In the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii:

COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE FEDERAL SECURITIES LAWS

The Judicial Devisee’s, owners of the private #### Probate Trust, alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

The United States District Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 20(b), 20(d)(1) and 22(a) of the Securities Act of1933 ("Securities Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(b), 77t(d)(1) & 77v(a), and Sections 21(d)(l), 21(d)(3)(A), 21(e) and 27 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d)(1), 78u(d)(3)(A), 78u(e), and 78aa, 17 CFR Parts 275 and 279, and the Investment Advisors Act of 1940, Custody Rule, Amendment to rule 206 (4) (2), to “deter custody related violations”. Wells Fargo Bank N.A. agent for the Registered Holders of UBS Commercial Mortgage Security Trust 2007-FL1 have, directly or indirectly, made use of the means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange in connection with the transactions, acts, practices and courses of business alleged in this Complaint.

Venue is proper in this district pursuant to Section 22(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77v(a), and Section 27 of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78aa, because certain of the transactions, acts, practices, and courses of conduct constituting the violations alleged herein occurred within this district, the subject commercial property is located in this district, and some of the individual defendants resides in this district affected by relative rules and pursuant to Hawaii Revised Statute Ch. 412, “trust companies acting as custodians”, The Money Transmitters Act, HRS 498D, and cross referenced in Mortgage Licensing Act, HRS 454 F.

SUMMARY

This action has been filed to halt an ongoing securities fraud scheme conducted by Defendant, John G. Stumpf, CEO for WELLS FARGO BANK N.A., care of Wells Fargo & Company, P.O. Box 63750 San Francisco, CA 94163, the Plaintiff in that matter of CV 2CC ####### , a Foreclosure, and Robert Wolf, CEO for The Registered Holders of UBS Commercial Mortgage Securities Trust 2007-FL1/Commercial Mortgage Pass-Through Certificates Series 2001-FL1. , Rhonda I.L. Loo, retired judge, c/o: 2145 Main St. Wailuku, HI 96793, Shackley F. Raffetto, circuit judge, c/o: 2145 Main St. Wailuku HI 96793, Attorney, Barry A. Sullivan c/o: Topa Financial Center Fort St Tower, 745 Fort St., Suite 801, Honolulu, HI 96813, Stephen K.C. Mau, c/o: Pacific Guardian Center 737 Bishop Street , [Honolulu](http://uslawyersdb.com/city1706-0-Honolulu.html) Hawaii [ HI ] 96813, Christopher Lau, c/o: 220 S. King St. Suite 960, Honolulu HI 96813, Michael Pietsch, Pres. of Title Guaranty and Escrow of Hawaii, Inc. c/o: 235 Queen St. Honolulu 96813, HI and Relief Defendants, Thomas D. Welch Jr. c/o: The Kahului Building, 33 Lono Avenue, Suite 470 Kahului, Hawaii 96732-1681, attorney for Keaka LLC, Maluaka LLC, MAKENA HOTEL LLC, Matthew V. Pietsch, c/o: 2200 Main Street

Wailuku, HI 96793 attorney for Hawaii Development, LLC, DSMCL 2009 Investment, LLC, Mountain Seas Development, Ltd., Allan Swain and Robert Allan Farmer, in their sole capacity as Trustees of the Swain Maluaka Trust dated April 23, 2008, Miles Furutani, MILES FURUTANI MAKENA RECEVIER, LLC, Suite 600, Central Pacific Plaza 220 South King Street Honolulu, Hawaii 96813.

WELLS FARGO BANK N.A., “WFB” filed a complaint for Foreclosure in that civil matter (above), in the circuit court of the Second Circuit, island of Maui, and during proceedings the #### Trust gave notice of interests and filed a statement of interests with evidence of open bonded probate Documents.

The CEO, Defendant Stumpf and his attorney, Barry Sullivan, received several notices from the 1146 Trust in regard to settlement of liens and working out a settlement plan with the judicial devisee’s to the private probate no. #### , now a probate trust, called the #### Trust to which he made no response. WFB as Plaintiff in that matter, claimed to have owed to it, a principal of $192,500,000.00 plus other costs, yet there is no mention of the #### Trust Patent Probate liens attached to the land (probate asset) containing 514 acres involved , nor the settlement of the land owners fees owed to them. There is an “order” for a the conduct of a sale by Commissioner Christopher Lau, and it is dated Feb. 4, 2010 and it is signed by a retired district court of the second circuit judge, Rhonda I.L. Loo. The #### Trust issue remains undisposed of and is not subjected to said “order”, apparently giving the idea that a transfer of the #### Trust realty could occur in that mentioned “sale”. WFB for UBS, and its agents raised these funds by making false promises about a public offering (see registered series), misleading investors about the asset backed securities (asset is actually in the 1146 Trust probate) and making false representations about the use of investor funds. The Relief Defendants may have had personal knowledge of the fact that the #### probate assets (514 acres of an estate in open probate) was the concealed source of its credit and income for use as collateral in the WFB loan. There is no doubt that the commercial mortgage security on this property was financed and funded by ignorant investors.

