

IN THE MATTER OF:

JOHNSTON, MAYER & ASSOCIATES,

MARK STEVENS, and

ERIC STEVENS,

Respondents.

BEFORE THE MARYLAND

COMMISSIONER OF

FINANCIAL REGULATION

Case No.: CFR-FY2010-046

FINAL ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST

WHEREAS, the Commissioner of Financial Regulation (the “Commissioner”) conducted an investigation into the credit services business activities of Johnston, Mayer & Associates (“JM&A”), Mark Stevens, and Eric Stevens, (collectively the “Respondents”); and

WHEREAS, as a result of that investigation, the Deputy Commissioner of Financial Regulation (the “Deputy Commissioner”) found evidence to support that Respondents have engaged, and continue to engage, in acts or practices constituting a violation of a law, regulation, rule or order over which the Commissioner has jurisdiction, namely that Respondents have violated various provisions of the Annotated Code of Maryland, including Commercial Law Article (“CL”), Title 14, Subtitle 19, (the Maryland Credit Services Businesses Act, hereinafter “MCSBA”), and Financial Institutions Article (“FI”), Title 11, Subtitles 2 and 3; and

WHEREAS, the Deputy Commissioner issued a Summary Order to Cease and Desist (the “Summary Order”) against Respondents on July 18, 2010, after determining that

Respondents were in violation of the aforementioned provisions of Maryland law, and that it was in the public interest that Respondents cease and desist from engaging in credit services business activities with Maryland residents, homeowners and/or consumers (hereinafter “Maryland consumers”), including directly or indirectly offering, contracting to provide, or otherwise engaging in, loan modification, loss mitigation, or similar services related to residential real property (hereinafter “loan modification services”); and

WHEREAS, the Summary Order notified Respondents of, among other things, the following: that Respondents were entitled to a hearing before the Commissioner to determine whether the Summary Order should be vacated, modified, or entered as a final order of the Commissioner; that the Summary Order would be entered as a final order if Respondents did not request a hearing within 15 days of the receipt of the Summary Order; and that as a result of a hearing, or of Respondents’ failure to request a hearing, the Commissioner may, in the Commissioner’s discretion and in addition to taking any other action authorized by law, enter an order making the Summary Order final, issue penalty orders against Respondents, issue orders requiring Respondents to pay restitution and other money to consumers, as well as take other actions related to Respondents’ business activities; and

WHEREAS, the Summary Order was properly served on Respondents via First Class U.S. Mail and Certified U.S. Mail; and

WHEREAS, Respondents failed to request a hearing on the Summary Order within the fifteen (15) day period set forth in FI § 2-115(a)(2) and have not filed a request for a hearing as of the date of this Final Order to Cease and Desist (this “Final Order”); and

WHEREAS, the Commissioner has based his decision in this Final Order on the following determinations:

1. The MCSBA defines “*credit services business*” at CL § 14-1901(e); this provision provides, in part, as follows:

(1) “Credit services business” means any person who, with respect to the extension of credit by others, sells, provides, or performs, or represents that such person can or will sell, provide, or perform, any of the following services in return for the payment of money or other valuable consideration:

- (i) Improving a consumer’s credit record, history, or rating or establishing a new credit file or record;
- (ii) Obtaining an extension of credit for a consumer; or
- (iii) Providing advice or assistance to a consumer with regard to either subparagraph (i) or (ii) of this paragraph.

Additionally, CL § 14-1903(f) defines “*extension of credit*” as “the right to defer payment of debt or to incur debt and defer its payment, offered or granted primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.”

