

ORIGINAL

1 Thomas M. Melton (Utah State Bar No. 4999)
 meltont@sec.gov
 2 Karen L. Martinez (Utah State Bar No. 7914)
 martinezk@sec.gov
 3 Cheryl M. Mori (Utah State Bar No. 8887)
 moric@sec.gov
 4 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 Securities and Exchange Commission
 5 15 West South Temple Street, Suite 1800
 Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
 6 Telephone: (801) 524-5796
 Facsimile: (801) 524-5262

FILED - SOUTHERN DIVISION
 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
 APR - 5 2006
 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SANTA ANA

NOTE CHANGES MADE BY THE COURT.

Priority ~~___~~
 Send ~~___~~
 Enter ~~___~~
 Closed ~~___~~
 JS-5/JS-6 ~~___~~
 JS-2/JS-3 ~~___~~
 Scan Only ~~___~~

7 Local Counsel:
 8 Karen Matteson (Cal. Bar No. 102103)
 Securities and Exchange Commission
 9 5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90036-3648
 Telephone: (323) 965-3840
 10 Facsimile: (323) 965-3908

LODGED
 MAR 19 2006
 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SOUTHERN DIVISION AT SANTA ANA
 DEPUTY

11 ~~UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT~~

12 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 **SOUTHERN DIVISION**

14
 15 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
 16 COMMISSION,

Case No.:
SACV06-172 AHS (ANx)

17 Plaintiff,
 18 vs.

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT
 AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW *In Support of*
 REGARDING PRELIMINARY
 INJUNCTION ~~ORDER~~

19 LAMBERT VANDER TUIG et
 20 al.,

21 Defendants.
 22
 23
 24

25
 26
 27
 28 **THIS CONSTITUTES NOTICE OF ENTRY
 AS REQUIRED BY FRCP, RULE 77(d)**

ENTERED - SOUTHERN DIVISION
 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT -
 APR - 6 2006
 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 DEPUTY

42

1 This matter came before the Court for a hearing on
2 February 27, 2006. Appearing on behalf of the
3 plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission
4 ("Commission") was Thomas M. Melton, Karen L. Martinez
5 and Cheryl Mori. Appearing on behalf of Jonathan
6 Carman was Irving Einhorn. Defendant Lambert Vander
7 Tuig appeared on his own behalf. Alan Simon appeared
8 on behalf of the Receiver, who was also present in the
9 courtroom.

10 The Court heard argument from counsel for the
11 Commission. There being no opposition, the Court
12 entered an Order of Preliminary Injunction on February
13 27, 2006. The Court requested that the plaintiff
14 submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of
15 law. *No objections to the proposed Findings of Fact and*
conclusions of Law have been filed. *AWA*

16 **I. FINDINGS OF FACT**

17 The Court makes the following preliminary findings of
18 fact:

19 **A. Jurisdiction and Venue**

20 1. The Court has jurisdiction over this action
21 pursuant to Section 20(b), 20(d)(1) and 22(a) of the
22 Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§
23 77t(b), 77t(d)(1) and 77v(a), and Sections 21(d)(1),
24 21(d)(3)(A), 21(e) and 27 of the Securities Exchange
25 Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act"), 15, U.S.C. §§ 78u(d)(1),
26 78u(d)(3)(A), 78u(e) and 78aa. Defendants have,
27 directly or indirectly, made use of the means or
28 instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails,

1 or of the facilities of a national securities exchange,
2 in connection with the transactions, acts, practices
3 and courses of business set forth in the Court's
4 Findings of Facts.

5 2. Many of the acts, practices, courses of
6 business and transactions described herein have
7 occurred within the Central District of California.

8 **B. Defendants**

9 3. The Carolina Development Company, Inc. (a/k/a
10 The Carolina Company at Pinehurst, Inc.) ("Carolina
11 Company") is a Nevada corporation headquartered in
12 Irvine, California. Since at least September 2004, the
13 company was known as "The Carolina Company at
14 Pinehurst, Inc." At some time in 2005, the company
15 changed its name to "The Carolina Development Company,
16 Inc." Stock certificates are still issued in the name
17 of "The Carolina Company at Pinehurst."

