On Reddit, Alexis Martin Neely claimed her business is not a franchise. However, because she offers a system replicating franchise benefits - which includes providing "significant assistance" - the business legally meets the FTC's franchise criteria, regardless of whether that assistance is ultimately delivered.

Furthermore, franchises *are* independent businesses. They are separate legal entities that pay to use a parent company's brand and operating system. Saying a business isn't a franchise because it's independent is logically incorrect, as independence is the core mechanic of the franchise model.

Neely uses flawed semantics to misstate the law. Legally, a business can be both a franchise and an independent entity; in fact, that is exactly how the franchise model works, making the independence of PFL firms entirely irrelevant. Furthermore, whether a business is a franchise depends entirely on what is offered at the time of sale, not whether the buyer ultimately adopts the branding or follows the system.

As a licensed California attorney (Bar No. 212365), Ali Katz (Alexis Martin Neely) is presumed capable of reading franchise law.

It is safe to infer from her comments that she fully understands her business model meets the legal definition of a franchise, yet she deliberately chooses to misstate the law anyway.

> **We do not require our members to use our branding at all. We are not a franchise, though we do provide many of the benefits of a franchise, such as done for you content, done for you automation systems and the like, but we do not require our members to use our branding.** All of our PFL firm leaders are independent firms, many of whom want to use their own branding, and we encourage and support that, providing the content that can then be integrated with a lawyer's unique branding.