LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER
RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP
JOHN J. STOIA, JR. (141757)
JStoia@lerachlaw.com
THEODORE J. PINTAR (131372)
TPintar@lerachlaw.com
655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619/231-1058
619/231-7423 (fax)

BARRACK RODOS & BACINE
STEPHEN R. BASSER (121590)
SBasser@barrack.com
402 West Broadway, Suite 850
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619/230-0800
619/230-1874 (fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Robert H. Hansen and Friou P. Jones

[Additional counsel appear on signature page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

ROBERT H. HANSEN and FRIOU P. JONES, on Behalf of Themselves and All Others Similarly Situated, Plaintiffs, vs. CONSECO INSURANCE COMPANY, an Illinois company f/k/a CONSECO ANNUITY ASSURANCE COMPANY, Defendant.	Master File No. 5:05-cv-04726-RMW FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR: 1) Violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act 18 U.S.C. §1962(a)-(d); 2) Financial Elder Abuse, Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §15600; 3) Violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200 *et seq*; 4) Violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17500 *et seq*; 5) Breach of Fiduciary Duty; 6) Aiding and Abetting Breach of Fiduciary Duty; 7) Fraudulent Concealment, Cal. Civ. Code §1710 *et seq*.; 8) Breach of the Duty of Good Faith and Fair Dealing; and 9) Unjust Enrichment and Imposition of Constructive Trust <u>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</u> <u>CLASS ACTION</u>

Plaintiffs Robert H. Hansen and Friou P. Jones, by and through their attorneys, bring this action against Conseco Insurance Company (formerly known as Conseco Annuity Assurance Company) ("Conseco" or "defendant") on behalf of themselves and all other similarly-situated senior citizens (persons 65 and older). Plaintiffs allege upon information and belief, as well as the investigation of counsel, as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1331-32 and 18 U.S.C. §1964. This Court has personal jurisdiction over defendant pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §1965(b) and (d). The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367. The amount in controversy exceeds $75,000 for each plaintiff, exclusive of costs and interest. Furthermore, the aggregate amount in controversy for this class action exceeds $5,000,000, and less than one-third of all class members reside in California. *See* Class Action Fairness Act ("CAFA"), 28 U.S.C. §1332, Pub. L. 109-2, 119 Stat. 4 (2005).

2. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(a) and (b) because Conseco maintains offices, has agents and is licensed to and does transact business here. Venue is also proper under 18 U.S.C. §1965(a) because Conseco transacts substantial business in this District.[1]

INTRODUCTION

3. This class action challenges defendant's unlawful and unethical scheme to fraudulently solicit, market, sell and issue deferred annuity policies to senior citizens in California and nationwide. Defendant targets the elderly, including plaintiffs, as prospective purchasers of deferred annuities even though they are unlikely to receive any benefit from the annuity because the maturity date, *i.e.*, the date on which income payments will begin, exceeds their actuarial life expectancy. By and through its network of affiliated sales and marketing agents, defendant turns a

---

[1] According to A.M. Best Company's 2005 Report, the geographic direct premium distribution for Conseco is: California (21.2%); Florida (9.7%); Ohio (5.8%); Michigan (4.9%); Illinois (4.8%); and other jurisdictions (53.7%). Over the past five years, Conseco has collected over $400 million in premiums from sales of its annuity products to customers in California.

blind eye while elderly individuals are persuaded into consolidating their savings and other investments into deferred annuities that tie up their money for years, carry exorbitant "surrender charges," create the likelihood of early withdrawal or surrender thus subjecting the owner to undisclosed tax penalties and create complicated estate problems for their loved ones after their death.

4. Plaintiffs bring this nationwide class action on behalf of themselves and all other senior citizens who purchased one or more fixed or indexed deferred annuities, solicited, referred, marketed, sold and/or issued by defendant Conseco and any of its Affiliated Agents, and/or who have suffered or could suffer a penalty and/or surrender charge, including those incurred on death, for accessing their money during the minimum holding period or before its maturity date, or who have acquired a Conseco fixed or indexed annuity through the surrender (in whole or in part) of an existing permanent life insurance policy or annuity, or by borrowing against an existing permanent life insurance policy.

5. Conseco markets and sells its deferred annuity products on a national basis primarily through a network of Independent Marketing Organizations ("IMOs") and individual sales agents (collectively referred to herein as "Affiliated Agents"). Conseco utilizes IMOs to target senior citizens in sales of its deferred annuities in California and throughout the United States. The IMOs hire and manage groups of independent sales agents, who are trained solely to sell Conseco annuity products. The IMOs also systematically solicit, market and sell deferred annuities to seniors, using fraudulent and deceptive sales tactics and methods, such as offering "free financial and estate planning advice," including living trust mills, to induce their trust, obtain personal financial information and persuade them to convert their savings and other investments such as 401(k)s, 403(b)s, IRAs, CDs and life insurance policies into deferred annuities. Defendant profits from this scheme by collecting premiums, inadequately disclosed commissions and expensive surrender charges from annuity sales that would not occur but for the deceptive, fraudulent and illegal conduct of Conseco and Affiliated Agents described herein.

6. To stimulate sales production, Conseco offers sales incentives, commissions and other promotions to Affiliated Agents for selling Conseco deferred annuity products. Conseco does

so even though it is aware of the unsavory tactics used by the Affiliated Agents (e.g., financial seminars, estate planning and living trust mills) to coerce vulnerable elderly victims into buying deferred annuities. Conseco, through its headquarters in Illinois, prepares, disseminates and approves uniform information, illustration and sales materials to Affiliated Agents for marketing and selling its deferred annuities to unsuspecting senior citizens. And, in concert with the Affiliated Agents, Conseco systematically misrepresents that such annuities are appropriate investments for seniors, while downplaying the substantial drawbacks, including massive surrender charges, in violation of state disclosure requirements and consumer protection laws.

7. Conseco has also repeatedly failed to disclose, in the standard form annuity contracts, sales illustrations and related marketing materials, all material facts necessary to inform senior citizens of the true risks and unsuitability of these products and have failed to properly train and supervise the Affiliated Agents about state law and Conseco's internal policies and procedures in connection with the sale of deferred annuities to senior citizens. In addition, Conseco and Affiliated Agents have failed to disclose the full extent of their business relationships and therefore, plaintiffs and the class are unaware of the conflict of interest created by these relationships.

8. Defendant's sales practices alleged herein violate the federal Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organizations Act ("RICO"), 18 U.S.C. §1961 *et seq.*, and California elder abuse and consumer protection statutes. *See* Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §15600 *et seq*.; Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§17200 *et seq*., 17500 *et seq*. Defendant's practices also constitute fraudulent concealment, breach of fiduciary duty, bad faith, and unjust enrichment warranting a constructive trust.

9. This action seeks to enjoin Conseco from engaging in its unethical and unconscionable sales practices, including the form and substance of such disclosures. It also seeks to compensate the elderly victims of its scheme and penalize Conseco for its knowingly wrongful practices.

PARTIES

10. Plaintiff Friou B. Jones currently resides in Sarasota, Florida. In 2003, Peter Cataldo, a duly-appointed Conseco sales agent, solicited, offered, and sold Mr. Jones a flexible premium

deferred annuity underwritten and issued by Conseco. At the time of the purchase, Mr. Jones was 81 years old.

11. Plaintiff Robert H. Hansen is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a resident and citizen of the State of California, County of Santa Clara, and over 65 years of age. Mr. Hansen was 68 years old when Conseco sold him a "Conseco Choice" equity-indexed annuity in August 2000 that by its terms would not mature until August 2027 – well beyond Mr. Hansen's actuarial life expectancy. Additionally, for the first 15 years following the purchase Mr. Hansen was entitled to only withdraw minimal amounts from the annuity lest he be subject to a 20% graduated surrender charge. The expiration of this 15 year lock-up period was also beyond Mr. Hansen's actuarial life expectancy at the time he purchased the annuity.

12. Defendant Conseco Insurance Company, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Conseco, Inc., is organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Illinois and is authorized to, and in fact does, transact substantial business in the State of California and within this judicial district. Conseco Insurance Company maintains its executive offices at 222 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Illinois, 60654. Prior to 2004, defendant was known as Conseco Annuity Assurance Company.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Deferred Annuity Policies

13. An annuity is a contract between an annuity owner (or "annuitant") and an insurance company pursuant to which the annuity owner makes an upfront lump-sum payment or a series of payments to the insurance company. The insurance company, in turn, agrees to make payments to the annuity owner over a period of time. With a standard or "immediate" annuity, the annuitant has a right to a stream of income via payments from the insurance company that is usually guaranteed to last for as long as the annuitant is alive. This provides security to annuitants who are concerned they may outlive their assets.

14. With a deferred annuity, the annuitant foregoes payment until some point in the future, which is determined by the annuity's maturity date or minimum holding period. A deferred annuity has two periods: the accumulation period and the payout period. During the accumulation

period, the earnings on the annuitant's premium payments grow, tax-deferred, for as long as the owner leaves the earnings in the annuity. During the payout period, the annuity company pays income to the annuitant or designated beneficiary of the annuity income. Thus, deferred annuities are very different from immediate annuities and provide a long-term investment vehicle, not an up-front income stream. The annuities at issue in this action are deferred annuities.

15. There are at least two kinds of deferred annuities: a "fixed" deferred annuity and an "equity-indexed" deferred annuity.

(a) A "fixed" annuity is an annuity in which the insurance company offers a guaranteed interest rate for a set period of time on the annuitant's premium payments.

(b) An "indexed" annuity is an annuity for which the rate of interest the company provides to the policyholder fluctuates depending upon the performance of a stock market index, such as the S&P 500. The amount of interest credited to an equity-indexed annuity also depends on several other factors, including the term (the period over which the annuity interest is calculated), participation rate (amount of the increase in the index that will be used to calculate the interest), cap rate (an agreed-upon rate which limits the maximum interest rate), floor rate (minimum interest rate), whether the annuity utilizes averaging (determining the interest rate by averaging the index's performance over the term of the annuity) and whether the annuity utilizes compound or simple interest. Unbeknownst to the senior, the insurance company often reserves the right to change certain of these features to the detriment of the annuitant. In short, equity-indexed annuities are complex derivative products, and consequently lend themselves to abusive sales practices directed toward senior citizens who are unsophisticated investors.