18 4. Lambert D. Vander Tuig (a/k/a Lambert Vander
19 Tag and Dean L. Vander Tag and Dean L.
20 VanderTag) ("Vander Tuig"), age 47 of Rancho Santa *DM*
21 Margarita, California, is the President, Chief
22 Executive Officer, and Director of Carolina Company.
23 Vander Tuig previously was associated as a registered
24 representative with various brokers and dealers from
25 1988 through 1996. On March 27, 2000, Vander Tuig was
26 permanently enjoined in federal district court from
27 violating Sections 5(a), 5(c), and 17(a) of the
28 Securities Act and Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act

1 and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, and was ordered to pay
2 \$61,305 in disgorgement plus prejudgment interest and
3 \$61,305 in civil penalties. On August 16, 2000, the
4 Commission entered an Order against Vander Tuig barring
5 him from association with any broker or dealer in an
6 administrative proceeding related to the civil law
7 action. Vander Tuig has failed to pay any of the
8 disgorgement, penalties, or prejudgment interest.
9 During the relevant period, Vander Tuig has used the
10 name Lambert Vander Tag, Dean L. Vander Tag, and Dean
11 L. VanderTag. During the relevant period, Vander Tuig
12 acted as a broker. Vander Tuig was not registered with
13 the Commission as a broker in accordance with Section
14 15(b) of the Exchange act and did not otherwise have
15 the Commission's consent to act as a broker.

16 5. Jonathan Carman ("Carman"), ~~age 42~~ of Aliso *AMA*
17 Viejo, California, is the Vice President of Carolina
18 Company. Carman is second in charge at Carolina
19 Company, directly below Vander Tuig. Carman was not
20 registered with the Commission as a broker in
21 accordance with Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act.

22 **C. The Boiler Room Operation**

23 6. Since at least September 2004, Carolina
24 Company offered its stock through a private placement
25 offering. To solicit investors, Carolina Company
26 employed independent contractors as sales
27 representatives in a boiler room operation. Sales
28 representatives primarily made cold calls to

1 individuals from lead lists purchased by the company.
2 Carolina Company employed approximately 60 sales
3 representatives.

4 7. Throughout the relevant time period, Carolina
5 Company information regarding assets, operations, and
6 the stock offered were provided to the boiler room
7 staff directly by Vander Tuig and/or Carman. Vander
8 Tuig and Carman prepared and provided various scripts
9 to the boiler room staff to use in cold calls. Vander
10 Tuig and Carman also conducted regular meetings with
11 the sales people to convey information to pass on to
12 investors. When investors had specific questions,
13 Vander Tuig and Carman told sales people how to
14 respond. Vander Tuig and Carman also had direct verbal
15 communications with investors, and Vander Tuig ~~has~~ made *AM*
16 written representations in letters to all shareholders.

17 8. During the relevant period, Vander Tuig and
18 Carman ~~continually~~ revised and amended the information *AM*
19 and documents given to investors.

20 9. In the boiler room, after a salesperson made
21 initial contact with a potential investor, the Carolina
22 Company sent an investor package to the interested
23 party. The investor package contained the Private
24 Placement Offering Memorandum ("PPM") as well as a
25 variety of sales materials about the Carolina Company
26 and the investment. Sales people had a series of
27 telephone conversations with an interested party before
28 he or she decided to invest.

1 10. Sales people also referred potential investors
2 to the Carolina Company's website
3 (www.thecarolinaco.com), which contained similar and
4 additional information about Carolina Company.

5 **D. Misrepresentations to Investors**

6 **1. False Statements About Sales and Revenues**

7 11. During the relevant time period, Defendants
8 made representations to investors that Carolina Company
9 had already sold homes and properties. In sales
10 materials distributed in 2004, Defendants represented
11 that the company had built and sold homes and
12 properties at profit margins of 50-60%, 100%, and 400%,
13 and that it had other properties in various stages of
14 development. In 2005, Defendants represented that
15 Carolina Company was "currently profitable" and "had
16 significant **increases** in both revenue and profit for
17 the last three consecutive years."

