

LAWRENCE G. WASDEN  
Attorney General

BRIAN D. NICHOLAS – I.S.B. #3585  
Deputy Attorney General  
State of Idaho  
Department of Finance  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, Idaho 83720-0031  
Telephone: (208) 332-8092  
Facsimile: (208) 332-8016  
brian.nicholas@finance.idaho.gov

**BEFORE THE DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE  
OF THE STATE OF IDAHO**

STATE OF IDAHO, DEPARTMENT OF  
FINANCE, CONSUMER FINANCE  
BUREAU,

Complainant,

vs.

RELIANT SUPPORT SERVICES, INC., a  
California corporation,

Respondent.

Docket No. 2012-9-06

**ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST**

The State of Idaho, Department of Finance, Consumer Finance Bureau (Department), pursuant to the Idaho Collection Agency Act, Idaho Code § 26-2221 *et seq.* (the Act), hereby alleges the following facts that constitute a basis for the issuance of an order pursuant to §§ 26-2244(1) and 26-2228(4) of the Act, requiring RELIANT SUPPORT SERVICES, INC. (Respondent) to immediately cease and desist from violating the Act, to include engaging in unlicensed debt and credit counseling activity in Idaho.

## RESPONDENT

1. Respondent is a California corporation doing business as a debt management company, which business is defined as debt or credit counseling under the Act. Respondent conducts its debt management business from 25391 Commercentre Drive, Suite 200, Lake Forest, California. Harald Gallob is Respondent's Director/Officer.

2. Respondent represents on its website, <http://reliantsupport.com>, that it is "more than just a debt relief service." Respondent also makes the following claims:

We provide a full spectrum of financial analysis for every individual situation. Debt management is a solution if you have found yourself deep in debt, and have found that the interest rates on your credit cards are overwhelming and spiraling out of control ... Our program has pre-negotiated interest rates with all creditors which are usually much lower than your current interest rates. ...

Reliant Support is a California-based debt-information company that works with law offices on behalf of consumers to resolve their debt problems. ... Our clients benefit by allowing Reliant Support to create an action plan to negotiate their unsecured debt and settle it within 2 to 4 years.

3. Respondent has never applied for nor has ever been issued any license under the Act, to include, specifically, a license authorizing it to engage in the business of debt or credit counseling.

## FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

4. On or around April 17, 2012, Idaho resident M.O. received a solicitation from Respondent. The top of such solicitation stated in bold, "RESOLUTION PENDING." The solicitation was "notifying" M.O. of her "ability to resolve [her] past due, unsecured debt in the amount of \$23,155, which is currently on file and reporting as delinquent on [her] tri-bureau credit report." The solicitation advised M.O. that "immediate actions can allow restructuring or renegotiation of [her] unsecured debt." It further indicated that M.O. had been "granted pending eligibility to pay the **reduced amount** of as little as **\$11,578....**" The solicitation did not contain

a company name, but did contain a toll free number to call to “stop any further collection efforts by [the] creditor and redeem amount covered under this plan.”

5. Because M.O. is not in arrears on any debt purportedly owed by M.O., and because M.O. had never been involved in a collection proceeding, after receiving the solicitation, M.O. decided to call the telephone number provided on the solicitation. M.O. spoke to Dennis, and when asked, Dennis informed M.O. that the solicitation was sent by Respondent. During that discussion, M.O. inquired as to Respondent’s licensing status with the Department. In response, Dennis stated that Respondent was “registered” with Titan Law Group in Boise, Idaho, and that M.O. would need to speak with that firm. After speaking with Dennis, M.O. filed a complaint with the Department on or about April 18, 2012.

6. After receiving the complaint, a Department staff member noted that Respondent failed to hold a license under the Act authorizing it to engage in a debt or credit counseling business in Idaho.

7. On May 8, 2012, the Department sent a letter to Respondent concerning M.O.’s complaint, and Respondent’s apparent unlicensed debt or credit counseling activity in Idaho. In that letter, the Department requested that Respondent provide information necessary for the Department to determine the extent of Respondent’s unlicensed debt or credit counseling activity in Idaho and the amount of moneys it had received from, and owed to, Idaho residents.

8. On May 23, 2012, Respondent, through its counsel, responded to the Department’s request for information by asserting that it does not believe it is engaged in the business of debt or credit counseling activities as defined by the Act. Respondent asserted that it “specializes in the marketing and generation of qualified leads for consumers who require legal services associated with resolving pending unsecured debt issues [and that it] does not offer to

provide or provide debt management or credit counseling services.” Respondent stated that because it only determines interest in the services of a law firm and because it does not maintain lists of individuals to whom it has mailed information, Respondent was not able to provide the Department with information requested in the Department’s May 8, 2012 letter.

9. On July 6, 2012, the Department’s attorney wrote to Respondent informing it that based upon the information the Department had reviewed, including the representations made on Respondent’s website, that it appeared that Respondent is holding itself out to consumers as a debt or credit counselor as defined under the Act. The letter offered options to Respondent to resolve its apparent unlicensed debt or credit counseling activity in Idaho. To date, Respondent has not responded to that letter.

10. Based on information the Department has obtained in connection with the Department’s investigation of Respondent’s unlicensed debt or credit counseling activity in Idaho, the Department concludes as follows:

a. Respondent has offered to provide its debt or credit counseling services to at least one (1) Idaho resident.

b. Respondent has stopped communicating with the Department and its legal representative.

c. Charles M. Pollock is listed as President/Director of Titan Law Group with the Nevada Secretary of State. While Mr. Pollock is licensed to practice law in the state of Nevada, Mr. Pollock is not licensed to practice law in the state of Idaho. The Department knows of no other attorney with that firm that is licensed to practice law in the state of Idaho. Further, Titan Law Group has no offices in the state of Idaho.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND VIOLATIONS

### *UNLICENSED DEBT COUNSELING OR CREDIT COUNSELING ACTIVITY IN IDAHO*

11. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 10 above are fully incorporated herein by this reference.

12. Idaho Code § 26-2222(9) defines “debt counselor” or “credit counselor” as “any person engaged in any of the activities enumerated in subsection (7) of section 26-2223” of the Act. Such definition encompasses the unlicensed debt management and debt resolution services offered by Respondent to at least one (1) Idaho consumer as referenced herein.

13. Idaho Code § 26-2223(7) provides as follows, in pertinent part:

**26-2223. Collection agency, debt counselor, credit counselor, or credit repair organization – License required.** -- No person shall without complying with the terms of this act and obtaining a license from the director:

...

(7) Engage or offer to engage in this state ... in the business of providing counseling or other services to debtors in the management of their debts, or contracting with the debtor to effect the adjustment, compromise, or discharge of any account, note or other indebtedness of the debtor.

14. Respondent’s acts of engaging in debt or credit counseling activities in Idaho as to at least one (1) Idaho consumer without a license under the Act, as referenced above, constitutes a violation of Idaho Code § 26-2223(7). The following facts demonstrate Respondent engaged in activities in violations of Idaho Code § 26-2223(7):

- a. Respondent’s website indicates it provides a full spectrum of financial analysis for every individual and that it has a program to manage and control debts for consumers; and
- b. Respondent solicited an Idaho consumer advising her that she has been approved to pay amounts on her debt through Respondent’s actions.

15. Respondent claims it only acts to generate customers for a law firm that actually performs the debt management services. This statement is contrary to Respondent's website and is inconsistent with its solicitation materials. Respondent does hold itself out as providing debt management and debt counseling services. Respondent's act of engaging in such activity without a license in Idaho, and at the same time, failing to communicate with the Department, in the purview of the Department, is against the public interest.

16. Idaho Code § 26-2229A(1) provides that every licensee or person required to be licensed under the Act and its agents shall deal openly, fairly, and honestly without deception in the conduct of its business activities in Idaho under the Act.

17. Idaho Code § 26-2229A(9) provides that no person licensed or required to be licensed under the Act shall make a representation or statement of material fact, or omit to state a material fact, in connection with the offer, sale or performance of any service authorized under the Act, if the representation, statement or omission is false or misleading or has the tendency or capacity to be misleading.