16. With a deferred annuity, the annuity owner cannot withdraw his or her investment or the earned interest until the holding period expires or the deferred annuity matures, which is usually between 10 and 20 years after the initial payment of the premium.

17. The penalty for early withdrawal of either the principal or earnings is called a "surrender charge." The percentage of the surrender charge, which can start as high as 20% or more, declines after a period of five to eight years, and then diminishes further with each passing year for a specified number of years. The surrender charge is often a hefty penalty discouraging early

withdrawal of principal from an annuity or early annuitization (a choice by the annuity owner to being receiving regular payments from the annuity). As a result, the terms of deferred annuities severely limit senior citizens' access to their funds for emergencies or cash flow purposes.

18. Defendant represents that its deferred annuities are beneficial because the principal and the interest they accrue is tax-deferred prior to withdrawal. After that deferral period, it is taxed at ordinary income tax rates. This may be beneficial to an annuity owner who is currently working and, therefore, paying income tax. A deferred annuity does not typically benefit a senior citizen, however, because they are already retired and, therefore, not paying as much in income taxes, if at all.

19. Moreover, the deferred annuity is not appropriate for senior citizens who often need to have access to the principal or earnings prior to the maturity date or expiration of the holding period due to medical expenses, assisted living cost and otherwise. Most importantly, deferred annuities are inappropriate for senior citizens because the investment does not mature or the settlement options do not fully vest within the senior citizen's lifetime. Defendant and its Affiliated Agents know this is the case and initially target the elderly, like plaintiffs and the class, in order to reap massive surrender charges prior to policy maturity.

State Law and Regulators Warn Against Selling Deferred Annuities to the Elderly

20. Governmental regulators, insurance regulations, industry standards and internal corporate policies all expressly recognize the unsuitability of deferred annuities as investments for persons aged 65 and older.

21. For example, in California, the legislature has enacted senior citizen protection statutes relating specifically to the types of policies at issue here, due to the lack of flexibility inherent in deferred annuities, coupled with the diminishing resources of the elderly. These provisions (codified at Cal. Ins. Code §785 *et seq*.) impose a duty of honesty, good faith and fair dealing on insurers when selling deferred annuity products to senior citizens, prohibit "churning" and similar sales practices and dictate strict disclosure requirements to ensure the suitability of a deferred annuity for the senior citizen's needs. The Florida legislature has taken similar action to protect seniors by enacting legislation that imposes a duty on insurance companies and agents

offering annuity products to seniors over the age of 65 to clearly document the basis for selling the product. *See* Fla. Stat. §627.4554.

22. Further, under Cal. Ins. Code §1631, only licensed insurance agents may solicit, offer and sell deferred annuities. This licensing requirement guarantees that consumers receive appropriate guidance when purchasing a deferred annuity and a level of integrity and accountability. It also attempts to guarantee that only persons who are required to refrain from misleading the vulnerable consumer will sell these complex products to seniors, subject to regulations and legal duties requiring him or her to disclose all facts and information within the agent's knowledge regarding a marketed insurance product which may be "material" to a prospective annuitant's decision to purchase such products. *See, e.g.*, Cal. Ins. Code §§330, 331, 332, 334.

23. Recently, current California Insurance Commissioner John Garamendi issued a notice to all insurers and insurance agents regarding the use of "unfair marketing and sales tactics designed to accomplish the sale of annuities principally to senior citizens." As Commissioner Garamendi noted, insurers and insurance agents often utilize misleading marketing and deceptive sales schemes, such as portraying themselves as expert financial planners who are acting in the senior's best interests, to lure seniors into purchasing annuities that do not fulfill the senior's retirement needs. In reality (and unbeknownst to the senior), just the opposite is true. He explained:

> Seniors characteristically perceive the agent as a legal advisor or estate planner and not as an insurance agent because the representatives misrepresent themselves as experts in the initial subject area. They gain the trust and confidence of the senior. [sic] and then misuse that trust to sell an annuity that is oftentimes unsuitable for the senior.
>
> Because of this perception that the salesperson has their best interests in mind, seniors may conclude that they need not totally understand what the pros and cons of an annuity are for their specific situation. They may not be told, or if told they may not understand, the impact of surrender penalties on their net worth, or far-off annuitization dates on their liquidity, or the sale of an annuity or other investment to buy the annuity offered on the taxes they will owe.

Cal. Ins. Commissioner John Garamendi, Notice (Nov. 18, 2005), at 3.

24. Before this notice, in 2002, former California Insurance Commissioner Harry Low issued a Notice to all insurers and insurance agents about using a ruse to "accomplish the sale of annuities that is principally used in the solicitation of senior citizens." The Department of Insurance

("DOI") Notice and warning went unheeded by defendant. Because annuity sales are extremely lucrative (to the tune of ***$115.6 billion annually***), Conseco continues to use the Affiliated Agents to dishonestly market and sell deferred annuities to senior citizens.

25. Florida has also taken steps to curb such abuses. In 2004, Florida's Chief Financial Officer, Tom Gallagher ("CFO Gallagher"), drew attention to these deceitful business practices by warning consumers about such practices. In doing so, CFO Gallagher emphasized the need for the broker or agent to conduct an objective determination as to whether the offered annuity is a suitable investment vehicle for seniors needing access to their retirement funds: "Annuities can be an effective investment tool for many Floridians wanting a steady stream of income for retirement. . . . But too many of our state's seniors have been preyed upon by agents who are motivated by commission payments, not consideration of a senior's financial circumstances." Along with releasing this warning to seniors, CFO Gallagher took action to protect seniors by pursuing a bill that required insurance companies and agents offering annuity products to seniors over the age of 65 to clearly document the basis for selling the product. Shortly thereafter, that legislation was passed.

26. In addition to warning seniors and insurers about sales of deferred annuity products, states have also recognized that certain marketing methods utilized by insurers and their agents are fraudulent and deceptive. The Pennsylvania Attorney General drew attention to living trust mill scams in July 2001, saying:

> Unfortunately, when it comes to living trusts, unscrupulous con artists are ready to play on consumers' fears of the unknown. In some cases, consumers – mostly elderly – are solicited by phone or mail to attend seminars or to set up in-home appointments to discuss living trusts. Living trusts are then marketed through high-pressure sales pitches which prey on the fear that assets will be tied up indefinitely or that estates are prone to heavy taxes and fees if a living trust is not in place. Con artists often rely on unfamiliar terms such as "probate" and "executor" to convince consumers that a living trust is right for them even though many of the complex rules and fees that can complicate estate distributions do not exist in Pennsylvania.
>
> Sometimes victims are sold worthless "kits", costing several thousand dollars, which are nothing more than standard forms that may or may not be valid, as laws concerning living trusts vary from state to state. In other cases, false promoters simply want to gain access to consumers' financial information so they can sell them other products like insurance annuities.

27. It is not only the policymakers and the regulators, but the industry itself that also recognizes the problems in marketing and selling deferred annuities to senior citizens. On May 27,

2003, the National Association of Securities Dealers ("NASD") – the security industry's self-regulatory body – issued an alert about the marketing and sale of deferred annuities, especially to the elderly. "The marketing efforts used by some variable annuity sellers deserve scrutiny – ***especially when seniors are the targeted investors***." (Emphasis added.) In its alert, the NASD acknowledged: "The variety of features offered by variable annuity products can be confusing. For this reason, it can be difficult for investors to understand what's been recommended for them to buy – especially when facing a hard charging salesperson." Although the alert focused on variable annuities, it applies equally to other deferred annuities.

28. On December 12, 2005, the North American Securities Administration Association issued an alert to seniors about financial planning seminars being conducted by bogus senior specialists. In that alert, the NASAA explained how these purported "specialists" use their title to help them defraud seniors:

> Individuals may call themselves "senior specialists" to create a false level of comfort among seniors by implying a certain level of training on issues important to the elderly. But the training they receive is often nothing more than marketing and selling techniques targeting the elderly . . . [s]enior specialists commonly target investors through seminars where the specialist reviews the seniors' assets, including securities portfolios. Typically, the specialist recommends liquidating securities positions and using the proceeds to purchase indexed or variable annuities products the specialist offer.

Defendant's Scheme to Sell Deferred Annuities to Senior Citizens

29. Despite these warnings, defendant continues to solicit, market, sell and underwrite deferred annuity policies targeting the elderly, including plaintiffs and the class. Unbeknownst to plaintiffs, Conseco offers sales incentives, commissions and other promotions to Affiliated Agents for selling seniors Conseco deferred annuity products. Conseco, in turn, receives immense profits and maintains or increases market share from the sale of deferred annuities to seniors.

30. Conseco ignores numerous states' policy and regulatory warnings, and as a business practice, turns a blind eye toward the unscrupulous tactics used by the Affiliated Agents to sell its products, and routinely issues age limit exceptions to generate tremendous profits. On information and belief, Conseco also approves or ratifies Affiliated Agents' misleading and deceptive marketing plans and ruses designed to target senior citizens. They do so despite numerous warnings and

actions by governmental entities showing that this is an unlawful and unacceptable business practice, because of the massive profits and commissions earned by defendant.

31. Defendant's common course of conduct and scheme include a number of players and shifty machinations calculated to defraud or otherwise take advantage of the elderly. Defendant encourages Affiliated Agents to garner the trust of seniors and their confidential and personal financial information, and in turn manipulate them into buying a deferred annuity.

32. For example, as defendant is aware, Affiliated Agents target seniors in advertisements for financial, retirement, long-term care, and estate planning seminars and workshops that are publicized in mass mailings and an array of newspapers. In these targeted solicitations and at the estate planning seminars, sales agents seek to gain the trust of seniors by presenting themselves as expert financial advisors who purport to provide objective investment and financial advice, and who purport to possess the special knowledge needed to interpret and understand the complex deferred annuity policies they offer. The meetings are hosted by Affiliated Agents and held in seniors' homes, hotels, senior centers, and other locations. As part of defendant and its Affiliated Agents' scheme, service providers misrepresent that they offer bona fide legal, accounting, and other types of objective advice for financial and/or estate planning, when, in fact, they merely seek to sell the senior a deferred annuity.

33. Defendant trains individual sales agents to target senior citizens by offering such financial or estate planning as community service events for the elderly. Upon information and belief, defendant also instructs sales agents to use these meetings to lure seniors into providing confidential financial information. Defendant provides standardized or approved forms to sales agents for eliciting confidential and sensitive information about the seniors' assets under the guise of gathering the requisite information for preparing other financial or legal documents. The Affiliated Agents then use this information to determine whether a given senior is a viable target for their deceptive sales scheme (known within the industry as "prospecting").

