D, Notice of Sale of
15 Securities Pursuant to Regulation D (in identical manner to the filing in the Hugoton Joint Venture).

16 12. Also in November of 2005, Consolidated filed and served with the Commissioner two
17 copies of the Form D filed with the SEC for the Anadarko Joint Venture, two copies of the U-2
18 Uniform Consent to Service of Process, and the \$300.00 notice filing fee required under California
19 Corporations Code Section 25102.1(d). It is undisputed that Consolidated filed the referenced
20 materials with the Department of Corporations on behalf of the Anadarko Joint Venture.

21 13. On or about January 23, 2006, Wayne Strumpfer, then-acting California Corporations
22 Commissioner, issued a "Desist and Refrain Order" ("D&R") to Kenneth W. Keegan, Faber Lane
23

24 ¹ Notwithstanding the filing of the Forms D by Consolidated with respect to the Hugoton and
25 Anadarko Joint Ventures, Consolidated takes the position and has always taken the position, that the
26 interests in the Hugoton and Anadarko Joint Ventures are *not* securities but are true general
27 partnership interests with all the attendant liabilities, management powers, and duties associated with
28 a general partnership. The details of these liabilities, duties, responsibilities, and Consolidated's
position that the joint venture interests are not securities are all set forth in the Confidential
Information Memoranda, Joint Venture Agreements, and all other accompanying and related
materials for the joint ventures. The filing of the Forms D is done out of an over-abundance of
caution and so Consolidated can avail itself of the safe harbor provisions afforded it under
Regulation D.

1 Johnston, Brandon Taylor, Guardian Capital Management, Consolidated Management Group, LLC,
2 Consolidated Leasing Anadarko Joint Venture, and Consolidated Leasing Hugoton Joint Venture #2
3 (collectively, "the Respondents"). The D&R alleges violations of sections 25110 and 25210 of the
4 California Corporations Code.

5 14. The D&R asserts that Consolidated, the Hugoton Joint Venture, and the Anadarko
6 Joint Venture (as well as the other Respondents) "are engaged in the offer and sale of securities in
7 the form of joint venture interests" and that they "have engaged in general solicitations to the public
8 to offer and sell these joint venture interests." The D&R further alleges that the "Department of
9 Corporations has not issued a permit or other form of qualification authorizing any person to offer
10 and sell these securities in this state." The D&R concludes, based upon the referenced findings, that
11 the joint venture interests offered and sold in the Hugoton and Anadarko Joint Ventures "are
12 securities and are subject to qualification under the California Corporate Securities Law of 1968, and
13 that these securities have been offered and sold without being qualified in violation of Corporations
14 Code section 25110 and are not exempt."

15 15. As a result of the Commissioner's findings, the Commissioner ordered Consolidated,
16 the Hugoton Joint Venture, and the Anadarko Joint Venture (as well as the other Respondents) to
17 desist and refrain from "the further offer or sale in the State of California of securities, including but
18 not limited to joint venture interests, unless and until qualification has been made under the law or
19 unless exempt." The D&R does *not* assert any allegation of fraud.

20 16. On February 21, 2006, Consolidated, the Anadarko Joint Venture, and the Hugoton
21 Joint Venture (collectively, "the Consolidated Respondents") filed with the Department of
22 Corporations their Request for Hearing, Motion to Dismiss, and Notice of Defense. In their Motion
23 to Dismiss, the Consolidated Respondents asserted, among other things, that the Commissioner
24 lacked jurisdiction over them because the Joint Venture Interests are not securities, and further, even
25 if the Joint Venture Interests were to be interpreted as securities, the filing with the State of
26 California of the Forms D, U-2, and fees made the sale of the Joint Venture Interests exempt from
27 the registration requirements of California's securities code. The Motion to Dismiss also asserted
28 that the Commissioner's authority over the Consolidated Respondents with respect to the sale of the

1 Joint Venture Interests was preempted by the application of the National Securities Markets
2 Improvement Act of 1996 ("NSMIA") [15 U.S.C. § 77r], which by its title, "Exemption from State
3 Regulation of Securities Offerings," is self-explanatory.²

4 17. On February 22, 2006, Kenneth Keegan, Faber Laine Johnston, Brandon Taylor, and
5 Guardian Capital Management (collectively, "the Guardian Respondents") joined in the
6 Consolidated Respondents' Request for Hearing, Motion to Dismiss, and Notice of Defense. On
7 March 2, 2006, the Guardian Respondents withdrew their Request for Hearing and consented to the
8 D&R (as to themselves only).