18 12. In addition, until at least May 2005,
19 Defendants distributed an income statement to potential
20 investors showing increasing income from 2002 to 2004.
21 The income statement represented that Carolina Company
22 made net profits of \$206,334 in 2002; \$716,671 in 2003;
23 and \$1,525,647 in 2004.

24 13. Contrary to these representations, Carolina
25 Company had made no sales and little or no revenue from
26 February 2002 through January 2006.

1 **2. False Statements About Going Public**

2 14. From September 2004, boiler room sales people
3 told investors that Carolina Company would be going
4 public in the near future. Initially, Defendants
5 claimed that Carolina Company would go public by the
6 end of 2004, then Defendants claimed the company would
7 go public in early 2005.

8 15. Over time, Defendants continually delayed the
9 expected date. At the time of the filing of the
10 Commission's case, Defendants were telling investors
11 that Carolina Company expected to go public in February
12 2006.

13 16. Contrary to what was represented to investors,
14 Carolina Company had taken no significant steps to
15 register any offering of stock.

16 **3. False Statements About Restricted Stock**
17 **and Failure to Disclose Stock Already**
18 **Traded Publicly**

19 17. Initially, Defendants represented that the
20 trading symbol "CACP" had been approved for Carolina
21 Company's stock to trade publicly.

22 18. The PPM stated that the "National Association
23 of Security Dealers (NASD) has approved the trading
24 symbol CACP to represent The Carolina Development
25 Company."

26 19. Sales agents told investors that the symbol
27 CACP would be used when the company actually went
28

1 public, but that the stock was not yet trading
2 publicly.

3 20. Contrary to these representations, Carolina
4 Company's stock was already offered for sale in the
5 National Quotation Service, the "Pink Sheets," an
6 electronic quotation system for over-the-counter
7 securities.

8 21. During 2005, the stock price varied between
9 \$.001 and \$1.75 per share. In December 2005, CACP stock
10 traded at \$0.10 per share. This was the same class of
11 common stock that was purchased by investors in 2004,
12 2005, and 2006 for many times that price.

13 22. Defendants failed to disclose that the same
14 stock was being quoted in the Pink Sheets for
15 substantially less than the price at which it was being
16 offered through the boiler room.

17 23. Defendants affirmatively represented that CACP
18 stock was not the same stock being offered by the
19 boiler room.

20 24. This representation was false, as the CACP
21 stock offered in the Pink Sheets is the same class of
22 common stock as that offered by the boiler room.

23 25. Moreover, Carolina Company represented that as
24 soon as the company went public, any shares purchased
25 would be immediately available to sell.

26 26. All shares issued to investors, however, bore
27 "Restricted" legends and were subject to restrictions
28

1 on resale, including that the shares would be
2 unavailable to sell for a minimum period of one year.

3 27. Defendants failed to disclose that shares
4 purchased would be restricted.

5 28. Defendants told investors who inquired about
6 the restriction after receiving their certificates that
7 when Carolina Company went public, the company would
8 issue new unrestricted certificates or it would deliver
9 paperwork allowing the restricted shares to trade
10 immediately.

11 29. These representations were false as there is
12 no provision in the securities laws allowing Carolina
13 Company to do this.

14 **4. Misrepresentations About Properties Owned**

15 30. During 2004, 2005, and 2006, Carolina Company
16 made a number of representations that it owned a
17 variety of resort properties in varying stages of
18 development.

19 31. These representations were made in the PPM, in
20 other sales materials, on the website, in letters to
21 investors, and in verbal communications with investors.

22 32. The representations were directly attributable
23 to Vander Tuig and/or Carman and were communicated to
24 investors by Vander Tuig and Carman directly or by
25 sales people.

