NOV 4 1994

## STATE OF ARIZONA

# DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE BY

In the Matter of

Docket No. 8474

MALCOLM GILES dba TIS/TAX & INVESTMENT STRATEGIES, INC.,

ORDER

Respondent.

The hearing in this matter began on October 5, 1994.

Assistant Attorney General Peter H. Schelstraete appeared on behalf of the Arizona Department of Insurance ("Department").

Donald Loose represented the Respondent, Malcolm Giles dba

TIS/Tax & Investment Strategies, Inc. ("Mr. Giles"). References to "TIS/TAX & Investment Strategies, Inc. will be abbreviated as "TIS/TAX".

The proceedings continued on October 6 and October 11, 1994. Mr. Giles was present on October 5 and October 6. Mr. Giles did not appear for the hearing on October 11, 1994. The parties rested and presented closing arguments on October 11, 1994. The record remained open until October 19, 1994.

The Department presented testimony from the following witnesses: Harold Birnbaum, Maureen Catalioto, JoLynn Clemens, Marguerite Daniels, Jody DeMark, Donna Dietle, Brad Hahn, Gladys Maxson, John Maxson, Archie Neill, Judy Neill, and Les Nesmith. Mr. Giles did not testify and called no witnesses.

Based upon the entire record in this matter, including all pleadings, motions, testimony, and exhibits admitted during the hearing of this matter, and the record made at the July 25, 1994 pre-hearing proceeding, Administrative Law Judge Gregory Y.

Harris has prepared the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order for the Director's consideration and approval. Based upon these recommendations, the Director makes the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and enters the following Order:

## FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Mr. Giles holds license number 636867 issued by the Director ("the "License"). The License authorizes Mr. Giles to transact disability, life, and variable annuity business.
- 2. On or about June 10, 1993, Mr. Giles met with Marguerite Daniels ("Mrs. Daniels") to discuss her purchase of an annuity, an insurance product. On that date, Mrs. Daniels signed applications to purchase two annuity insurance policies (collectively referred to as the "Annuity Policies") through Mr. Giles from U.S.G. Annuity and Life Company ("U.S.G.").
- 3. Shortly after his meeting with Mrs. Daniels, Mr. Giles submitted applications for both Annuity Policies to U.S.G.
- 4. U.S.G. assigned policy number 152137 to the policy which Mrs. Daniels purchased for the transfer of a portion of her retirement portfolio (the "Retirement Policy").
- 5. U.S.G. assigned policy number 152136 to the policy which Mrs. Daniels bought to transfer a portion of the assets of a trust administered by Mrs. Daniels (the "Trust Policy"). Mrs. Daniels' late brother, Arthur Grimm, established this trust before his death. When he died, Mrs. Daniels became both the trustee and a beneficiary of the trust and its assets.
  - 6. U.S.G. issued the Trust Policy in August 1993.

- 7. The Trust Policy had a cost basis of \$136,620.46.
- 8. Mr. Giles received a commission of \$14,345.15 from U.S.G. for his sale of the Trust Policy to Mrs. Daniels.
- 9. U.S.G. issued the Retirement Policy in November of 1993.
- 10. The Retirement Policy had a cost basis of \$47,431.37.
- 11. Mr. Giles received a commission of \$4,090.80 from U.S.G. for his sale of the Retirement Policy to Mrs. Daniels.
- 12. Between Thanksgiving and mid-December, 1993, Mrs. Daniels had several conversations concerning the delivery of the Annuity Policies with Jody DeMark, an employee of Mr. Giles. In these conversations, Mrs. Daniels sought to arrange to have Mr. Giles deliver the Annuity Policies to her.
- 13. Mrs. Daniels planned to vacation away from Arizona beginning in mid-December, 1993. Mrs. Daniels wanted to receive advice from an accountant before the start of her vacation about whether the Annuity Policies would satisfy or were consistent with her investment goals and obligations. Thus, Mrs. Daniels wanted to receive delivery of the Annuity Policies from Mr. Giles before leaving for her vacation.
- 14. Mrs. Daniels did not receive a direct answer from Mr. Giles regarding her request for the delivery of the Annuity Policies before she began her vacation. Instead, on December 1, 1993, Mr. Giles told Ms. DeMark that he would not deliver the Annuity Policies to Mrs. Daniels until after January 1, 1994.

