

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

FILED \_\_\_\_\_ ENTERED \_\_\_\_\_  
LOGGED \_\_\_\_\_ RECEIVED \_\_\_\_\_

NOV 20 2018

AT GREENBELT  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Plaintiff,

v.

ECOLOGICAL FOX LLC *et al.*

Defendants.

BY  
No: 18-cv-3309-PJM

DEPUTY

**EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND INTERIM  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Whereas, Plaintiff, the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”), filed its Complaint for Permanent Injunction and Other Equitable Relief pursuant to Section 13(b) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (“FTC Act”), 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), and moved, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b), for a temporary restraining order, asset freeze, other equitable relief, and an order to show cause why a preliminary injunction should not issue against individual Defendants Andris Pukke, Luke Chadwick, John Usher, Rod Kazazi, Brandi Greenfield, Frank Costanzo, and Defendants Global Property Alliance, Inc., Sittee River Wildlife Reserve, Buy Belize, LLC, Buy International, Inc., Foundation Development Management, Inc., Eco-Futures Development, Eco-Futures Belize Limited, Power Haus Marketing, Sanctuary Belize Property Owners’ Association, Prodigy Management Group LLC, Foundation Partners, BG Marketing, LLC, Ecological Fox, LLC, Belize Real Estate Affiliates LLC, Exotic Investor LLC, Southern Belize Realty LLC, (collectively, the “Sanctuary Belize Enterprise” or “SBE”), and Atlantic International Bank Ltd.; and relief defendants Angela Chittenden, Beach Bunny Holdings, LLC, the Estate of John Pukke, John Vipulis, and Deborah Connelly;

Whereas on November 5, 2018, the Court granted the FTC’s motion and entered the Ex Parte Temporary Restraining Order with Asset Freeze, Writs Ne Exeat, Appointment of a

Temporary Receiver, and Other Equitable Relief, and Order to Show Cause Why a Preliminary Injunction Should Not Issue (“TRO”);

Whereas, on November 12, 2018, the Court entered the Order Amending Ex Parte Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO Amendment”);

Whereas, the FTC and the Receiver entered the defendants’ business premises on November 7, 2018, and found new evidence of the FTC’s allegations and significant corroboration, including documents showing the relevant individuals had the roles identified by the FTC in its pleadings and telemarketing scripts showing the defendants were making the relevant claims to consumers;

Whereas, considering the filings by the FTC and the parties, the arguments made by the parties during the November 19, 2018 telephonic hearing, the equities, and the FTC’s likelihood of ultimate success on the merits, an order extending the terms of the TRO, as amended by the TRO Amendment, is in the public interest; and

For the reasons stated on the record during the November 19, 2018, telephonic hearing;

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:**

A. The TRO and TRO Amendment, which are attached to this Order, shall remain in effect as an interim preliminary injunction through the conclusion of a hearing to determine whether a preliminary injunction should issue in this matter. That hearing shall commence on February 11, 2019.

B. The following schedule shall apply to all proceedings in advance of this hearing:

New Motions due:	December 14, 2018
Answers to the Complaint due:	January 11, 2019
Oppositions to Motions due:	January 11, 2019
Motion Replies due:	January 25, 2019

Motions Hearing: February 1, 2019  
Pre-Hearing Conference: February 5, 2019  
Preliminary Injunction Hearing: February 11, 2019

The documents that need to be filed by December 14, 2018, include any new motions related to the TRO, as well as any Rule 12 motions. The documents that need to be filed by January 11, 2019, include the defendants' oppositions to the FTC's currently pending motion for a preliminary injunction.

**SO ORDERED**, this 20 day of Nov, 2018.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE