| 1  | Carlin Metzger (cmetzger@cftc.gov)   |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2  | Illinois Bar No. 6275516<br>Susan Gradman (sgradman@cftc.gov)  |  |  |
| 3  | Illinois Bar No. 6225060   |  |  |
| 4  | Scott R. Williamson (swilliamson@cftc.gov)<br>Illinois Bar No. 6191293                                 |  |  |
| 5  | Attorneys for Plaintiff<br>Commodity Futures Trading Commission  |  |  |
| 6  | 525 W. Monroe, Suite 1100  |  |  |
| 7  | Chicago, Illinois 60661<br>Tel. 312-596-0700; Fax 312-596-0714   |  |  |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |  |  |
| 9  | NORTHERN DISTRICT CALIFORNIA   |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |
| 11 | COMMODITY FUTURES)Case No:TRADING COMMISSION)  |  |  |
| 12 | )<br>Plaintiff, )  |  |  |
| 13 | )  |  |  |
| 14 | vs. )  |  |  |
| 15 | DENARI CAPITAL, LLC, TRAVIS )<br>CAPSON, ARNAB SARKAR, )   |  |  |
| 16 | )<br>Defendants.   |  |  |
| 17 | Defendants. )  |  |  |
| 18 | COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, CIVIL MONETARY PENALTIES,<br><u>AND OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF</u>        |  |  |
| 19 | The Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("Commission" or "CFTC"), by and through its                  |  |  |
| 20 | attorneys, hereby alleges as follows:  |  |  |
| 21 | I. <u>SUMMARY</u>  |  |  |
| 22 | 1. Since at least 2012 and continuing to the present ("Relevant Time"), Defendants Travis              |  |  |
| 23 | Capson ("Capson"), Arnab Sarkar ("Sarkar") and their company Denari Capital LLC ("Denari")             |  |  |
| 24 | (together, "Defendants") have fraudulently solicited and accepted at least \$8,300,000 from at least   |  |  |
| 25 | twenty-eight participants, whose funds were commingled in a pooled investment scheme that included     |  |  |
| 26 | leveraged or margined off exchange foreign currency ("forex") transactions. At least nine specifically |  |  |
|    | COMPLAINT – PAGE: 1  |  |  |

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 2 of 25

invested in forex transactions as part of a pooled account. At least another sixteen provided more than three million dollars to Defendants in the form of purported general loans; and certain others were told that some or all of their funds would be used for investments in real estate, a gold mining company, and/or various securities transactions.

2. Capson and Sarkar pooled and commingled participant funds into a Denari bank account and used the funds for various purposes, including at least \$1.9 million deposited into forex trading accounts, and other funds used for real estate investments, securities transactions and personal expenses. As of the end of July 2019, Denari owed its participants more than \$5,200,000, which it does not have sufficient funds or assets to satisfy.

3. As part of their fraudulent scheme, Capson and Sarkar willfully or recklessly made misrepresentations of material fact to actual and prospective participants concerning the past profitability of Denari's forex trading activity, and the profits participants were making on their interests in Denari's pooled forex account ("Pool"). Denari also issued false account statements to participants that misrepresented the profitability of their respective interests in the Pool.

4. Because Denari, Capson and Sarkar solicited funds for the purpose of trading forex in a pooled account, Denari acted as a Commodity Pool Operator ("CPO") and Capson and Sarkar acted as Associated Persons ("APs") of a CPO without being registered to act in those capacities as required by law.

5. On April 1, 2019, Denari and Capson belatedly filed with National Futures Association ("NFA") applications to become registered with the Commission as a CPO and as a Commodity Trading Advisor ("CTA"), and as an Associated Person thereof. On July 15, 2019, NFA commenced an examination of Denari based on information contained in these applications. During that examination, Capson provided false information to NFA investigators. Specifically, Capson falsely told NFA staff that Denari had been trading forex with its own money since 2015, and that Denari did not use third party funds to trade in Denari's forex trading account until after it had applied for and become registered with the Commission in May 2019.

# Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 3 of 25

| 1  | 6. By engaging in this conduct and the conduct further described herein, Defendants   |  |  |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2  | engaged, are engaging, or are about to engage in acts and practices that violate the anti-fraud and   |  |  |
| 3  | registration provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act ("Act"), 7 U.S.C. §§ 1-26 (2012), and   |  |  |
| 4  | Commission Regulations ("Regulations") promulgated thereunder, 17 C.F.R. pts. 1-190 (2019).   |  |  |
| 5  | Specifically, Defendants have:  |  |  |
| 6  | <ul> <li>(a) violated anti-fraud provisions contained in Sections 4b(a)(2)(A)-</li> <li>(C) and 4o(1)(A)-(B) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6b(a)(2)(A)-(C),</li> </ul>  |  |  |
| 7  | 6o(1)(A)-(B) (2012), and Regulation 5.2(b)(1)-(3), 17 C.F.R.<br>§ 5.2(b)(1)-(3) (2019);   |  |  |
| 8  |   |  |  |
| 9  | (b) violated the registration requirements set forth in Sections $4m(1)$ ,<br>4k(2) and $2(c)(2)(C)(iii)(I)(cc)$ of the Act, 7 U.S.C. §§ $6m(1)$ ,<br>6(k)(2) = 2(c)(2)(C)(iii)(I)(cc) (2012) and Begulation 5 $2(c)(2)(i)$ |  |  |
| 10 | 6(k)(2), $2(c)(2)(C)(iii)(I)(cc)$ (2012), and Regulation 5.3(a)(2)(i)-(ii), 17 C.F.R. 5.3(a)(2)(i)-(ii) (2019); and   |  |  |
| 11 | (c) commingled participant funds and failed to provide disclosure   |  |  |
| 12 | documents in violation of Regulations 4.20, 4.21, 4.24 and 4.25, 17 C.F.R. §§ 4.20, 4.21, 4.24, 4.25 (2019).  |  |  |
| 13 | Additionally, Defendants Capson and Denari made false statements to NFA in violation of Section   |  |  |
| 14 | 9(a)(4) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13(a)(4) (2012).   |  |  |
| 15 | 7. Unless restrained and enjoined by this Court, Defendants are likely to continue to engage in the   |  |  |
| 16 | acts and practices alleged in this Complaint and similar acts and practices, as more fully described below.   |  |  |
| 17 | 8. Accordingly, the CFTC brings this action pursuant to Section 6c of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13a-1   |  |  |
| 18 | (2012), to enjoin Defendants' unlawful acts and practices and to compel their compliance with the Act. In   |  |  |
| 19 | addition, the CFTC seeks civil monetary penalties and remedial ancillary relief, including, but not limited to,   |  |  |
| 20 | trading and registration bans, disgorgement, restitution, pre- and post-judgment interest, and such other relief  |  |  |
| 21 | as the Court may deem necessary and appropriate.  |  |  |
| 22 | II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE  |  |  |
| 23 | 9. This Court has jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (2012) (federal  |  |  |
| 24 | question jurisdiction) and 28 U.S.C. § 1345 (2012) (district courts have original jurisdiction over civil   |  |  |
| 25 | actions commenced by the United States or by any agency expressly authorized to sue by Act of   |  |  |
| 26 | Congress). Section 6c(a) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13a-l(a) (2012), authorizes the Commission to seek  |  |  |
|    | COMPLAINT – PAGE: 3   |  |  |

