

1 THE HONORABLE FRED Van SICKLE

2 F. MIKE SHAFFER, WSBA No. 18669  
3 BRADLEY B. JONES, WSBA NO. 17197  
4 KENNETH G. KIEFFER, WSBA No. 10850  
5 GORDON THOMAS HONEYWELL  
6 MALANCA PETERSON & DAHEIM LLP  
7 1201 Pacific Avenue, Suite 2100  
8 Tacoma WA 98402  
9 253-620-6500

10 STEVE W. BERMAN, WSBA No. 12536  
11 CLYDE A. PLATT, JR., WSBA No. 22946  
12 ERIN K. FLORY, WSBA No. 16631  
13 HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
14 1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900  
15 Seattle, WA 98101-2609  
16 206-623-7292

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
18 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

19 In re METROPOLITAN SECURITIES  
20 LITIGATION

No. CV-04-025-FVS

CLASS ACTION

21 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:  
22 ALL ACTIONS

23 **CONSOLIDATED AND SECOND**  
24 **AMENDED CLASS ACTION**  
25 **COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF**  
26 **THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933**  
**AND WASHINGTON SECURITIES**  
**ACT**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Consolidated & Second Amended Complaint  
(Case No. CV04-0025-FVS)  
[MET 2nd Amend Complaint Clean Aug 30 2006]

LAW OFFICES  
GORDON, THOMAS, HONEYWELL, MALANCA,  
PETERSON & DAHEIM LLP  
1201 PACIFIC AVENUE, SUITE 2100  
POST OFFICE BOX 1157  
TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98401-1157  
(253) 620-6500 FACSIMILE (253) 620-6565

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. SUMMARY OF ACTION .....1

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE .....7

III. THE PARTIES AND CERTAIN NON-PARTY WITNESSES .....8

    A. Plaintiffs .....8

    B. Defendants .....8

    C. Witnesses .....13

IV. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS .....16

    A. The Metropolitan Registration Statements .....16

    B. The Summit Registration Statements .....17

V. UNDERLYING ALLEGATIONS OF NEGLIGENCE IN CONNECTION WITH PLAINTIFFS’ CLAIMS.....20

    A. An Overview of the Organization, Structure and Failed Business Model of the Metropolitan – Summit Enterprise .....20

        1. The Metropolitan Group Was Dependent on Continuously Selling Securities to Public Investors and Successfully Evaded State Regulation so it Could Sell More Debt.....25

        2. State Regulators Criticized the Metropolitan Group’s Registration Statements and Expressed Alarm About its Sales of Securities to Investors .....30

        3. The Metropolitan Group Expanded its Commercial Lending in Increasingly Risky Operations .....39

        4. The Metropolitan Group’s Faulty Controls and Lending Practices Were Exacerbated By the Fact That

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

it Was, in Effect, a Sole Proprietorship Riddled With  
Conflicts of Interest .....42

5. The Corporate Form of the Metropolitan Group Was  
Abused Through the Use of Related Party  
Transactions.....47

6. The Metropolitan Group Was Addicted to Fiscal Year-  
End “Rabbit” Transactions.....50

7. Regulatory Scrutiny Eventually Contributed to the  
Metropolitan Group’s Failure.....52

B. Faulty Auditing and Accounting Enabled Metropolitan and  
Summit to Continue to Access the Public Markets,  
Concealed Conditions and Risks that Later Foreseeably  
Materialized and Damaged Class Members .....56

1. The Metropolitan Group’s Securities Sales During the  
Class Period Were Made Possible by Unqualified  
Audit Opinions that Should Have Complied with a  
Variety of Professional Standards .....56

2. Description of Field Work Standards .....60

a) First Standard of Field Work – Adequate  
Planning and Associated Considerations.....61

