

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS  
Central Division**

In re:

TELEXFREE, LLC, TELEXFREE, INC., and  
TELEXFREE FINANCIAL, INC.,

Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case Nos. 14-40987-MSH,  
14-40988-MSH, 14-40989-MSH

(Jointly Administered)

PAULO EDUARDO FERRARI – PUTATIVE  
CLAIMS REPRESENTATIVE ON BEHALF  
OF HIMSELF AND THOSE SIMILARLY  
SITUATED, RAFAELA SERRANO AS  
TRUSTEE OF THE TELEXFREE  
SETTLEMENT TRUST PURSUANT TO 26  
USC SECTION 468B,

Plaintiff,

v.

TELEXFREE, INC, f/k/a COMMON CENTS  
COMMUNICATIONS, INC. et al.,

Defendants.

Adversary Proceeding  
No. 14-04080

**TRUSTEE'S MOTION TO STAY THE ACTION**

The Plaintiff, Paulo Eduardo Ferrari (the “Plaintiff”) has brought a Complaint against the Debtors and numerous other entities and individuals asserting numerous claims for violation of federal and state securities law and common law claims, including claims for fraud and misrepresentation. The Complaint, which seeks class action certification, consists of 539 paragraphs encompassing 61 pages and many of the factual allegations substantially parallel those in other complaints including the Complaint filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Massachusetts Division of Securities against the Debtors and others.



1440987160513000000000074

Contemporaneously with filing the Complaint, the Plaintiffs filed a Motion to Withdraw the Reference (the “Withdrawal Motion”). In addition to this Complaint, there are two other complaints<sup>1</sup> filed against the Debtors in this Court, which are substantially similar to the present Complaint, which the Court has stayed. A copy of the Order is annexed as Exhibit A. There are numerous complaints<sup>2</sup> filed in various jurisdictions asserting substantially the same claims against substantially the same defendants, except the Debtors are not parties to those actions. Those actions are also currently stayed pending a determination by the Multi-Litigation Panel as to how they should proceed. The District Court for the District of Massachusetts has under advisement a motion by the United States to stay the SEC litigation pending the criminal complaints against Messrs. Wanzeler and Merrill.

The Trustee moves that the Court enter an order Staying the Action on the bases that (a) as to the Debtors, the Complaint in substance asserts no more than a claim to recover the amount allegedly owed to the claimant, which can be most expeditiously and efficiently handled as part of the claims process; (b) the claim against the Debtors should not be joined with the numerous securities and other claims involving the numerous defendants; (c) to allow the litigation to continue against the Debtors will embroil the Trustee in complex securities litigation involving numerous parties and claims involving costly discovery and motion practice, all of which will exponentially increase the cost to the estate with no corresponding benefit; and (d) as to the Debtors, the class certification may not be appropriate, because a central issue to resolving the individual claims will be the netting of the debits and credits as to each claimant. Accordingly the Trustee respectfully prays that the Court enter an Order Staying the Actions.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Waldemara Martin and Leandro Valentin v. TelexFree, Inc., et al.*, Adversary Proceeding No. 14-04044-MSH, *Anthony Cellucci, et al. v. Telexfree, Inc., et al.*, Adversary Proceeding No. 14-04057-MSH

<sup>2</sup> *Reverend Jeremiah Githere, et al. v. TelexElectric LLP, et al.* (C.A. 14-12825 (D.Mass.)); *Ferguson, et al. v. TelexElectric, LLP*, C.A. 5:14-cv-00316-D (EDNC); *Guevara v. Merrill, et al.*, D.A. 1:14-cv-22405 (S.D. Fla.) and *Cook v. TelexElectric LLLP, et al.*, C.A. 2:14-cv-00134 (N.D. Ga.)

In further support of his request for a Stay, the Trustee states as follows:

**PROCEDURAL STATEMENT**

1. On April 13, 2014, TelexFree LLC, TelexFree, Inc. and TelexFree Financial, Inc. each filed petitions for relief under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code. The petitions were initially filed with the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Nevada. Subsequently, the cases were transferred to this Court.

