

NOTICE OF FILING

This document was lodged electronically in the FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA (FCA) on 3/04/2020 4:49:30 PM AEDT and has been accepted for filing under the Court's Rules. Details of filing follow and important additional information about these are set out below.

Details of Filing

Document Lodged: Concise Statement
File Number: VID228/2020
File Title: AUSTRALIAN SECURITIES & INVESTMENTS COMMISSION v
MAYFAIR WEALTH PARTNERS PTY LTD & ORS
Registry: VICTORIA REGISTRY - FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA



Dated: 6/04/2020 10:13:07 AM AEST

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Sia Lagos'.

Registrar

Important Information

As required by the Court's Rules, this Notice has been inserted as the first page of the document which has been accepted for electronic filing. It is now taken to be part of that document for the purposes of the proceeding in the Court and contains important information for all parties to that proceeding. It must be included in the document served on each of those parties.

The date and time of lodgment also shown above are the date and time that the document was received by the Court. Under the Court's Rules the date of filing of the document is the day it was lodged (if that is a business day for the Registry which accepts it and the document was received by 4.30 pm local time at that Registry) or otherwise the next working day for that Registry.



Form NCF1

Concise Statement

No. _____ of 2020

Federal Court of Australia

District Registry: Victoria

Division: General

IN THE MATTER OF MAYFAIR WEALTH PARTNERS PTY LTD

ACN 168 878 779

AUSTRALIAN SECURITIES AND INVESTMENTS COMMISSION

Plaintiff

MAYFAIR WEALTH PARTNERS PTY LTD AND OTHERS

Defendants

A. IMPORTANT FACTS GIVING RISE TO THE CLAIM

1. The First Defendant, Mayfair Wealth Partners Pty Ltd trading as Mayfair Platinum (**Mayfair**), promotes financial products, being promissory notes called “M+ Fixed Income Notes” and “M Core Fixed Income Notes”, to investors in Australia (the **Mayfair Products**). The Second Defendant, M101 Holdings Pty Ltd (**M101 Holdings**), issues the M+ Fixed Income Notes. The Third Defendant, M101 Nominees Pty Ltd (**M101 Nominees**), issues the M Core Fixed Income Notes.
2. The Fourth Defendant, Online Investments Pty Ltd trading as Mayfair 101 (**Online Investments**), participates in the marketing of the Mayfair Products. Online Investments is the holding company of Mayfair and operates a website (www.termdepositguide.com) which promotes and markets the Mayfair Products.
3. The application form for the M+ Fixed Income Notes referred to providing a “Fixed Income ... term-based investment opportunity.”

Filed on behalf of (name & role of party)	Australian Securities and Investments Commission, the plaintiff		
Prepared by (name of person/lawyer)	Hugh Copley, Litigation Counsel		
Law firm (if applicable)			
Tel	(07) 3867 4892	Fax	1300 935 075
Email	hugh.copley@asic.gov.au		
Address for service	Level 20, 240 Queen Street, Brisbane Qld 4000		
(include state and postcode)	Attention: Hugh Copley		

4. The application form for the M Core Fixed Income Notes described the product as “secured promissory notes” and referred to it as a “Fixed Income ... secured, asset-backed, term-based investment opportunity”.
5. The Mayfair Products are and were during the Relevant Period (being from 3 July 2019) marketed and promoted by the defendants in a number of ways, including via Mayfair’s websites www.mayfairplatinum.com.au and www.mayfair101.com, as well as the website www.termdepositguide.com, newspaper advertising and online advertising, including the use of sponsored link internet advertising with specific ‘adwords’.
6. The marketing and promotional material for the Mayfair Products included the following words and expressions:
 - (a) “term deposit alternative”;
 - (b) “term investment” and “fixed term”;
 - (c) “certainty” and “confidence”; and / or
 - (d) “capital growth”.
7. The sponsored link internet advertising is conducted via the Google AdWords program and Bing Ads program, and included the use of:
 - (a) meta-title tags such as “term deposit rates – best term deposit options”;
 - (b) domain names such as “term deposit guide”; and
 - (c) ‘adwords’ for sponsored searches including “bank deposits” and “term deposits”.
8. The Mayfair Products were marketed to wholesale but inexperienced investors, at least a substantial subset of whom were unlikely to understand the significant risk associated with the Mayfair Products.
9. By engaging in the conduct in paragraphs 2 to 8, the defendants, in the course of trade or commerce, made representations to consumers that the Mayfair Products were comparable to, and of similar risk profile to, bank term deposits (**Bank Term Deposit Representations**).
10. The Bank Term Deposit Representations were as to future matters and the defendants did not have reasonable grounds for making them. In this regard, ASIC relies on s 12BB of the *Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act*

2001 (Cth) (**ASIC Act**) and s 769C of the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) (**Corporations Act**).