26 33. Many of the defendants' representations
27 regarding real estate were false or grossly
28 exaggerated.

1 ^{Some} 34. ~~All~~ investors purchased shares because they *AMH*
2 believed Carolina Company owned these various
3 properties.

4 ^{Many} 35. ~~All~~ of these claims were false because *AMH*
5 Carolina Company did not actually own these
6 developments or did not have the equity it claimed.

7 **5. Outstanding and Authorized Shares**
8 **Misrepresented**

9 36. The PPM used through December 2005 states
10 that, as of July 31, 2004, Carolina Company had
11 5,471,121 shares outstanding and 80,000,000 shares of
12 common stock were authorized.

13 ^A 37. ~~The new PPM, which the company is now~~ *AMH*
14 ~~distributing~~ also represents that only 80,000,000
15 shares of common stock are authorized and further
16 states that only 30,829,117 shares were outstanding as
17 of November 15, 2005.

18 38. Contrary to these representations, in November
19 2005, Carolina Company had a total of 100,000,000
20 shares of common stock authorized, not 80,000,000 as
21 represented.

22 39. On December 21, 2005, the total outstanding
23 shares went over 100,000,000 and the transfer agent
24 changed its records to reflect that 200,000,000 were
25 authorized.

26 40. Carolina Company already had 68,657,674 shares
27 outstanding prior to September 2004.
28

1 41. From September 1, 2004 through December 22,
2 2005, Carolina Company issued an additional 32,024,395
3 shares, bringing the total outstanding shares to
4 100,682,069 - well over the 80,000,000 shares
5 supposedly authorized and well over the 30,829,117
6 supposedly outstanding.

7 42. As of January 19, 2006, Carolina Company had
8 101,854,181 total shares outstanding.

9 **6. Misrepresentations Regarding "Book Value"**
10 **of Stock**

11 43. Throughout the relevant time period, Carolina
12 Company has represented that it holds millions of
13 dollars in equity in various development properties.
14 This information was conveyed verbally and was also
15 contained in the "appraisal valuation" document given
16 to potential investors in the investor package.

17 44. During the relevant period, the appraisal
18 valuation document was revised a number of times to
19 show purported increases in the number of developments
20 acquired and purported increases in appraisal values
21 and equity.

22 45. Initially, Carolina Company claimed it owned
23 three development properties and that it held \$24.3
24 million in equity in those properties.

25 46. Carolina Company also claimed it had 5.5
26 million shares outstanding, which resulted in a book
27 value "near \$4.41 per share." The book value was
28

1 calculated by dividing the equity (\$24.3 million) by
2 number of shares outstanding (5.5 million).

3 47. According to the ongoing revisions to the
4 appraisal valuation document, the book value of the
5 stock also continued to increase.

6 48. By December 2005, Carolina Company claimed it
7 had 31 million shares outstanding and the book value of
8 the stock was "more than \$6.45 per share."

9 49. In September 2004, the company already had
10 over 68 million shares outstanding.

11 50. Currently, Carolina Company has more than 101
12 million shares outstanding.

13 51. All of the representations related to book
14 value were false because Carolina Company's equity and
15 number of shares outstanding were misrepresented.

16 **7. Offering Oversold**

17 52. The PPM, dated June 30, 2004, states that
18 Carolina Company's offering is for 4,350,000 shares of
19 common stock at prices ranging from \$1.50 to \$3.00 for
20 a total offering of \$10,150,000.

21 53. The Form D, filed with the Commission on
22 October 25, 2005, also states the offering is for a
23 total of \$10,150,000.

24 54. This is the only Form D filed by the Carolina
25 Company with the Commission.

26 55. From September 2004 through January 2006,
27 Carolina Company stock was offered and sold at prices
28 ranging from at least \$1.00 to \$3.00.

1 56. During that time period, Carolina Company
2 issued over 33 million shares of common stock, well
3 over the amount represented.

4 57. From February 2002 until January 2006,
5 Carolina Company raised over \$49,500,000 through the
6 sale of stock.