b) Second Standard of Field Work – Internal  
Control Considerations .....64

c) Third Standard of Field Work – Adequate  
Evidential Material .....66

3. Summary of GAAS Standards .....66

4. Independent Audits and the Types of Audit Opinions .....68

a) Unqualified Audit Opinions .....69

b) Qualified Audit Opinions.....69

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

- c) Adverse Audit Opinions.....70
- d) Disclaimers of Opinion.....71
- 5. PWC and E&Y Negligently Issued Unqualified Opinions Throughout the Class Period.....71
- C. In Rendering Unqualified Opinions During the Class Period, the Accountant Defendants Negligently Violated Virtually All of Their Relevant Duties under GAAS and GAAP .....74
  - 1. The Accountant Defendants Should Have Known That the Metropolitan Group’s Audits Presented High Risks but Negligently Failed to Account for Those Risks in Their Audits.....75
  - 2. The Accountant Defendants Should Have Known That the Metropolitan Group’s Internal Controls Were so Deficient as to Preclude Unqualified Audit Opinions.....78
    - a) The Metropolitan Group lacked any true internal audit function .....86
    - b) The Accountant Defendants should have known that the Group’s Audit Committees were dysfunctional .....88
    - c) The Accountant Defendants should have known that the Metropolitan Group’s financial controls and accounting systems were clearly unsuitable for the enterprise’s structure and transactions .....89
    - d) The Accountant Defendants should have known that formal financial controls were consistently ignored.....93
    - e) The Accountant Defendants should have known that the Group’s internal controls and records for its commercial lending operations were in shambles .....95

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

- 3. The Accountant Defendants Failed to Reveal or Account For the Material Weaknesses and Reportable Conditions Inherent in the Metropolitan Group’s Lack of Controls .....101
- 4. The Consequence of the Accountant Defendants’ Negligence with Respect to Internal Controls was to Allow the Metropolitan Group to Continue on its Already Ruinous Path .....104
- D. The Account Defendants Violated GAAS and Their Professional Duty of Care Because They Were Not Sufficiently Independent .....105
- E. The Accountant Defendants Negligently Performed Other Field Work.....114
  - 1. PWC Inadequately Staffed the Audit .....114
  - 2. Inappropriate Acceptance of Residual Valuations .....116
  - 3. Improper Reliance on Faulty Appraisals Without Adequate Testing .....118
- F. The Accountant Defendants Negligently Performed Their Reporting Duties and Materially Departed From GAAP in Their Audit Reports .....128
  - 1. Abrogation of GAAP Through Inadequate Disclosures in Financial Statements .....129
  - 2. Abrogation of GAAP Through Improper Reliance of Management Misrepresentations.....130
  - 3. Abrogation of GAAP With Respect Related Party Transactions .....132
  - 4. Abrogation of GAAP By Failing to Properly Recognize Loan Losses.....140

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

5. Abrogation of GAAP By Improperly Recognizing Gains on Sales For Real Estate Transactions.....147

6. Abrogation of GAAP By Improperly Accounting For Investments as Loans .....149

G. The Accountant Defendants Negligently Issued Unqualified Opinions Because They Failed to Obtain Sufficient Evidential Matter to Support Those Opinions .....153

H. The Accountant Defendants Negligently Issued Unqualified Opinions in Violation of AU § 312 Due to Multiple Misstatements in Audited Financials.....154

I. The Accountant Defendants Negligently Failed to Require Combined Financial Statements .....156

J. The Accountant Defendants Failed to Comply With AU § 315 Standards Regarding a Transition of Auditors .....159

K. Summary of GAAS Violations .....166

L. Summary of GAAP Violations .....172

M. Representative Transactions.....175

1. FYE 2000 .....175

a) The Koa Transaction.....176

b) Tagert Lakes .....186

c) Lake Mary .....188

d) PW, LLC .....189

e) Partial Sale of Leases and Structured Settlements .....190

2. FYE 2001 .....192

a) Mughar/Florida Hotels.....192

1	b)	Napa Partners.....	199
2	c)	Trillium Commons.....	204
3	d)	American Realty Investors, Inc. ....	205
4	e)	Nasko Holdings .....	205
5			
6	3.	FYE 2002 .....	206
7	a)	Trillium Live Oaks/Everett .....	207
8	b)	Malouf/Rams Hill .....	214
9	c)	Neighborhood, Inc. ....	216
10	d)	Lansing-Clarion .....	218
11	e)	Silver Canyon/Grand Hills.....	220
12	f)	DPAC or DAC.....	222
13			
14	N.	Effect on Financial Statements.....	225
15	O.	Additional Misrepresentations and Omissions in the	
16		Registration Statements .....	225
17	P.	Roth Capital Was Negligent in its Due Diligence, Its Pricing	
18		Approvals of Metropolitan Group Securities, and Its	
19		Representations to Investors .....	254
20	1.	Roth Capital’s Investigations .....	256
21	2.	Roth Capital’s Pricing Approvals.....	257
22	3.	Roth Capital’s Negligent Misrepresentations and	
23		Omissions .....	258
24	a)	Roth Capital’s Representations as QIU Assured	
25		Investors That the Market For Metropolitan and	
26		Summit Securities Was Fair, Efficient, and	
		Suitable, All of Which Was Untrue.....	258