34. Based upon the training given to them by defendant, Affiliated Agents then focus additional marketing efforts on those seniors they have identified as viable targets through this scam. Defendant and sales agents use this information to "churn" existing senior citizen life insurance

and/or annuity policyholders, that is, to deplete the accumulated cash value from an existing life insurance or annuity (either by its surrender or, in the case or a life insurance policy, borrowing against the policy's cash value), or sale of other assets such as mutual funds, and to apply that money to purchase a new Conseco deferred annuity.

35. Defendant also encourages its agents and brokers to attend annuity workshops, where, in addition to learning how to lure seniors into attending disguised trust mills, Affiliated Agents learn how to maximize their sales commissions (and defendant's profits) through unscrupulous sales practices. One common technique, called "pushing the hot-button," involves exploiting a senior's emotional insecurities and financial concerns in order to generate interest in the agent's annuity products. Under this technique, an agent will first gather a senior's financial information under the guise that such information is necessary to provide sound financial advice. Then, after purportedly studying the senior's financial information, the agent will generate fear in the senior by creating so-called problems, even though none truly exist. For example, an agent may tell the senior that their finances are in disarray or that the senior lacks adequate asset protection and could easily have his or her life savings seized –leaving them penniless. To complete the ruse, the agent conveniently provides the senior with the solution to their fear: an annuity that, unbeknownst to the senior, generates thousands of dollars in commissions for the agent and does nothing to ensure the senior's financial safety.

36. Senior citizens are an ideal target for defendant's scheme and are particularly susceptible to these deceptive and misleading practices. Many seniors have a diminished ability to understand complex investment transactions, harbor concerns about risky investments, and fear outliving their assets. Defendant pursues senior citizens with sales tactics designed to scare, deceive, coerce, harass and/or force them into converting their assets and investments into deferred annuities.

37. Defendants and sales agents exploit seniors' diminished mental ability by offering and selling equity-indexed deferred annuities, a tremendously complex investment product. Given the countless permutations and ever-changing features of defendant's equity-indexed deferred annuities, it is difficult, if not impossible, for seniors to understand the investment product being marketed and sold to them. Indeed, these investment products are so complex that defendant's sales

agents – despite their self-proclaimed sophistication – do not understand all of the components, features, and underlying risks of defendant's equity-indexed deferred annuities. Accordingly, defendant's sales agents never clearly explain the product to seniors before making the sale, much less make a complete and objective determination as to whether the equity-indexed deferred annuity is an appropriate product in light of the seniors' age, financial situation and retirement goals.

38. Defendant and its Affiliated Agents collude in targeting the elderly and coordinate the exchange of private financial and personal information of intended victims. As defendant encourages, Affiliated Agents develop profiles of particular individuals based on age, available assets, and predicted vulnerability. The Affiliated Agents arrange to share information, documentation, advertising and promotional materials with other co-conspirators so that they, in turn, can provide it to targets for inducing reliance and trust based on the name and reputation of Conseco.

39. The Affiliated Agents have agreements with Conseco to sell its deferred annuities, and they adhere to the sales procedures, protocols and materials dictated, prepared and/or approved by Conseco. These sales protocols and procedures include the use of standard annuity marketing materials, illustrations and form contracts created and/or authorized by Conseco. Conseco instructs the Affiliated Agents not to elaborate on the information presented in its form annuity contracts, the form "Notice to California Residents Age 65 or Older," and uniform pre-printed sales illustrations and marketing materials when making a sales presentation to prospective customers.

40. Upon information and belief, Conseco has changed its agent training protocols and agent supervision and reporting practices in recent years such that it no longer adheres to statutory obligations in selling deferred annuities to seniors. At the same time, Conseco has increasingly relied on independent agents/brokers and IMOs to market and sell its equity-indexed deferred annuities. This has undercut Conseco's obligation to properly train and supervise its brokers and agents such that it no longer ensures Affiliated Agents fully disclose all material information about its deferred annuity products to consumers at the point of sale. For example, with respect to sales of defendant's equity-indexed deferred annuities, Affiliated Agents fail to disclose that returns can be very low. The participation rates are often capped between 3% and 10%, and those "caps" severely

limit growth during the strongest months of the index while placing no limits on the negatives of the weakest months of the index. As a result, several months of strong gains can easily be cleaned out by one month of losses.

41. Conseco fails to make any review or good faith effort to ascertain or verify the suitability of its deferred annuity products for senior citizens. Conseco fails to require sales agents to issue an age exception prior to issuing a policy to senior citizens. Thus, Conseco fails to do its due diligence to prevent misleading or incomplete sales presentations to seniors about the deferred annuity products. Further, upon information and belief, Conseco turns a blind eye to complaints about Affiliated Agents and fails to take appropriate corrective and/or disciplinary action.

42. Conseco pays the Affiliated Agents, including Cataldo and Zehner, bonuses and unusually high commissions for targeting and selling deferred annuities to senior citizens. By doing so, Conseco induces, condones and encourages Affiliated Agents to engage in aggressive and predatory marketing tactics, including targeting and exploiting the vulnerability and concerns of senior citizens. For example, with the knowledge and at least tacit approval of Conseco, the Affiliated Agents persuade senior citizens to convert their savings or liquidate other investments such as 401(k)s, 403(b)s, IRAs, CDs and life insurance policies into Conseco deferred annuities, often resulting in surrender charges incurred for accessing the senior's money after purchasing Conseco's products.

43. Defendant engages in various deceptive sales techniques designed to mislead senior citizens regarding the purported benefits and advantages of annuities compared to other forms of investments, and have concealed or downplayed the disadvantages of purchasing a deferred annuity in later stages of life. Defendant's marketing materials mislead seniors by not adequately disclosing the hefty surrender charges that remain in effect for the first 10-15 years of the annuity and by not adequately disclosing that the maturity date or full vesting of the settlement options is beyond the actuarial life expectancy of the annuitant.

44. Defendant's marketing materials also mislead seniors by disguising the fact that purchasers of indexed deferred annuities can have 0% returns in a given year. Instead, defendant's marketing materials falsely proclaim that indexed deferred annuities are a risk-free investment

because the deferred annuity contract provides for a guaranteed minimum account value. Defendant's marketing materials do not disclose, however, that the guaranteed minimum account value does not exceed the premiums paid for many years, and that an annuitant must not surrender the policy for a significant period of time before the guaranteed minimum account value will protect against the risk of losing money.

45. Conseco's contracts are intentionally drafted so that the average person, let alone an elderly person, cannot readily understand the terms. Mr. Jones' annuity, for example, presents him with a raft of confusing settlement options and fails to adequately explain that these options will not fully vest for five years. In addition, its Affiliated Agents attempt to conceal the provisions that render the deferred annuity inherently unsuitable for seniors, e.g., harsh surrender penalties and limits on withdrawals.

Mr. Jones Purchases a Conseco Deferred Annuity

46. In 2003, Mr. Jones received an unsolicited advertisement from Mr. Peter Cataldo. In the advertisement, Cataldo advertised themselves as a "Licensed Consultant." As such, Cataldo represented that he could provide objective financial advice and/or estate planning for seniors such as Mr. Jones. Cataldo asked Mr. Jones if he would like to "stop paying income taxes on [his] savings dollars?"

47. After receiving the solicitation, Mr. Jones made an appointment for personalized financial planning and arranged to meet with Cataldo. At the meeting, Mr. Jones expressed concern over an Allianz annuity he currently owned. Because his existing Allianz annuity required annuitization at age 89, it would not provide the immediate income that he and his wife needed for retirement.

48. Mr. Jones offered a purported solution: a Conseco "Hallmark Marquee Flexible Deferred Annuity." To finance the purchase of the Conseco annuity, Cataldo suggested that Mr. Jones raid the cash value of the existing Allianz annuity. Mr. Jones expressed reservations about the transaction because he did not want to pay the surrender charges associated with the existing Allianz policy. Cataldo, however, was determined to make the sale. He stressed the purported benefits and

advantages of the deferred annuity and at the same time, concealed drawbacks such as the steep surrender charges.

49. Based on Cataldo's representations, Mr. Jones agreed to surrender his existing Allianz policy and purchase the Conseco deferred annuity. The Conseco annuity number is 0N7XXXXX.[2] The policy has a minimum holding period of five years, which requires Mr. Jones to live to be 86-years old before the settlement options fully vest. Should Mr. Jones choose to begin receiving payments under one of the settlement options within five years of purchase or choose a settlement option providing for payments for a period of less than five years, the balance of the annuity and the payments therefrom will be subject to penalties and/or massive surrender charges. Furthermore, should Mr. Jones choose to withdraw the entire sum within nine years of purchase, he will be subject to the same surrender charges.

50. At no time during the meeting did Cataldo make an objective determination as to whether the deferred annuity was suitable for Mr. Jones. Rather, Cataldo focused on the extent of Mr. Jones' retirement assets, including the Allianz annuity already held by Mr. Jones, and how such assets could be used to fund the Conseco policy. Accordingly, Mr. Jones received a deferred annuity that did not suit his financial needs, locking up much-needed income for years by imposing hefty surrender charges on payments received under the settlement options and any lump sum withdrawal until Mr. Jones reached the ages of 86 and 91, respectively.

51. Likewise, at no time during the meeting did Cataldo disclose to Mr. Jones that the "Hallmark Marquee" annuity sold to him had a minimum holding period of five years, meaning that the income payments would be subject to steep surrender charges if Mr. Jones chose to annuitize the policy within five years of purchasing the annuity.

52. From solicitation to purchase, Cataldo represented that he provided objective and expert financial planning advice specially tailored to meet the needs of seniors, including Mr. Jones. He represented that he had the experience and qualifications necessary to provide this advice and to

---

[2] "XXXXX" inserted for privacy purposes.

serve Mr. Jones' best interests. Based on these representations, Mr. Jones believed Cataldo was giving him objective financial advice, and he relied on that advice to his detriment.

53. According to the National Center for Health Statistics, the average life expectancy of a male is approximately 77 years. Thus, Mr. Jones had lived out his life expectancy when he purchased the Conseco annuity.