11. Alternatively, the Bank Term Deposit Representations were false, misleading or deceptive or likely to mislead or deceive consumers because:
 - (a) the Mayfair Products are debentures and dissimilar in nature and risk profile to bank term deposits;
 - (b) the Mayfair Products are not sufficiently similar to a term deposit for the purposes of comparison;
 - (c) the Mayfair Products have a significantly higher risk profile than bank term deposits;
 - (d) the Mayfair Products lack the prudential regulations that apply to bank term deposits;
 - (e) the Mayfair Products are not the subject of any bank or other guarantee;
 - (f) investors in the Mayfair Products might not receive interest and / or capital repayments;
 - (g) at maturity and after a valid withdrawal notice, Mayfair could elect to extend time for repayment to investors for an indefinite period of time.
12. By engaging in the conduct in paragraphs 2 to 8, the defendants, in the course of trade or commerce, made representations to consumers that on maturity the principal would be repaid in full (**Repayment Representation**).
13. The Repayment Representation was as to a future matter and the defendants did not have reasonable grounds for making it. ASIC refers to and repeats paragraph 10.
14. In the alternative to paragraph 13, the Repayment Representation was false, misleading or deceptive or likely to mislead or deceive consumers because:
 - (a) investors in the Mayfair Products might not receive capital repayments at maturity or at all; and
 - (b) at maturity and even after a valid withdrawal notice, Mayfair could elect to extend time for repayment to investors for an indefinite period of time.

15. The marketing and promotional material for the Mayfair Products included statements that the products were specifically designed for investors seeking “certainty and confidence in their investments”.
16. By engaging in the conduct in paragraph 15, the defendants, in the course of trade or commerce, made representations to consumers that the Mayfair Products carried no risk of default (**No Risk of Default Representations**).
17. The No Risk of Default Representations were as to future matters and the defendants did not have reasonable grounds for making them. ASIC refers to and repeats paragraph 10.
18. In the alternative to paragraph 17, the No Risk of Default Representations were false, misleading or deceptive or likely to mislead or deceive consumers because:
 - (a) investors in the Mayfair Products may not receive interest and / or capital repayments,
 - (b) at maturity and after a valid withdrawal notice, Mayfair could elect to extend time for repayment to investors for an indefinite period of time;
 - (c) investors could lose some or all of their principal investment;
 - (d) the matters set out in paragraph 11 above.
19. The marketing and promotional material for the Mayfair Products included statements that the Mayfair Products provided “income and capital growth opportunities”.
20. By engaging in the conduct in paragraph 19, the defendants, in the course of trade or commerce, made representations to consumers that the Mayfair Products provided capital growth opportunities (**Capital Growth Representations**).
21. The Capital Growth Representations were as to future matters and the defendants did not have reasonable grounds for making them. ASIC refers to and repeats paragraph 10.
22. In the alternative to paragraph 21, the Capital Growth Representations were false, misleading or deceptive or likely to mislead or deceive consumers because the Mayfair Products carried no capital growth opportunities for investors.

B. RELIEF SOUGHT FROM THE COURT

23. ASIC seeks:

- (a) declarations of contravention against the defendants as set out in its Originating Process;
- (b) orders pursuant to ss 12GBA and 12GBCA of the ASIC Act that the defendants each pay a pecuniary penalty in respect of their contraventions of s 12DB(1)(a) and (e) in such amount as the Court considers appropriate;
- (c) orders pursuant to s 12GD(1) of the ASIC Act and / or s 1101B and / or s 1324 of the Corporations Act restraining the defendants from publishing the false, misleading or deceptive statements comprised of the:
 - i. Bank Term Deposit Representations, being representations to consumers that the Mayfair Products are comparable to, and of similar risk profile to, bank term deposits;
 - ii. Repayment Representations, being representations to consumers that on maturity the principal would be repaid in full;
 - iii. No Risk of Default Representations, being representations to consumers that the Mayfair Products carried no risk of default; and
 - iv. Capital Growth Representations, being representations to consumers that the Mayfair Products provided capital growth opportunities.
- (d) orders pursuant to s 12GLA(2)(c) and (d) and s 12GLB(1) of the ASIC Act requiring the defendants to make corrective disclosures and to publish corrective advertising;
- (e) costs; and
- (f) such further or other relief that the Court considers appropriate.

C. PRIMARY LEGAL GROUNDS FOR RELIEF

24. By engaging in the conduct described above, the defendants contravened s 1041H(1) of the Corporations Act and ss 12DA(1) and 12DB(1)(a) and (e) of the ASIC Act.

D. ALLEGED HARM

25. The Mayfair Products were marketed to inexperienced investors and exposed investors to a greater level of risk than bank term deposits.
26. For the M+ Fixed Income Notes, as at 1 April 2020:

- (a) 185 investors have invested;
- (b) the total amount invested is \$72,959,818.00;
- (c) 63 investors have reinvested their funds at the end of the investment term (representing \$13,913,129.90);
- (d) 16 investors have redeemed their investment (representing \$3,978,531.76); and
- (e) 12 investors have not been able to redeem their investments at the maturity date (representing \$4,400,428.69).

27. For the M Core Fixed Income Notes, as at 1 April 2020:

- (a) 96 investors have invested;
- (b) The total amount invested is \$67,587,852.07;
- (c) no investors have reinvested their funds at the end of the investment term;
- (d) 6 investors have redeemed their investment (representing \$1,603,879.87); and
- (e) No investors have not been able to redeem their investments at the maturity date.

Date: 3 April 2020

This concise statement was prepared by J P Moore QC and C van Proctor of Counsel.



Signed by Hugh Copley

Solicitor for the Plaintiff

Certificate of lawyer

I, Hugh Copley, certify to the Court that, in relation to the Concise Statement filed on behalf of the Plaintiff, the factual and legal material available to me at present provides a proper basis for each allegation in the pleading.

Date: 3 April 2020



Signed by Hugh Copley

Lawyer for the Plaintiff