2. The activities of persons engaged in the business of offering or providing loan modification services customarily include obtaining extensions of credit for consumers, namely obtaining forbearance or other deferrals of payment on consumers’ mortgage loans. This includes any offered services intended as part of the loan modification process, or which are represented to consumers to be necessary for participating in a loan modification program. Under certain circumstances, loan modification services may involve improving a consumer’s credit record, history, or rating or establishing a new credit file or record. Therefore, unless otherwise exempt, pursuant to CL §§ 14-1901(e), 14-1903(a), and 14-1903(f), persons engaged in the business of offering or providing residential loan modification services, which include offering or providing extensions of credit to

consumers, fall under the statutory definition of “credit services businesses,” and are thereby subject to the licensing, investigatory, enforcement, and penalty provisions of the MCSBA.

3. The following relevant and credible evidence, obtained pursuant to the Commissioner’s investigation, was considered in the issuance of the Summary Order: Respondents’ advertising and marketing materials; Respondents’ standard documents for providing loan modification services for Maryland consumers; communications between Respondents and the Commissioner’s staff; communications between Respondents and Maryland consumers; statements by Maryland consumers who had entered into loan modification agreements with Respondents but for whom Respondents failed to obtain or even attempt to obtain a loan modification for the consumers; and the Commissioner’s licensing records. More particularly, this evidence supports the following findings:

a. Respondent JM&A is a business entity purportedly operating out of offices located in the District of Columbia and/or in Alexandria, Virginia. Further, the Commissioner’s investigation revealed that JM&A engages in business activities with Maryland consumers involving Maryland residential real property, although it is not a registered business entity in the State of Maryland.

b. Respondent Mark Stevens engages in business activities involving Maryland consumers. Mark Stevens is the owner, director, officer, manager, employee and/or agent of JM&A.

c. Respondent Eric Stevens engages in business activities involving Maryland consumers. Eric Stevens is the owner, director, officer, manager, employee and/or agent of JM&A.

d. Respondents advertised and marketed to Maryland consumers that Respondents could obtain loan modifications for homeowners on their residential mortgages. Further, Respondents entered into agreements to provide loan modification services, which included obtaining extensions of credit as defined by the MCSBA, for Maryland consumers on their residential mortgage loans.

e. In late 2008, Sam Ankrah and [REDACTED] (collectively "Consumer A"), who were in default on their Maryland residential mortgage loan, entered into a loan modification agreement with Respondents. Consumer A paid approximately \$1,500.00 in up-front fees to Respondents in exchange for which Respondents represented that they would be able to obtain a loan modification for Consumer A. Although Respondents collected \$1,500.00 in up-front fees, Respondents never obtained a loan modification for Consumer A. Only after numerous unsuccessful attempts by Consumer A to collect a refund, and only after the Commissioner began his investigation in to this matter, did Respondents provide a refund of the up-front fees to Consumer A.

f. In July 2009, [REDACTED] ("Consumer B") entered into a loan modification agreement with Respondents. Consumer B paid \$5,500.00 in up-front fees to Respondents in exchange for which Respondents represented that they would be able to obtain a loan modification for Consumer B. Although Respondents collected \$5,500 in up-front fees, Respondents never obtained a loan modification for Consumer B. Further, Consumer B requested a refund of the up-front fees, to which the Respondents have yet to provide a refund.

g. In January 2009, [REDACTED] ("Consumer C") entered into a loan modification agreement with Respondents. Consumer C paid \$2,172.00 in up-front fees to

Respondents in exchange for which Respondents represented that they would be able to obtain a loan modification for Consumer C. Although Respondents collected \$2,172 in up-front fees, Respondents never obtained a loan modification for Consumer C. Further, Consumer C requested a refund of the up-front fees, to which the Respondents have yet to provide a refund.

h. During the course of the investigation, in mid 2009, Respondent Mark Stevens falsely stated at that time that JM&A had provided loan modification services to approximately four or five Maryland consumers. Subsequently, on or about September 17, 2009, the Commissioner served a subpoena on Respondents ordering them to produce all documents in their control in any way related to their loan modification services provided to Maryland consumers by October 1, 2009. The Commissioner granted Respondents a thirty (30) day extension to comply with the September 17th subpoena. On or about November 12, 2009, in response to that subpoena a box of consumer loan modification files were supplied to the Commissioner.

i. After a review of the loan modification files supplied by the Respondents in response to the September 17th subpoena, the Commissioner's investigation revealed, in part, the following:

(i). That there were eighty-four files provided by the Respondents, although a few of those files were repeat files.