54. As a result of the Conseco deferred annuity he purchased, Mr. Jones has suffered damages in lost access to needed funds, payment of unnecessary fees and charges to sales agent Cataldo, and foregoing other investments that would have faired better.

Mr. Hansen Purchases a Conseco Deferred Annuity

55. In or about March 2000, Robert C. Zehner, a duly appointed Conseco sales agent met with Mr. Hansen and his spouse, Eileen J. Hansen, ostensibly for the purpose of providing financial advice in connection with the Hansen's estate planning. During this meeting, Zehner never inquired about or sought information concerning plaintiff's financial or insurance assets necessary to determine whether Conseco's deferred annuity products were suitable for Mr. Hansen's needs. Instead, the agent's focus was ascertaining the degree and extent of Mr. Hansen's pre-existing deferred annuity issued by Security Life Insurance Company and the Hansen's other liquid assets that could be used to purchase a new Conseco deferred annuity.

56. At the conclusion of the meeting, Zehner recommended and induced Mr. Hansen to surrender his existing Security Life deferred annuity and use its net proceeds to purchase a $108,194.24 single premium "Conseco Choice" equity-indexed Flexible Premium Deferred and Fixed Annuity issued by Conseco in August 2000 under certificate no. CC002509.

57. At the time of the solicitation and sale of the Conseco annuity, Zehner, in addition to being a licensed and appointed agent of Conseco, operated an insurance trust mill which targeted senior citizens for unsuitable deferred annuity sales.

58. At no time during the meeting did Conseco's sales agent disclose to the Hansens that the deferred annuity had a maturity date of August 22, 2027, and thus would not mature and begin to distribute the full contracted benefits to plaintiff until long after his actuarial life expectancy. Agent Zehner also did not disclose that the Conseco annuity imposed high surrender charges (20%

graduated over the first 15 years of the annuity) and that Zehner was receiving substantial commissions from Conseco as a result of Mr. Hansen's deferred annuity purchase. Zehner also did not explain or disclose to the Hansens the negative financial and investment consequences associated with the surrender of plaintiff's Security Life deferred annuity, the net proceeds of which were used to purchase the Conseco annuity product.

59. Mr. Hansen was harmed by his purchase of the Conseco deferred annuity because it was an unsuitable financial product in light of the maturity date and surrender charges as known to Conseco at the time it approved Mr. Hansen's application. In addition to a maturity date of 2027, the Conseco annuity provided that Mr. Hansen would only be permitted minimal access to the principal investment for the first 15 years of the annuity unless he paid substantial surrender charges to Conseco.

60. Aside from the minimal guaranteed first year interest (3%) on 75% of the $108,194.24 in premiums deposited into annuity's opening account, the only benefit from Mr. Hansen's transaction accrued to Conseco and its sales agent who collected premiums, fees, and commissions from the sale of the annuity which required Mr. Hansen to relinquish any rights to money paid into the Conseco deferred annuity.

61. Due to his age and other factors, including without limitation, the concealment and other misconduct by defendant and its sales agents, including Zehner, Mr. Hansen did not discover until 2004 that the Conseco deferred annuity product recommended and sold to him were wholly unsuitable for his insurance and financial needs. At such time, Mr. Hansen terminated his Conseco annuity and was assessed a substantial surrender charge by defendant which damaged plaintiff.

RICO ALLEGATIONS

62. Conseco and Affiliated Agents have engaged in a fraudulent scheme, common course of conduct and conspiracy, to increase or maintain market share and premium revenue for Conseco and revenues for the Affiliated Agents from extremely lucrative commissions.

63. To achieve these goals, defendant entered into agreements to sell deferred annuity policies to senior citizens, used and disseminated virtually uniform marketing materials to solicit and sell such policies and paid commissions and other fees for accomplishing a sale. As a direct result of

defendant and Affiliated Agents' conspiracy and fraudulent scheme, Conseco was able to extract premiums, fees, early withdrawal penalties, and other revenues from plaintiffs and the class.

Elder Abuse Annuity Enterprise

64. Based upon plaintiffs' current knowledge, the following constitute one or more groups of persons and entities associated in fact, hereinafter referred to in this Complaint as the "Elder Abuse Annuity Enterprise" or the "EAA Enterprise": defendant and Affiliated Agents, including, but not limited to, Cataldo and Zehner.

65. The EAA Enterprise is an ongoing and continuing organization consisting of both corporations and individuals associated for the common or shared purpose of selling, promoting and/or marketing deferred annuity policies to plaintiffs and the class through deceptive and misleading sales tactics or materials, and deriving profits from those activities.

66. The EAA Enterprise functions by providing financial, long-term care or estate planning, consultation, advice and related services, as well as insurance products. Many of these services and products are legitimate and non-fraudulent. However, defendant and its Affiliated Agents, through the EAA Enterprise, have engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity which also involves a fraudulent scheme to increase premium revenue for Conseco, and additional revenue for the Affiliated Agents from commissions, through the sale of deferred annuities to senior citizens.

67. The EAA Enterprise engages in and affects interstate commerce because it involves activities across state boundaries, such as the marketing, promotion, advertisement and sale of inappropriate deferred annuity products to seniors, and the receipt of premiums, commissions, and surrender charges from the sale of inappropriate deferred annuity products to senior citizens.

68. Within the EAA Enterprise, there is a common communication network by which co-conspirators share information on a regular basis. The EAA Enterprise uses this common communication network for the purpose of marketing, soliciting and selling annuity products to the general public, including senior citizens.

69. The EAA Enterprise has a systematic linkage because there are contractual relationships, financial ties and continuing coordination of activities. Through the EAA Enterprise, defendant and its Affiliated Agents engage in consensual decision making to implement their

fraudulent scheme and to function as a continuing unit for the common purpose of exacting payments, surrender charges and premium dollars. Furthermore, the EAA Enterprise functions as a continuing unit with the purpose of assisting with, perfecting and furthering their wrongful scheme to market and sell Conseco's deferred annuity products to senior citizens.

70. While defendant participates in and is a member of the EAA Enterprise, it also has a separate and distinct existence.

71. Defendant and its Affiliated Agents must conceal the inherent properties of deferred annuities to market and sell this inappropriate investment to senior citizens, who are highly unlikely to survive until the settlement options fully vest or the annuity matures. To limit the substantive information that prospective purchasers receive, defendant has to maintain control over information prospective purchasers get at the point of sale. Defendant exercises substantial control over the direction of the EAA Enterprise by:

(a) designing and issuing deferred annuity products with extended holding periods or maturity dates, high surrender charges and other similar provisions to senior citizens;

(b) developing uniform sales and marketing materials, standardized annuity contracts, high-pressure sales techniques and scripted sales presentations including, but not limited to, those materials developed by defendant for use by the Affiliated Agents;

(c) developing uniform sales techniques to "churn" senior citizens into purchasing deferred annuities from Conseco by baiting them to convert current investments to deferred annuities by extolling the high interest rate without disclosing the associated penalties;

(d) instructing and requiring sales agents to use standardized sales materials, uniform sales techniques and presentations developed and/or authorized by defendant to market and sell unsuitable deferred annuities to senior citizens;

(e) rewarding sales agents with perks and high commissions for selling a deferred annuity product to a senior citizen;

(f) accepting applications for and issuing deferred annuities that mature after the actuarial life expectancy of the annuitant; and

(g) imposing and/or collecting charges from the class for exercising their right to receive payments under a settlement option prior to the expiration of the holding period, withdrawing some or all of the annuity and/or dying prior to the maturity date.

72. Although defendant sells immediate annuities or other policies appropriate for senior citizens, the EAA Enterprise has targeted senior citizens specifically for deferred annuity products.

73. At all relevant times, each participant in the EAA Enterprise was aware of the scheme to induce seniors to purchase inappropriate deferred annuity products, was a knowing and willing participant in the scheme and reaped profits therefrom.

74. The EAA Enterprise has an ascertainable structure separate and apart from the pattern of racketeering activity in which defendant has engaged.

75. Defendant has directed and controlled the ongoing organization necessary to implement its scheme and illicit business practices at meetings and through communications about which plaintiffs cannot now know because all such information lies in defendant's hands.

RICO Conspiracy

76. Defendant and its Affiliated Agents have not undertaken the practices described herein in isolation but as part of a common scheme and conspiracy.

77. Defendant and its Affiliated Agents have engaged in a conspiracy to increase or maintain market share and premium revenue for Conseco and to generate additional revenue for Affiliated Agents through high commissions and incentives paid by Conseco for selling deferred annuities to senior citizens.

78. The objects of the conspiracy are: (a) to induce senior citizens to purchase Conseco's deferred annuity policies; (b) to maximize annuity sales for Conseco; (c) to maximize commissions for Affiliated Agents; and (d) to maximize the revenues of Conseco and its Affiliated Agents.

79. To achieve these goals, Conseco has routinely issued age exceptions for deferred annuities, issued virtually uniform information to the Affiliated Agents for marketing and selling such policies and paid high commissions for the sale of deferred annuities to seniors by any means. The Affiliated Agents have agreed to sell deferred annuities to seniors, even though they are inappropriate investments for them, and they have used deceptive and unconscionable methods to

secure such sales and commissions. Defendant and Affiliated Agents have also agreed to participate in other illicit and fraudulent practices, all in exchange for agreement to and participation in the conspiracy.

80. Defendant and each member of the conspiracy, with knowledge and intent, has agreed to the overall objectives of the conspiracy and participated in the common course of conduct to commit acts of fraud and indecency in inducing the trust of elderly citizens, persuading them to consolidate their assets in a deferred annuity, and to solicit, market and sell such policies to persons for whom the investment will provide no benefit, but rather, will cause them harm through steep penalties, complications for loved ones upon their death, tax liability and other costs and expenses.

81. Indeed, for the conspiracy to succeed, defendant and Affiliated Agents had to agree to implement and use the similar devices and fraudulent tactics against their intended targets.

82. Many instances of common conduct, activity and similar facts evidence the presence of a conspiracy and exist among defendant and co-conspirators including, but not limited to:

(a) similar advertisements and marketing materials with vague, misleading, and incomplete language about the inappropriateness of deferred annuity policies for seniors;

(b) similar plans and methods for sales agents to solicit, market, refer, and sell Conseco's deferred annuities under the guise of providing financial and estate planning for seniors;

(c) similar tactics for steering the class to Conseco deferred annuity policies; and

(d) similar agreements between and among defendant and co-conspirators to sell deferred annuity products to seniors, despite industry standards and governmental warnings.