2. In filing their cases, the Debtors represented that they operated a telecommunication business that used multi-level marketing to assist in the distribution of Voice over Internet Protocol telephone services. However, in fact, the Debtors were operating a pyramid scheme whereby they would solicit members and the payment of membership fees with promises of substantial returns for placing TelexFree advertisements and for recruiting additional individuals.

3. Within two days of the commencement of the Debtors' cases, on April 15, 2014, the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") commenced an action against the Debtors, and others, in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, alleging, among other things, that the Debtors were engaged in an illegal pyramid scheme and were raising funds through fraudulent and unregistered offerings of securities. Shortly after the commencement of the action by the SEC, various federal agencies effectuated a search of the Debtors' premises in Marlborough, Massachusetts, and seized numerous computers, servers and other assets of the Debtors, including millions of dollars in cashier's checks.

4. On June 6, 2014, the United States Bankruptcy Court authorized the appointment of a trustee, and Stephen B. Darr was duly appointed as the Chapter 11 Trustee for the Debtors' bankruptcy estates.

5. On August 27, 2014, the Court allowed a similar motion by the Trustee to stay pending class actions against the Debtors (Exhibit A).

### **TRUSTEE'S ACTIONS**

6. Since his appointment, the Trustee has been diligently working to develop an understanding of the Debtors' business, assets, potential claims, and to develop a procedure to ascertain the victims of the Debtors' pyramid scheme and to compensate more victims. One of the major tasks before the Trustee is to develop an appropriate procedure to consider the claims and determine the true value of the claims.

7. The Trustee's efforts to carry out his investigations have been hampered by a lack of information. As noted, prior to his appointment, the United States Government had seized substantially all of the Debtors' financial records, the Debtors' principals have been indicted. The Trustee has recently received information, both from the Government and as a result of various requests served upon third parties and is in the process of analyzing that information.

8. One of the primary issues the Trustee needs to address in connection with the claims is to determine the actual amount of the creditor's loss by ascertaining (a) how much the creditor actually invested in dollars, (b) how much of the creditor's claim is based upon fees and commissions earned through participation in the pyramid scheme, and (c) how much, if any, the creditor was paid by the Debtors. The net would be, in the Trustee's view, the appropriate amount of the creditor's claim.

9. The Trustee has been led to believe that the number of creditors/victims could be in the hundreds of thousands.

10. Currently, the Trustee has recovered some funds; the available funds would only result in a minimal distribution based on the estimated claims. [funds available]. While the

Trustee anticipates recovering additional funds, the resources of the estates are clearly limited and should be utilized to address compensation to the victims,<sup>3</sup> and should not be expended by becoming embroiled in the purported class action litigation.

### **ARGUMENT**

While, as a general proposition, the automatic stay does not prevent a creditor from commencing an adversary proceeding against the debtor or its trustee in the bankruptcy court where the debtor's case is pending, the rule does not have universal application. *See Cellceutix Corp. v. Nickless (In re Formatech)*, 496 B.R. 26 (Bankr. D. Mass. 2013).

A closer examination of the underlying complaint reveals that the cases establishing that rule all involved forms of equitable relief seeking a determination with respect to the existence of the claim, such as actions for rescission and constructive trust, as opposed to the amount of the claim. For example, *see Kesar, Inc. v. Unimark LLC (In re Unimark LLC)*, 405 B.R. 113 (Bankr. D. Del. 2009) (complaint for rescission); and *Dibbern v. Adelphia Commc'ns Corp.*, 325 B.R. 89 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2005) (complaint for constructive trust).

While the Plaintiffs' action contains claims for equitable relief, the principal claim as asserted against the Debtors, as opposed to the other Defendants, seeks to establish damages and is, therefore, duplicative of the claim process itself. Accordingly, the Plaintiffs' action as against the Debtors should not be proceeding as an adversary proceeding, but should be addressed through the claims process. *See, for example, Healy/Mellon-Stuart Co. v. Coastal Group, Inc.*, 100 B.R. 177 (Bankr. D. Del. 1989); and *Sears Roebuck & Co. v. Penney*, 76 B.R. 160 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 1987).

