1

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

ELLIS. INC., RICHARD Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff,

JUDGMENT

Case No. CV 2003-005280

RON J. PATERSON and KATHLEEN PATERSON, husband and wife, d/b/a/ LEASEFINANCE GROUP; JANE AND JOHN DOES I-X; BLACK and WHITE CORPORATIONS I-X; ABC LLC'S, limited liability companies; and ABC PARTNERSHIPS I-X,

Defendants.

The Court, based on its prior rulings in this case, and having heard and considered the evidence and testimony presented at trial in this matter and having heard and considered Plaintiff's oral motion for directed verdict at the conclusion of the parties' presentation of evidence and testimony, and good cause therefor appearing, the Court makes the following findings and rulings:

This case involves a fiduciary, business relationship that existed between Defendant Ron Paterson ("Paterson") and Plaintiff, CB Richard Ellis, Inc. ("CBRE") from January 1, 2002, until January 24, 2003.

Scanned

2. During the aforementioned period, Paterson received \$473,949.83 in advance deposits or "commitment fees" from certain third parties, as follows:

Table 1. Fees and Deposits Collected by Paterson

THIRD PARTY		AMOUNT	DATE
First Magnus Financial Corporation		\$6,870.58	1/29/02
First Magnus Financial Corporation		\$48,650.86	2/12/02
First Magnus Financial Corporation		\$6,165.56	3/7/02
Gerard Klauer Mattison & Co., Inc.		\$80,000.00	3/18/02
First Magnus Financial Corporation		\$8,795.14	4/23/02
Gerard Klauer Mattison & Co., Inc.		\$66,875.35	4/26/02
Service Craft LLC		\$21,800.00	7/25/02
Great Lakes Die Cast Corp.		\$10,00 0.00	9/3/02
Ruan Transportation		\$10,000.00	9/9/02
Sincere Trading of K.B.A. Co-op, Ltd.		\$9,604 .68	9/12/02
Call Net Enterprises, Inc.		\$29,990.00	9/27/02
Coast Dental		\$20,513.97	10/22/02
Aventis Pasteur, Inc.		\$39,530 .00	12/10/02
Aventis Pasteur, Inc.		\$22,762 .00	12/12/02
Aventis Pasteur, Inc.		\$36,15 5.00	12/17/02
Service Craft LLC		\$52,030 .00	1/23/03
Service Craft LLC		\$4,2 06.69	1/23/03
	TOTAL	\$473,94 9.83	

- 3. The amounts listed in Table 1 above (the "Funds"), were all paid to Paterson in relation to certain proposed equipment lease transactions or the financing of such transactions, which Paterson was supposed to broker or negotiate on behalf of the above-named third parties.
- 4. Paterson deposited the Funds into checking accounts controlled solely by him and/or his wife, Kathleen Paterson. CBRE was not a signatory on any of these accounts.
- 5. None of the proposed equipment leases for the third parties lited above in Table 1 was ever consummated or funded, nor was financing ever approved on any of those proposed equipment leases. As a result, the Funds collected by Defendants were not earnings or commissions that Defendants were entitled to keep.

 $\mathbf{2}$

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Paterson did not tell his superiors at CBRE anything about any of the Funds and they had no knowledge Paterson was collecting any such advance fees or deposits until sometime in the summer of 2002.
- 8. When CBRE learned the Paterson had been collecting and depositing client funds, it questioned Paterson about the scope and extent of the deposits and fees he had collected. In response, Paterson (both by material omissions and intentionally misleading statements) falsely claimed as of October 22, 2002, that he had collected less than \$70,000 in advance fees and deposits from third parties, and also falsely asserted that all but approximately \$11,000 of those advance fees and documents were not in his possession, but had been forwarded to lenders or lessors on behalt of cortain clients in conjunction with their proposed equipment lease transactions.
- After it had discovered that Paterson had taken in client : enies and deposited them into his own bank accounts, CBRE ordered Paterson to brward any future advance fees or deposits from clients to the appropriate CBRE accounting personnel for deposit into CBRE's accounts.
- 10. Despite having been given these instructions, Paterson \$150,897.69 in additional advance fees and deposits from clients between October 22. 2002 and January 23, 2003, (without CBRE's knowledge or consent), ar adeposited those funds into his own and/or his wife's bank accounts and Defendant . - pent that money to pay personal expenses.
- 11. Paterson hid his actions from CBRE and refuse I to provide I thing and financial records requested by CBRE related to the Funds. As a result, he was terminated by CBRE on January 24, 2003.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 12. Paterson failed and refused to return any of the Funds to the third partie; or to CBRE, despite repeated demands for such payment.
- 13. CBRE repaid approximately \$405,000 of the Funds to all but one of the third parties listed in Table 1, and is currently being sued by the remaining ungain third party, First Magnus Financial Corporation, for \$70,482.14.
- 14. In the course of his business relationship with CBRE, Pater on incurred \$35,000 in business expenses that CBRE has admitted were legitimate and should have been reimbursed to Paterson.
- 15. The Court finds that Paterson's defalcations as described above constituted serious breaches of his contractual and fiduciary duties to CBRE and the third parties, as well as conversion and theft of the Funds.
- 16. The Court also finds that CBRE is subrogated to the claims of the time parties in Table 1 for the repayment of the Funds they paid to Paterson.
- 17. The Court has found, pursuant to Rule 50, Ariz.R.Civ.P., tha idear is not legally sufficient evidentiary basis for a jury to find for Defendants on Comma I Not the Complaint or to find in favor of Paterson on his Counterclaim other than for the \$35,000 in expenses admitted by CBRE.
- 18. The Funds constitute liquidated damages upon which prejudgment interest can and will be calculated at the statutory rate of 10% per annum from the date those Funds were converted by Paterson, until the date of this Judgment.
- 19. For purposes of calculating prejudgment interest, the Court as will red the filing date of Plaintiff's Complaint, March 18, 2003, as the date upo. which the Funds became liquidated damages. On that basis, the Court calculated prejudgment interest of \$94,789.79 accrued on the Funds between March .8, 1999. and March 18, 2005.
- 20. Prejudgment interest has continued to accome on the Funds on a March 18, 2005, at the rate of \$129.85 per day.

Scanned

WHEREFORE, based on the foregoing findings and rulings, and good is therefor appearing and there being no just reason for delay,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED directing that judgment be entered in factor of Plaintiff CBRE on its Complaint against Defendants in the principal support \$473,949.83, together with prejudgment interest thereon of \$ 94,7,7,7, ..., minus the sum of \$35,000 as an offset for Paterson's business expenses.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED awarding CBRS reasonable attor. eys' for the amount of \$ \(\frac{50,000}{29,899,27} \) pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-341.01(A), as well as on its in the amount of \$ \(\frac{9,899,27}{29} \)

attorneys' fees and costs awarded to Plaintiff shall accrue interest at the rate of percent (10%) per annum from and after this date until man in full.

DONE IN OPEN COURT this ____ day of ______

Judge of the Sweets urt

fine foregoing instrument is a full, true and correct copy of the original on file in this office.

Attest 20 MICHAEL K JEANES, Clerk of the Superior Court of the State of Arizona, in and for the County of Maricopa.

_Deputy