83. As a result of the conspiracy, plaintiffs and the class made payments for deferred annuity products and other "services" beyond what they would have otherwise.

Use of the Mails and Wires

84. Defendant and its Affiliated Agents used thousands of mail and interstate wire communications to create and manage their fraudulent scheme through virtually uniform misrepresentations, concealments and material omissions. Defendant and its Affiliated Agents' scheme includes, but is not limited to: false and misleading marketing materials, mass mailings,

phone calls, advertisements, agreements, insurance contracts, correspondence, policy materials, Web sites, and commission payments to Affiliated Agents.

85. Defendant's fraudulent use of the mails and wires included the following communications sent by defendant and its Affiliated Agents to each other, plaintiffs and third parties via U.S. Mail, commercial carrier, wire, or other interstate electronic media:

(a) false or misleading representations that the Affiliated Agents provide objective financial advice to assist the class in crafting their financial and estate plans;

(b) misrepresentations and omissions about the inappropriateness of deferred annuity policies for seniors, as well as the drawbacks of such policies, such as steep penalties for withdrawal prior to the maturity date;

(c) materials failing to disclose the existence and effect of commissions paid to Affiliated Agents by Conseco, including the conflicts of interest created by the payments and as part of the conspiracy;

(d) misrepresentations and omissions aimed at inducing plaintiffs and the class to purchase Conseco deferred annuities; and

(e) invoices and payments related to defendant and Affiliated Agents' improper scheme.

86. Defendant's corporate headquarters have communicated by U.S. Mail and by facsimile with various regional offices and subsidiaries, divisions and other insurance entities in furtherance of its scheme with the Affiliated Agents.

87. Defendant's virtually uniform misrepresentations, acts of concealment and omissions were knowing and intentional and made for the purpose of deceiving the class, selling lucrative deferred annuity policies, and entitling the Affiliated Agents to high commissions from Conseco.

88. Defendant and its Affiliated Agents either knew or recklessly disregarded that their misrepresentations and omissions were material and were relied upon by plaintiffs and the class as shown by their payments for deferred annuity policies placed with Conseco, as well as other fees for financial planning advice.

FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT AND EQUITABLE TOLLING

89. Defendant has affirmatively and fraudulently concealed its unlawful scheme, conspiracy and course of conduct from plaintiffs and the class. Plaintiffs and other class members did not know, and could not reasonably have known, of defendant's fraudulent scheme and could not have reasonably discovered the falsity of defendant's representations, advertising and similar documents, nor could plaintiffs and the class reasonably have known the concealed information until shortly before the filing of this Complaint.

90. To this day, defendant continues to fraudulently conceal its practices from the class and public alike. Defendant has refused to release or provide information about its practices in a way that plaintiffs and/or the class could have discovered its fraudulent scheme and practices. Although the initial decisions to engage in these practices were made years ago, defendant has repeatedly decided since to continue concealing its fraudulent practices.

91. Defendant has uniformly trained its sales force and other representatives not to disclose its fraudulent practices described herein. Defendant did not disclose its practices in any of its policies or sales and marketing materials provided to plaintiffs and the class.

92. As a result of the foregoing, plaintiffs and the class could not reasonably discover the unlawful and unethical practices described herein and did not do so until just recently. The vast majority of class members still do not know that they have been injured by defendant's conduct.

93. Defendant's conduct is continuing in nature. There is a substantial nexus between the fraudulent conduct that has occurred within the statute of limitations and the misconduct prior to that time. The acts involve the same type of illicit practices and are recurring, continuous events.

94. The statute of limitations applicable to any claims brought by plaintiffs or other class member as a result of the conduct alleged herein has been tolled as a result of defendant's fraudulent concealment.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

95. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and/or (b), plaintiffs bring this nationwide class action on behalf of themselves and all other senior citizens (persons 65 and older) who purchased one or more fixed or indexed deferred annuities solicited, referred, marketed, sold and/or issued by

defendant Conseco and any of its Affiliated Agents, and/or who have suffered or could suffer a penalty and/or surrender charge, including those incurred on death, for accessing their money during the minimum holding period or before its maturity date, or who acquired a Conseco fixed or indexed annuity through the surrender (in whole or part) of an existing permanent life insurance policy or annuity, or by borrowing against an existing permanent life insurance policy.

96. Excluded from the class is defendant and its directors, officers, predecessors, successors, affiliates, agents, co-conspirator and employees, as well as the immediate family members of such persons.

97. All class members have suffered injury to their property by reason of defendant's scheme and unlawful course of conduct, in that they paid for insurance policies that were inappropriate given their age, and that they have or could suffer early withdrawal penalties.

98. The class is reasonably estimated to be in the thousands or tens of thousands and is thus so numerous that joinder of all its members is impracticable. The precise number of class members and their addresses are unknown to plaintiffs, but can be ascertained through appropriate discovery of defendant's records. Class members may be notified of the pendency of this action by publication and/or other notice.

99. There is a well-defined community of interest in the relevant questions of law and fact affecting putative class members. Common questions of law and fact predominate over any individual questions affecting class members, including, but not limited to the following:

(a) whether defendant improperly solicited, referred, marketed, issued or sold deferred annuities to senior citizens, including plaintiffs and the class;

(b) whether defendant engaged in mail and/or wire fraud;

(c) whether defendant engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity;

(d) whether the EAA Enterprise is an "enterprise" within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. §1961(4);

(e) whether defendant conducted or participated in the affairs of the EAA Enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1962(c);

(f) whether defendant conspired with Affiliated Agents to commit violations of the racketeering laws in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1962(d);

(g) whether defendant committed elder abuse as defined in Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §15600 *et seq*.;

(h) whether defendant committed unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices, in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200, in its marketing, promotion, solicitation, sales and issuance of deferred annuities to plaintiffs and class members;

(i) whether defendant engaged in false and misleading advertising in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17500, *et seq*.;

(j) whether defendant fraudulently concealed information about deferred annuities from plaintiffs and the class in violation of California law;

(k) whether defendant breached its obligation of good faith to plaintiffs and the class;

(l) whether defendant aided and abetted or ratified the wrongful acts of Affiliated Agents;

(m) whether defendant has been unjustly enriched at the expense of the class;

(n) whether plaintiffs and the class are entitled to damages; and

(o) whether the class is entitled to injunctive, declaratory, and/or other relief.

100. The claims of plaintiffs and the other class members have a common origin and share a common basis. The claims originate from the same illegal, fraudulent conspiracy on the part of defendant and Affiliated Agents and their acts in furtherance thereof, as well as the conduct of their co-conspirators.

101. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of those of the absent class members. If brought and prosecuted individually, the claims of each class member would require proof of many of the same material and substantive facts, rely upon the same remedial theories and seek the same relief.

102. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class and has no interests adverse to or that directly and irrevocably conflict with the interests of other class members.

Plaintiffs are willing and prepared to serve the Court and the putative class in a representative capacity with all of the obligations and duties material thereto.

103. Plaintiffs have retained the services of counsel, identified below on the signature page, who are experienced in complex class-action litigation and in particular class actions involving insurance matters. Plaintiffs' counsel will adequately prosecute this action, and will otherwise assert, protect and fairly and adequately represent plaintiffs and all absent class members.

104. The prosecution of separate actions by individual class members would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications, which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the class. Such incompatible standards of conduct and varying adjudications on the same essential facts, proof and legal theories would also create and allow the existence of inconsistent and incompatible rights within the class.

105. A class action is superior to other methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversies raised in this Complaint because:

(a) individual claims by the class members would be impracticable as the costs of pursuit would far exceed what any one class member has at stake;

(b) little individual litigation has been commenced over the controversies alleged in this Complaint, and individual class members are unlikely to have an interest in separately prosecuting and controlling individual actions;

(c) the concentration of litigation of these claims in one forum will achieve efficiency and promote judicial economy; and

(d) the proposed class action is manageable.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, 18 U.S.C. Section 1962(a)-(d)

106. Plaintiffs and the class repeat and reallege all allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if set forth separately in this Claim for Relief.

107. This claim arises under 18 U.S.C. §1962(a)-(d), which provides in relevant part:

> (a) It shall be unlawful for any person who has received any income derived, directly or indirectly, from a pattern of racketeering activity or through collection of

> an unlawful debt in which such person has participated as a principal within the meaning of section 2, title 18, United States Code [18 USCS § 2], to use or invest, directly or indirectly, any part of such income, or the proceeds of such income, in acquisition of any interest in, or the establishment or operation of, any enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce.
>
> (b) It shall be unlawful for any person through a pattern of racketeering activity or through collection of an unlawful debt to acquire or maintain, directly or indirectly, any interest in or control of any enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce.
>
> (c) It shall be unlawful for any person employed by or associated with any enterprise engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce, to conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such enterprise's affairs through a pattern of racketeering activity . . . .
>
> (d) It shall be unlawful for any person to conspire to violate any of the provisions of subsection . . . (c) of this section.

108. As a direct and indirect result of defendant's conduct as described above, substantial income was generated and received by and came under the control of defendant. Defendant used that income to establish and/or operate the EAA Enterprise, which was engaged in interstate of foreign commerce. Therefore, defendant has violated 18 U.S.C. §1962(a).

109. Defendant, through the conduct described above, acquired, maintained and exercised control over the EAA Enterprise, which was engaged in or affected interstate of foreign commerce. Therefore, defendant has violated 18 U.S.C. 1961(b).

110. In violation of 18 U.S.C. §1962(c), defendant has conducted or participated, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of the affairs of the EAA Enterprise through a "pattern of racketeering activity," as defined by 18 U.S.C. §1961(5).

111. At all relevant times, defendant was a "person" within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. §1961(3), because it was "capable of holding a legal or beneficial interest in property."

112. The EAA Enterprise constituted a single "enterprise" or multiple enterprises within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. §1961(4), as individuals and other entities associated-in-fact for the common purpose of engaging in defendant's profit-making scheme.

113. The EAA Enterprise was created and/or used as a tool to carry out the elements of defendant's illicit scheme and pattern of racketeering activity. The EAA Enterprise has ascertainable structures and purposes beyond the scope and commission of defendant's predicate

acts and conspiracy to commit such acts. The EAA Enterprise is separate and distinct from defendant.