---

<sup>3</sup> The Trustee is cooperating with the Securities and Exchange Commission and the United States Attorney to coordinate an approach to maximize the recovery to victims of the pyramid scheme. One of the principal goals of the cooperative approach is to maximize the recovery by controlling the cost of administration of the Estates.

Additionally, as noted above, the determination of individual creditors' claims in the present case may not lend itself well to a class action proceeding. Each claim needs to be reviewed so that the amount that represents the true value of the claim can be ascertained. Many of the claims received to date appear to include not only the amount actually invested, but also seek to reclaim for commission due and not reflect payments having been received. However, to accurately determine what each victim lost, it is necessary to net out against the actual investment payments received. See *Securities Investor Protection Corp. v. Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC (In re Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC)*, 424 B.R. 122, 132, 141-42 (Bankr. S.D. NY 2010) (in order to distinguish net winners from net losers it is necessary to net out cash received from cash invested), affirmed *In re Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC*, 654 F.3d 229 (2d Cir. 2011) (specifically affirming net equity method).

The Court has the inherent power to stay proceedings. *Landis v. North American Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 255 (1936) (“[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel and for litigants.”). In considering the Trustee’s request for a stay of the action, the Court should also consider the impact allowing the litigation to proceed will have upon the assets of the estate. Should this and the companion cases of *Waldemara Martin* and *Anthony Cellucci* be permitted to proceed, the Trustee will be required to expend substantial amounts of money defending the estate, which will deplete the limited funds available to the Trustee and ultimately diminish any recovery by the victims.

WHEREFORE, the Trustee respectfully prays that the Court stay further proceedings in this matter, and for such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

**STEPHEN DARR AS HE IS THE DULY  
APPOINTED TRUSTEE OF THE  
CHAPTER 11 ESTATES OF  
TELEXFREE LLC, TELEXFREE, INC.  
AND TELEXFREE FINANCIAL, INC.**

By his attorneys,  
MURPHY & KING, P.C.

/s/ Charles R. Bennett, Jr.

Charles R. Bennett, Jr. (BBO #037380)

Murphy & King, P.C.

One Beacon Street

Boston, MA 02108

Telephone: (617) 423-0400

Email: [CBennett@murphyking.com](mailto:CBennett@murphyking.com)

Dated: October 9, 2014

674703

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Charles R. Bennett, Jr., hereby certify that on October 9, 2014, I caused a copy of the foregoing document to be served by operation of the Court's CM/ECF system or by first class mail upon the following parties:

BY ECF:

- Orestes G. Brown obrown@metaxasbrown.com
- Daniel Dullea scott@goldberganddullea.com
- Monica Snyder msnyder@murthalaw.com, kbratko@murthalaw.com
- Thomas S. Vangel tvangel@murthalaw.com

BY FIRST CLASS MAIL:

Citizens Bank Of Massachusetts  
48 State street  
Boston, MA 02109

Citizens Financial Group, Inc.  
28 STATE STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02109

Carlos Costa  
44A MCCLINTOCK AVENUE, UNIT A  
WORCESTER, MA 01604

Joseph Craft  
825 EAST MAIN STREET  
BOONVILLE, IN 47601-1855

Craft Financial Solutions, LLC  
C/O JOSEPH H. CRAFT aka JOE CRAFT, CPA  
825 EAST MAIN STREET  
BOONEVILLE, IN 47601-1855

Fidelity Cooperative Bank  
675 Main Street  
Fitchburg, MA 01420

International Payout Systems, Inc.  
2500 EAST HALLANDALE BEACH BOULEVARD  
SUITE 800  
HALLANDALE BEACH, FL 33009



Steven M. Labriola  
21 KIWANIS BEACH ROAD  
UPTON, MA 01568

Law Offices of Nehra and Waak  
1710 Beach St  
Muskegon, MI 49441

Middlesex Savings Bank  
6 Main Street  
Natick, MA, 01760

Gerald Nehra  
Attorney at Law PLLC  
1710 Beach Street  
Muskegon, MI 49441

Propay, Inc.  
3400 NORTH ASHTON BOULEVARD  
LEHI, UT 84043

Telex Mobile Holdings, Inc.  
C/O BWFC PROCESSING CENTER, LLC  
REGISTERED AGENTS  
3960 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY, SUITE 500  
LAS VEGAS, NV 89169

