

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO

STATE OF OHIO ex rel.)	
ATTORNEY GENERAL)	
DAVE YOST)	Case No: 24CV006513
)	
)	Judge: KIM J. BROWN
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	
)	
FIRST PREMIER HOME WARRANTY)	<u>CONSENT JUDGMENT AND</u>
CORP., <i>et al.</i>)	<u>FINAL AGREED ENTRY AND</u>
)	<u>ORDER WITH DEFENDANTS</u>
Defendants.)	
)	

PREAMBLE

This matter came upon the filing of a Complaint by Plaintiff, the Attorney General of Ohio, charging Defendants First Premier Home Warranty Corp. ("FPHW") and Albert H. Sayegh ("Sayegh") with violations of the Ohio Consumer Sales Practices Act ("CSPA"), R.C. 1345.01 *et seq.*, and its Substantive Rules, Ohio Adm.Code 109:4-3-01 *et seq.*, and the Telephone Solicitation Sales Act ("TSSA"), R.C. 4719.01 *et seq.* Plaintiff and Defendants have agreed to settle and resolve the matters contained herein and all claims alleged against Defendants.

By signing this Consent Judgment, Defendants submit to the personal jurisdiction of this Court, consent to the entry of this Consent Judgment and Final Agreed Entry and Order ("Consent Judgment") pursuant to R.C. 1345.07(F), to the imposition of this Consent Judgment, and to the rights of Plaintiff to enforce this Consent Judgment.

RECEIVED
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OHIO

OCT 30 2025

CONSUMER PROTECTION SECTION
PUBLIC INSPECTION FILE

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Defendant FPHW is a foreign corporation formed in King County, New York on January 13, 2020. Upon information and belief, Defendant FPHW's principal place of business is 2918 Avenue R, Brooklyn, New York 11129.
2. Defendant FPHW is not registered to do business with the Ohio Secretary of State.
3. Defendant Sayegh is a natural person who resides in Brooklyn, New York.
4. Defendant Sayegh is the owner and president of Defendant FPHW.
5. Defendant Sayegh directed, supervised, approved, formulated, authorized, ratified, benefited from, and/or otherwise participated in the acts and practices of Defendant FPHW.
6. Defendants market and sell residential "home warranty" service plans in Ohio and nationwide under the name First Premier Home Warranty ("FPHW Plans").
7. Defendants have sold FPHW Plans to Ohio consumers since at least 2021.
8. Defendants advertise FPHW Plans to Ohio residents to encourage them to enter into home service contracts for repairs and services on their homes in Ohio.
9. Defendants advertise FPHW Plans to Ohio real estate agents so they will induce Ohio residents to enter into home service contracts for repairs and services on their homes in Ohio.
10. Defendants advertise FPHW Plans on the website, <https://firstpremierhomewarranty.com/>.
11. Defendants maintain an FPHW Facebook page and advertise through a variety of online platforms that advertise home warranties to consumers.

12. In marketing and selling services to consumers online, Defendants, after inviting consumers to call First Premier, made sales pitches to them via telephone, including sometimes offering a special price reduction
13. Consumers seeking information from Defendants are prompted to provide their contact information, including their home zip code, into a form on Defendants' website. Upon receiving this information from consumers, Defendants email consumers with FPHW Plan information.
14. Defendants' email directs consumers to call for a "Limited Discount Rate."
15. Defendants have never obtained a certificate of registration to be a telephone solicitor from the Ohio Attorney General's Office.
16. Defendants have never obtained and filed a copy of a surety bond with the Ohio Attorney General's Office, in connection with being a telephone solicitor.
17. Defendants charge consumers for the purchase of a FPHW Plan without first providing consumers with a notice of cancellation or obtaining copies of signed, written confirmations of sales. Consumers receive copies of the FPHW Plan after the sales call and after payment is made.
18. Defendants represent that the FPHW Plan is a home warranty, when in fact it is a home service contract, which is substantially different from a home warranty, though consumers are not familiar with the distinction.
19. Defendants disclose in their contract, that "FPHW offers home service contracts, which are not warranties"; however, a copy of the contract that includes the aforementioned

disclosure and terms and conditions regarding the cancellation/refund policies is not provided to Consumers until after they have signed up and paid for the product.