114. The EAA Enterprise has engaged in, and its activities affected, interstate and foreign commerce by soliciting, marketing, referring, selling and issuing deferred annuity policies to thousands, if not tens of thousands, of persons within and without the U.S.

115. The EAA Enterprise actively disguised the nature of defendant's wrongdoing and concealed or misrepresented defendant's participation in the conduct of the EAA Enterprise to maximize profits while minimizing their exposure to criminal and civil penalties.

116. Defendant exerted substantial control over the EAA Enterprise, and participated in the operation and managed the affairs of the EAA Enterprise as described herein.

117. Defendant has committed or aided and abetted the commission of at least two acts of racketeering activity, i.e., indictable violations of 18 U.S.C. §§1341 and 1343, within the past 10 years. The multiple acts of racketeering activity which defendant committed and/or conspired to, or aided and abetted in the commission of, were related to each other, pose a threat of continued racketeering activity and therefore constitute a "pattern of racketeering activity."

118. Defendant's predicate acts of racketeering within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. §1961(1) include, but are not limited to:

(a) **Mail Fraud:** Defendant has violated 18 U.S.C. §1341 by sending or receiving materials via U.S. Mail or commercial interstate carriers for the purpose of executing its scheme to market and sell deferred annuities to seniors by means of false pretenses, misrepresentations, promises and/or omissions. The materials include, but are not limited to: advertisements, deferred annuity marketing brochures, performance illustrations, applications, contracts, sales presentation scripts, training manuals, videotapes, correspondence, annuitant lead lists, premium and commission payments, reports, data, summaries, statements and other materials relating to the marketing and sale of Conseco's deferred annuities.

(b) **Wire Fraud**: Defendant has violated 18 U.S.C. §1343 by transmitting and receiving materials by wire for the purpose of executing its scheme to defraud and obtain money on false pretenses, misrepresentations, promises and/or omissions. The materials transmitted and/or received include, but are not limited to, those mentioned in subsection (a) above.

119. Many of the precise dates of defendant's fraudulent uses of the U.S. Mail and wire facilities have been deliberately hidden and cannot be alleged without access to the defendant's books and records. Indeed, the success of defendant's scheme depends upon secrecy, and defendant has withheld details of the scheme from plaintiffs and class members. Generally, however, plaintiffs can describe the occasions on which the predicate acts of mail and wire fraud would have occurred, and how those acts were in furtherance of a scheme. They include thousands of communications to perpetuate and maintain the scheme, including, among other things:

(a) processing applications for deferred annuity products;

(b) issuing age waivers for applicants over the age of 65 or, alternatively, issuing policies to applicants over the age of 65 without an age waiver;

(c) processing premium payments from senior citizens;

(d) paying and receiving commissions for the marketing, referral and sale of deferred annuity products to a senior;

(e) transmitting and receiving materials about defendant and its Affiliated Agents' financial, long-term care and estate planning seminars, workshops and other similar events for senior citizens;

(f) disseminating training materials for selling deferred annuities;

(g) sharing information about prospective purchasers of deferred annuities; and

(h) imposing and processing penalties and surrender charges for early access to funds trapped in the deferred annuity products.

120. The materials sent or received by defendant via the U.S. Mail, commercial carrier, wire or other interstate electronic media, contained, *inter alia*:

(a) misrepresentations that deferred annuity products are suitable for seniors;

(b) misrepresentations or omissions about defendant's unlawful sales techniques, misleading sales materials and annuity contracts to induce plaintiffs and the class to purchase deferred annuities;

(c) misrepresentations about the nature of the relationship between the Affiliated Agents and defendant; and

(d) omissions that the Affiliated Agents are not "independent" estate and financial planning services or insurance advisors because they are paid extremely high commissions from Conseco for selling deferred annuities.

121. Defendant knowingly and intentionally made these misrepresentations, acts of concealment and failures to disclose so as to deceive plaintiffs and the class. Defendant either knew or recklessly disregarded that these were material misrepresentations and omissions, and plaintiffs and the class relied on the misrepresentations and omissions as set forth herein.

122. Defendant has obtained money and property belonging to plaintiffs and the class as a result of these statutory violations. Plaintiffs and other class members have been injured in their business or property by defendant's overt acts or mail and wire fraud. Plaintiffs and the class have also been injured in their business or property by defendant aiding and abetting its Affiliated Agents' acts of mail and wire fraud.

123. In violation of 18 U.S.C. §1962(d), defendant conspired with Affiliated Agents to violate 18 U.S.C. §1962(c) as described herein. Various other persons, firms and corporations, not named as defendant in this Complaint, have participated as co-conspirators with defendant and Affiliated Agents in these offenses and have performed acts in furtherance of the conspiracy.

124. Defendant aided and abetted violations of the above laws, thereby rendering them indictable as a principal in the 18 U.S.C. §§1341 and 1343 offenses pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §2.

125. Plaintiffs and the class have been injured in their property by reason of defendant's violations of 18 U.S.C. §1962(c) and (d), including lost access to needed funds, unnecessary and concealed fees, charges and penalties that they would not have otherwise incurred, expenses to hire a financial planner and/or attorney and lost value in previous investments that they would not have otherwise incurred. In the absence of defendant's violations of 18 U.S.C. §1962(c) and (d), plaintiffs and the class would not have incurred these costs and expenses, or they would have incurred less.

126. Plaintiffs and the class relied, to their detriment, on defendant's fraudulent misrepresentations and omissions, which were made by means of Web sites, mass mailings,

newspaper advertisements, telephone calls, marketing materials and virtually uniform representations or omissions. Plaintiffs and the class's reliance is evidenced by their payments made for services and for insurance products to defendant.

127. Plaintiffs and the class's injuries were directly and proximately caused by defendant's racketeering activity.

128. Defendant knew plaintiffs and the class relied on its misrepresentations and omissions about the pricing and advantages or disadvantages about certain insurance policies and/or insurance carriers. Defendant knew that annuitants would incur substantial costs as a result.

129. Under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. §1964(c), plaintiffs are entitled to bring this action and to recover treble damages, the costs of bringing this suit and reasonable attorneys' fees.

130. Defendant is accordingly liable to plaintiffs for three times their actual damages as proved at trial plus interest and attorneys' fees.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Financial Elder Abuse, California Welfare & Institutions Code Section 15600, *et seq*.

131. Plaintiffs and the class repeat and reallege all allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if set forth separately in this Claim for Relief.

132. Defendant's conduct constitutes financial abuse under Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §15657.5, *et seq*., as defined in Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §15610.30. California Welfare and Institutions Code §15610.30(a) provides in relevant part:

(a) "Financial abuse" of an elder or dependent adult occurs when a person or entity does any of the following:

(i) Takes, secretes, appropriates, or retains real or personal property of an elder or dependent adult to a wrongful use or with intent to defraud, or both.

(ii) Assists in taking, secreting, appropriating, or retaining real or personal property of an elder or dependent adult to a wrongful use or with intent to defraud, or both.

133. At all relevant times, defendant took and/or assisted in the taking of property from plaintiffs and the class (who are all age 65 or older) for its own wrongful use and/or with intent to defraud. Plaintiffs and the class trusted and relied on defendant.

134. Defendant manipulated plaintiffs and the class into purchasing deferred annuities.

135. Defendant aided and abetted the Affiliated Agents in accomplishing the wrongful acts. In doing so, defendant acted with an awareness of its wrongdoing and realized that its conduct would substantially assist the accomplishment of the wrongful conduct.

136. In performing these acts, Affiliated Agents either acted as agents of Conseco, or Conseco ratified such acts, or both.

137. Defendant's conduct was reckless, oppressive, fraudulent and malicious within the meaning of Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §15657, *et seq*.

138. Under Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §15657.5, *et seq*., defendant is liable for reasonable attorneys' fees and costs for investigating and litigating this claim.

139. Under Cal. Civ. Code §3294 and Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §15657.05(a), defendant is liable for punitive damages.

140. Under Cal. Civ. Code §3345, defendant is liable for treble damages and penalties because: (a) defendant knew or should have known its conduct was directed as to a senior citizen; (b) its conduct caused a senior citizen to suffer substantial loss of property set aside for retirement, and assets essential to their health and welfare; (c) plaintiffs and the class are senior citizens who are more vulnerable than others to defendant's conduct because of their age, impaired understanding, impaired health or restricted mobility; and (d) plaintiffs and the class actually suffered substantial physical, emotional and economic damages resulting from defendant's conduct.

141. Under Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §§15657, *et seq*. and 15657.05, *et seq*., defendant is liable to plaintiffs and the class for their pain and suffering.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violation of California Business & Professions Code Section 17200, *et seq*.

142. Plaintiffs and the class repeat and reallege all allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if set forth separately in this Claim for Relief.

143. California Business and Professions Code §17200 prohibits any "unlawful . . . business act or practice." Defendant has violated §17200's prohibition against engaging in an unlawful act or practice by, *inter alia*, the following:

(a) violating the statutes prohibiting defendant's conduct, as described herein, including violations of RICO, 18 U.S.C. §1962;

(b) violating the California Consumers Legal Remedies Act ("CLRA"), Cal. Civ. Code §1750 *et seq*.;

(c) violating Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17500, *et seq*.;

(d) violating Cal. Ins. Code §§330-334; 762; 780; 781; 785; 787(a), (i), (k); 789.8, *et seq*.; 790, *et seq*.; 791.03, *et seq*., 1861.03, *et seq*.; 10127.10; 10127.13; and 10509, *et seq*.;

(e) violating Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§6125, 6126(a), 6175.3, 6175.4, and 6450;

(f) violating Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §§15610.30, 15656 and 15657, *et seq*.;

(g) violating Cal. Civ. Code §§1689.5, *et seq*., 1709, 1710, 1572, 1573 and 1575;

(h) violating or aiding and abetting a violation of Cal. Corp. Code §§25230 and 25235; and

(i) violating Cal. Penal Code §§368, *et seq*., 459, 484, 487, and 532.

144. Plaintiffs reserve the right to allege other violations of law which constitute other unlawful business acts or practices. Such conduct is ongoing and continues to this date.

145. California Business and Professions Code §17200 also prohibits any "unfair . . . business act or practice." As detailed in the preceding paragraphs, defendant engaged in a systematic scheme to sell deferred annuities to plaintiffs and the class, in violation of federal and state law, and the fundamental policies delineated in statutory provisions. Defendant gained the trust of plaintiffs and the class, had access to their financial information and induced them into purchasing

deferred annuities – all the while knowing deferred annuities are inappropriate for seniors. As a result, defendant engaged in unfair business practices prohibited by Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200, *et seq*.