(ii). That there were forty-eight (48) loan modification files in which no fees were indicated in the loan modification services contracts. The Respondents collected up-front fees on many of these agreements even though the contract provides for no fee;

(iii). That there were eighteen (18) loan modification files in which a \$1 fee was indicated in the loan modification services contracts. The Respondents collected up-front fees on many of these agreements well above the contracted for \$1 amount;

(iv). That there was one (1) loan modification file in which a fee of \$521 was indicated in the loan modification services contracts;

(v). That there were seventeen (17) loan modification files in which fees in the four figure range were indicated in the loan modification services contracts;

(vi). That a typical JM&A loan modification file included the following documents: a "Borrower Information Statement", a "Monthly Expenses" sheet, an "Income and Expenses" sheet, an "Information Required" sheet, an "Authorization to Represent", and a two page contract entitled, "Contract for California, Colorado, Illinois, Maryland and Virginia"- "Agreement for Negotiations." The contract provides twelve decretal paragraphs, of which decretal paragraph "3", titled "Fees for Services", reads, "[f]or and in consideration of the foregoing, Client agrees to pay to Johnston Mayer the sum of [sum to be listed, if any] only if and when Johnston Mayer has been 100% successful at negotiating an agreement that allows Client to retain ownership of the property and can afford the new payments to all the client (sic) general lenders";

(vii). That at least nine (9) additional Maryland consumers paid up-front fees to Respondents in exchange for which Respondents represented that they would be able to obtain a loan modification for these consumers, however Respondents never obtained a loan modification for these consumers. These consumers included: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (collectively "Consumer D") paid \$2,095.95 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer E") paid \$1,819.32 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer F") paid \$3,017.50 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer G") paid \$3,100 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer H") paid \$1,700 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer I") paid \$4,420 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer J") paid \$2,872 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer K") paid \$2,500 in up-front fees; and [REDACTED] ("Consumer L") paid \$3,000 in up-front fees.

(viii). That at least thirty-four (34) additional Maryland consumers paid up-front fees to Respondents in exchange for which Respondents represented that they would be able to obtain a loan modification for these consumers, however, the Commissioner's investigation was unable to determine if Respondents were successful in obtaining a loan modification for these consumers. These consumers included: [REDACTED] ("Consumer M") paid \$3,300 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer N") paid \$1,405 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer O") paid \$1,500 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer P") paid \$2,200 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer Q") paid \$1,600 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] (collectively "Consumer R") paid \$3,000 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer S") paid \$2,400 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer T") paid \$2,500 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer U") paid \$2,633.51 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer V") paid \$1,700 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer W") paid \$3,042 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer X") paid \$2,002 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer Y") paid \$1,840 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer Z") paid \$2,000 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer AA") paid \$2,695 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer BB")

paid \$3,300 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer CC") paid \$8,000 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer DD") paid \$2,200 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer EE") paid \$2,100 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer FF") paid \$2,100 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer GG") paid \$1,356 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer HH") paid \$2,000 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer II") paid \$521 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer JJ") paid \$2,500 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer KK") paid \$1,790 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer LL") paid \$1,800 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer MM") paid \$3,000 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer NN") paid \$3,100 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer OO") paid \$2,000 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] (collectively "Consumer PP") paid \$1,795 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer QQ") paid \$2,000 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer RR") paid \$2,954 in up-front fees; [REDACTED] ("Consumer SS") paid \$4,455.45 in up-front fees; and [REDACTED] ("Consumer TT") paid \$3,400 in up-front fees.

(viii). That Respondents were successful in obtaining loan modifications for three (3) Maryland consumers.