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 4 of 25

injunctive relief against any person whenever it shall appear that such person has engaged, is engaging, or is about to engage in any act or practice that violates any provision of the Act or any rule, regulation, or order promulgated thereunder. In addition, this Court has jurisdiction over the forex transactions pursuant to Section 2(c)(2)(C) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 2(c)(2)(C) (2012), which subjects the forex solicitations and transactions at issue in this action to, *inter alia*, Sections 4b and 4o of the Act, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6b, 6o (2012), as further described below.

10. Venue properly lies with this Court pursuant to Section 6c(e) of the Act, 7 U.S.C.
§ 13a-l(e) (2012), because Defendants transacted business in this District, and the acts and practices in violation of the Act have occurred, are occurring, or are about to occur within this District.

#### 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

#### **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

11. Assignment to the San Francisco or Oakland Division is appropriate because Denari has its office in and Sarkar resides in Contra Costa County where San Francisco and Oakland are located.

#### III. <u>PARTIES</u>

12. Plaintiff **Commodity Futures Trading Commission** is an independent federal regulatory agency that is charged by Congress with the responsibility for enforcing the provisions of the Act, 7 U.S.C. §§ 1-26 (2012), and the Commission Regulations promulgated thereunder, 17 C.F.R. pts. 1-190 (2019).

13. Defendant **Denari Capital**, **LLC** is a California limited liability company. Denari's 18 business address is 3100 Oak Road, Suite 380, Walnut Creek, California. Denari's articles of 19 organization were filed with the State of California on August 14, 2012. On May 1, 2019, Denari 20 became registered with the CFTC as a CPO and a Commodity Trading Advisor ("CTA"), and with NFA 21 as a forex firm. NFA summarily filed a member responsibility action ("MRA") against Denari and 22 Associate Responsibility Action ("ARA") (together "MRA/ARA") against Denari principal Capson, on 23 August 6, 2019, summarily suspending them from NFA membership; prohibiting them and anyone 24 acting on their behalf from soliciting or accepting any funds for any investment in Denari; prohibiting 25 them from disbursing or transferring any funds from accounts in the name of Denari or over which 26

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 5 of 25

Denari or Capson have control without prior approval of NFA; prohibiting them from placing any commodity interest trades, including forex; requiring Denari to hire a qualified third party to calculate the amount owed to each joint venture investor and each promissory noteholder and to notify each investor of their respective valuation; and requiring Denari and Capson to provide copies of the MRA/ARA to all joint venture investors and promissory noteholders, all NFA members that have an investment over which Denari or Capson exercise control, and any banks or financial institutions that maintain accounts in the name of Denari or Capson or over which they exercise control. NFA 19MRA0001 (Aug. 6, 2019).

14. Defendant **Travis G. Capson** is a principal and co-owner of Denari. Capson is a resident of Kanab, Utah. Capson became registered with the CFTC as an AP and was listed as a principal of Denari on May 1, 2019. As explained above, his registration has been suspended due to NFA's MRA/ARA effective August 6, 2019.

15. Defendant **Arnab Sarkar** is a resident of El Cerrito, California. He is a principal and coowner of Denari along with Capson. Sarkar has been listed as a principal of Denari with NFA since July 10, 2019. Sarkar has never been registered with the CFTC in any capacity.

#### IV. STATUTORY BACKGROUND

16. Denari accepted funds from participants and pooled those funds into a trading account at a Retail Foreign Exchange Dealer ("RFED"), in which Denari engaged in retail forex transactions.

17. Neither Denari nor the third party participants in Denari's pool were eligible contract participants ("ECP"). Section 1a(18)(A)(xi) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 1a(18)(A)(xi) (2012), sets a high dollar-value threshold requirement for an ECP. For individuals, it is generally limited to those who have more than \$10 million invested on a discretionary basis. Moreover, pursuant to Section 1a(18)(A)(iv)(II) of the Act, the Denari pool additionally cannot be an ECP because at least some, if not all of its participants are not ECPs.

Pursuant to Section 2(c)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 2(c)(2)(C)(ii)(I) (2012), these
leveraged or margined retail forex transactions with non-ECPs are subject to certain provisions of the
Act, including certain anti-fraud provisions.

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 6 of 25

19. Denari operates a "Commodity Pool" as defined by the Act, albeit not as a separate entity or under a specific name. Section 1a(10) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 1a(10) (2012), defines a "commodity pool" as any investment trust, syndicate, or similar form of enterprise operated for the purpose of trading in commodity interests, including any commodity for future delivery, security futures product, swap, or commodity option.

20. Denari is a "Commodity Pool Operator" as defined by the Act. 7 U.S.C. § 1a(11)(A)(i), in relevant part, defines a CPO as any person engaged in a business that is of the nature of a commodity pool, investment trust, syndicate, or similar form of enterprise, and who, in connection therewith, solicits, accepts, or receives from others, funds, securities, or property, either directly or through capital contributions, the sale of stock or other forms of securities, or otherwise, for the purpose of trading in commodity interests, including commodities for future delivery, security futures products, and swaps.

21. The individuals whose funds Capson and Sarkar used to invest in the forex pool are "participants" in the pool within the meaning of Regulation 4.10(c), 17 C.F.R. § 4.10(c) (2019), which defines a "participant" as any person who "has any direct financial interest in a pool (e.g., a limited partner)."

22. Capson and Sarkar are APs of Denari as defined in Section 4k of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 6k (2012), and Regulation 1.3, 17 C.F.R. § 1.3 (2019). Those provisions, with certain qualifications, define an AP as a natural person associated with any CPO as a partner, officer, employee, consultant, or agent (or any person occupying a similar status or performing similar functions), in any capacity that involves: (i) the solicitation of funds, securities, or property for a participation in a commodity pool; or (ii) the supervision of any person or persons so engaged.

#### V. <u>THE DENARI SCHEME</u>

A. The Denari Pool

23. Capson and Sarkar formed Denari in August of 2012 in California for the purpose of investing in various products including forex trading, real estate and other business interests. Capson and Sarkar each hold a 50% ownership interest in Denari.