146. California Business and Professions Code §17200 also prohibits any "fraudulent . . . business act or practice." As detailed in the preceding paragraphs, defendant's conduct was likely to deceive plaintiffs, the class and the public by, *inter alia*, representing that they were providing objective financial or estate planning, and making misrepresentations and omissions about the disadvantages of purchasing a deferred annuity as a senior citizen, including the steep surrender charges and lengthy maturation periods that exceed plaintiffs and other members of the class's life expectancy.

147. Defendant aided and abetted its Affiliated Agents in accomplishing the wrongful acts. In doing so, defendant acted with an awareness of its wrongdoing and realized that its conduct substantially assisted in the accomplishment of the wrongful conduct.

148. As a result of defendant's practices, plaintiffs and other class members have incurred financial losses, including access to needed funds, unnecessary and concealed fees, charges and penalties that they would not have otherwise incurred, expenses to hire a financial planner and/or attorney and the lost value in previous investments that they would not have otherwise incurred.

149. Unless defendant is enjoined from continuing to engage in the unlawful, fraudulent and unfair business practices described above, members of the general public residing within the United States, including California, will continue to be damaged.

150. Pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17203, plaintiffs seek an order requiring defendant to immediately cease such acts of unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business practices and requiring it to return the full amount of money improperly collected – including, but not limited to, commissions and profits from the sale of annuities and income derived from penalties and fees – to all those who have paid them, plus interest and attorneys' fees.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violation of California Business & Professions Code Section 17500 *et seq*.

151. Plaintiffs and the class repeat and reallege all allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if set forth separately in this Claim for Relief.

152. Defendant has intentionally issued false or misleading marketing materials and advertisements about the deferred annuity products that it sells. Defendant's uniform sales materials and standardized annuity contract forms misled and deceived plaintiffs and the class as to the suitability of deferred annuities as investment vehicles for senior citizens.

153. Defendant failed to disclose to plaintiffs, the class or the general public that deferred annuities are inappropriate investments for seniors, instead providing virtually uniform messages that annuities are perfect investments for seniors. Defendant failed to disclose that deferred annuities may be inappropriate because of life expectancies and their need for liquidity in the event of health care emergencies, sudden need to reside in a nursing home or other financial crises. Defendant has intentionally issued false or misleading advertisements soliciting seniors to attend seminars and workshops and other events for financial, long-term care, and estate planning, without adequately disclosing that defendant intends to sell them insurance policies.

154. In addition, defendant has or should have approved all of its Affiliated Agents' advertisements and marketing materials pursuant to Cal. Ins. Code §787(l), and is, therefore, liable for such false or misleading advertisements even if it did not issue them directly. The Affiliated Agents have intentionally issued false or misleading advertisements representing: (a) they are certified financial planners and other bona fide service providers, without also disclosing that they are insurance agents and brokers who sell insurance for Conseco and receive compensation therefrom; (b) their credentials, status, character or representative capacity; (c) the services they purport to provide; and (d) the deferred annuity policies that they sell.

155. Defendant has aided and abetted its Affiliated Agents in accomplishing the wrongful acts. In doing so, defendant acted with awareness of its misconduct and knew that its conduct would substantially further the wrongful conduct.

156. As a result of defendant's misconduct as alleged herein, plaintiffs and the class have incurred actual financial losses and damages including, but not limited to, penalties, fees, charges and deductions as a result of following the advice and recommendations of defendant fees and charges for the purchase of inappropriate financial products and taxes, assessments and penalties not have otherwise incurred but reliance on defendant's misrepresentations and omissions.

157. As a direct and proximate result of defendant's wrongful conduct, plaintiffs, the class and the general public have suffered monetary and non-monetary damages.

158. Unless defendant is enjoined from continuing to engage in such wrongful actions and conduct, members of the general public will continue to be damaged by defendant's false and misleading advertising.

159. So as not to be unjustly enriched by its own wrongful actions and conduct, defendant should be required to disgorge and restore to plaintiffs, members of the class and the general public all monies wrongfully obtained by defendant as a result of its false and misleading advertising, along with interest.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Breach of Fiduciary Duty

160. Plaintiffs and the class repeat and reallege all allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if set forth separately in this Claim for Relief.

161. By virtue of their purported positions as financial advisors, estate planning specialists, and because of their superior knowledge and ability to manipulate and control senior citizens' finances and legal status, the IMO's owned, operated, and/or controlled by defendant who marketed and sold Conseco deferred annuities to senior citizens assumed fiduciary duties to plaintiffs and the class.

162. These entities and defendant owed to plaintiffs and members of the class the highest duties of loyalty, honesty, fidelity, trust, and due care in their fiduciary obligations, and were and are required to use their utmost ability to provide estate planning and investment advice in a fair, just and equitable manner, and to act in furtherance of the best interests of plaintiffs and the class so as to benefit their clients, and not themselves.

163. As set forth above, defendant and its IMO's each breached their obligations and fiduciary duties of care, loyalty, reasonable inquiry, oversight, good faith and supervision, by *inter alia*:

(a) Unreasonably and in bad faith refusing to give sufficient consideration to plaintiffs' welfare rather than their own financial interests;

(b) Unreasonably and in bad faith issuing an age exemption without performing a full and complete investigation of whether or not such an exception would be suitable for their customer;

(c) Ignoring Conseco's protocols and standards in order to further their own financial interests;

(d) Churning existing senior citizen life insurance and/or annuity policyholders, and using deceptive and misleading standardized marketing materials in violation of Cal. Ins. Code §§781 and 10509.8;

(e) Failing to competently supervise and monitor their employees;

(f) Failing to disclose the true characteristics of the deferred annuities sold to senior citizens, instead making false and fraudulent representations that defendant's deferred annuities are safe and suitable for purchase by seniors citizens;

(g) Making material omissions of fact that the IMOs marketing and selling of defendant's annuities were "independent;" and

(h) Maintaining an illegal marketing scheme and conspiracy in violation of §1961(1)(B) of RICO to sell annuity insurance to senior citizens

164. As described herein, defendant and the IMOs owned, operated and/or controlled by Conseco recklessly or knowingly breached their fiduciary duties by orchestrating, devising, carrying out, participating in, and/or failing to prevent, terminate, or timely correct the wrongdoing alleged herein.

165. Each of these violations was achieved because defendant willingly, knowingly, and/or recklessness sought to gain its own financial advantage to the disadvantage of plaintiffs and the class.

166. As a direct and proximate result of defendant's violations of its fiduciary duties, plaintiffs and the class have been injured, and suffered and continue to suffer economic and non-economic losses, all in an amount to be determined according to proof at trial.

167. In light of the foregoing, plaintiffs request that the Court deem this a constructive fraud, and require defendant to immediately rescind the annuity contracts to which plaintiffs and the class are subject.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Aiding and Abetting Breach of Fiduciary Duty

168. Plaintiffs and the class repeat and reallege all allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if set forth separately in this Claim for Relief.

169. Defendant and the IMOs owned, operated, and/or controlled by Conseco aided and abetted, encouraged, and rendered substantial assistance to one another in order to accomplish the wrongful acts complained of herein. In aiding and abetting and substantially assisting the commission of the acts complained of, defendant and its IMOs acted with an awareness of their wrongdoing and realized that their conduct would substantially assist the accomplishment of the wrongful conduct and scheme alleged herein. In performing these acts, each such IMO either acted as agents of defendant, or defendant ratified such acts, or both, and benefited financially from their scheme.

170. As a result of the wrongful conduct of defendant and its IMOs, and each of them, plaintiffs and the class have suffered and continue to suffer economic and non-economic losses, all in an amount to be determined according to proof at trial.

171. In addition, the wrongful acts of defendant and its IMOs, and each of them, were done maliciously, oppressively, and with the intent to mislead and defraud, and plaintiffs and the class are entitled to punitive and exemplary damages to be ascertained according to proof, which is appropriate to punish and set an example of defendant.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Fraudulent Concealment,
Cal. Civ. Code Section 1710, *et seq*.

172. Plaintiffs and the class repeat and reallege all allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if set forth separately in this Claim for Relief.

173. Defendant intentionally misrepresented or concealed the following material information from plaintiffs and the class:

(a) the disadvantages of buying a deferred annuity, including tax and estate consequences and penalties, and lack of access to their annuity investments within their lifetime;

(b) the significant commissions that Affiliated Agents earn from the sale of deferred annuities to senior citizens, including plaintiffs and the class; and

(c) the surrender charges, penalties and other fees and expenses incurred upon early withdrawal or death by obscuring and hiding references thereto.

174. Plaintiffs and the class relied on these representations and omissions, as shown by their purchase of the deferred annuities and payment of premiums and other charges and fees.

175. Defendant performed the wrongful acts with the intent of gaining its own financial advantage to the disadvantage of plaintiffs and the class.

176. Defendant aided and abetted its Affiliated Agents in accomplishing the wrongful acts. In doing so, defendant acted with an awareness of its wrongdoing and realized that its conduct would substantially assist the accomplishment of the wrongful conduct.

177. In performing these acts, each Affiliated Agent either acted as an agent of Conseco, Conseco ratified such acts or both.

178. As a result of defendant's wrongful conduct, plaintiffs and the class have suffered and continue to suffer economic and non-economic losses, all in an amount to be determined at trial.

179. The wrongful acts of defendant were done maliciously, oppressively and with the intent to mislead and defraud. Plaintiffs and the class are entitled to punitive and exemplary damages in an amount appropriate to punish and set an example of defendant pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code §3294,, *et seq*.

EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Breach of the Duty of Good Faith and Fair Dealing

180. Plaintiffs and the class repeat and reallege all allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if set forth separately in this Claim for Relief.

181. As alleged above, the relationship of insurer and insured exists between Conseco and plaintiffs and the other members of the class. The relationship of insurer and insured creates a duty, implied in law, extending from Conseco to plaintiffs and the class to deal fairly with them and in good faith. As a result, there is an implied obligation of good faith and fair dealing in each insurance policy. The insurance company must not do anything to injure the right of the insured to receive the full benefits of the agreement.

182. In addition, defendant has a duty of honesty, good faith and fair dealing arising from Cal. Ins. Code §785(a), which provides: "All insurers, brokers, agents, and others engaged in the transaction of insurance owe a prospective insured who is 65 years of age or older, a duty of honesty, good faith, and fair dealing."