20. Defendants provide consumers with a 30-day cancellation period in the FPHW Plan; however, consumers allege they are not orally informed of the cancellation period on the sales call.
21. On their website, Defendants provide information regarding the difference between Homeowners Insurance and a Home Warranty; however, the FPHW Plans sold are neither of those products, but rather are home service contracts.
22. Defendants charge consumers between \$400 and \$650 a year for a FPHW Plan.
23. In some instances, consumers complained that they purchased FPHW Plans and when the term expired Defendants attempted to automatically renew their accounts if consumers did not take affirmative action to cancel the agreement.
24. Consumers must pay a service call fee for *each* service request. The amount of the service fee is not reimbursed.
25. Defendants' website states "pay your service call fee and manage your claim online. We'll try to have a technician to you within 24-48 hours."
26. In contrast to this representation, Defendants disclose in the fine print of the FPHW Plan contracts that "In some circumstances, it could take more than forty-eight (48) hours for a service provider to accept the request"; however, a copy of the contract including the aforementioned disclosure is not provided to the consumer until after they have signed up and paid for the product.
27. To submit a claim, consumers are instructed to do so by phone or online.

28. To schedule a service appointment, after the consumer submits a claim, Defendants will assign a service technician to the claim. Defendants will then provide the consumer with the service technician's contact information so that they can schedule an appointment with the service technician directly.
29. Consumers complained to the Ohio Attorney General's Office that sometimes it takes days or weeks to have a service technician dispatched to provide a diagnosis and/or repair.
30. Defendants' website contains lists of what the FPHW Plans cover.
31. In reality, the FPHW online representations regarding FPHW Plan coverage do not identify the coverage limitations.
32. Defendants offer two separate FPHW Plans – a "Premier" plan and a "Platinum" plan. Defendants also offer optional add-ons to their plans, such as Pool/Spa, Well Pump, Central Vacuum, Limited Roof Leak, etc.
33. The general coverage representations made by Defendants are inconsistent with the fine print in some of the FPHW Plans.
34. Consumers complained to the Ohio Attorney General's Office that even when a certain appliance is "covered" under their FPHW Plan, many times various component parts of the appliance are not covered per the fine print.
35. Many of the more expensive appliances or household components that are covered under an FPHW Plan are subject to a maximum payout per contract term, which is sometimes far lower than the typical cost of diagnosis, repair, or replacement.

36. The FPHW Plan Home Service Agreement also states, “We reserve the right to offer cash back in lieu of repair or replacement in the amount of Our actual cost, which at times may be less than retail, to repair or replace any covered system, component, or appliance.”
37. The Ohio Attorney General’s Office received consumer complaints alleging that when a covered item failed, Defendants refused to replace the system and/or appliance and instead offered an inadequate cash payment pursuant to the term above.
38. The Ohio Attorney General’s Office received consumer complaints alleging that when Defendants agreed to provide a coverage payment or reimbursement, Defendants failed to provide payment in a timely manner.
39. In some instances, consumers complained that Defendants failed to comply with the cancellation terms in the FPHW Plan and failed to provide refunds when consumers canceled the plan because of dissatisfaction with coverage.
40. In some instances, consumers complained that Defendants charged consumers cancellation fees not included in the contract.
41. Defendants advertise on their website that the FPHW Plan has positive ratings across several platforms, including Google, USA Today, Forbes, and Investopedia.
42. Defendants misrepresented what these reliable sources are saying about FPHW Plans and cannot substantiate the representations they include on the website.
43. Defendants posed as consumers on internet review platforms and posted fictitious positive reviews about the FPHW services and plans.
44. Defendants also engaged their family members to pose as consumers and posted fictitious positive reviews about the FPHW's services and plans.

45. The Ohio Attorney General's Office received consumer complaints alleging that Defendants refused to process claims until the consumer agreed to remove their negative reviews.
46. The Ohio Attorney General's Office received a vendor complaint that Defendants required the prospective subcontractor service technicians to leave 5-star reviews for Defendants' business prior to being hired as a vendor.
47. In some instances, service technicians subcontracted by Defendants have left positive reviews stating in the review that they are trying to become service providers for Defendants.
48. The Ohio Attorney General's Office received complaints alleging that Defendants required consumers to agree to remove negative reviews prior to processing their request to cancel services.
49. Defendants have posted fictitious positive reviews about Defendant FPHW to provide consumers with false confidence in Defendants' FPHW Plans.
50. Defendants failed to accurately and timely respond to consumer complaints made to Defendants, the Attorney General's Office, or to the Better Business Bureau.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

51. The Attorney General is the proper party to commence these proceedings under the authority vested in him by R.C. 1345.07 and by virtue of his statutory and common law authority to protect the interests of the citizens of the State of Ohio.
52. Jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action lies with this Court pursuant to R.C. 1345.04.