7 **8. Vander Tuig Concealed His Real Name and**
8 **Previous Commission Action Against Him**

9 58. Since at least September 2004, Vander Tuig has
10 used the aliases "Lambert Vander Tag," "Dean L. Vander
11 Tag," and "Dean L. VanderTag."

12 59. Vander Tuig concealed his real name in the
13 Form D filed with the Commission.

14 60. Vander Tuig signed the Form D but used the
15 name "Dean L. Vander Tag."

16 61. The PPMs given to investors until December
17 2005 listed Vander Tuig as "Lambert Vander Tag."

18 62. The new PPM which was being distributed to
19 potential investors at the time of the filing of the
20 Commission's suit lists Vander Tuig as "Dean L.
21 VanderTag."

22 63. In approximately May 2005, some of the sales
23 agents learned of Vander Tuig's real name and
24 questioned him about it. Vander Tuig admitted that he
25 had previously had a Commission action brought against
26 him, but claimed that it was a misunderstanding and
27 that he had paid a fine and taken care of it.

1 64. In fact, Vander Tuig has not paid the
2 disgorgement or penalties entered against him.

3 65. Although sales materials tout Vander Tuig's
4 experience and success in taking companies public, the
5 sales representations and the PPM do not disclose to
6 investors that Vander Tuig has previously been found to
7 have violated federal securities laws and has been
8 barred from association with any broker or dealer.

9 **9. Carolina Company Was A Ponzi Scheme**

10 66. Carolina Company did not receive any income or
11 returns on its purported investments.

12 67. Carolina Company paid approximately \$9,962,000
13 in commission and payroll expenses, an amount that
14 exceeds 20% of the monies raised through the sale of
15 stock.

16 68. Carolina Company returned approximately
17 \$412,000 to investors in the form of "dividends." This
18 amount does not reflect the scope of returns to
19 investors because many investors opted to receive their
20 putative dividends in stock in Carolina Company.

21 69. Carolina Company returned \$1,379,000 to
22 investors as "return of principal."

23 70. The dividends and return of principal to
24 investors were paid out of investments made by later
25 investors.

26 **10. Defendants Misappropriated Investor Funds**

27 71. Defendants, or their wives, have received more
28 than \$6,074,000. These payments were received by

1 Defendants directly, paid to other entities controlled
2 by Defendants, or paid to third parties on Defendants'
3 behalf.

4 72. Defendants used Carolina Company funds to pay
5 their mortgages, car payments, church donations,
6 vacations, meals and even minimal personal expenses
7 such as tanning.

8 **E. Investors Not Accredited**

9 73. The PPM represented that the offering was
10 being made pursuant to the exemption from registration
11 provided by Section 4(2) of the Securities Act and Rule
12 506 of Regulation D, and was therefore, generally
13 offered only to accredited investors.

14 74. Contrary to this representation, the offering
15 was actually made by cold calling potential investors
16 from lists.

17 75. At least some of the sales representatives
18 failed to qualify potential investors by asking them
19 their income and net worth.

20 76. At least one sales representative claimed
21 individuals could aggregate their income or net worth
22 if they could not qualify individually.

23 77. The subscription agreement provided to
24 investors during the relevant period contained no
25 questions about the investor's income, net worth, or
26 investment experience.

27 ~~78. During the relevant period, Carolina Company~~
28 ~~had more than five hundred investors. Most of those~~ *all*

1 ~~investors were not asked about their income or net~~ *AM*
2 ~~worth.~~

3 **F. Defendants' Assertion of Their Rights Against**
4 **Self Incrimination Under the Fifth Amendment**

5 79. Vander Tuig and his wife, Jill Kraus, were
6 deposed on February 23, 2006, in accordance with the
7 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Vander Tuig asserted
8 his rights under the Fifth Amendment to every question.
9 Jill Kraus was also deposed on February 23, 2006.
10 After acknowledging her name, she asserted her rights
11 under the Fifth Amendment to every question.