(ix). That Consumer C's loan modification file, along with other Maryland consumers' loan modification files were not produced by the Respondents to the Commissioner. Accordingly, Respondents have failed to fully comply with the September 17th subpoena, and thus are in violation of FI § 2-114.

j. That "Exhibit A" attached hereto is a table representing the information gathered by the Commissioner during the course of his investigation as to

Respondents' conduct with regard to loan modification services provided to Maryland consumers.

k. Respondents engaged in willful conduct which was intended to deceive and defraud Maryland consumers referenced above, which demonstrated a complete lack of good faith and fair dealings by Respondents, and which breached any duties that Respondents owed to these consumers. Such conduct included, but was not limited to, the following:

(i). Respondents failed to perform those loan modification services for Maryland consumers that they promised to provide and for which they had collected up-front fees;

(ii). Respondents purposely concealed this information when contacted by Maryland consumers who had entered into loan modification agreements with Respondents by intentionally misrepresenting the progress of their loan modifications, when in fact Respondents had not even attempted to modify their residential mortgage loans;

(iii). Respondents failed to return telephone calls and e-mail communications from Maryland consumers once they became concerned that Respondents had done nothing to obtain loan modifications on their behalf; and

(iv). Finally, Respondents refused to provide refunds to these Maryland consumers when refunds were due for lack of service.

4. In the present matter, Respondents are subject to the MCSBA, including its prohibition on engaging in credit services business activities without first being licensed under the MCSBA. *See* CL § 14-1902(1) (“[a] credit services business, its employees, and independent contractors who sell or attempt to sell the services of a credit services business

shall not: (1) [r]eceive any money or other valuable consideration from the consumer, unless the credit services business has secured from the Commissioner a license under Title 11, Subtitle 3 of the Financial Institutions Article. . . .”); CL §14-1903(b) (“[a] credit services business is required to be licensed under this subtitle and is subject to the licensing, investigatory, enforcement, and penalty provisions of this subtitle and Title 11, Subtitle 3 of the Financial Institutions Article”); FI § 11-302 (“[u]nless the person is licensed by the Commissioner, a person may not: . . . (3) [e]ngage in the business of a credit services business as defined under Title 14, Subtitle 19 of the Commercial Law Article”); and FI § 11-303 (“[a] license under this subtitle shall be applied for and issued in accordance with, and is subject to, the licensing and investigatory provisions of Subtitle 2 of this title, the Maryland Consumer Loan Law – Licensing Provisions”).

5. According to the Commissioner’s records, at no time relevant to the facts set forth in the Summary Order of July 18, 2010, or in the present Final Order, have the Respondents been licensed by the Commissioner under the MCSBA.

6. Respondents have engaged in credit services business activities without having the requisite license by advertising that they could provide loan modification services as described above, and by entering into contractual agreements with Maryland consumers, referenced above, to provide such services. Respondents’ unlicensed loan modification activities thus constitute violations of CL § 14-1902(1), CL §14-1903(b), FI § 11-302, and FI § 11-303, thereby subjecting Respondents to the penalty provisions of the MCSBA.

7. Additionally, by collecting up-front fees prior to fully and completely performing all services on behalf of Maryland consumers, referenced above, Respondents violated CL § 14-1902(6) of the MCSBA (“[a] credit services business, its employees, and

independent contractors who sell or attempt to sell the services of a credit services business shall not: . . . (6) [c]harge or receive any money or other valuable consideration prior to full and complete performance of the services that the credit services business has agreed to perform for or on behalf of the consumer”).

8. Further, although Respondents made representations that they would obtain beneficial loan modifications for Maryland consumers, referenced above,, the Commissioner’s investigation supports a finding that Respondents never obtained the promised loan modifications for these consumers; as such, Respondents violated CL § 14-1902(4) (“[a] credit services business, its employees, and independent contractors who sell or attempt to sell the services of a credit services business shall not: . . . (4) [m]ake or use any false or misleading representations in the offer or sale of the services of a credit services business”).