WFB for UBS claimed to use investor funds for specific and limited purposes, such trading and financing enhancement programs based on “asset backed” securities. In reality, WFB for UBS, solicited investors to invest in commercial securities backed by hidden probate assets, while the owners (#### Trust) were kept from accessing their private probate estate and while being kept from receiving compensation for the use and manipulation of their probate asset estate. The Relief Defendants may have knowledge and worked in a supporting conspiracy to commit deprivation of private property, in order to maintain an abusive status quo for political reasons in Hawaii. The other Defendants conspired to ignore the land owners whose probate assets provide the source of income and credit for WFB/UBS in order to maintain an abusive status quo for political reasons in Hawaii, and to avoid properly disbursing the open private probate 1146 to the judicial devisee’s.

Since at least 2007 WFB for UBS, and their sales agents acting at their direction enticed investors with false promises that they were investing in property with clean hands and good faith. The Maui Prince Hotel and Makena Hotel LLC, with other Relief Defendants may also have taken part in the knowledge that the #### Trust probate estate assets were being used as the source of their income and credit, however keeping such asset concealed from others and especially investors in the securities made from those probate assets.

WFB/UBS continues to lull Commercial Mortgage Securities investors with promises of distributions and is now operating under the means of hidden sources to their income and credit. The false portrayal of a good faith financial transaction has caused injury to the actual judicial devisee’s patent holders in possession of all vested title in and to Royal Patent Grant No. 835 the judicial devisee’s have not received lawful compensation for the use and occupancy of their realty still within an open bonded (insured) probate. The facts demonstrate International Securities Fraud perpetrated by WFB for UBS Defendants, aided by Relief Defendants.

The defendants, by engaging in the conduct described in this Complaint, have violated, and unless enjoined will continue to violate, the antifraud provisions of the federal securities laws.

THE FRAUDULENT SCHEME

Defendants' Securities Offerings Background

Since approximately 2007 the Defendants placed their fraud based instruments for public offer, the Registered Holders of the Commercial Mortgage Securities Trust were unknowingly holding fraudulent securities and through WFB’s foreclosure case on MAKENA HOTEL LLC, et al. is attempting to *continue to defraud the investors the judicial devisee’s ,the SEC and other regulatory financial agencies.* The #### probate asset which is being touted as “backing” Defendants security instruments, is not within the legal possession of the parties claiming it, and therefore WFB /UBS have no right to use said probate asset. The 514 acre probate estate realty used by WFB/UBS as part of the “backing” of defendants securities, demonstrates money laundering and crimes against the #### trust. According to HRS Chapter 412, Hawaii Probate Rules and Codes a judge of court will appoint a trust company or personal representative to act as custodian and or fiduciary of the a decedents estate, providing there are no judicial devisee’s or heirs to act for themselves. In Hawaii, Hawaii Probate Rule 88, and in original laws the clerk of court maintains the file contact with the heirs, judicial devisee’s and their authorized representatives every three to five years. At the direction of the judge, a probate estate should be distributed and disbursed to the judicial devisee’s and or heirs of the decedent by final court order. The #### probate continues without a court order to have legally delivered title the estate from the judicial devisee’s to the defendants. The judges in the matter (above) have personal knowledge of their custodial relationship to the #### Trust private probate estate, the documents and file is within the second circuit, however the judges in this matter chose to transfer an illegitimate right of claim to the probate estate asset owned by the #### Trust to the defendants by what appears to be an “order” to defendants to take probate properties, funds and derivatives from the judicial devisee’s in probate. The actions taken by the judges, and in concert with the attorneys and clerks, amount to criminal deprivation of the beneficiaries’ private properties, and to custody/ fiduciary related violations of securities with complicity with human rights abuses.