53. This Court has venue to hear this case pursuant to Ohio Civ.R. 3(C)(1) and (3).
54. Defendants are each a “supplier,” as that term is defined in R.C. 1345.01(C), as they engaged in the business of effecting and soliciting “consumer transactions” by soliciting individual consumers in the State of Ohio to enter into transactions for “home warranty” services for purposes that are primarily personal, family or household within the meaning specified in R.C. 1345.01(A).
55. Defendants are each a “telephone solicitor,” as that term is defined in R.C. 4719.01(A)(8), as they were, at all times relevant herein, engaged in telephone solicitations to persons in Ohio.
56. Defendants committed acts or practices in violation of the CSPA, R.C. 1345.01 *et seq.*, its Substantive Rules, Ohio Adm.Code 109:4-3-01 *et seq.*, and the TSSA, R.C. 4719.01 *et seq.*
57. Defendants committed acts or practices in violation of the CSPA, R.C. 1345.02(A), by engaging in inadequate and unfair customer service practices.
58. Defendants committed acts or practices in violation of the CSPA, R.C. 1345.02(A) and R.C. 1345.02(B)(1), by representing that the subject of a consumer transaction has sponsorship, approval, performance characteristics, accessories, uses, or benefits that it does not have.
59. Defendants committed acts or practices in violation of the CSPA, R.C. 1345.02(A) and R.C. 1345.02(B)(8), by representing that a specific price advantage exists, if it does not.
60. Defendants committed acts or practices in violation of the CSPA, R.C. 1345.02(A) and R.C. 1345.02(B)(10), by representing that a consumer transaction involves a warranty if the representation is false.

61. Defendants committed acts or practices in violation of the CSPA, R.C. 1345.02(A), by fabricating false positive reviews or requiring third parties to make fabricated positive reviews regarding their goods and services.
62. Defendants committed acts or practices in violation of the CSPA, R.C. 1345.02(A) and R.C. 1345.03(B)(3), by entering into service contracts where some consumers may not receive a substantial benefit from the contracts.
63. Defendants committed acts or practices in violation of the CSPA, R.C. 1345.02(A) and R.C. 1345.03(B)(5), by entering into service contracts on terms that may be construed as one-sided in favor of the Defendants.
64. Defendants committed acts or practices in violation of the Exclusions and Limitations in Advertisements Rule, Ohio Adm.Code 109:4-3-02(A), and the CSPA, R.C. 1345.02(A), by advertising service contracts for sale and failing to clearly and conspicuously disclose, in close proximity to the words stating the offer, all material exclusions, reservations, limitations, modifications, or conditions of such offers.
65. Defendants committed acts or practices in violation of the CSPA, R.C. 1345.02(A), by representing, directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, that certain reviews regarding Defendants' products or services were truthful reviews by actual users of the Defendants' products and services, when such reviews were not truthful reviews by actual users of the Defendants' products and services, but instead were posted by individuals connected to the business or third parties who were solicited to generate reviews.

66. Defendants committed acts or practices in violation of the TSSA, R.C. 4719.01, by acting as a telephone solicitor without first obtaining a certificate of registration from the Ohio Attorney General.
67. Defendants committed acts or practices in violation of the TSSA, R.C. 4719.01, by submitting charges to consumer purchasers' bank or credit card accounts without first either providing a notice of cancellation or obtaining from them original copies of signed, written confirmations complying with R.C. 4719.07(F) and (G) or meeting the requirements under R.C. 4719.07(H) for being exempt from doing so.

COMPLIANCE PROVISIONS

68. Defendants shall not violate the CSPA, R.C. 1345.01 *et seq.*, and its Substantive Rules, Ohio Adm.Code 109:4-3-01 *et seq.*, and the TSSA, R.C. 4719.01 *et seq.* Specifically, this provision includes, but is not limited to, prohibiting Defendants from doing the following:
 - a. Fabricating false positive reviews or soliciting third parties to make fabricated positive reviews;
 - b. Requiring or asking third parties to make positive reviews in order to become a vendor or employee with FPHW;
 - c. Requiring consumers to remove their reviews of FPHW to receive any benefit under their service contract from FPHW;
 - d. Using "cash in lieu" clause to avoid paying claims despite the consumer using a technician assigned by FPHW; and
 - e. Charging cancellation fees not described in the contract.