9 18. On March 6 and 7, 2006, the Consolidated Respondents and counsel for the
10 Department of Corporations and the Commissioner proceeded with the scheduled hearing before an
11 Administrative Law Judge at the Office of Administrative Hearings in Oakland, California. At that
12 hearing, the Consolidated Respondents reiterated that the Commissioner's actions against the
13 Consolidated Respondents through the D&R are preempted under NSMIA and that the
14 Commissioner lacks jurisdiction over the Respondents.

15 19. The Administrative Law Judge took the Consolidated Respondents' Motions and
16 arguments under advisement and ordered the hearing to proceed. The hearing took place over two
17 full days, and at the conclusion of the second day the parties and the Administrative Law Judge
18 agreed upon a post-hearing briefing schedule. The final brief was submitted to the Administrative
19 Law Judge on April 5, 2006, and the matter was "deemed submitted" to him on that date for
20 purposes of rendering his proposed decision within thirty (30) days.

21 20. On May 5, 2006, the Administrative Law Judge issued his proposed decision on the
22 D&R. The Administrative Law Judge stated the following with respect to the NSMIA preemption
23 issue:

24 While the issue of federal preemption may be raised in an
25 administrative proceeding, **it cannot be decided here.** Article III,
26 section 3.5, of the California Constitution provides, in relevant part, as
27 follows:

28 ² The Consolidated Respondents also filed a separate motion to dismiss and brief on the issue of
NSMIA preemption. These were served on the Commissioner on February 27, 2006.

1 An administrative agency ... has no power:

2 [¶] ... [¶]

3 (c) To declare a statute unenforceable, or to refuse to enforce a
4 statute on the basis that federal law or federal regulations
5 prohibit the enforcement of such statute unless an appellate
6 court has made a determination that the enforcement of such
7 statute is prohibited by federal law or federal regulations.

8 The Administrative Law Judge then denied the Consolidated Respondents' (preemption) Motion to
9 Dismiss.

10 21. Plaintiffs (the Consolidated Respondents) never alleged that the statute at issue
11 (California Corporations Code section 25102.1) was unenforceable. On the contrary, Plaintiffs
12 argued just the opposite. Plaintiffs believe the California statute as written complies with the
13 mandates of federal preemption set forth in NSMIA. Plaintiffs believe it is the Commissioner's
14 *interpretation* of the statute that is the problem, because the Commissioner believes he has the
15 authority to "look behind" the covered security exemption claimed by the Plaintiffs for an alleged
16 *registration* violation. For this reason, Plaintiffs believe the Commissioner has overstepped his
17 authority, even under the California statute.

18 22. Under California Government Code Section 11517(c)(2), the Commissioner has until
19 August 13, 2006 (the 100th day following receipt of the proposed decision) to act on the
20 Administrative Law Judge's proposed decision. The Commissioner can adopt the decision in its
21 entirety, reject it, or make certain changes to it. Plaintiffs remain subject to the terms of the D&R,
22 and they continue to suffer harm as a result of the prohibitions in the D&R. Additionally, Plaintiffs
23 are seriously harmed by the Commissioner's (and Administrative Law Judge's) erroneous
24 conclusion that the Joint Venture Interests are securities, a conclusion that the Administrative Law
25 Judge should never have had the opportunity to consider, because the entire basis for the
26 administrative proceeding is preempted by federal law.

27 23. Plaintiffs seek relief from this Court from the Commissioner's actions in issuing the
28 D&R for alleged registration violations of the California Corporations Code, such actions being
expressly prohibited under NSMIA.

1 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

2 **(Declaratory Judgment)**

3 24. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs in this claim for
4 relief.