9. Respondents further violated the MCSBA through the following: they failed to clearly and conspicuously state in their loan modification advertisements their license number under the MCSBA or their exemption, in violation of CL § 14-1903.1; they failed to obtain the requisite surety bonds, in violation of to CL §§ 14-1908 and 14-1909; they failed to provide Maryland consumers, referenced above, with the requisite information statements, in violation of CL §§ 14-1904 and 14-1905; and Respondents failed to include all of the requisite contractual terms in their agreements with Maryland consumers, referenced above, as required under CL § 14-1906.

10. By failing to obtain beneficial loan modifications for Maryland consumers, referenced above, which Respondents had agreed to provide, Respondents breached their contracts with these consumers and/or breached the obligations arising under those

contracts. Such breaches constitute *per se* violations of the MCSBA pursuant to CL § 14-1907(a) (“[a]ny breach by a credit services business of a contract under this subtitle, or of any obligation arising under it, shall constitute a violation of this subtitle”).

11. As the contracts between Respondents and Maryland consumers, referenced above, failed to comply with the specific requirements imposed by the MCSBA (as discussed above), all loan modification contracts between Respondents and these Maryland consumers are void and unenforceable as against the public policy of the State of Maryland pursuant to CL § 14-1907(b) (“[a]ny contract for services from a credit services business that does not comply with the applicable provisions of this subtitle shall be void and unenforceable as contrary to the public policy of this State”).

12. The MCSBA prohibits fraud and deceptive business practices at CL § 14-1902(5), which provides as follows:

[a] credit services business, its employees, and independent contractors who sell or attempt to sell the services of a credit services business shall not: . . . (5) [e]ngage, directly or indirectly, in any act, practice, or course of business which operates as a fraud or deception on any person in connection with the offer or sale of the services of a credit services business.

13. CL § 14-1912 discusses liability for failing to comply with the MCSBA, providing as follows:

(a) *Willful noncompliance.*— Any credit services business which willfully fails to comply with any requirement imposed under this subtitle with respect to any consumer is liable to that consumer in an amount equal to the sum of:

(1) Any actual damages sustained by the consumer as a result of the failure;

(2) A monetary award equal to 3 times the total amount collected from the consumer, as ordered by the Commissioner;

(3) Such amount of punitive damages as the court may allow; and

(4) In the case of any successful action to enforce any liability under this section, the costs of the action together with reasonable attorney's fees as determined by the court.

(b) *Negligent noncompliance*.— Any credit services business which is negligent in failing to comply with any requirement imposed under this subtitle with respect to any consumer is liable to that consumer in an amount equal to the sum of:

(1) Any actual damages sustained by the consumer as a result of the failure; and

(2) In the case of any successful action to enforce any liability under this section, the cost of the action together with reasonable attorney's fees as determined by the court.

14. Respondents engaged, directly or indirectly, in acts, practices, or other activities which operated as a fraud or deception on Maryland consumers, referenced above, in connection with the offer or sale of the services of a credit services business, and thereby violated CL § 14-1902(5); such actions also constituted willful noncompliance with the MCSBA under CL § 14-1912(a). Respondents' fraudulent, deceptive, and willful conduct included the following: they failed to perform those loan modification services for Maryland consumers, referenced above, which they promised to provide and for which they had collected up-front fees; Respondents purposely concealed this information when contacted by several Maryland consumers, referenced above, who had already entered into loan modification agreements with Respondents by intentionally misrepresenting the progress of the consumers' loan modifications; Respondents failed to return telephonic and electronic communications from several Maryland consumers, referenced above, once those consumers became concerned that Respondents had done nothing to obtain a loan modification on their behalf; and Respondents refused to provide refunds to certain Maryland consumers, referenced above, when such refunds were due for lack of service.