Telexelectric LLP  
c/o BWFC Processing Center LLC  
3960 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Suite 500  
Las Vegas, NV 89169

Telexfree Financial, Inc  
2321 NW 37TH AVE.  
COCONUT CREEK, FL 33063

Telexfree LLC  
4705 S Durango Dr  
#10-J51  
Las Vegas, NV 89147

Richard W Waak  
Law Office of Nerha and Waak  
11300 East Shore Drive  
Delton, MI 49046

/s/ Charles R. Bennett, Jr.  
Charles R. Bennett, Jr.

674703

## **EXHIBIT A**

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS  
CENTRAL DIVISION**

In re:  
TELEXFREE, INC. *ET AL.*

Debtors

Chapter 11  
Case No. 14-40987-MSH  
14-40988-MSH-14-40989-MSH  
(Jointly administered)-MSH

WALDEMARA MARTIN *ET AL.*, PUTATIVE  
CLAIMS REPRESENTATIVES AND THOSE  
SIMILARLY SITUATED

Plaintiffs

Adversary Proceeding  
No. 14-4044

v.

TELEXFREE, INC. *ET AL.*

Defendants

ANTHONY CELLUCI *ET AL.*,  
PUTATIVE CLASS  
REPRESENTATIVES AND THOSE SIMILARLY  
SITUATED

Plaintiffs

Adversary Proceeding  
No. 14-4057

v.

TELEXFREE, INC. *ET AL.*

Defendants

PAULO EDUARDO FERRARI, PUTATIVE  
CLAIMS REPRESENTATIVES ON BEHALF OF  
HIMSELF AND THOSE SIMILARLY SITUATED *ET  
AL.*

Plaintiffs

Adversary Proceeding  
No. 14-4080

v.

TELEXFREE, INC. *ET AL.*

Defendants

**ORDER STAYING ADVERSARY PROCEEDINGS**

WHEREAS, Stephen Darr, the chapter 11 trustee of the debtors in the main case, filed a motion to stay adversary proceedings nos. 14-4044 and 14-4057 to which Middlesex Savings Bank, in adversary proceeding no. 14-4044, filed a limited opposition; and

WHEREAS, on August 20, 2014, adversary proceeding no. 14-4080 was commenced; and

WHEREAS, currently pending before the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts are motions to withdraw the reference in adversary proceedings nos. 14-4044 and 14-4057.


NOW, THEREFORE, for the reasons more fully set forth in the trustee's motions to stay, filed in adversary proceedings nos. 14-4044 and 14-4057, including that on July 1, 2014 a motion for transfer and consolidation of six related actions was filed with and is currently pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, and the stipulation among the plaintiffs and the trustee with respect to the trustee's motion to stay filed in adversary proceeding 14-4057 and in the interests of judicial economy and for good cause, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. Adversary proceedings nos. 14-4044 and 14-4057 are stayed pending further order of the court.
2. The hearings scheduled for August 28, 2014 on the trustee's motions to stay in adversary proceedings nos. 14-4044 and 14-4057 are canceled.
3. The hearing scheduled for September 23, 2014 on the motion of defendant Randy N. Crosby to dismiss or in the alternative to stay in adversary proceeding no. 14-4057 is canceled.

4. Counsel for the plaintiffs in adversary proceeding no. 14-4080 shall file a statement with the court by September 11, 2014, as to whether the actions currently pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation are related to the claims asserted in adversary proceeding 14-4080 and whether adversary proceeding 14-4080 should also be stayed.
5. Counsel for the plaintiffs in adversary proceeding nos. 14-4044 and 14-4057 shall file a statement as to actions taken by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation and a copy of any order or decision issued by the Panel within 7 days of the Panel's taking such action.

Dated: August 27, 2014

By the Court,

  
Melvin S. Hoffman  
U.S. Bankruptcy Judge