

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

MITZI PASCH)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	No.
vs.)	
)	Div.
ROBERT WILSON,)	
ONDOC, LLC)	
)	
Defendants.)	

COMPLAINT

COMES NOW Plaintiff and states as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action for damages, punitive damages and attorneys’ fees and costs arising out of Defendants’ sale of securities by use of false and untrue statements. Plaintiff alleges claims under state and federal securities laws, as well as related common law claims for fraud and negligent representation.

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Mitzi Pasch (“Mitzi”) is a citizen of the State of Missouri.
2. Defendant Robert Wilson (“Wilson”) is a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania.
3. Defendant OnDoc, LLC is a Pennsylvania limited liability company with its principal place of business in Pennsylvania. OnDoc provides individuals with online access to discount prescriptions and to medical professionals for advice and consultation for a monthly fee.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 and §1332 because the parties are of diverse citizenship and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. This Court has pendent jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367(a).

5. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) because the acts, transactions, or courses of business constituting the sales of these securities occurred in this District.

6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendants because the Defendants solicited Mitzi's investment in OnDoc by communications directed to Mitzi in St. Louis, including at least one video conference where Mitzi was present in St. Louis. In addition, upon information and belief, OnDoc has transacted and transacts business with Missouri residents.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

7. OnDoc is the brainchild of Defendant Robert Wilson. Mitzi now believes that Wilson incorporated OnDoc as a Pennsylvania limited liability company in February 2018. However, when Wilson solicited Mitzi's investment in OnDoc, Wilson represented that OnDoc was a corporation and offered Mitzi the "opportunity" to acquire common stock. In any event, OnDoc markets itself as an entity that provides individuals with online access to discount prescriptions and to medical professionals for advice and consultation for a monthly fee. OnDoc is structured as a typical multi-level or pyramid marketing operation, under which distributors are encouraged to recruit new distributors and are compensated based on their own production, the production of new distributors, and so on.

8. Beginning in the late Summer or Fall of 2018, Wilson solicited Mitzi's investment in OnDoc through a series of false and fraudulent statements, including without limitation:

(a) In October 2018, Wilson represented to Mitzi (and others) that an NFL quarterback who played for the North Carolina franchise had donated \$500,000 toward the purchase of OnDoc vouchers for poor and underprivileged families through OnDoc's charitable arm, OnDoc Cares. If true, the quarterback's participation would have provided significant public gravitas and operating capital for OnDoc. Upon information and belief, the quarterback did not make the donation;

(b) Also in October 2018, Wilson represented to Mitzi (and others) that the Chief Executive Officer of Stream, a highly successful direct sales organization, had endorsed OnDoc and the OnDoc program. Upon information and belief, the Stream CEO did not and has never endorsed OnDoc;

(c) On November 4, 2018, Wilson represented that the accounting firm of Ernst & Young had opined that the going concern value of OnDoc was \$20.4 million dollars. Upon information and belief, Ernst & Young has never valued OnDoc at \$20.4 million dollars;

(d) On November 4, 2018, Wilson represented that Ernst & Young estimated that OnDoc would have a total of 125,000 clients by fiscal year 2019;

(e) Wilson misrepresented the number of OnDoc clients on various occasions. For example, on November 6, 2018, in connection with a virtual power point presentation, Wilson represented that OnDoc had already exceeded the customer levels projected in a power point presentation for the first and second quarters of 2019, which was not true. During the same power point presentation, still prior to Mitzi making her first investment in OnDoc, Wilson

represented (i) that OnDoc had at least 2400 customers and (ii) that the Federal Trade Commission had given a glowing endorsement of OnDoc, predicting that OnDoc would have 175,000 customers by the end of fiscal year 2019;

(f) On or about November 4, 2018, Wilson represented to Mitzi that, if she would invest in OnDoc, her son would be awarded a finder's fee equal to a 2.5% shareholding interest in OnDoc. Upon information and belief, Wilson never had any intention of awarding Mitzi's son a finder's fee and never did;

(g) Wilson provided Mitzi with a Confidential Private Placement Memorandum dated November 4, 2018 in which he represented:

- (i) That OnDoc was soliciting the purchase of "up to 50,000 Shares of Common Stock at \$2.00 per share" even though Wilson knew that OnDoc was a limited liability company whose ownership was represented by membership interests, not shares of common stock;
- (ii) That OnDoc was initially capitalized by, among other things, a \$100,000 capital investment by Wilson;
- (iii) That an individual named Leslie Siegel owned 50,000 shares of OnDoc common stock when no person owned any "stock" in OnDoc and, upon information and belief, Leslie Siegel never owned any "stock" or even any membership interest in OnDoc;
- (iv) That other individuals, including Wilson, also owned shares of OnDoc "stock" when no person owned any "stock" in OnDoc;
- (v) That OnDoc had a board of "directors" who would serve "until their successors have been elected or qualified at an annual

shareholders' meeting when, in fact, OnDoc did not operate with a board of directors and, for the reasons previously stated, the board would never be elected by any OnDoc "shareholders."

(h) On November 14, 2018, Wilson represented that Leslie Siegel was a "board member" of OnDoc, which was not true;

(i) On November 14, 2018, Wilson represented to Mitzi that Mark and Shannon Williams had invested in OnDoc. Upon information and belief, Mark and Shannon Wilson have never invested in OnDoc.

(j) On or about November 15, 2018, Wilson provided Mitzi with a Unit Purchase Agreement in which he:

(a) Warranted and represented in various places that he owned common stock in OnDoc, "is a Shareholder in OnDoc, LLC, who is the record owner of outstanding share of the capital stock of OnDoc, LLC" and the like;

(b) Represented that, following Mitzi's purchase of OnDoc "stock," Mitzi would receive "certificates representing the Corporation's Shares".

(k) On November 18, 2018, Wilson provided Mitzi with a *different* Confidential Private Placement Memorandum in which he:

(i) Misrepresented in various places that OnDoc had issued common stock and was offering shares of that stock for sale;

(ii) Repeated the misrepresentation that he had invested \$100,000;

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.