15. FI §§ 2-114(a) and (b) set forth the Commissioner's general authority to order the production of information, as well as documents and records, while investigating potential violations of laws, regulations, rules, and orders over which the Commissioner has jurisdiction (which is in addition to the Commissioner's specific investigatory authority set forth in various other Maryland statutes and regulations). Thus, for example, FI § 2-114(a)(2) provides that the Commissioner may "[r]equire ... a person to file a statement in writing, under oath or otherwise as the Commissioner determines, as to all the facts and circumstances concerning the matter to be investigated." Further, pursuant to FI § 2-114(b), "the Commissioner or an officer designated by the Commissioner may," among other things, "take evidence, and require the production of books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, and agreements, or other documents or records which the Commissioner considers relevant or material to the inquiry."

16. Pursuant to the Commissioner's authority to conduct investigations under FI § 2-114, the Deputy Commissioner issued a subpoena to Respondents on September 17, 2009, ordering them to provide specific information and all documents related to their loan modification activities involving Maryland consumers no later than October 1, 2009. However, Respondents failed to fully provide all the required information and documents by that date, and in fact have not provided all the documents and information as of the date of this Final Order. Therefore, by failing to fully comply with the Deputy Commissioner's subpoena, Respondents are in violation of FI § 2-114.

NOW, THEREFORE, having determined that Respondents waived their right to a hearing in this matter by failing to request a hearing within the time period specified in the

Summary Order, and pursuant CL §§ 14-1902, 14-1907, 14-1912, and FI § 2-115(b), it is by the Maryland Commissioner of Financial Regulation, hereby

ORDERED that the Summary Order issued by the Deputy Commissioner against Respondents on July 18, 2010, is entered as a final order of the Commissioner as modified herein, and that Respondents shall permanently **CEASE** and **DESIST** from engaging in credit services business activities with Maryland consumers, including contracting to provide, or otherwise engaging in, loan modification, loss mitigation, or similar services with Maryland consumers; and it is further

ORDERED that, pursuant to FI § 2-115(b), and upon careful consideration of (i) the seriousness of the Respondents' violations; (ii) the lack of good faith of Respondents, (iii) the history and ongoing nature of Respondents' violations; and (iv) the deleterious effect of Respondents' violations on the public and on the credit services businesses and mortgage industries, Respondents shall pay to the Commissioner a total civil money penalty in the amount of **ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIX THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$136,000)**, which consists of the following:

<i>Prohibited Activity and Violation</i>	Penalty per Violation	x Number of Violations	= Penalty
<i>Unlicensed Activity in Violation of MCSBA</i>	\$1,000	87 Md. Consumers	\$ 87,000
<i>Charging Up-Front Fees in Violation of MCSBA</i>	\$1,000	48 Md. Consumers	\$ 48,000
<i>Failure to Comply with Subpoena in Violation of FI § 2-114</i>	\$1,000	1 Failure to comply	\$ 1,000

		TOTAL	\$ 136,000
--	--	--------------	-------------------

and it is further,

ORDERED that Respondents shall pay to the Commissioner, by cashier's or certified check made payable to the "Commissioner of Financial Regulation," the amount of \$136,000 within fifteen (15) days from the date of this Final Order; and it is further

ORDERED that, pursuant to CL § 14-1907(b), all loan modification agreements which Respondents entered into with Maryland consumers described herein, are void and unenforceable as contrary to the public policy of the State of Maryland; and it is further