The Offering

WFB for UBS, has not notified its investors or holders that the particular property involved is not theirs to invest in or offer for investment, demonstrating a conspiracy to coax others to join in the criminal deprivation of the devisee’s probate asset in estate. The particular security claimed in the case mentioned above, does not have a legal asset backing it and cannot have been offered as collateral by non devisee’s without the requisite legal proceedings in probate court. The relief defendants in an organized agreement to that matter, aid the continuing fraud in the Offer and Sale of false securities and cause further injury to holders and investors in to the subject property and on the other hand, cause severe injury to the judicial devisee’s whose realty is illegally used as the “asset” to back falsely portrayed securities.

The Defendants together, by the abuse of the circuit court venue and with the aid of a retired judge without an assignment to the case (above) conspired to defraud the #### Trust and the Registered Holders of UBS Mortgage Securities Trust by creating a scheme to appear as if a legal foreclosure had taken place. The financial transactions taking place on income derived from the hidden probate asset held within the probate court to which Devisee’s only retain possessory patent title, are clearly done by deceptive and unfair means.

WFB for UBS and their sales agents made false and misleading statements to investors to induce them to invest, including false promises about a public offering involving the subject property, misleading statements about title, patent possession and their ability to carry on with politically protected, false representations about the use of the devisee’s probate assets. The Defendants knowingly deprived the judicial devisee’s of their probate estate, while providing themselves with income derived from said probate asset (514 acres of probate estate land), in particular 24.26 acres used as the Hotel site in value of $92, 559,400.00 USD. While causing such financial transactions to take place on the private probate asset owned by the #### Trust, the fact that said “asset” belongs to deprived heirs in probate, was and is thereby concealed. The assessed value is made by the Director of Finance, County of Maui Real Property Tax department.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

UNREGISTERED OFFER AND SALE OF SECURITIES

Violations of Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act

(Against All Defendants)

The #### Trust re alleges the above statements made, and avers:

The Defendants and each of them, by engaging in the conduct described above, directly or indirectly, made use of means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails, to offer to sell or to sell securities, or to carry or cause such securities to be carried through the mails or in interstate commerce for the purpose of sale or for delivery after sale.

No registration statement has been filed with the Security Exchange Commission or has been in effect with respect to the offerings actual disposition in respect to the subject property the realty backing the security, alleged herein.

By engaging in the conduct described above, defendants and each of them, violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77e(a) and 77e(c).

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

FRAUD IN THE OFFER OR SALE OF SECURITIES

Violations of Section 17(a) Of the Securities Act (Against All Defendants)

The #### Trust realleges the above statements and avers:

Defendants and each of them, by engaging in the conduct described above, directly or indirectly, in the offer or sale of securities by the use of means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails:

a.· with scienter, employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud;

b. obtained money or property by means of untrue statements of a material fact or by omitting to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; or

c. engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser.

By engaging in the conduct described above, defendants and each of them, violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77q(a).

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH THE PURCHASE OR SALE OF SECURITIES

Violations of Section lO(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule lOb-5 Thereunder

(Against All Defendants)

The #### Trust realleges the above statements and avers:

Defendants, and each of them, by engaging in the conduct described above, directly or indirectly, in connection with the purchase or sale of a security, by the use of means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange, with scienter:

a. employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud;

b. made untrue statements of a material fact or omitted to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; or

c. engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon other persons.

By engaging in the conduct described above, defendants and each of them, violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Section 1O(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5 there under, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the #### Trust respectfully requests that the Court:

I.

Issue findings of fact and conclusions of law that defendants (all) committed the alleged violations whether directly or indirectly or aided in the pursuit of such violations.

II.

Issue judgments, in a form consistent with Rule 65(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, temporarily, preliminarily, and permanently enjoining defendants and their officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those in active concert or participation with any of them, who receive actual notice of the order by personal service or otherwise, and each of them, from violating Sections 5(a), 5(c), and 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77e(a), 77e(c), & 77q(a), and Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5 there under, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5.

III.

Issue, in a form consistent with Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction freezing the assets of each of defendants and relief defendants and any entity affiliated with any of them, prohibiting each of the defendants and relief defendants from destroying documents, granting expedited discovery, and requiring accountings from each of the defendants and relief defendants.

IV.

Order defendants to disgorge all ill-gotten gains from the illegal conduct alleged herein, together with prejudgment interest thereon.

V.

Order defendants to pay civil penalties pursuant to Section 20(d) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §77t(d) and Section 21(d)(3) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. §78u(d)(3).

VI.

Retain jurisdiction of this action in accordance with the principles of equity and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in order to implement and carry out the terms of all orders and decrees that may be entered, or to entertain any suitable application or motion for additional relief within the jurisdiction of this Court.

VII.

Grant such other and further relief as this Court may determine to be just and necessary.