- 15. In response to Mrs. Daniels' requests for the delivery of the Annuity Policies, Ms. DeMark agreed to make the policies available for Mrs. Daniels to pick up. On December 16, 1993, Ms. DeMark placed the Annuity Policies in an envelope and left the envelope with the receptionist at the office suite complex where Mr. Giles leased space (the "Esplanade Office").
- 16. On December 16, 1993, Mrs. Daniels retrieved both the Trust Policy and the Retirement Policy from the Esplanade Office.
- 17. Mrs. Daniels did not sign a policy delivery receipt for either of the Annuity Policies when she retrieved the Annuity Policies from the Esplanade Office.
- 18. Consistent with A.R.S. §20-1233, and pursuant to the provisions of the policies issued by U.S.G., Mrs. Daniels received a 20 day free look (the "Free Look Period") to examine the Trust Policy and the Retirement Policy.
- 19. During the Free Look Period, Mrs. Daniels had both the statutory and contractual right to return the Annuity Policies and receive a refund of all monies paid without a surrender charge.
- 20. If Mrs. Daniels cancelled either of the Annuity Policies during the Free Look Period, Mr. Giles would lose the commission paid to him by U.S.G. for the sale of the cancelled policy.
- 21. The Free Look Period began on December 16, 1993 when Mrs. Daniels retrieved the Annuity Policies from the Esplanade Office.

- 22. Mrs. Daniels elected to maintain the Retirement Policy and to cancel the Trust Policy after she consulted with an accountant and a financial planner. On December 17, 1993, Mrs. Daniels provided notice to U.S.G. of her intent to cancel the Trust Policy within the Free Look Period.
- 23. Mr. Giles learned that Mrs. Daniels had exercised her statutory and contractual right to cancel the Trust Policy within the Free Look Period. After receiving this information, Mr. Giles asked Ms. DeMark to schedule a meeting with Mrs. Daniels. On January 10, 1994, Ms. DeMark arranged for this meeting to be held on January 18, 1994 at Mrs. Daniels' home.
- 24. Mr. Giles also directed Ms. DeMark to create and transmit a billing statement to Mrs. Daniels. Mr. Giles instructed Ms. DeMark to have the billing statement show that Mrs. Daniels owed Mr. Giles \$2,776.25 for services he performed in connection with his sale of the Annuity Policies to Mrs. Daniels.
- 25. Ms. DeMark prepared the billing statement working backward from the figure given to her by Mr. Giles. She used the log sheets maintained in Ms. Daniels' file as the source document for the billing statement. The billing statement showed dates of services rendered, the amount of time spent on each task, and an hourly billing rate for both Mr. Giles (\$125.00/hour) and Ms. DeMark (\$85.00/hour).
- 26. The log used by Ms. DeMark to create the billing statement did not include contemporaneously created time records. Instead, when she prepared the billing statement, Ms.

DeMark guessed how much time had been spent on the tasks listed in the billing statement.

- 27. All items listed on the billing statement related to Mr. Giles' solicitation, inducement, effectuation, negotiation, or transaction of matters subsequent to or arising out of Mrs. Daniels' purchase of the Annuity Policies.
- 28. Ms. DeMark sent the billing statement dated

  January 14, 1994 to Mrs. Daniels. The billing statement,

  printed on TIS/TAX letterhead, represented that Mrs. Daniels

  owed Mr. Giles or TIS/TAX \$2,776.25 for 22.5 hours of work

  performed in connection with the sale of the Annuity Policies.
- 29. At no time before the creation of the billing statement had Mr. Giles or any employee or agent of Mr. Giles advised Mrs. Daniels that she would be subject to an hourly rate for Mr. Giles' services in connection with his sale of the Annuity Policies if she sought to cancel either of the Annuity Policies.
- 30. On January 18, 1994, Mr. Giles met with Mrs. Daniels at her home. During this meeting, Mr. Giles asked Mrs. Daniels to sign policy delivery receipts for the Annuity Policies in blank. These policy delivery receipts were printed on TIS/TAX letterhead.
- 31. The policy delivery receipts given to Mrs.