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 7 of 25

Capson and Sarkar began illegally operating Denari in 2012 while they were working for an investment firm registered with the Financial Institution Regulatory Authority ("FINRA"), including opening a bank account in Denari's name and soliciting two participants who were customers of the FINRA registered firm where they worked. Capson and Sarkar settled a subsequent FINRA proceeding regarding this conduct in June 2014 based on their failure to disclose outside business activities and engaging in a private securities transaction without providing prior written notice to the FINRA member firm where they worked. Neither Capson nor Sarkar disclosed the FINRA settlement to certain Denari participants and only disclosed it to participants who confronted them about it after learning about the settlement themselves, or who requested an explanation as to why Capson and Sarkar left their prior investment firm.

24. Between 2012 and the present, Capson and Sarkar solicited at least twenty-eight relatives, friends, business associates, and others by various means, including in-person communication, phone, email, and word-of-mouth. Capson and Sarkar solicited participants for various investments, including forex trading, real estate, and investment in a gold mining company, among other investments.

25. Denari provided participants with promotional brochures it created in 2012, 2018 and 2019. In the brochures created in 2018 and 2019, Denari claimed that "over the past 10 years we have developed a disciplined investment strategy that has earned positive returns in 36 of the past 40 quarters." Denari also represented in its 2012, 2018 and 2019 brochures that it "charges no management fees. We will pay all expenses associated with the fund management, performance reporting and market research. By not passing any of these expenses on to our clients through traditional quarterly fees we are compensated through performance, not assets under management."

26. Denari's promotional materials included claimed annual rates of return for 2017 of 50.22% and for 2018 of 36.33%, and portrayed Denari as never having a losing year. However, Denari's forex trading account actually experienced a negative return of more than 49% in 2017 and a positive return of only 19% in 2018.

#### COMPLAINT - PAGE: 7

1

2

3

4

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 8 of 25

27. Denari's promotional material also reported monthly "trading results" for January through July 2018 that are inconsistent with the actual monthly trading results realized in its trading account. Specifically, Denari's promotional material states rates of return of 3.79%, 3.55%, 3.43%, 3.09%, 3.53%, 0.94%, and 2.47% for January through July 2018 respectively, while its actual monthly trading results are -7.42%, -2.82%, -6.09%, 6.92%, 17.29%, 0.01%, and 4.69% for the same time period. Consequently, these statements in Denari's promotional materials are false.

28. Additionally, Denari did not provide any prospective or actual participants in the Denari pool with the disclosure documents required by CFTC Regulations, nor did Denari register with the CFTC as a CPO or file or claim any exemption from registration with the CFTC as required by the Act.

29. Denari provided "Joint Venture Agreements" or "Promissory Notes" to prospective and actual participants. Since September of 2012, at least nine participants signed "Joint Venture Agreements" with Denari. Capson also signed these agreements as managing partner of Denari. These agreements state that "the Joint Venturers have agreed to make contributions to a common fund for the purpose of investing under the direction of Denari Capital, LLC." The agreements also state that Denari could acquire "any assets, which may include but are not limited to real estate, foreign currency," or other business interests, in connection with the venture. The Denari Joint Venture Agreements provide that "Denari Capital, LLC will be solely responsible for all investment decisions and will receive a portion of the investment earnings equal to the percentage agreed upon by each of the Joint Venturers."

30. At least sixteen Denari participants signed the Promissory Notes. Capson signed the Promissory notes as managing partner of Denari. The Promissory Notes state that Denari agrees to repay the loans, usually with 10% to 12% interest annually. Most of the loans had a one-year term with an option to renew at the lender's choice.

31. For example, one of the Promissory Notes involved a \$50,000 loan made by an individual on May 15, 2018 to Denari. The note had a one-year term, with a promise for the principle to be repaid upon demand at the end of any month after June 2019. The note also provided for monthly interest payments at a rate of 10% annually on the outstanding principle balance.

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 9 of 25

32. Denari, through Capson and Sarkar, deposited and commingled investor and participant funds received pursuant to the Joint Venture Agreements and Promissory Notes into one or more bank accounts in Denari's name and subsequently transferred some of these funds into forex trading accounts for the purpose of trading forex.

33. Of the at least \$8,300,000 that Denari solicited and accepted, at least \$3,200,000 was received from participants who signed promissory notes, at least \$3,700,000 was received from participants who signed Joint Venture Agreements and were advised that at least some of their funds could be used for foreign currency trading, and at least \$1,450,000 was received from participants for the purpose of other investments.

В.

#### Denari's Forex Trading Accounts

34. Denari first opened a forex trading account in its own name in August 2012 with a futures commission merchant ("FCM A"), at the time an RFED registered with the CFTC. Capson was the sole authorized trader on the account. Denari's account opening application with FCM A falsely claimed that it was only investing proprietary funds, and not funds of third parties. Denari funded its FCM A account with a deposit of \$270,000 it received from a pool participant who was also a purported co-founder and former part owner of the company in August 2012.

35. In February 2017, Denari transferred its trading account held at FCM A to a different RFED, FCM B. Capson is the sole authorized trader on the account at FCM B. In addition to the nearly \$9,000 opening transfer balance in February 2017, Denari made seven additional deposits to the FCM B account through July 2019. The deposits ranged in amounts from \$20,000 to \$700,000 and totaled \$1,662,000. The account at FCM B experienced overall trading losses of approximately \$228,000.

#### C. Denari Does Not Have Sufficient Funds To Cover Its Obligations To Participants

36. Capson and Sarkar are signatories on the Denari bank accounts into which participant and investor funds were deposited.

37. Between October 2017 and July 2019, Capson and Sarkar transferred approximately \$1,085,000 from Denari's forex trading account at FCM B to a Denari bank account. Denari's bank

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 10 of 25

records also show deposits from a least five pool participants to a Denari bank account since January 1, 2017 totaling more than \$1,000,000. Denari and Capson distributed funds from one or more Denari bank accounts to participants as purported profit and interest payments and Capson and Sarkar withdrew and, on information and belief, misappropriated funds from one or more Denari bank accounts for their personal use, including purchasing items on Amazon, meals at restaurants, gas, and gym memberships, among other things.

38. As of June 30, 2019, Denari's forex trading account at FCM B had a net liquidating value ("NLV") of approximately \$1,000,000. However, according to a June 30, 2019 Denari financial statement, the value of Denari's forex pool participants' interest is approximately \$1,600,000.

39. In addition to the NLV of approximately \$1,000,000 in Denari's forex trading account as of June 30, 2019, Denari's only other liquid asset consisted of a bank account that had a balance of approximately \$200,000 as of June 30, 2019. Therefore, as of June 30, 2019, Denari did not have sufficient liquid assets to cover its forex pool participants' interests in the Pool.

40. In July 2019, Capson and Sarkar withdrew \$74,423.81 from the Denari forex trading account and transferred the funds to a Denari bank account. As of July 31, the NLV of Denari's account at FCM B declined to approximately \$530,000. Meanwhile, Denari's bank account balance totaled approximately \$300,000 as of July 22, for combined liquid assets of approximately \$830,000.

41. Combining all of Denari's liquid assets and even attributing them to the Denari forex pool, the Denari forex pool had a shortfall of at least \$400,000 as of June 30, 2019.

42. Additionally, Denari's June 30, 2019 balance sheet indicates that the firm owes more than \$5,200,000 in "business loans," which, according to Denari, represents the firm's obligation to the forex pool participants, promissory note holders and others, though the firm represented to NFA that its actual liability on these obligations exceeds \$5,300,000. Excluding the approximately \$1,600,000 that Denari and Capson have represented is owed to forex pool participants as of June 30, 2019, Denari, Capson and Sarkar appear to owe more than \$3,600,000 to the promissory noteholders and others whose

funds were commingled with the pool participants' funds. On information and belief, Defendants misappropriated some or all of these funds.

43. Denari does not have sufficient liquid assets to meet its current liabilities to its investors and pool participants nor, on information and belief, does it have sufficient assets, liquid or non-liquid, to satisfy its current obligations to its pool participants. Prior to issuance of NFA's MRA/ARA on August 6, 2019, Denari did not disclose to participants that it did not have sufficient funds or assets to meet its obligations to them.

44. Denari's June 30, 2019 balance sheet also included other assets purportedly valued at more than \$6,100,000. These assets consist of stock in three mining-related companies and a real estate holding in Nevada. However, Denari has not been able to substantiate its ownership of these assets nor the value Denari assigns to them to NFA.

45. Denari, Capson and Sarkar hold ownership interests in or have roles with the mining entities listed as Denari's assets. These assets include penny stock in one company that is insolvent; stock in a privately-held company of which Denari and Sarkar are majority shareholders; and stock in a third company in which Denari and Capson regularly engage in buying and selling the stock by privately arranging transactions in the stock.

46. The real estate holding in Nevada is not in Denari's name, and Denari also included on its balance sheet Capson's and Sarkar's personal shares in the mining-related companies, which had the effect of improperly increasing the assets listed on the firm's balance sheet.

47. NFA confronted Capson and Sarkar, on July 30, 2019, about the difference between the firm's liquid assets and its financial obligations to the participants. Capson and Sarkar were uncertain whether they could immediately repay these obligations and said they would liquidate the stock they own to make everyone whole. However, to date, they have not done so.

D.

#### Denari Issued False or Misleading Account Statements to Participants

48. During the Relevant Time, Defendants sent quarterly account statements to participants via mail or email that misrepresented the value of their respective investments and interests in the Pool,

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 12 of 25

and exaggerated returns. In particular, the account statements Defendants issued to participants depicted false returns, and misrepresented the value of the participants' respective accounts.

49. The statements reflected that Denari participants' funds were earning consistent profits with no losses. However, Denari improperly calculated the Pool's net asset value ("NAV"). Denari failed to factor in the impact of unrealized losses in its forex trading account and, therefore, inflated its performance results. Moreover, Denari regularly closed out profitable positions to recognize gains, while continuously rolling forward losing positions.

50. At least eleven participants received quarterly statements from Denari reflecting that their investments were earning consistent profits with no losses.

51. Further, Capson and Sarkar did not trade all of the funds that participants invested in Denari for the purpose of forex trading. Instead, on information and belief, Capson and Sarkar misappropriated a portion of these funds for personal and other uses.

E.

#### NFA's July 2019 Examination of Denari

52. In furtherance of its official duties under the Act, NFA conducts periodic audits and examinations of NFA members as a means of monitoring and assuring compliance with NFA rules, the Act, and the Regulations.

53. In July 2019, NFA began an examination of Denari.

54. On July 15, 2019, NFA sent Capson a document request and spoke to him by telephone. During that phone call, Capson told NFA representatives that Denari has been trading forex with its own, proprietary funds since 2015, and that Denari did not trade forex for third party investors until after Denari became registered as a CPO in 2019.

55. Capson's representations to NFA are false. Denari has been operating a forex pool and trading third party funds since at least 2012.

| 1        | VI.                  | VIOLATIONS OF THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AND REGULATIONS   |  |  |
|----------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| 2        |                      | <u>COUNT I</u>   |  |  |
| 3        | FR                   | FRAUD BY MISREPRESENTATIONS, OMISSIONS AND FALSE STATEMENTS  |  |  |
| 4        | VIOLAT               | VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 4b(2)(A)-(C) OF THE ACT, 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(2)(A)-(C) (2012), AN   |  |  |
| 5        |                      | <b>REGULATION 5.2(1)-(3), 17 C.F.R. § 5.2(b)(1)-(3) (2019)</b>   |  |  |
| 6        | 56                   | . The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 56 are re-alleged and incorporated   |  |  |
| 7        | herein by reference. |  |  |  |
| 8        | 57                   | . 7 U.S.C. § 6b(2)(A)-(C) makes it unlawful:   |  |  |
| 9        |                      | (2) for any person, in or in connection with any order to make, or the making of, any contract of sale of any commodity for future delivery, or  |  |  |
| 10       |                      | swap, that is made, or to be made, for or on behalf of, or with, any other<br>person, other than on or subject to the rules of a designated contract   |  |  |
| 11       |                      | market   |  |  |
| 12       |                      | (A) to cheat or defraud or attempt to cheat or defraud the other person;   |  |  |
| 13       |                      | (B) willfully to make or cause to be made to the other person any  |  |  |
| 14<br>15 |                      | false report or statement or willfully to enter or cause to be entered<br>for the other person any false record;   |  |  |
| 15       |                      | (C) willfully to deceive or attempt to deceive the other person by any means whatsoever in regard to any order or contract or the disposition  |  |  |
| 17       |                      | or execution of any order or contract, or in regard to any act of agency<br>performed, with respect to any order or contract for or, in the case of  |  |  |
| 18       |                      | paragraph (2), with the other person[.]  |  |  |
| 19       | 58                   | . 17 C.F.R. § 5.2(b) provides, in relevant part, that:   |  |  |
| 20       |                      | [i]t shall be unlawful for any person, by use of the mails or by any means<br>or instrumentality of interstate commerce, directly or indirectly, in or in<br>connection with any retail forex transaction: |  |  |
| 21       |                      | (1) To cheat or defraud or attempt to cheat or defraud any person;   |  |  |
| 22       |                      | <ul><li>(2) Willfully to make or cause to be made to any person any false</li></ul>  |  |  |
| 23<br>24 |                      | report or statement or cause to be entered for any person any<br>false record; or  |  |  |
| 24<br>25 |                      | (3) Willfully to deceive or attempt to deceive any person by any means whatsoever.   |  |  |
| 23<br>26 |                      |  |  |  |
| 20       |                      |  |  |  |
|          | l                    | COMPLAINT – PAGE: 13   |  |  |

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 14 of 25

59. Defendants, in connection with retail forex transactions, knowingly or recklessly: cheated or defrauded or attempted to cheat or defraud pool participants and deceived or attempted to deceive pool participants by, among other things, fraudulently soliciting pool participants by making material misrepresentations and omissions regarding their trading profits, trading performance track record, and value of their interest in the Pool, issuing false statements to participants, and on information and belief, misappropriating their funds.