12 80. Carman and Debra Carman were deposed on
13 February 24, 2006, in accordance with the Federal Rules
14 of Civil Procedure. Carman acknowledged his name, and
15 then asserted the Fifth Amendment to every subsequent
16 question. Similarly, his wife, Debra Carman,
17 acknowledged her name and asserted the Fifth Amendment
18 to every question.

19 **G. Defendants' ^{Conduct After} ~~Are Likely To Engage In Future~~ *AM***
20 **~~Violations of the Federal Securities Laws~~**
21 **~~Unless An Injunction ^{was} Is Entered~~**

22 81. After the temporary restraining order was
23 entered, Defendants continued to make
24 misrepresentations by representing that Carolina
25 Company was a functioning business and that it would
26 continue to operate in the future.

27 82. Defendants posted a similar false statement on
28 the company website claiming that they had not made

1 misrepresentations and that the Commission shut down
2 Carolina Company "in an attempt to stop [Carolina
3 Company] from going public."

4 ~~83. Vander Tuig is a recidivist who has previously~~
5 ~~been enjoined by this Court.~~ *all*

6 II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

7 1. This Court has jurisdiction over this action
8 pursuant to Sections 20(b), 20(d)(1) and 22(a) of the
9 Securities Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(b), 77t(d)(1) and
10 77v(a)) and Sections 21(d)(1), 21(d)(3)(A), 21(e) and
11 27 of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d)(1),
12 78u(d)(3)(A), 78u(e), and 78aa).

13 2. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to
14 Section 22(a) of the Securities Act (15 U.S.C. §
15 77v(a)) and Section 27 of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. §
16 78aa).

17 3. The ~~Commission seeks to~~^{art} preliminarily enjoins₁
18 Defendants from future violations of Sections 5(a),
19 5(c) and 17(a) of the Securities Act and Section 10(b)
20 of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder. The
21 ~~Commission~~^{art} further seeks to preliminarily enjoins₁
22 defendants Vander Tuig and Carman from future
23 violations of Section 15(a) of the Exchange Act. The
24 ~~Commission~~^{art} also seeks to preliminarily enjoins₁ defendant
25 Vander Tuig from future violations of Section
26 15(b)(6)(B) of the Exchange Act. *the*

27 4. Based on the above findings of fact, the
28 Commission has shown that Defendants made material *the*

1 misrepresentations and omissions of material fact in
2 connection with the offer, purchase or sale of Carolina
3 Company securities.

4 5. The means and instrumentalities of interstate
5 commerce and the mails were used in connection with the
6 conduct described in the findings of fact.

7 6. Defendants acted knowingly or recklessly with
8 respect to the conduct described in the findings of
9 fact.

10 7. Based upon the above findings of fact, the
11 Commission has shown that defendants, directly or
12 indirectly, offered and sold unregistered Carolina
13 Company common stock. Defendants have not met their
14 burden of establishing that an exemption from
15 registration applies.

16 8. Based on the above findings of fact, the
17 Commission has shown that defendants Vander Tuig and
18 Carman acted as brokers to effect or attempt to induce
19 transactions in Carolina Company securities without
20 being registered with the Commission in accordance with
21 Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act.

22 9. Based on the above findings of fact, the
23 Commission has shown that defendant Vander Tuig was
24 subject to an August 16, 2000 order finding that he
25 willfully violated provisions of the Securities Act and
26 the Exchange Act and barring Vander Tuig from
27 associating with any broker. The Commission has also
28

1 shown that Vander Tuig associated with a broker in
2 contravention of that August 16, 2000 order.

3 10. Based on the above findings of fact, the
4 Commission has shown ^{for purposes of a preliminary injunction} that Defendants have violated
5 Sections 5(a), 5(c) and 17(a) of the Securities Act and
6 Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5
7 thereunder. The Commission has also shown that
8 defendants Vander Tuig and Carman violated Section
9 15(a) of the Exchange Act and defendant Vander Tuig
10 violated Section 15(b)(6)(B) of the Exchange Act.

