

---

IN THE MATTER OF  
SOUNDTRACK CHEVELL INDUSTRIES, INC., ET AL.\*

*Docket 8998. Order, Apr. 22, 1975*

Dismissal of complaint as to respondent Tommie Tubb; denial of motions of three other individual respondents for dismissal of complaint as to them; and denial of law judge's recommendation that matter be withdrawn from adjudication for consent negotiations.

ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT AS TO RESPONDENT TUBB AND  
DENYING MOTIONS TO DISMISS AS TO OTHER RESPONDENTS

On Mar. 4, 1975, the Commission *sua sponte* issued an order directing complaint counsel to show cause why this complaint should not be dismissed as to respondent Tommie Tubb. Recently, the administrative law judge certified to the Commission handwritten letters from

---

\* For appearances, see p. 405, herein.

respondents William, Helen, and Lonnie Temple, and from the corporate respondent, which he construed as motions to dismiss the complaint as to them for lack of public interest. The law judge recommended that these motions be denied, but that this matter be withdrawn from adjudication for thirty days for the purpose of pursuing settlement proposals contained in the letters.

Complaint counsel have responded to the Show Cause order and motions to dismiss, and respondent William Temple has filed handwritten replies.

With respect to the Show Cause order, complaint counsel have offered no information tending to suggest Tubb exercised meaningful control over the acts or practices of the corporate respondent. Accordingly, the Commission now believes the public interest would not be served by litigating the charges alleged against him.

With respect to the motions to dismiss, nothing raised in regard to the remaining respondents has altered the Commission's original reason to believe a proceeding as to them would be in the public interest.

Concerning the law judge's suggestion that this matter be withdrawn from adjudication to consider the settlement proposals of certain of these respondents, two of them have asked that we appoint counsel to represent them on grounds of indigency and, until the law judge makes his recommendation on that issue, we believe such settlement negotiations would be inappropriate. Accordingly,

*It is ordered*, That as to respondent Tommie Tubb, the complaint in the above-captioned matter be, and it hereby is, dismissed;

*It is further ordered*, That the motions of respondents William F. Temple, Helen Temple, and Lonnie Temple, requesting that this complaint be dismissed as to them be, and they hereby are, denied:

*It is further ordered*, That the law judge's recommendation that this matter be withdrawn from adjudication for consent negotiations be, and it hereby is, denied.

Commissioners Hanford and Nye dissent from the dismissal of this complaint as to respondent Tommie Tubb for the reasons set forth in their dissenting statement of Mar. 4, 1975, [p 405 herein] to the Order to Show Cause.

Complaint

85 F.T.C.

## IN THE MATTER OF

## BUSSY ENTERPRISES, INC., ET AL.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC., IN REGARD TO ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE  
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND TRUTH IN LENDING ACTS*Docket C-2656. Complaint, Apr. 22, 1975—Decision, Apr. 22, 1975*

Consent order requiring a La Mesa, Calif., mortgage brokerage business, among other things to cease violating the Truth in Lending Act by failing to disclose to consumers, in connection with the extension of consumer credit, such information as required by Regulation Z of the said Act.

*Appearances*

For the Commission: *George J. Gregores.*

For the respondents: *Pro se.*

## COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and of the Truth in Lending Act, and the implementing regulation promulgated thereunder, and by virtue of the authority vested in it by said Acts, the Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that Bussy Enterprises, Inc., a corporation doing business as Valley Mortgage Service, and Richard F. Bussy, individually and as an officer of said corporation, hereinafter sometimes referred to as respondents, have violated the provisions of said Acts, and the implementing regulation promulgated under the Truth in Lending Act, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be in the public interest, hereby issues its complaint stating its charges in that respect as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Bussy Enterprises, Inc. is a corporation organized, existing and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California with its principal office and place of business located at 8341 Lemon Ave., La Mesa, Calif.

Respondent Richard F. Bussy is an individual and officer of the corporate respondent. In that capacity, he formulates, directs, and controls the acts and practices hereinafter set forth. His business address is the same as that of the corporate respondent.

PAR. 2. Respondents are now, and for some time last past have been engaged in arranging for the extension of credit through the operation of a mortgage brokerage business, which generally arranges, for a fee, for investors to lend money to consumers using real property as security for the performance of the obligation arising out of the transaction.