60. Defendants made or caused to be made false account statements issued to pool participants via regular and electronic mail showing consistent profits with no losses.

61. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants violated 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(2)(A)-(C) and 17 C.F.R. § 5.2(b)(1)-(3).

62. The foregoing acts, omissions, and failures occurred within the scope of Capson's and Sarkar's employment or office with Denari. Therefore, Denari is liable for their acts, omissions, and failures in violation of 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(2)(A)-(C) and 17 C.F.R. § 5.2(b)(1)-(3), pursuant to Section 2(a)(1)(B) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 2(a)(1)(B) (2012), and Regulation 1.2, 17 C.F.R. § 1.2 (2019).

63. Defendants Capson and Sarkar control Denari directly or indirectly, and did not act in good faith or knowingly induced, directly or indirectly, Denari's conduct alleged in this Count. Therefore, under Section 13(b) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13c(b) (2012), Capson and Sarkar are liable for Denari's violations of 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(2)(A)-(C) and 17 C.F.R. § 5.2(b)(1)-(3).

64. Each misrepresentation, omission of material fact and false statement, including but not limited to those specifically alleged herein, is alleged as a separate and distinct violation of 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(2)(A)-(C) and 17 C.F.R. § 5.2(b)(1)-(3).

#### COUNT II

#### FRAUD BY A CPO

#### VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 40(1) OF THE ACT, 7 U.S.C. § 60(1) (2012)

65. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 56 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.

| 66. 7 U.S.C. § $6o(1)$ (2012) prohibits any CPO or AP of a CPO from using the mails or an   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| other means of interstate commerce, directly or indirectly:   |  |  |  |  |
| (A) to employ any device, scheme or artifice to defraud any client or participant or prospective client or participant; or                                      |  |  |  |  |
| (B) to engage in any transaction, practice or course of business which operates as a fraud or deceit upon any client or participant or prospective participant. |  |  |  |  |
| 67. Pursuant to Regulation 5.1(d)(1), 17 C.F.R. § 5.1(d)(1) (2019), and subject to certain  |  |  |  |  |
| exceptions not relevant here, any person who operates or solicits funds, securities, or property for a  |  |  |  |  |
| pooled investment vehicle and engages in retail forex transactions is defined as a retail forex CPO.  |  |  |  |  |
| 68. Pursuant to Section 2(c)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 2(c)(2)(C)(ii)(I) (2012),  |  |  |  |  |
| "[a]greements, contracts, or transactions" in retail forex and accounts or pooled investment vehicles   |  |  |  |  |
| "shall be subject to section[] 60 [of the Act]," except in circumstances not relevant here.   |  |  |  |  |
| 69. During the Relevant Time, Denari acted as a CPO in that it engaged in a business that is  |  |  |  |  |
| of the nature of an investment trust, syndicate or similar form of enterprise operated for the purpose of   |  |  |  |  |
| trading in commodity interests or commodity futures, and in connection therewith, solicited, accepted   |  |  |  |  |
| and received funds from others for the purpose of trading in commodity interests and commodity futures.   |  |  |  |  |
| 70. During the Relevant Time, Capson and Sarkar acted as APs of Denari by soliciting funds  |  |  |  |  |
| for the pool and handling participant funds while being associated with Denari as partners, officers,   |  |  |  |  |
| employees, consultants, or agents.  |  |  |  |  |
| 71. Capson and Sarkar, while acting as APs of a CPO, and Denari, while acting as a CPO,   |  |  |  |  |
| defrauded and deceived participants of the Denari Pool by using the mails or any other means of   |  |  |  |  |
| interstate commerce in violation of 7 U.S.C. § $6o(1)$ by, among other things:  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) on information and belief, misappropriating participant funds;  |  |  |  |  |
| (b) fraudulently soliciting participants and prospective participants by making   |  |  |  |  |
| material misrepresentations and omitting material facts regarding Defendants  |  |  |  |  |
| trading profits, trading performance track record, and the value of participants'   |  |  |  |  |
| interest in the Pool; and   |  |  |  |  |
| COMPLAINT – PAGE: 15  |  |  |  |  |

