| 1 2 | AMY JANE LONGO (Cal. Bar No. 198304) Email: longoa@sec.gov ROBERTO A. TERCERO (Cal. Bar No. 143760) Email: terceror@sec.gov | |
|-----|---|---------------------------|
| 3 | Attorneys for Plaintiff | |
| 4 | 11 ()(A) | |
| 5 | Katharine Zoladz, Associate Regional Director | |
| 6 | Michele Wein Layne, Regional Director Katharine Zoladz, Associate Regional Director 444 S. Flower Street, Suite 900 Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (323) 965-3998 Facsimile: (213) 443-1904 | |
| 7 | Facsimile: (213) 443-1904 | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE | Case No. '22CV0274 MMAKSC |
| 13 | COMMISSION, | |
| 14 | Plaintiff, | COMPLAINT |
| 15 | VS. | |
| 16 | ANDREW T.E. COLDICUTT, | |
| 17 | Defendant. | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") alleges: | |
| 21 | <u>SUMMARY</u> | |
| 22 | 1. This case concerns violations of the federal securities laws by defendant | |
| 23 | Andrew T.E. Coldicutt ("Defendant" or "Coldicutt"), a self-described "Securities | |
| 24 | Compliance" attorney in San Diego. Beginning in 2017, Coldicutt participated in | |
| 25 | fraudulent scheme to create a sham public company and register an offering of its | |
| 26 | securities with the SEC, concealing from SEC filings the company's true control | |
| 27 | persons/promoters and source of funding, and his role as its securities attorney. | |
| 28 | 2. Approached by two managers of a hedge fund who sought to acquire a | |

public company whose shares they could freely trade, Coldicutt made a company up 1 out of thin air ("Issuer A"), that was purportedly a fruit-harvesting and distribution 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

27

28

- business. Coldicutt knew that Issuer A was a total sham, run by a puppet CEO, and funded by the undisclosed promoters. Knowing that his clients sought to carry out a pump and dump of the company's shares, Coldicutt prepared and filed with the SEC a materially misleading Form S-1 registration statement and several amendments thereto, including a fictitious business plan and fake form business agreements that he drafted (the "Issuer A Form S-1"). Having been previously sued by the SEC in two subpoena enforcement actions, to avoid arousing suspicions, Coldicutt arranged for another lawyer to sign the attorney opinion letter that accompanied Issuer A's SEC filings, and took steps to make the puppet CEO's public persona appear legitimate.
- By means of Coldicutt's fraudulent conduct, Issuer A's registration 3. statement went effective in 2019, fraudulently offering its securities to the public markets. Defendant received attorneys' fees and a bonus payment as a result of his role in the fraud.
- 4. Unbeknownst to Coldicutt, the undisclosed control persons/promoters who posed as his clients were an undercover FBI agent and a cooperating witness, as were several of their associates with whom Coldicutt interfaced in taking Issuer A public. Thus, Coldicutt's scheme to offer Issuer A's shares to the public through materially misleading SEC filings and other deceptive acts was the subject of numerous audio recordings, which reflect both his scienter and his actions in real time.
- 5. Through this conduct, Defendant violated Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §77q(a)(1)-(3). The SEC seeks a permanent injunction against future violations of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act; a permanent injunction against directly or indirectly providing, or receiving compensation from the provision of, professional legal services to any person or entity in connection with the offer or sale of securities by means of a registration statement, prospectus, offering circular, or

1

3

4 5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

private placement memorandum, including, without limitation, preparing or issuing any opinion letter relating to such offer or sale; a civil penalty; and a penny stock bar.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 20(b), 20(d)(1) and 22(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §77t(b), 77t(d)(1)(a).
- Defendant has, directly or indirectly, made use of the means or 7. instrumentalities of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, or by use of the mails, to engage in the transactions, acts, practices and courses of business alleged in this complaint.
- Venue is proper in this district pursuant to Section 22(a) of the Securities 8. Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77v(a), and Section 27(a) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78aa(a), because certain of the transactions, acts, practices and courses of conduct constituting violations of the federal securities laws occurred within this district. In addition, venue is proper in this district because Defendant resides in this district.

THE DEFENDANT

- 9. Andrew T.E. Coldicutt, age 41, is a Canadian citizen residing in San Diego, California. He is a securities attorney licensed to practice law in the State of California, and founder of the Law Offices of Andrew Coldicutt.
- On May 4, 2017, the SEC filed a subpoena enforcement application 10. against Coldicutt and his law firm in connection with investigative subpoenas issued by the SEC staff. SEC v. Andrew T.E. Coldicutt, et al., Case No. 2:17-cv-03401 (C.D. Cal. May 4, 2017), Case No. 2:17-mc-00068 (CAS) AFMx, Case No. 2:17-cv-03888 (CAS) AFMx. The Court issued an order to show cause on May 11, 2017 (Dkt. No. 8), followed by an order compelling compliance on June 8, 2017 (Dkt. No. 15). The SEC filed a supplemental subpoena enforcement application against Coldicutt and his law firm on July 7, 2017 (Dkt. No. 16), which likewise resulted in an order to show cause (Dkt. No. 17), followed by an order compelling compliance. SEC v. Coldicutt, No. 2:17-cv-03888 (CAS) AFMx, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 121056

(C.D. Cal. Jul. 31, 2017).