18. Respondent's act of sending a solicitation to at least one (1) Idaho resident indicating that she had past due debt when she did not constitutes a representation or statement of material fact in connection with the offer of any service authorized under the Act. Such representation is false or misleading or has the tendency or capacity to be misleading. Such acts also show that Respondent is failing to deal openly, fairly, and honestly without deception in the conduct of its business activities in Idaho under the Act.

19. Further, Respondent's act of sending a solicitation which appears to represent that it may assist a consumer in reducing their debts and representing on its website that it may provide those services, when it may only be obtaining an interest in such services constitutes a

representation or statement of material fact in connection with the offer of any service authorized under the Act. Such representation is false or misleading or has the tendency or capacity to be misleading. Such acts also show that Respondent is failing to deal openly, fairly, and honestly without deception in the conduct of its business activities in Idaho under the Act.

### **DIRECTOR'S AUTHORITY**

20. Idaho Code § 26-2228(2) authorizes the Director of the State of Idaho, Department of Finance (Director) to conduct investigations as necessary to determine whether a person has violated any provision of the Act, a rule promulgated under the Act, or an order issued under the Act.

21. Idaho Code § 26-2244(1) provides that whenever it appears to the Director that it is in the public interest, he may order any person to cease and desist from acts, practices, or omissions which constitute a violation of the Act.

### **ORDER**

The Director, having reviewed the foregoing and having determined that good cause has been shown, that Respondent's violations of the Act require immediate action to protect Idaho residents, and that the public interest is served thereby,

NOW, THEREFORE, the Director HEREBY FINDS that Respondent has violated the Idaho Collection Agency Act as set forth above.

Pursuant to Idaho Code §§ 26-2244(1) and 67-5247, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that RELIANT SUPPORT SERVICES, INC. and its agents and employees immediately CEASE AND DESIST from any further debt and credit counseling activities in Idaho; from any other conduct under the Act for which a license from the Director is required; and from any other violations of the Act.

This ORDER is EFFECTIVE UPON ISSUANCE.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED this 25<sup>TH</sup> day of JANUARY, 2013.



STATE OF IDAHO  
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gavin M. GEE", written over a horizontal line.

GAVIN M. GEE, Director

**NOTICE**

Respondent is HEREBY NOTIFIED that this ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST is a final order of the Director.

Respondent may file a motion for reconsideration or request for hearing concerning this final order within fourteen (14) days of the service date of this order. Any such motion for reconsideration or request for hearing must be in writing, addressed to:

Michael Larsen  
Consumer Finance Bureau Chief  
Idaho Department of Finance  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, Idaho 83720-0031

A copy of such motion for reconsideration or request for a hearing shall also be served on the Department's counsel, Brian D. Nicholas, Deputy Attorney General, at the same address.

The Department will dispose of a motion for reconsideration within twenty-one (21) days of the receipt of a motion for reconsideration, or the motion will be considered denied by operation of law. Idaho Code § 67-5246(4); Idaho Rules of Administrative Procedure of the Attorney General (IRAP) at IDAPA 4.11.01.740.02.a. Should Respondent make a timely request

for a hearing, the Department shall schedule a hearing within the twenty-one (21) day time period.

Pursuant to Idaho Code §§ 67-5270 and 67-5272, any party aggrieved by this final order may appeal to the district court by filing a petition in the district court of the county in which:

- i. A hearing was held;
- ii. The final agency action was taken;
- iii. The party seeking review of the order resides, or operates its principal place of business in Idaho; or
- iv. The real property or personal property that was the subject of the agency action is located.

See IDAPA 04.11.01.740.02.b.

An appeal must be filed within twenty-eight (28) days of (a) the service date of this final order, (b) of an order denying a motion for reconsideration, or (c) the failure within twenty-one (21) days to grant or deny a motion for reconsideration or schedule a hearing, whichever is later. See Idaho Code § 67-5273. The filing of an appeal to the district court does not itself stay the effectiveness or enforcement of the order under appeal. See IDAPA 04.11.01.740.02.c.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 25<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2013, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing fully-executed ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST to be served on the following by the designated means:

Reliant Support Services  
25391 Commercentre Dr., Ste. 200  
Lake Forest, CA 92630

- U.S. mail, postage prepaid
- certified mail
- facsimile: (949) 585-9411
- email: info@reliantsupport.com

Paralegal