  Daniels did not identify the name of the insured, the policy number, the date on which delivery occurred, or any other information relating to Mrs. Daniels' December 16, 1993 receipt of the Annuity Policies.

32. Mrs. Daniels signed more than one policy delivery receipt. Mr. Giles had not signed the policy delivery receipts which he gave to Mrs. Daniels. Mrs. Daniels signed her name, and dated the receipts December 13, 1993, the date she mistakenly believed to have been the date on which she retrieved the Annuity Policies from the Esplanade Office. Mr. Giles did not correct Mrs. Daniels' mistake, did not complete the policy delivery receipts signed by Mrs. Daniels, and did not leave or provide her with a copy of the incomplete delivery receipts which she had signed.

- 33. Before Mr. Giles met with Mrs. Daniels on January 18, 1994, Mr. Giles knew that Mrs. Daniels had not received the Annuity Policies until December 16, 1993.
- 34. On February 1, 1994, Mr. Giles gave Ms. DeMark a policy delivery receipt bearing what appeared to be the signature of Mrs. Daniels. The policy delivery receipt bore the date November 13, 1993. Mr. Giles instructed Ms. DeMark to falsely complete this delivery receipt by adding detail, including the name of the insured and the policy number, to the receipt. Ms. DeMark complied with Mr. Giles' instructions and filled in blanks on the policy delivery receipt so that the policy delivery receipt falsely appeared or purported to represent that Mrs. Daniels had received the Trust Policy on November 13, 1993. With this, Mr. Giles directed the creation of the "Falsely Completed Delivery Receipt".
- 35. Mr. Giles further directed Ms. DeMark to fax the Falsely Completed Delivery Receipt to U.S.G. U.S.G. had asked Mr. Giles for proof of delivery of the Trust Policy in

connection with U.S.G.'s evaluation of whether Mrs. Daniels had cancelled the Trust Policy within the Free Look Period.

- 36. When Mr. Giles instructed Ms. DeMark to complete the Falsely Completed Delivery Receipt, he knew both that delivery of the Trust Policy had occurred on December 16, 1993 and that any representation that delivery of the Trust Policy had occurred on November 13, 1993 was false.
- 37. U.S.G. denied Mrs. Daniels' request to cancel the Trust Policy without a surrender charge. Instead, U.S.G. sought to assess a \$13,105.93 surrender charge to cancel the policy. U.S.G. relied upon the False Delivery Receipt in support of its decision to reject Mrs. Daniels' request to cancel the Trust Policy without a surrender charge.
- 38. Mrs. Daniels has incurred \$1,215.00 in attorneys fees directly in connection with her efforts to cancel the Trust Policy without a surrender charge.
- 39. Mrs. Daniels began to receive benefits from U.S.G. before Mr. Giles delivered the Annuity Policies to her. However, Mrs. Daniels' Free Look Period for the Trust Policy began upon actual delivery of the policy on December 16, 1993. Neither Mr. Giles' delay in effecting delivery of the Trust Policy nor U.S.G.'s pre-delivery payment of benefits to Mrs. Daniels deprived Mrs. Daniels of the right to examine or cancel the Trust Policy without a surrender charge.
- 40. In connection with his sale of the Annuity Policies to Mrs. Daniels, Mr. Giles represented that he transacted business under the name TIS/TAX & Investment Strategies, Inc.

41. On or about May 26, 1994, the Director, by and through his duly authorized Executive Assistant Director, issued an Order ("Director's Order") requiring Mr. Giles to produce documents and appear and give testimony under oath before the Department on June 15, 1994 at 10:00 a.m. In the Director's Order, Mr. Giles was advised that:

FAILURE to comply with the Director's Order will constitute a wilful violation of, or wilful noncompliance with an Order of the Director, and may result in disciplinary action being taken.

- 42. Mr. Giles, through counsel, stipulated with the Department to appear on June 24, 1994 at 10:30 a.m. to produce documents and to testify before the Department.
- 43. On June 24, 1994, Mr. Giles appeared before the Department, but refused to give testimony under oath in accordance with the Director's Order.
- 44. The Director's Order, required Mr. Giles to produce:

[D]ocuments relating to the sale of insurance to Marguerite Daniels, including, but not limited to, applications, original policy delivery receipts, ledger books, appointment logs, and all memos and correspondence.