ORDERED that, pursuant to CL §§ 14-1902, 14-1907, and 14-1912, Respondents shall pay restitution to each Maryland consumer with whom Respondents entered into loan modification agreements and collected up-front fees; and thus Respondents shall pay restitution of \$3,300.00 to Consumer M, \$1,405.00 to Consumer N, \$1,500.00 to Consumer O, \$2,200.00 to Consumer P, \$1,600.00 to Consumer Q, \$3,000.00 to Consumer R, \$2,400.00 to Consumer S, \$2,500.00 to Consumer T, \$2,633.51 to Consumer U, \$1,700.00 to Consumer V, \$3,042.00 to Consumer W, \$2,002.00 to Consumer X, \$1,840.00 to Consumer Y, \$2,000.00 to Consumer Z, \$2,695.00 to Consumer AA, \$3,300.00 to Consumer BB, \$8,000.00 to Consumer CC, \$2,200.00 to Consumer DD, \$2,100.00 to Consumer EE, \$2,100.00 to Consumer FF, \$1,356.00 to Consumer GG, \$2,000.00 to Consumer HH, \$521.00 to Consumer II, \$2,500.00 to Consumer JJ, \$1,790.00 to Consumer KK, \$1,800.00 to Consumer LL, \$3,000.00 to Consumer MM, \$3,100.00 to Consumer NN, \$2,000.00 to Consumer OO, \$1,795.00 to Consumer PP, \$2,000.00 to Consumer QQ,


\$2,954.00 to Consumer RR, \$4,455.45 to Consumer SS, and \$3,400.00 to Consumer TT, with whom Respondents entered into loan modification agreements, with the total amount of restitution owed to these consumers equaling **EIGHTY-FOUR THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND FORTY-EIGHT DOLLARS AND NINETY-SIX CENTS (\$84,548.96)**; and that with respect to certain Maryland consumers described herein, Respondents' activities constituted willful noncompliance with the MCSBA, and pursuant to CL § 14-1912(a) Respondents shall pay a monetary award to the following Maryland consumers in an amount equal to three times the amount collected from these consumers, and thus Respondents shall pay a monetary award of \$16,500.00 to Consumer B, \$6,516.00 to Consumer C, \$6287.85 to Consumer D, \$5,457.96 to Consumer E, \$9052.50 to Consumer F, \$9,300.00 to Consumer G, \$5,100.00 to Consumer H, \$13,260.00 to Consumer I, \$8,616.00 to Consumer J, \$7,500.00 to Consumer K, and \$9,000.00 to Consumer L, with whom Respondents entered into loan modification agreements, with the total amount of the monetary award to these consumers equaling **NINETY-SIX THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND NINETY DOLLARS AND THIRTY-ONE CENTS (\$96,590.31)** (consisting of the \$5,500.00 up-front fee collected from Consumer B, plus \$2,172.00 up-front fee collected from Consumer C, plus \$2,095.95 up-front fee collected from Consumer D, plus \$1,819.32 up-front fee collected from Consumer E, plus \$3,017.50 up-front fee collected from Consumer F, plus \$3,100.00 up-front fee collected from Consumer G, plus \$1,700.00 up-front fee collected from Consumer H, plus \$4,420.00 up-front fee collected from Consumer I, plus \$2,872.00 up-front fee collected from Consumer J, plus \$2,500.00 up-front fee collected from Consumer K, plus \$3,000.00 up-front fee collected from Consumer L, multiplied by three); and it is further

ORDERED that Respondents shall pay the required restitution and monetary awards to those consumers described herein within 30 days of this Final Order being signed. Respondents shall make payment by mailing to each consumer a check in the amount specified above via U.S. First Class Mail at the most recent address of that consumer known to the Respondents. If the mailing of a payment is returned as undeliverable by the U.S. Postal Service, Respondents shall promptly notify the Commissioner in writing for further instruction as to the means of the making of said payment. Upon the making of the required payments, the Respondents shall furnish evidence of having made the payments to the Commissioner within ninety (90) days of this Final Order being signed, which evidence shall consist of a copy of the front and back of the cancelled check for each payment; and it is further

ORDERED that Respondents shall send all correspondence, notices, civil penalties and other required submissions to the Commissioner at the following address: Commissioner of Financial Regulation, 500 North Calvert Street, Suite 402, Baltimore, Maryland 21202, Attn: Proceedings Administrator.

**MARYLAND COMMISSIONER OF
FINANCIAL REGULATION**

1/4/11
Date



Mark A. Kaufman
Commissioner