|  | Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 16 of 25   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1  | (c) causing false account statements to be issued to participants in the Pool that   |  |  |  |
| 2  | reflected consistent profits with no losses.   |  |  |  |
| 3  | 72. Defendants engaged in the acts and practices described in this Count willfully or with   |  |  |  |
| 4  | reckless disregard for the truth.  |  |  |  |
| 5  | 73. The foregoing acts, omissions, and failures occurred within the scope of Sarkar's and  |  |  |  |
| 6  | Capson's employment or office with Denari. Therefore, Denari is liable for their acts, omissions, and  |  |  |  |
| 7  | failures in violation of 7 U.S.C. § 60(1), pursuant to 7 U.S.C. § 2(a)(1)(B) and 17 C.F.R. § 1.2.  |  |  |  |
| 8  | 74. Defendants Capson and Sarkar control Denari directly or indirectly, and did not act in   |  |  |  |
| 9  | good faith or knowingly induced, directly or indirectly, Denari's conduct alleged in this Count.   |  |  |  |
| 10   | Therefore, under 7 U.S.C. § 13c(b), Capson and Sarkar are liable for Denari's violations of 7 U.S.C.   |  |  |  |
| 11   | § 60(1)(A) and (B).  |  |  |  |
| 12   | 75. Each fraudulent or deceptive act, including without limitation those specifically alleged  |  |  |  |
| 13   | herein, is alleged as a separate and distinct violation of 7 U.S.C. $\S$ 6 $o(1)$ .  |  |  |  |
|  | <u>COUNT III</u>   |  |  |  |
| 14   | <u>COUNT III</u>   |  |  |  |
| 14<br>15   | <u>COUNT III</u><br>FAILURE TO REGISTER AS A CPO   |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 15   | FAILURE TO REGISTER AS A CPO   |  |  |  |
| 15<br>16   | FAILURE TO REGISTER AS A CPO<br>VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 4m(1) OF THE ACT, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6m(1), 2(c)2(C)(iii)(I)(cc) (2012), AND  |  |  |  |
| 15<br>16<br>17   | FAILURE TO REGISTER AS A CPO<br>VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 4m(1) OF THE ACT, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6m(1), 2(c)2(C)(iii)(I)(cc) (2012), AND<br>REGULATION 5.3(a)(2)(i), 17 C.F.R. § 5.3(a)(2)(i) (2019)  |  |  |  |
| 15<br>16<br>17<br>18   | FAILURE TO REGISTER AS A CPO         VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 4m(1) OF THE ACT, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6m(1), 2(c)2(C)(iii)(I)(cc) (2012), AND         REGULATION 5.3(a)(2)(i), 17 C.F.R. § 5.3(a)(2)(i) (2019)         76. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 56 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by   |  |  |  |
| 15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19   | FAILURE TO REGISTER AS A CPO         VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 4m(1) OF THE ACT, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6m(1), 2(c)2(C)(iii)(I)(cc) (2012), AND         REGULATION 5.3(a)(2)(i), 17 C.F.R. § 5.3(a)(2)(i) (2019)         76. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 56 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.  |  |  |  |
| 15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20   | FAILURE TO REGISTER AS A CPO         VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 4m(1) OF THE ACT, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6m(1), 2(c)2(C)(iii)(I)(cc) (2012), AND         REGULATION 5.3(a)(2)(i), 17 C.F.R. § 5.3(a)(2)(i) (2019)         76.       The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 56 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.         77.       With certain exemptions and exclusions not applicable here, 7 U.S.C. § 6m(1) requires all  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> </ol>                                     | FAILURE TO REGISTER AS A CPO         VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 4m(1) OF THE ACT, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6m(1), 2(c)2(C)(iii)(I)(cc) (2012), AND         REGULATION 5.3(a)(2)(i), 17 C.F.R. § 5.3(a)(2)(i) (2019)         76.       The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 56 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by         reference.         77.       With certain exemptions and exclusions not applicable here, 7 U.S.C. § 6m(1) requires all         CPOs operating a commodity pool to be registered with the Commission.  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>                         | FAILURE TO REGISTER AS A CPO         VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 4m(1) OF THE ACT, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6m(1), 2(c)2(C)(iii)(I)(cc) (2012), AND         REGULATION 5.3(a)(2)(i), 17 C.F.R. § 5.3(a)(2)(i) (2019)         76.       The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 56 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by         reference.       77.       With certain exemptions and exclusions not applicable here, 7 U.S.C. § 6m(1) requires all         CPOs operating a commodity pool to be registered with the Commission.       78.       Subject to certain exceptions not relevant here, 7 U.S.C. § 6m(1) states that it shall be  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>             | <ul> <li>FAILURE TO REGISTER AS A CPO</li> <li>VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 4m(1) OF THE ACT, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6m(1), 2(c)2(C)(iii)(I)(cc) (2012), AND REGULATION 5.3(a)(2)(i), 17 C.F.R. § 5.3(a)(2)(i) (2019)</li> <li>76. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 56 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.</li> <li>77. With certain exemptions and exclusions not applicable here, 7 U.S.C. § 6m(1) requires all CPOs operating a commodity pool to be registered with the Commission.</li> <li>78. Subject to certain exceptions not relevant here, 7 U.S.C. § 6m(1) states that it shall be "unlawful for any [CPO], unless registered under this chapter, to make use of the mails or any means</li> </ul>   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol> | <ul> <li>FAILURE TO REGISTER AS A CPO</li> <li>VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 4m(1) OF THE ACT, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6m(1), 2(c)2(C)(iii)(I)(cc) (2012), AND REGULATION 5.3(a)(2)(i), 17 C.F.R. § 5.3(a)(2)(i) (2019)</li> <li>76. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 56 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.</li> <li>77. With certain exemptions and exclusions not applicable here, 7 U.S.C. § 6m(1) requires all CPOs operating a commodity pool to be registered with the Commission.</li> <li>78. Subject to certain exceptions not relevant here, 7 U.S.C. § 6m(1) states that it shall be "unlawful for any [CPO], unless registered under this chapter, to make use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce in connection with his business as such [CPO]."</li> </ul> |  |  |  |

A person, unless registered in such capacity as the Commission by rule, regulation, or order shall determine and a member of a futures association registered under section 17, shall not . . .

(cc) operate or solicit funds, securities, or property for any pooled investment vehicle that is not an eligible contract participant in connection with [applicable retail forex contracts, agreements, or transactions].

80. For the purposes of retail forex transactions, a CPO is defined in 17 C.F.R. § 5.1(d)(1)"as any person who operates or solicits funds, securities, or property for a pooled investment vehicle that is not an eligible contract participant as defined in section 1(a)(18) of the Act, and who engages in retail forex transactions." Denari was not an ECP as defined in section 1(a)(18) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 1(a)(18) (2012).

81. Except in circumstances not relevant here, 17 C.F.R. § 5.3(a)(2)(i) requires those that meet the definition of a retail forex CPO to register as a CPO with the Commission.

82. During the Relevant Time, Denari engaged in activities as a retail forex CPO, with participants who are not ECPs, without being registered as such, and in connection therewith used the mails or other means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, in violation of 7 U.S.C. § 6m(1) (2012) and 17 C.F.R. § 5.3(a)(2)(i) and 17 C.F.R. § 2(c)(2)(C)(iii)(I)(cc).

83. Each use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce in connection with Denari's business as a CPO without proper registration during the Relevant Time period, including but not limited to those specifically alleged herein, is alleged as a separate and distinct violation.

84. During the Relevant Time, Capson and Sarkar directly or indirectly controlled Denari, and did not act in good faith or knowingly induced, directly or indirectly, the acts constituting Denari's violations described in this Count. Pursuant to 7 U.S.C. § 13c(b), Capson and Sarkar are therefore liable for Denari's violations described in this Count to the same extent as Denari.

Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 18 of 25

# COUNT IV

#### FAILURE TO REGISTER AS APs AND

# ALLOWING UNREGISTERED APS TO REMAIN ASSOCIATED WITH A CPO VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 4k(2) OF THE ACT, 7 U.S.C. § 6k(2) (2012), AND REGULATION 5.3(a)(2)(ii), 17 C.F.R. § 5.3(a)(2)(ii) (2019)

85. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 56 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.

86. With certain exemptions and exclusions not applicable here, it is unlawful for a person to be associated with a CPO as a partner, officer, employee, consultant, or agent, or a person occupying a similar status or performing similar functions, in any capacity that involves the solicitation of funds, securities, or property for participation in a commodity pool unless registered with the Commission as an AP of the CPO pursuant to 7 U.S.C. § 6k(2).

87. Except in certain circumstances not relevant here, 17 C.F.R. § 5.3(a)(2)(ii) requires those that meet the definition of an AP of a retail forex CPO under 17 C.F.R. § 5.1(d) to register as an AP of a CPO with the Commission.

88. It is also unlawful under this section of the Act for a CPO to permit such a person to become or remain associated with the CPO in any such capacity if the CPO knew or should have known that the person was not registered as an AP.