5 25. In 1996, Congress enacted NSMIA, which eliminated the dual system of regulation
6 for certain securities offerings and prohibited states from requiring the registration of such securities.
7 *See* 15 U.S.C. § 77r (1997); *Temple v. Gorman*, 201 F. Supp. 2d 1238, 1243 (S.D. Fla. 2002).

8 26. The NSMIA “Exemption from State Regulation of Securities Offerings” provides:

9 No law, rule, regulation, or order or other administrative action of any State or any
10 political local division thereof—requiring, or with respect to, registration or
11 qualification of securities transactions, shall directly or indirectly apply to a security
12 that . . . is a covered security; or . . . shall directly or indirectly prohibit, limit, or
13 impose conditions, based on the merits of such offering or issuer, upon the offer or
14 sale of any [covered security].

15 15 U.S.C. § 77r(a).

16 27. The purpose of NSMIA was to “further and advance the development of national
17 securities markets and eliminate the costs and burdens of duplicative and unnecessary regulation by,
18 as a general rule, designating the Federal government as the exclusive regulator of national offerings
19 of securities.” *See* H.R. Rep. No. 104-622, at 16 (1996); *Temple*, 201 F. Supp. 2d at 1243.

20 28. “Where a Form D is filed with the SEC for a transaction that purports to merit an
21 exemption from federal registration pursuant to Regulation D, [states cannot] require duplicative
22 registration or a transactional exemption from registration.” *See Temple*, 201 F. Supp. 2d at 1243.

23 29. Consolidated filed with the SEC a Form D with respect to the sale of interests in both
24 the Hugoton and Anadarko Joint Ventures. Therefore, even if the sale of the joint venture interests
25 were securities transactions (which Plaintiffs assert that they are not), the joint venture interests fall
26 within the definition of “covered securities.” The Federal government—not the State of
27 California—is the only party authorized by Congress to scrutinize the merits of Plaintiffs’ offering.
28 If California, or any other state, had the authority to challenge the basis for a party’s Form D filing,
particularly for a State-securities-registration violation, there would exist an incongruous system of

1 securities regulation that would eliminate a party's ability to rely upon a Form D filing under Rule
2 506. This is exactly what NSMIA was intended to eliminate.

3 30. Plaintiffs request that this Court declare, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a), that
4 because they filed Forms D under Rule 506 with respect to the sale of the Joint Venture Interests,
5 NSMIA prohibits the Commissioner from challenging the status of those transactions as "covered
6 securities" and prohibits the Commissioner from requiring that Plaintiffs comply with California's
7 registration requirements with respect to the sale of joint venture interests.

8 31. A declaratory judgment is appropriate because it will serve the useful purpose of
9 clarifying and settling the legal issue of whether the Commissioner is preempted by NSMIA from
10 challenging the merits of Plaintiffs' Form D filing, and, if answered in the affirmative, whether the
11 Commissioner is prohibited by NSMIA from imposing registration requirements on Plaintiffs with
12 respect to the sale of the Joint Venture Interests (in light of the Form D filings under Rule 506). A
13 declaratory judgment is also appropriate because it will terminate and afford Plaintiffs relief from the
14 impermissibly issued D&R.

15 SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

16 (Violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Supremacy Clause)

17 32. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs in this claim for
18 relief.

19 33. "Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or
20 usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any
21 citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any
22 rights, privileges, or immunities, secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party
23 injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceedings for redress" 42 U.S.C. §
24 1983 (2003).

25 34. A Section 1983 claim arises when (1) the provision in question creates obligations
26 that are binding on the governmental unit, (2) the statute, by its terms, or as interpreted, creates
27 obligations sufficiently specific and definite to be within the competence of the judiciary to enforce,
28 (3) the provision is intended to benefit the putative plaintiff, and (4) such claim is not foreclosed by

1 express provision or other specific evidence from the statute itself. *See Golden State Transit Corp.*
2 *v. City of Los Angeles*, 493 U.S. 103, 107-109 (1989).

3 35. The Supremacy Clause of the Constitution invalidates state action that interferes with,
4 or is contrary to, federal law. *Bernhardt v. Pellman*, 339 F.3d 920, 929 (9th Cir. 2003).