11 11. In order to obtain preliminary injunctive
12 relief, the Commission ~~must~~ [^] makes a prima facie showing
13 that violations have occurred and the Commission ~~must~~
14 [^] shows that there is a reasonable likelihood of future
15 violations. SEC v. United Financial Group, 474 F.2d
16 354 (9th Cir. 1973); SEC v. Koracorp Industries, Inc.,
17 575 F.2d 692 (9th Cir. 1978).

18 12. The Commission has shown, based on the above
19 findings of fact, that unless an injunction is granted,
20 there is a reasonable likelihood that Defendants will
21 engage in future violations of the federal securities
22 laws as set forth in the Complaint.

23 13. In order to protect the public interest against
24 such future violations of the federal securities laws,
25 the Court has broad powers and wide discretion to
26 fashion a remedy appropriate to protect the public
27 interest. Mills v. Electric Auto-Lite Co., 396 U.S.
28 375, 391, 90 S. Ct. 616, 625 (1970); SEC v. Lincoln

1 Thrift Association, 577 F.2d 600, 609 (9th Cir. 1978);
2 SEC v. United Financial Group, 474 F.2d 354 (9th Cir.
3 1973).

4 14. The relief granted by the preliminary
5 injunction order dated February 27, 2006 is appropriate
6 and necessary for the protection of the public
7 interest.

8 15. Every finding of fact contained in the
9 foregoing conclusions of law shall be deemed a finding
10 of fact as if set forth as a finding of fact.

11
12 DATED this 5th day of April, 2006.

13
14
15 Alicemarie H. Stotler
16 Honorable Alicemarie H. Stotler
17 District Court Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2 Thomas M. Melton (Utah State Bar No. 4999)
meltont@sec.gov
3 Karen L. Martinez (Utah State Bar No. 7914)
martinezk@sec.gov
4 Cheryl M. Mori (Utah State Bar No. 8887)
moric@sec.gov
5 Attorneys for Plaintiff
Securities and Exchange Commission
6 15 W. South Temple, Suite 1800
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
7 Telephone: (801) 524-5796
Facsimile: (801) 524-5262
8

9 Local Counsel:
Karen Matteson (Cal. Bar No. 102103)
mattesonk@sec.gov
10 Securities and Exchange Commission
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, 11th Floor
11 Los Angeles, California 90036-3648
Telephone: (323) 965-3840
12 Facsimile: (323) 965-3908

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
14 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
15 **SOUTHERN DIVISION**

16 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
17 COMMISSION,
18 Plaintiff,
19 vs.
20 LAMBERT VANDER TUIG (a/k/a
LAMBERT VANDER TAG a/k/a DEAN L.
21 VANDER TAG a/k/a DEAN L.
VANDERTAG), THE CAROLINA
22 DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, INC. (a/k/a
THE CAROLINA COMPANY AT
23 PINEHURST, INC.), AND JONATHAN
CARMAN
24 Defendants.
25

Case No.
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

26
27 I hereby certify that in this 8th day of March 2006, I caused the foregoing
28 PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW REGARDING

1 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION to be served on all parties receiving service by
2 sending said document by United States first class mail, postage prepaid to,
3

4 Ira Lee Sorkin, Esq.
5 Daniel J. Horowitz, Esq.
6 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY, LLP
7 1177 Avenue of the Americas
8 New York, NY 10036-2714
9 *Attorneys for Lambert Vander Tuig*

10 Irving M. Einhorn, Esq.
11 LAW OFFICE OF IRVING M. EINHORN
12 1710 Tenth Street
13 Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
14 *Attorney for Jonathan Carman*

15 Thomas M. Seaman
16 One Park Plaza
17 Suite 370
18 Irvine, CA 92614
19 *Court-appointed Receiver*

20 Alan H. Martin, Esq.
21 SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
22 650 Town Center Drive
23 Fourth Floor
24 Costa Mesa, CA 92626-1993
25 *Counsel to Court-appointed Receiver.*

26
27
28