45. On June 24, 1994, Mr. Giles failed to produce all of the documents designated in the Director's Order. The documents which Mr. Giles failed to produce included policy delivery receipts involving the Annuity Policies. Further, Mr. Giles did not produce either the original or a copy of the Falsely Completed Delivery Receipt.

46. The policy delivery receipts for the Annuity Policies and the Falsely Completed Delivery Receipt constitute records Mr. Giles had the obligation to maintain and produce in response to the Director's Order pursuant to A.R.S. §20-302.

- 47. Mr. Giles' refusal to testify on June 24, 1994 in response to the Director's Order deprived the Director of the opportunity to receive and review information relevant to Mr. Giles' sale of the Annuity Policies to Mrs. Daniels. As a consequence, the Director did not receive either Mr. Giles' explanation of the creation and transmission of the Falsely Completed Delivery Receipt or an explanation of Mr. Giles' failure to maintain or produce the Falsely Completed Delivery Receipt in response to the Director's Order.
- 48. Following Mr. Giles' failure to give testimony under oath and his failure to produce records pursuant to the Director's Order, the Director ordered the summary suspension of the insurance license issued by the Director to Mr. Giles.
- 49. On August 30, 1993, Mr. Giles met with Archie Neill and Judy Neill to discuss the possible creation of a living trust to be called the "Neill Family Trust". Mr. Giles proposed the Neills' purchase of an annuity contract as an asset of the proposed trust. The Neills signed applications provided to them by Mr. Giles to buy an annuity contract as an asset of the proposed trust.
- 50. On August 30, 1993, Mr. Giles received a \$600.00 check from Judy Neill toward the creation of a living trust, an asset of which was to be an annuity, applications for which the Archie Neill and Judy Neill signed.

51. The Neills became dissatisfied with the lack of progress toward the creation of the living trust, an element of which included the purchase on an annuity contract in the name of the trust. Thus, on October 14, 1994, the Neills sought to cancel the application and stop Mr. Giles' creation of a living trust. In addition, the Neills sought a refund from Mr. Giles.

- 52. Mr. Giles refused to give the Neills a refund of the \$600.00 given to him by Judy Neill.
- 53. In his dealings with the Neills, Mr. Giles represented that he transacted business under the name TIS/TAX & Investment Strategies, Inc.
- 54. Mr. Giles submitted an application in April 1993 to the Department to renew the License (the "Renewal Application"). Mr. Giles identified his employer as "TIS/TAX & Investment Strategies, Inc." on the Renewal Application.
- 55. Individuals seeking to transact business under an assumed business name must file a Certificate for Assumed Business Name with the Department pursuant to A.R.S. §20-318.
- 56. Mr. Giles has not submitted a Certificate For Assumed Business Name to the Department to transact business under the name of TIS/TAX.
- 57. Mr. Giles has not satisfied his obligation to submit a Certificate For Assumed Business Name to the Department with his submission of the Renewal Application in which he identified his employer as TIS/TAX.
- 58. TIS/TAX does not hold a license to transact the business of insurance in Arizona.

59. Mr. Giles appeared with his counsel during the first two days of the formal hearing of this matter. At the close of the second day of hearing, the parties agreed that the proceedings would reconvene on October 11, 1994 for the third hearing. The parties agreed upon this date based upon the unavailability of Mr. Giles' counsel on October 7, 1994, and Mr. Giles' unavailability on October 13 and 14, 1994.

- 60. Mr. Giles chose to not appear on October 11, 1994, the final day of the hearing. His counsel rested without calling any witnesses, including Mr. Giles, to testify in this matter. Thus, Mr. Giles presented no evidence concerning or explaining: a) the creation, transmission and maintenance of the Falsely Completed Delivery Receipt; b) the insurance related transaction with the Neills; and c) Mr. Giles' use of the name TIS/TAX in connection with his transaction of insurance.
- 61. An insufficient record was created to demonstrate that Mr. Giles' transaction of insurance business with Gladys Maxson and John Maxson violated the provisions of Title 20.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The conduct described above constitutes a wilful violation of, or wilful noncompliance with the provisions of Title 20 of the Arizona Revised Statutes and violation of an order of the director within the meaning A.R.S. §20-316(A)(2).
- 2. The conduct described above constitutes a failure of the Respondent to maintain records pertaining to transactions under his license and failure to maintain all such records as to any particular transaction for three years immediately following

in the date of completion of such transaction as provided in A.R.S.  $\S20-302(C)$ .