183. To fulfill its duty of good faith and fair dealing, the insurer must give at least as much consideration to the interests of the insured as they give to its own interests. Defendant breached that duty of good faith and fair dealing in several ways, including, but not limited to:

(a) using deceptive and misleading materials, which failed to adequately disclose the disadvantages of buying a deferred annuity, including penalties and lack of access to their annuity investments within their lifetime;

(b) failing to disclose the significant commissions that Affiliated Agents earn from the sale of annuities to plaintiffs and the class;

(c) obscuring and hiding references to the surrender charges, penalties and/or other fees incurred upon early withdrawal or death;

(d) drafting and using form annuity contracts that fail to properly apprise seniors of required information and in the required format about the surrender period and associated surrender penalties in violation of Cal. Ins. Code §10127.13;

(e) failing to consider plaintiffs and the class's welfare above its own;

(f) failing to comply with state law, industry standards and/or internal policies and by selling deferred annuities to seniors after issuing age exceptions without performing full and complete investigations as to appropriateness of the annuities sold to plaintiffs;

(g) failing to fully and accurately perform their brokering and underwriting duties; and

(h) failing to competently train and supervise its Affiliated Agents and/or employees.

184. As a proximate result of the aforementioned acts and omissions of defendant, plaintiffs and the class have suffered damages in a sum to be proven at the time of trial. It has also become necessary for plaintiffs to retain counsel to recover amounts due under the contracts.

185. The aforementioned acts were performed maliciously, fraudulently and oppressively, thereby entitling plaintiffs and the class members to punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish defendant.

NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Unjust Enrichment and Imposition of Constructive Trust

186. Plaintiffs and the class repeat and reallege all allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if set forth separately in this Claim for Relief.

187. Defendant owed various duties to plaintiffs and the class as a result of their insurer/insured relationship and/or duty of good faith and fair dealing.

188. By engaging in the elder deferred annuity scheme, defendant extracted payments from plaintiffs and class members, including, but not limited to, annuity premiums, commissions, service charges, surrender charges and other fees, expenses and charges based upon misleading and fraudulent uniform sales presentations, marketing materials and annuity illustrations.

189. As a result of the relationships between and among the parties and the facts stated above, defendant will be unjustly enriched if it is permitted to retain such funds; therefore, a constructive trust should be established over the monies that plaintiffs and the class members paid to defendant. These monies are traceable to defendant.

190. The victims of the unsuitable deferred annuity sales scheme described above have no adequate remedy at law and have been damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

191. WHEREFORE, plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the class, pray for judgment against defendant as follows:

(a) For a temporary, preliminary and permanent order for injunctive relief enjoining defendant from pursuing the practices complained of above;

(b) For a temporary, preliminary and permanent order for injunctive relief requiring defendant to undertake an immediate public information campaign to inform members of the general public as to its prior practices and notifying the members of the putative class of the potential for restitutionary relief;

(c) For an order requiring disgorgement and restitution of defendant's ill-gotten gains and payment of restitution to plaintiffs and the class all funds acquired by means of any practice declared by this Court to be unlawful, fraudulent or unfair;

(d) An order certifying the class as defined herein;

(e) Distribution of any monies recovered on behalf of plaintiffs or the class, via fluid recovery or *cy pres* recovery where necessary to prevent defendant from retaining any of the profits or benefits of their wrongful conduct;

(f) Imposition of a constructive trust;

(g) For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of investigation and litigation under 18 U.S.C. §1964(c); Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §§15657.05, *et seq*., 15657.5, *et seq*.; and the common fund doctrine;

(h) For compensatory, special and general damages according to proof;

(i) For punitive and exemplary damages under Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §15657(a) and Cal. Civ. Code §3294;

(j) For treble damages and penalties pursuant to18 U.S.C. §1964(c); Cal. Civ. Code §3345; Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§6153, 6175.4, 6175.5 and 17206.1; and Cal. Ins. Code §789;

(k) For double damages under Cal. Prob. Code §859;

(l) For transfer of the wrongfully obtained monies and/or property under Cal. Prob. Code §§850-859, *et seq*.;

(m) For costs of suit, pre-judgment and post-judgment interest; and

(n) Such other and further relief as the Court may deem necessary or appropriate.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury.

DATED: March 3, 2006

BARRACK RODOS & BACINE
STEPHEN R. BASSER (121590)
JOHN L. HAEUSSLER (215044)

/s STEPHEN R. BASSER
STEPHEN R BASSER

402 West Broadway, Suite 850
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619/230-0800
619/230-1874 (fax)

LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER
RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP
JOHN J. STOIA, JR.
THEODORE J. PINTAR
HELEN I. ZELDES
RACHEL L. JENSEN
655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619/231-1058
619/231-7423 (fax)

BONNETT, FAIRBOURN, FRIEDMAN
& BALINT, P.C.
ANDREW S. FRIEDMAN
ELAINE RYAN
2901 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1000
Phoenix, AZ 85012
Telephone: 602/274-1100
602/274-1199 (fax)

FINKELSTEIN & KRINSK LLP
HOWARD D. FINKELSTEIN (102934)
MARK L. KNUTSON (131770)
501 West Broadway, Suite 1250
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619/238-1333
619/238-5425 (fax)

RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN & SAKAI, LLP
LOUISE H. RENNE
INGRID M. EVANS
50 California Street, Suite 2100
San Francisco, CA 94111-4624
Telephone: 415/678-3800
415/678-3838 (fax)

JAMES, HOYER, NEWCOMER
& SMILJANICH, P.A.
CHRISTA L. COLLINS
JOHN YANCHUNIS
J. ANDREW MEYER
4830 West Kennedy Blvd.
Urban Centre One, Suite 550
Tampa, FL 33609
Telephone: 813/286-4100
813/286-4174 (fax)

LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL D. THAMER
MICHAEL D. THAMER (101440)
1244 South Highway 3
P.O. Box 1568
Callahan, CA 96014
Telephone: 530/467-5307

SHERNOFF, BIDART & DARRAS
WILLIAM SHERNOFF (38856)
EVANGELINE F. GARRIS (176014)
600 South Indian Hill Blvd.
Claremont, CA 91711
Telephone: 909/621-4936
909/625-6915 (fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

S:\CasesSD\Conseco Annuity\FAC Hansen Jones.doc

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 3, 2006, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the e-mail addresses denoted on the attached Electronic Mail Notice List, and I hereby certify that I have caused the foregoing document or paper to be mailed via the United States Postal Service to the non-CM/ECF participants indicated on the attached Manual Notice List and Service List.

s/ STEPHEN R. BASSER
STEPHEN R. BASSER

BARRACK RODOS & BACINE
STEPHEN R. BASSER (121590)
JOHN L. HAEUSSLER (215044)
402 West Broadway, Suite 850
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619/230-0800
619/230-1874 (fax)
E-mail: SBasser@Barrack,com

Mailing Information for a Case 5:05-cv-04726-RMW

Electronic Mail Notice List

The following are those who are currently on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case.

- **Howard D. Finkelstein**
  fk@classactionlaw.com
- **Linda B. Oliver**
  LOliver@ReedSmith.com SWurth@ReedSmith.com

Manual Notice List

The following is the list of attorneys who are **not** on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case (who therefore require manual noticing). You may wish to use your mouse to select and copy this list into your word processing program in order to create notices or labels for these recipients.

Thomas A. Doyle
Baker & McKenzie, LLP
130 E. Randolph Drive
Suite 3500
Chicago, IL 60601-6314

James J. Dries
Baker & McKenzie, LLP
130 E. Randolph Drive
Suite 3500
Chicago, IL 60601-6314

Mark L. Karasik
Baker & McKenzie, LLP
130 E. Randolph Drive
Suite 3500
Chicago, IL 60601-6314

Michael D Thamer
Law Offices of Michael D.Thamer
Post Office Box 1568
12444 South Highway 3
Callahan, CA 96014-1568

Counsel for Defendant(s)

Robert D. Phillips, Jr.
Linda B. Oliver
Mary C. Tsai
Reed Smith LLP
P.O. Box 2084
Oakland, CA 94604-2084
Tel: (510) 763-2000
Fax: (510) 273-8832

James J. Dries
Mark L. Karasik
Thomas A. Doyle
Baker & McKenzie LLP
One Prudential Plaza
130 E. Randolph Drive
Chicago, IL 60201
Tel: (312) 861-8000
Fax: (312) 861-2899

Counsel for Plaintiff(s)

Stephen R. Basser
John L. Haeussler
Marisa C. Livesay
Barrack Rodos & Bacine
402 West Broadway, Suite 850
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel: (619) 230-0800
Fax: (619) 230-1874

Howard D. Finkelstein
Mark L. Knutson
Finkelstein & Krinsk
501 West Broadway, Suite 1250
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel: (619) 238-1333
Fax: (619) 238-5425

John J. Stoia, Jr.
Theodore J. Pintar
Helen I. Zeldes
Rachel L. Jensen
Lerach Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins LLP
655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101
Tel: (619) 231-1058
Fax: (619) 231-7423

Andrew S. Friedman
Elaine A. Ryan
Bonnett, Fairbourn, Friedman & Balint, P.C.
2901 N. Central Ave., Suite 1000
Phoenix, AZ 85012-3311
Tel: (602) 274-1100
Fax: (602) 274-1199

Christa Collins
John Yanchunis
J. Andrew Meyer
James, Hoyer, Newcomer & Smiljanich
One Urban Centre, Suite 550
4830 W. Kennedy Blvd.
Tampa, FL 33609-2589
Tel: (813) 286-4100
Fax: (813) 286-4174

Louise H. Renne
Ingrid M. Evans
Renne Sloan Holtzman Sakai LLP
50 California Street, Suite 2100
San Francisco, CA 94111-4624
Tel: (415) 678-3800
Fax: (415) 678-3838

William M. Shernoff
Evangeline F. Garris
Shernoff Bidart & Darras LLP
600 S. Indian Hill Boulevard
Claremont, CA 91711
Tel: (909) 621-4935
Fax: (909) 625-6915

Michael D. Thamer
Law Offices of Michael D. Thamer
12444 South Highway 3
P.O. Box 1568
Callahan, CA 96014-1568
Tel: (530) 467-5307
Fax: (530) 467-5437