5 36. "Even in the absence of an explicit statutory provision establishing a cause of action,
6 a private party may ordinarily seek declaratory and injunctive relief on the basis of federal
7 preemption." *Bud Antle, Inc. v. Barbosa*, 45 F.3d 1261, 1269 (9th Cir. 1994); *see also Bernhardt*,
8 339 F.3d at 929 (finding that a Supremacy Clause claim does not depend upon the existence of a
9 civil rights claim).

10 37. NSMIA creates specific and definite obligations that are binding on California (and
11 all the States) by prohibiting it from imposing laws, rules, regulations, orders, or other
12 **administrative actions** that require issuers of "covered securities" to register or qualify securities
13 transactions. *See* 15 U.S.C. § 77r(a) (1997).

14 38. "Covered securities" are defined to include securities that are exempt from
15 registration under 15 U.S.C. § 77r(a) pursuant to SEC rules or regulations issued under 15 U.S.C.
16 § 77d(2) (not involving a public offering). *See* 15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(4)(D).³ A party that timely and
17 properly files a Form D under Rule 506 with the SEC and the State in which the offering will be
18 made is deemed to fall within the exemption for "covered securities," and therefore, is exempt from
19 state registration and/or qualification requirements. *See Temple*, 201 F. Supp. 2d at 1243.

20 39. Plaintiffs are the intended beneficiaries of NSMIA because NSMIA is intended to
21 relieve parties of the burden of duplicative regulation in the area of securities registration. *See*
22 *Temple*, 201 F. Supp.2d at 1243; *see also Zuri-Invest AG v. Natwest Finance Inc.*, 177 F. Supp. 2d
23 189, 193 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (discussing NSMIA and stating that provisions 77r(a)(2) and (a)(3) were
24 intended specifically to "prevent an end run around the first preemption provision by states seeking
25 to impose their own registration requirements").

26
27
28 ³ States are not prohibited from imposing notice filing requirements that are substantially similar to
those imposed by 15 U.S.C. § 77d(2). *See* 15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(4)(D). However, this is irrelevant here
because it is undisputed that Plaintiffs complied with all of California's notice filing requirements.

1 40. As noted above, Consolidated filed Forms D with respect to the sale of interests in
2 each of the Joint Ventures. Therefore, even if the sale of the Joint Venture Interests were securities
3 transactions (which Plaintiffs assert that they are not), the sale of the interests falls within the
4 definition of "covered securities," and California is preempted from imposing registration
5 requirements with respect to these transactions.

6 41. The D&R violates 28 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution
7 because it violates the unequivocal mandate of 15 U.S.C. § 77r by imposing on Plaintiffs the
8 obligation to register and/or qualify the sale of "covered securities" within the State of California.

9 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
10 **(Preliminary and Permanent Injunction)**

11 42. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs in this claim for
12 relief.

13 43. "The Supreme Court and all courts established by Act of Congress may issue all writs
14 necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and
15 principles of law." *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) (1994).⁴ Pursuant to this Court's authority under the All
16 Writs Act, Plaintiffs seek a preliminary injunction pending final resolution of their claims and a
17 permanent injunction that prohibits the Commissioner from the following activities:

18 a. Requiring that Plaintiffs register and/or qualify the sale of joint venture
19 interests in the State of California when Plaintiffs have filed the appropriate Forms D and U-2
20 under Rule 506, have complied with all notice filing requirements, and have paid the required
21 fees.

22 b. Entering orders that prohibit Plaintiffs from selling joint venture interests in
23 the State of California when Plaintiffs have filed the appropriate Forms D and U-2 under Rule
24 506, have complied with all notice filing requirements, and have paid the required fees.

25 c. Enforcing the D&R entered on or about January 23, 2006.

26
27
28 ⁴ The Anti-Injunction Act does not limit this Court's ability to enjoin the Commissioner because the
Act does not apply to state administrative proceedings. *See Bud Antle*, 45 F.3d at 1265; *California*
v. M&P Invs., 46 F. App'x 876, 878 (9th Cir. 2002).

1 44. Plaintiffs are entitled to a preliminary injunction because there is a probable success
2 on the merits of their claims for violations of 28 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Supremacy Clause and the
3 D&R is causing Plaintiffs to suffer irreparable harm.

4 45. Plaintiffs are suffering irreparable harm because the Commissioner has made
5 erroneous findings that prevent Plaintiffs from doing business in California. Specifically, the D&R
6 contains findings that the sale of the Joint Venture Interests are "securities" and are not exempt
7 transactions. The business model upon which the Joint Ventures are based is the same model used
8 by Consolidated for the offer and sale of joint venture interests in California, as well as in other
9 states. Therefore, the Commissioner's erroneous findings have far-reaching effects on Consolidated,
10 not just in California, but in all other states in which Consolidated does business, all based on the
11 over-reaching, preempted acts of the Commissioner for alleged registration violations. NSMIA was
12 intended to give parties the right to be free from state regulation in the area of securities registration
13 and qualification of "covered securities." The D&R explicitly denies Plaintiffs that right.

14 46. Plaintiffs are also suffering irreparable harm because they are being denied the right
15 under Federal law to sell joint venture interests in California, lest they be held in contempt of court
16 for violating the D&R.

17 47. Furthermore, the public interest warrants the issuance of a preliminary injunction
18 because the Commissioner's actions attempt to impose additional regulation on "covered securities"
19 that Congress intended to eliminate.

20 48. Plaintiffs are willing and able to post a bond.

21 49. Plaintiffs' request for preliminary injunction is supported by the Verification of Mike
22 McNaul.

1 **DISCLOSURE OF NON-PARTY INTERESTED ENTITIES OR PERSONS**

2 50. Pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-16, the undersigned certifies that as of this date, other than
3 the named parties, there is no such interest to report.

4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that this Court enter judgment against Defendants:

- 6 (a) Declaring that because Plaintiffs filed Form D under Rule 506 with respect to the
7 offer and sale of the Joint Venture Interests, NSMIA prohibits the Commissioner from
8 challenging the status of those transactions as "covered securities" and prohibits the
9 Commissioner from requiring that Plaintiffs comply with California's registration
10 and/or qualification requirements with respect to the sale of joint venture interests;
- 11 (b) Ordering that the D&R is invalid and in violation of 28 U.S.C. § 1983 and the
12 Supremacy Clause of the Constitution;
- 13 (c) Enjoining Defendants and their officers, agents, employees, representatives, and all
14 persons in privity therewith, from:
 - 15 1. Requiring that Plaintiffs register and/or qualify the sale of joint venture
16 interests in the State of California when Plaintiffs have filed the appropriate
17 Forms D and U-2 under Rule 506, have complied with all notice filing
18 requirements, and have paid the required fees;
 - 19 2. Entering orders that prohibit Plaintiffs from selling joint venture interests in
20 the State of California when Plaintiffs have filed the appropriate Forms D and
21 U-2 under Rule 506, have complied with all notice filing requirements, and
22 have paid the required fees;
 - 23 3. Enforcing the D&R entered by the Commissioner against Plaintiffs on or about
24 January 23, 2006.

VERIFICATION

I, Mike McNaul, declare:

I am a Principal for Consolidated Management Group, LLC, which is a party to the above action and which is the Managing Venturer for Consolidated Leasing Anadarko Joint Venture and Consolidated Leasing Hugoton Joint Venture #2, also parties to the above action. I have read **PLAINTIFFS' VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF 42 U.S.C. § 1983 AND THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE AND FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF** and know the contents thereof.

The matters stated in paragraphs 3 through 23 are true and correct of my own knowledge.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States and of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this verification was executed by me on July 7, 2006.

Mike McNaul

1 (d) Ordering that Defendants reimburse Plaintiffs for their costs of suit and for such other
2 relief as justice may provide.

3 Dated: July 7, 2006

BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP
Christopher Van Gundy

BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP
Joel Held
Laura J. O'Rourke
Maricela Siewczynski

8 By: _____
9 Christopher Van Gundy
10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
11 Consolidated Management Group, LLC
12 Consolidated Leasing Anadarko Joint Venture
13 Consolidated Leasing Hugoton Joint Venture #2
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28