89. Further, pursuant to 17 C.F.R. § 5.1(d)(2), any person associated with a CPO "as a partner, officer, employee, consultant or agent (or any natural person occupying a similar status or performing similar functions), in any capacity which involves: (i) [t]he solicitation of funds, securities, or property for a participation in a pooled vehicle; or (ii) [t]he supervision of any person or persons so engaged" is an AP of a retail forex CPO.

90. During the Relevant Period, Defendants Capson and Sarkar were associated with a CPO as a partner, officer, employee or consultant, or agent in a capacity that involved the solicitation of funds, securities, or property for participation in a commodity pool or the supervision of any person or

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 19 of 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

persons so engaged. Therefore, Defendants Capson and Sarkar were APs of a CPO as defined by 17 C.F.R. § 1.3.

91. Capson and Sarkar violated 7 U.S.C. § 6k(2) and 17 C.F.R. § 5.3(a)(2)(ii) by acting as APs of Denari without being registered as APs of a CPO.

92. Denari violated 7 U.S.C. § 6k(2) in that, acting as a CPO, it allowed Capson and Sarkar to act as its APs when it knew or should have known that Capson and Sarkar were not registered as APs.

93. The foregoing acts, omissions, and failures occurred within the scope of Capson's and Sarkar's employment or office with Denari. Therefore, Denari is liable for their acts, omissions, and failures in violation of 7 U.S.C. § 6k(2) and 17 C.F.R. § 5.3(a)(2)(ii), pursuant to 7 U.S.C. § 2(a)(1)(B) and 17 C.F.R. § 1.2.

94. Each act by Capson and Sarkar of soliciting funds, securities, or property for participation in a commodity pool while being associated with Denari as a partner, officer, employee, consultant, or agent without being registered as an AP of a CPO, and each act by Denari of allowing Capson and Sarkar to be associated with it in such a capacity when Denari knew or should have known Capson and Sarkar were not registered as APs, is alleged as a separate and distinct violation of 7 U.S.C. § 6k(2).

#### COUNT V

#### COMMINGLING OF POOL FUNDS

# AND FAILURE TO RECEIVE POOL FUNDS IN POOLS' NAME

#### VIOLATIONS OF REGULATION 4.20, 17 C.F.R. § 4.20 (2019)

95. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 56 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.

96. 17 C.F.R. § 5.4 states that Part 4 of the Regulations, 17 C.F.R. pt. 4 (2019), applies to any person required to register as a CPO pursuant to Part 5 of the Regulations, 17 C.F.R. pt. 5 (2019), relating to forex transactions.

97. With certain exemptions not applicable here, 17 C.F.R. § 4.20(a) requires that a CPO must operate its commodity pool as an entity cognizable as a legal entity separate from its operator.

98. 17 C.F.R. § 4.20(b) prohibits CPOs, whether registered or not, from receiving pool participants' funds in any name other than that of the pool.

99. 17 C.F.R. § 4.20(c) prohibits a CPO, whether registered or not, from commingling the property of any pool it operates with the property of any other person.

100. Denari, while acting as a CPO, failed to operate its commodity pool as an entity cognizable as a legal entity separate from its operator, failed to receive pool participants' funds in the name of the Pool when they deposited funds into Denari's bank and trading accounts, and commingled the property of the Pool and pool participants' funds with property of Defendants and others.

101. By reason of the foregoing, Denari violated 17 C.F.R. § 4.20(a)-(c).

102. Defendants Capson and Sarkar control Denari directly or indirectly, and did not act in good faith or knowingly induced, directly or indirectly, Denari's conduct alleged in this Count. Therefore, under 7 U.S.C. § 13c(b), Capson and Sarkar are liable for Denari's violations of 17 C.F.R. § 4.20(a)-(c).

103. Each act of improperly receiving pool participants' funds and commingling the property of the Denari pool with non-pool property, including but not limited to those specifically alleged herein, is alleged as a separate and distinct violation of 17 C.F.R. § 4.20(b)-(c).

### COUNT VI

### FAILURE TO PROVIDE POOL DISCLOSURES

# VIOLATIONS OF REGULATIONS 4.21, 4.24, AND 4.25, 17 C.F.R. §§ 4.21, 4.24, 4.25 (2019)

104. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 56 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.

105. 17 C.F.R. § 4.21 provides that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

each commodity pool operator registered or required to be registered under the Act must deliver or cause to be delivered to a prospective participant in a pool that it operates or intends to operate a Disclosure Document for the pool prepared in accordance with §§ 4.24 and 4.25 by no later than the time it delivers to the prospective participant a subscription agreement for the pool . . . .

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 21 of 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

26

Regulation 4.24 outlines in detail twenty-three types of general disclosures required for 106. pools. Regulation 4.25 outlines in detail the performance disclosures required for pools, including performance disclosures for different points in time of the pool's operating history.

107. Denari did not provide any actual or prospective pool participants with pool disclosure documents in the form specified in 17 C.F.R. §§ 4.24, 4.25. Specifically, Denari failed to provide prospective pool participants with a pool disclosure document in the form specified in Regulations 4.24 and 4.25. Denari therefore violated 17 C.F.R. §§ 4.21, 4.24, 4.25.

108. Defendants Capson and Sarkar control Denari directly or indirectly, and did not act in good faith or knowingly induced, directly or indirectly, Denari's conduct alleged in this Count. Therefore, under 7 U.S.C. § 13c(b), Capson and Sarkar are liable for Denari's violations of 17 C.F.R. §§ 4.21, 4.24 and 4.25.

Each failure to furnish the required disclosure documents with the required content to 109. prospective pool participants and pool participants, including but not limited to those specifically alleged herein, is alleged as a separate and distinct violation of 17 C.F.R. § 4.21, 4.24 and 4.25.

#### **COUNT VII**

#### **MISREPRESENTATIONS TO NFA**

#### VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 9(a)(4) OF THE ACT, 7 U.S.C. § 13(a)(4) (2012)

110. The allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 56 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.

20 7 U.S.C. § 13(a)(4) makes it unlawful for any person willfully to falsify, conceal, or 111. cover up by trick, scheme or artifice a material fact, or to make any false, fictitious, or fraudulent 22 statements or representations, or to make or use any false writing or document knowing the same to 23 contain any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry to a registered entity, board of trade, swap 24 data repository, or futures association designated or registered under the Act and acting in furtherance of 25 its official duties under the Act.

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 22 of 25

112. Capson violated 7 U.S.C. § 13(a)(4) by willfully making false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or representations to NFA, a futures association registered under the Act, in connection with an examination that NFA conducted of Denari beginning in July 2019 in furtherance of NFA's official duties under the Act.

113. Specifically, during the examination, Capson falsely represented to NFA staff that Denari has been trading forex with its own proprietary funds since 2015, and that Denari did not trade forex for any third party participants until after Denari became registered with the CFTC on May 1, 2019.

114. Capson's representations were false. Denari has been operating a forex pool and trading for third party participants since at least 2012.