69. Defendants shall comply with the CSPA, R.C. 1345.01 *et seq.*, and its Substantive Rules, Ohio Adm.Code 109:4-3-01 *et seq.* and the TSSA, R.C. 4719.01 *et seq.* Specifically, this provision includes, but is not limited to, requiring Defendants to do the following:
- a. Honor the cancellation terms in the contract and in Defendants' advertising;
 - b. When a consumer requests to cancel their FPHW policy via phone, Defendants shall notify the consumer orally of any action the consumer needs to take to cancel their policy in conjunction with the terms of the FPHW policy;
 - c. Clearly and conspicuously disclose all materials terms and conditions to the FPHW Plans on FPHW's website, including, but not limited to, adding exemplar contracts to the website for consumers' review prior to purchase;
 - d. Clearly and conspicuously disclose on the FPHW website and in FPHW contracts, and in any FPHW advertising, that Defendants offer home services contracts, not home warranties;
 - e. Clearly and conspicuously explain on the FPHW website, in FPHW contracts, and in any FPHW advertising, the difference between home services contracts and home warranties;
 - f. Clearly and conspicuously disclose on their website to accurately reflect the days Defendants are closed for business and not available for customer service; and
 - g. Substantiate all claims, representations, and reviews made in FPHW advertising.
70. Defendants shall timely and in good faith respond to and negotiate a reasonable resolution to any consumer complaints filed with the Ohio Attorney General's Office or the Better Business Bureau ("BBB").

71. Defendants shall, within 30 days of receipt of a consumer's request to cancel their FPHW policy, issue a refund to the consumer on the consumer's original method of payment or alternative method agreed to by the consumer.
72. Defendants shall, within 30 days of receipt of a signed agreement from a consumer regarding the cash in lieu amount offered by Defendants, issue payment for the cash in lieu amount in the agreement.
73. Within 60 days of the entry of this Consent Judgment, Defendants shall implement a cancellation fee policy that only includes cancellation fees that are described in the contract and are reasonably related to the costs incurred by the Defendants. This policy shall apply and be disseminated to all current customers of Defendants and be applicable to current and future contracts. However, if a customer's current contract does not include a cancellation fee, a cancellation fee, in compliance with the new policy, shall not be imposed on that customer.
74. Within 60 days of the entry of this Consent Judgment, Defendants shall implement a record retention policy. Defendants shall maintain all electronic mail communications for a period of 3 years. Defendants shall maintain a copy of all advertisements for a period of 3 years.
75. Within 60 days of the entry of this Consent Judgment, Defendants shall remove from all public platforms that they maintain, control, or supervise, any and all misleading business information, unsubstantiated claims, and fake or unverified reviews or testimonials for FPHW. For purposes of this paragraph:
 - a. Public platforms that Defendants maintain, control, or supervise include, but are not limited to, FPHW's website (<https://firstpremierhomewarranty.com/>), and any of

FPHW's social media pages.

- b. Fake or unverified reviews or testimonials include, but are not limited to, reviews or testimonials that are not made by FPHW's customers (e.g. FPHW employees) or FPHW-contracted service technicians, such as copies or alterations of reviews previously posted by customers of other home warranty companies, fake testimonials provided by online reputation companies, fake reviews connected to any network of fabricated review sellers operating online, reviews posted by prospective technicians who are not actual FPHW vendors, and reviews posted by FPHW-contracted service technicians that have no experience as an FPHW customer. If Defendants cannot verify that a particular review is from an FPHW customer or that a review by a technician or prospective technician was not a review solicited by Defendants, Defendants must remove it.
 - c. Misleading business information includes, but is not limited to, false information about FPHW's years in business (as measured by when FPHW began providing home warranty services in 2020), incorrect information about the identity of FPHW's owners and officers, incorrect statements about customer/review ratings, and incorrect statements about FPHW's accreditations, certifications, or awards.
76. Within 60 days of the entry of this Consent Judgment, Defendants shall contact all third-party platforms as defined in subpart (a) of this paragraph and that Defendants otherwise know disseminate business information about FPHW and ask that those platforms remove from their websites and other publications any misleading business information about FPHW or correct FPHW's business information as needed. For purposes of this paragraph:

- a. Third-party platforms include, but are not limited to, the BBB, Facebook, Instagram, Google, USA Today, Investopedia, Forbes, Consumer Affairs, Top10.com, Best Home Warranty Online, 360 U.S. News, Home Advisor, USA Today, The Top1- Sites, Review Home Warranties, and 2024 Top Ranked Home Warranties;
 - b. Misleading business information includes, but is not limited to, the following: unsubstantiated consumer reviews, reviews from individuals FPHW cannot substantiate as FPHW consumers, false information about FPHW's years in business (as measured by when FPHW began providing home warranty services in 2020), incorrect information about the identity of FPHW's owners and officers, incorrect statements about customer/review ratings, and incorrect statements about FPHW's accreditations, certifications, or awards.
77. Within 60 days of the entry of this Consent Judgment, Defendants shall contact all third-party platforms as defined in subpart (a) of this paragraph and that Defendants otherwise know disseminate customer reviews about FPHW and ask that those platforms remove from their websites and other publications all identified fake and unverified customer reviews for FPHW. For purposes of this paragraph:
- a. Third-party platforms include, but are not limited to, the BBB, Google, TrustPilot, Instagram, Consumer Affairs, and Home Advisor;
 - b. Fake or unverified reviews or testimonials include, but are not limited to, reviews or testimonials that are not made by FPHW's customers or FPHW-contracted service technicians, such as copies or alterations of reviews previously posted by customers of other home warranty companies, fake testimonials provided by online reputation

ENJOINED from engaging in the acts or practices of which Plaintiff complains and from further violating the CSPA, R.C. 1345.01 *et seq.*, its Substantive Rules, Ohio Adm.Code 109:4-3-01 *et seq.*, and the TSSA, R.C. 4719.01 *et seq.*

- C. Defendants are ORDERED, jointly and severally liable, to pay, pursuant to R.C. 1345.07(B), consumer damages in the total amount of \$23,617.70 to the Consumer Protection Section of the Ohio Attorney General's Office, to be deposited into the Consumer Protection Section's holding account for distribution to consumers as indicated on Addendum A. The consumer damages amount shall be paid in full by October 16, 2025.
- D. Defendants are ORDERED, pursuant to R.C. 1345.07(D), jointly and severally liable to pay a civil penalty to the Ohio Attorney General's office in the total amount of \$100,000.00. \$30,000.00 of the civil penalty shall be suspended upon full and timely compliance with all terms of this Consent Judgment. The remaining amount of \$70,000.00 shall be deposited into the Consumer Protection Enforcement Fund, with one-fourth of the amount to the Franklin County Treasurer, per R.C. 1345.07(G). The civil penalty shall be paid as follows: \$30,000 shall be paid by November 30, 2025, and the remainder paid in full on or before January 31, 2026.
- E. It is further ORDERED that if Defendants' financial representations and statements to the Attorney General are found to have been inaccurate or if Defendants fail to make any payments due under this Consent Judgment, all remaining payments, including the full civil penalty amount of \$100,00.00 shall immediately become due and payable by Defendants. If Defendants fail to make any payment required by this Consent Judgment,

companies, reviews provided by FPHW employees, fake reviews connected to any network of fabricated review sellers operating online, reviews posted by prospective technicians who are not actual FPHW vendors, and reviews posted by FPHW-contracted service technicians that have no experience as an FPHW customer. If Defendants cannot verify that a particular review is from an FPHW customer or that a review by a technician or prospective technician is not a review solicited by Defendants, Defendants must remove it.

78. Unless stated otherwise, within 60 days of the entry of this Consent Judgment, Defendants shall update their website to comply with all terms of this Consent Judgment.
79. Within 90 days of the entry of this Consent Judgment, Defendants must provide the Attorney General's Office a document signed and sworn under a penalty of perjury by all Defendants or their individual representative detailing the steps taken to comply with paragraphs 68 through 78.

ORDER

- A. The Court hereby DECLARES that the acts and practices described above violate the CSPA, R.C. 1345.01 *et seq.*, its Substantive Rules, Ohio Adm.Code 109:4-3-01 *et seq.*, and the TSSA, R.C. 4719.01 *et seq.*, in the manner set forth in the Complaint.
- B. Defendants, doing business under the names First Premier Home Warranty Corp., First Premier Home Warranty, or any other name(s), their agents, partners, representatives, salespersons, employees, successors and assigns and all persons acting in concert and participation with them, directly or indirectly, through any corporate device, partnership or association, in connection with any consumer transaction, are hereby PERMANENTLY

Defendants agree to cease selling FPHW Plans to Ohio consumers until all due payments are made in full to Plaintiff.