- 3. The conduct described above constitutes the Respondent knowingly making a false or fraudulent statement or representation in or relative to an application for life or disability insurance, or the making of any such statement to obtain a fee as required in A.R.S. §20-458.
- 4. The conduct described above constitutes participation in unfair and deceptive trade practices within the meaning A.R.S. §20-442.
- 5. The conduct described above constitutes misrepresentation in unfair and deceptive trade practices within the meaning of A.R.S. §§20-443 and 20-443.01.
- 6. The conduct described above constitutes fraud within the meaning of A.R.S. §20-463.
- 7. The conduct described above constitutes the transaction of insurance in this state under an assumed name without the Respondent filing in the office of the director a certificate setting forth the name under which insurance is, or is to be, transacted, as required within the meaning of A.R.S. §20-318.

### ORDER

### IT IS ORDERED:

1. Immediately revoking insurance agent's license number 636867 issued to Respondent Malcolm Giles. This portion of the Order is based upon the findings of fact and conclusions of law relating to Mr. Giles' sale of the Annuity Policies to

Mrs. Daniels and to the participation in the creation of the Falsely Completed Delivery Receipt.

- 2. Suspending insurance agent's license number 636867 issued to Respondent Malcolm Giles for six months, retroactive to July 1, 1994. This portion of the Order is based upon the findings of fact and conclusions of law relating to Mr. Giles' wilful refusal to give testimony under oath and wilful refusal to produce documents pursuant to an order of the Director.
- 3. Directing Mr. Giles to pay restitution and present proof of the payment of restitution within 30 days of the date of this Order in the following amounts to the following individuals:
  - a. \$600.00 to Archie Neill and Judy Neill.
- b. \$13,105.93, the surrender charge sought to be assessed by U.S.G. in connection with Mrs. Daniels' attempt to cancel the Trust Policy. This amount shall be paid to Mrs. Daniels if, within 30 days of this Order, U.S.G. has not refunded the purchase price of the Trust Policy without assessing a surrender charge.
- c. \$14,345.15 to U.S.G., representing the commission paid by U.S.G. to Mr. Giles for his sale of the Trust Policy to Mrs. Daniels.
- d. \$1,215.00 to Mrs. Daniels for attorneys fees incurred by her in connection with her efforts to cancel the Trust Policy without a surrender charge. If, within 30 days of this Order, U.S.G. has paid \$1,215.00 to Mrs. Daniels for attorneys fees incurred by her in connection with her efforts to

1 secure the return of the premium paid to purchase the Trust 2 Policy, Mr. Giles shall pay this amount to U.S.G. 3 EFFECTIVE this 4th 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 COPY of the foregoing mailed/delivered 11 4th day of November, 1994, to: 12 Gay Ann Williams, Deputy Director Charles R. Cohen, Executive Assistant Director 13 Cathy O'Neil, Assistant Director Maureen Catalioto, Supervisor 14 Erin H. Klug, Manager, Early Detection Division Jo Lynn Clemmens, Examiner, Early Detection Division 15 Department of Insurance 2910 N. 44th Street, Suite 210 16 Phoenix, Arizona 85018 17 Peter H. Schelstraete Assistant Attorney General 18 1275 W. Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007 19 Donald A. Loose 20 11209 N. Tatum Blvd., Ste. 220 Phoenix, AZ 85028 21 Malcolm Giles 22 TIS/Tax & Investment Strategies, Inc. 5425 E. Shea Blvd. 23 Scottsdale, AZ 85254 24 USG Annuity & Life Company P.O. Box 617 25 Des Moines, IA 50303-0617 26 27 Crawford 28

-15-

day of November, 1994.

Director Of Insurance

Chief Administrative Law Judge