115. The foregoing acts, omissions, and failures occurred within the scope of Capson's employment or office with Denari. Therefore, Denari is liable for his acts, omissions, and failures in violation of 7 U.S.C. § 13(a)(4), pursuant to 7 U.S.C. § 2(a)(1)(B) and 17 C.F.R. § 1.2.

116. Each act of willful concealment and/or false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement Capson made to NFA, a futures association registered under the Act, in connection with NFA's examination of Denari commencing in July of 2019, conducted in furtherance of NFA's official duties under the Act, including, but not limited to, those specifically alleged herein, is alleged as a separate and distinct violation of 7 U.S.C. § 13(a)(4).

#### VII. <u>RELIEF REQUESTED</u>

WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court, as authorized by Section 6c of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13a-l (2012), and pursuant to the Court's own equitable powers, enter:

(a) An order finding that Defendants violated Sections 4b(a)(2)(A) and (C), 4b(a)(2)(B), 4o(1), 4m(1), 4k(2), and 2(c)(2)(C)(iii)(I)(cc) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6b(a)(2)(A), (C), 6(b)(2)(B), 6o(1), 6m(1), 6(k)(2), 2(c)(2)(C)(iii)(I)(cc) (2012), and Commission Regulations 4.20(a)-(c), 4.21, 4.24, 4.25, 5.2(b)(1)-(3), and 5.3(a)(2)(i)-(ii), 17 C.F.R. §§ 4.20(a)-(c), 4.21, 4.24, 4.25, 5.2(b)(1)-(3), 5.3(a)(2)(i)-(ii) (2019), and an order finding that Defendants Capson and Denari violated Section 9(a)(4) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13(a)(4) (2012).

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 23 of 25

1

2

3

(b) An order of permanent injunction prohibiting Defendants and any of their affiliates, agents, servants, employees, successors, assigns, attorneys, and persons in active concert or participation with Defendants, from directly or indirectly:

4 (i) engaging in conduct in violation of 7 U.S.C. §§ 6b(a)(2)(A), (C), 6(b)(2)(B), 6o(1), 5 6m(1), 6(k)(2), and 2(c)(2)(C)(iii)(I)(cc) and 17 C.F.R. §§ 4.20(a)-(c), 4.21, 4.24, 4.25, 5.2(b)(1)-(3), and 5.3(a)(2)(i)-(ii); 6 7 (ii) trading on or subject to the rules of any registered entity (as that term is defined in Section 8 la of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § la (2012)); 9 (iii) entering into any transactions involving "commodity interests" (as that term is defined in 10 Commission Regulation 1.3, 17 C.F.R. § 1.3 (2019)), for Defendants' own accounts or 11 for any account in which they have a direct or indirect interest; (iv) 12 having any commodity interests traded on Defendants' behalf; 13 controlling or directing the trading for or on behalf of any other person or entity, whether by (v) power of attorney or otherwise, in any account involving commodity interests; 14 (vi) 15 soliciting, receiving, or accepting any funds from any person for the purpose of purchasing 16 or selling any commodity interests; 17 (vii) applying for registration or claiming exemption from registration with the Commission in any capacity, and engaging in any activity requiring such registration 18 19 or exemption from registration with the Commission, except as provided for in 20 Regulation 4.14(a)(9), 17 C.F.R. § 4.14(a)(9) (2019); 21 (viii) acting as a principal (as that term is defined in Commission Regulation 3.1(a), 22 17 C.F.R. § 3.1(a) (2019)), agent or any other officer or employee of any person 23 registered, exempted from registration or required to be registered with the 24 Commission except as provided for in Regulation 4.14(a)(9); 25 26

#### Case 3:19-cv-07284-EMC Document 1 Filed 11/05/19 Page 24 of 25

(c) An order of permanent injunction additionally prohibiting Defendants Capson and Denari and any of their affiliates, agents, servants, employees, successors, assigns, attorneys, and persons in active concert or participation with them, from directly or indirectly engaging in conduct in violation of 7 U.S.C. §§ 13(a)(4);

(d) An order requiring Defendants and any third party transferee and/or successors thereof, to disgorge to any officer appointed or directed by the Court all benefits received including, but not limited to, salaries, commissions, loans, fees, revenues and trading profits derived, directly or indirectly, from acts or practices which constitute violations of the Act and Regulations as described herein, including pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;

An order directing Defendants and any successors thereof, to rescind, pursuant to such (e) procedures as the Court may order, all contracts and agreements, whether implied or express, entered into between them and any of the pool participants whose funds were received by them as a result of the acts and practices that constituted violations of the Act and Regulations, as described herein;

(f) An order requiring Defendants to make restitution by making whole each and every pool participant whose funds were received or utilized by them in violation of the provisions of the Act and Regulations as described herein, including pre-judgment interest;

An order directing Defendants to pay civil monetary penalties, to be assessed by the 16 (g) Court, in an amount not more than the penalty prescribed by Section 6c(d)(1) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13a-18 1(d)(1) (2012), as adjusted for inflation pursuant to the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act 19 Improvements Act of 2015, Pub. L. 114–74, 129 Stat. 584 (2015), title VII, Section 701, see 20 Commission Regulation 143.8, 17 C.F.R. § 143.8 (2019) for each violation of the Act, as described herein:

(h) An order requiring Defendants to pay costs and fees as permitted by 28 U.S.C. §§ 1920 and 2412(a)(2) (2006); and

(i)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

21

22

23

24

25

26

Such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

| 1  | Date: November 5, 2019 | COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING<br>COMMISSION                                |
|----|------------------------|--|
| 2  |                        | By: Attorneys for Plaintiff  |
| 3  |                        |  |
| 4  |                        | <u>/s/ Carlin Metzger</u>  |
| 5  |                        | Carlin R. Metger (cmetzger@cftc.gov)<br>Illinois Bar No. 6275516       |
| 6  |                        | Susan Gradman (sgradman@cftc.gov)<br>Illinois Bar No. 6225060          |
| 7  |                        | Scott R. Williamson (swilliamson@cftc.gov)<br>Illinois Bar No. 6191293 |
| 8  |                        | Commodity Futures Trading Commission                                   |
| 9  |                        | 525 W. Monroe St., Suite 1100<br>Chicago, IL 60661<br>(312) 596-0536   |
| 10 |                        | (512) 590-0550   |
| 11 |                        |  |
| 12 |                        |  |
| 13 |                        |  |
| 14 |                        |  |
| 15 |                        |  |
| 16 |                        |  |
| 17 |                        |  |
| 18 |                        |  |
| 19 |                        |  |
| 20 |                        |  |
| 21 |                        |  |
| 22 |                        |  |
| 23 |                        |  |
| 24 |                        |  |
| 25 |                        |  |
| 26 |                        |  |
| 20 |                        |  |
|    | 1                      | COMPLAINT – PAGE: 25   |