- F. Payment shall be made to the Attorney General's Office via a certified check or money order, made payable to the "Ohio Attorney General's Office" and delivered to:

Financial Specialist
Consumer Protection Section
Office of the Ohio Attorney General
30 East Broad Street, 14th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

- G. It is further ORDERED that the acceptance of any payment by the Plaintiff subsequent to the time it is due or the failure of the Plaintiff to insist on strict performance of any order contained within this Consent Judgment, shall not be construed as a waiver of any of the obligations created by this Consent Judgment.
- H. It is further ORDERED that in the event the Ohio Attorney General must initiate legal action or incur any costs to compel Defendants to abide by this Consent Judgment, Defendants shall be liable to the Ohio Attorney General, should the Ohio Attorney General prevail, for all related enforcement costs, including, but not limited to, a reasonable sum for attorneys' fees, investigative costs, and interest and collection costs as permitted by statute.
- I. Defendants shall not represent, directly or indirectly, that the Ohio Attorney General has sanctioned, condoned, or approved of any part or aspects of their business operations.
- J. Defendants are ORDERED to pay all court costs associated with this matter.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

JOINTLY APPROVED FOR ENTRY AND SUBMITTED BY:


DAVE YOST
Attorney General

/s/ Teresa A. Heffernan
Teresa Heffernan (0080732)
Paige Weinstein (0098371)
Assistant Attorneys General
Counsel for Plaintiff, State of Ohio
Consumer Protection Section
30 East Broad Street, 14th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Phone: 614-466-8157
Teresa.Heffernan@ohioago.gov
Paige.Weinstein@ohioago.gov

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS:

/s/ Manuel D. Cardona
Manuel D. Cardona
Counsel for Defendants
Dickinson Wright
180 E. Broad Street, Suite 2400
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Phone: 614-591-5468
mcardona@dickinsonwright.com

DEFENDANTS:



Albert H. Sayegh
Date: 9-25-25

FIRST PREMIER HOME WARRANTY CORP.
By: ALBERT SAYEGH
Title: Pres.
Date: 9-25-25

ADDENDUM A

Last Name	First Name	Restitution Amount
Alhilu	Zaid	\$185.00
Asad	Thahbia	\$500.00
Ayed	Hasan	\$2,628.00
Case	Ken	\$119.79
Curren	Jennill	\$250.00
Ellenwood	Karen	\$97.98
Foster	Amy	\$565.63
Helms	Jerrod	\$598.81
Hickling	Bonnie	\$434.00
Higgins	Candace	\$60.00
Huff	Kelly	\$1,950.00
Hughes	Byron	\$1,950.00
Hurst	Catherine	\$2,116.23
Jorgensen	Randall	\$1,257.57
Kozel	Michael	\$1,500.00
Levo	Susan	\$1,230.67
Littlefield	Emaly	\$1,551.06
Littlefield	Carla	\$488.84
Lloyd	Joseph	\$543.28
Lowe	James	\$569.24
Macias	Michael	\$639.89
Madden	David	\$479.00
Matasic	Margaret	\$633.00
McCoy	Karen	\$175.00
Medley	Shawyne	\$360.00
Robinson	Marlon	\$179.86
Scott	Willie	\$217.00
Shabazz	Habeebah	\$37.01
Sisco	Peggy	\$482.00
Williams	Christina	\$1,064.00
Worthy	James	\$217.00
Young	Angel	\$537.84

TOTAL RESTITUTION \$23,617.70

Franklin County Court of Common Pleas

Date: 10-30-2025
Case Title: STATE OF OHIO EX REL ATTORNEY GENERAL YO -VS- FIRST
PREMIER HOME WARRANTY CORP ET AL
Case Number: 24CV006513
Type: CONSENT JUDGMENT

It Is So Ordered.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Brown', is written over a circular official seal. The seal contains the text 'FRANKLIN COUNTY OHIO' and 'ALL THINGS ARE MADE BY MEASUREMENT'.

/s/ Judge Kim Brown

Court Disposition

Case Number: 24CV006513

Case Style: STATE OF OHIO EX REL ATTORNEY GENERAL YO -
VS- FIRST PREMIER HOME WARRANTY CORP ET AL

Case Terminated: 18 - Other Terminations

Final Appealable Order: Yes