RELATED ENTITIES AND INDIVIDUALS

- 11. **Issuer A** is a Wyoming corporation, located in San Diego, California. According to its registration statement, it is a development stage company, planning to harvest and distribute surplus fruit from homeowners' backyards. Through its June 17, 2019 registration statement and three amendments thereto, Issuer A registered an initial public offering of 30 million shares of its common stock for \$0.01 per share, for a total of \$300,000. The registration statement went effective on September 11, 2019, and Issuer A is now a reporting company obligated to file reports pursuant to Sections 13 and 15(d) of the Exchange Act.
- 12. **Consulting Company B** is a Delaware limited liability company, which Issuer A's registration statement identifies as providing loans to Issuer A.

THE ALLEGATIONS

- A. Coldicutt is Hired by the "Fund Managers"
- 13. On or about May 8, 2017, two purported hedge fund managers ("Fund Manager 1" and "Fund Manager 2," collectively the "Fund Managers") contacted Coldicutt to inquire about potential legal representation for their supposed hedge fund (the "Fund").
 - 14. Fund Manager 1 was in fact an undercover FBI agent.
 - 15. Fund Manager 2 was in fact a cooperating witness.
- 16. The Fund Managers told Coldicutt they were seeking representation as to, among other things, creating new companies and taking them public.
- 17. Coldicutt set up a meeting with the Fund Managers for on or about May 16, 2017, in Del Mar, California.
- 18. During their initial May 16 meeting, the Fund Managers told Coldicutt that they wanted to create a company and take it public.
- 19. Subsequently, on or about June 13, 2017, Fund Manager 1 emailed Coldicutt that he and Fund Manager 2 wanted to retain Coldicutt.

4

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27 28

- On or about June 14, 2017, Coldicutt provided the Fund Managers his 20. estimate of legal fees, including that he charged \$25,000 to create a company and take it public.
- On or about June 15, 2017, Fund Manager 2 emailed Coldicutt asking 21. for information about the fees charged by various third party associates that he had mentioned to the Fund Managers, including accountants, an auditor, and transfer agents.
- 22. On or about June 21, 2017, Fund Manager 1 signed Coldicutt's engagement letter on behalf of the Fund and wired \$5,000 to Coldicutt's attorney trust account as a retainer.
 - The Fund Managers and Coldicutt Plan to Take Issuer A Public B.
- On or about July 18, 2017, the Fund Managers held a planning meeting 23. with Coldicutt in Del Mar, California.
- During the July 18 meeting, Coldicutt described to the Fund Managers 24. how he could create the façade of a bona fide business, take it public, and obtain quotation clearance for its stock to trade on the over-the-counter market.
- During the July 18 meeting, Coldicutt offered to provide the Fund 25. Managers with information about stock promoters in whom they were interested.
- 26. Coldicutt stated during the July 18 meeting that he did not get involved in stock promotions; instead, he found it best to remain on the periphery of the microcap market because it meant that he "dodged bullets."
- 27. During the July 18 meeting, Coldicutt suggested to the Fund Managers several ways to avoid regulatory scrutiny when creating a public shell company.
- First, the Fund Managers had to come up with a strong business plan for 28. the shell company from which to prepare a registration statement, to persuade the SEC that the shell company was a real business.
- 29. Coldicutt stated that he was good at writing business plans and could do so for any type of business. There was a peach on the table where the meeting took

place, which had come from a nearby tree in the Fund Managers' yard. Coldicutt joked that he could write a plan for a company that would pick surplus peaches from homeowners' backyards. Throughout the meeting, the Fund Managers and Coldicutt joked about a peach picking business, which ultimately became Issuer A.

- 30. Second, Coldicutt stated that to give the appearance of legitimacy, the shell company would need initial startup money.
- 31. Coldicutt suggested documenting the initial funding in the form of a loan.
- 32. Third, Coldicutt stated that the Fund Managers should select a CEO with a business background for the shell company, and "not a Starbucks barista."
- 33. Fourth, Coldicutt stated that the Fund Managers would need an outside CFO or bookkeeper to prepare the financial statements, as well as an outside auditor.
- 34. Coldicutt offered to suggest accountants and auditing firms for the Fund Managers' consideration.
- 35. To avoid regulatory scrutiny, Coldicutt suggested selecting an audit firm that had previously conducted audits in the business sector of the shell company.
- 36. Fifth, Coldicutt stated that the Fund Managers should find 25 to 30 shareholders to invest in a private offering.
- 37. Coldicutt advised documenting the private offering with private placement memoranda and copies of investor checks.
- 38. Coldicutt advised that the investors should be "friendly" with the Fund Managers so that they would hold or trade the stock as the Fund Managers chose.
- 39. Coldicutt explained that, in order to get quotation clearance, FINRA would want to see a shareholder base, with actual investors who put their own money into the company.
- 40. Coldicutt cautioned that the investors had to be "real" because their names would appear in the S-1.
 - 41. The Fund Managers expressed concern to Coldicutt about the names of

7

9

1011

12

14

13

1516

17

18 19

2021

2223

2425

26

2728

the private offering shareholders, particularly their own names or the Fund's names, appearing in the Form S-1.

- 42. Coldicutt suggested instead having the 25 to 30 shareholders buy the shares from the Form S-1 once it was effective.
- 43. During the July 18 meeting, the Fund Managers asked about the status of the SEC's subpoena enforcement action against Coldicutt.
- 44. Fund Manager 1 asked if "things got difficult" for Coldicutt, whether they would still be able to work with him.
- 45. Coldicutt responded that he could still do the legwork but that he would have another microcap attorney "do the rest."
- 46. During the July 18 meeting, the Fund Managers told Coldicutt that they would proceed with taking a shell company public.
- 47. Fund Manager 1 told Coldicutt that the Fund Managers planned to pivot the shell company into the cannabis business, and run a stock promotional campaign.
 - 48. Coldicutt replied that "we" should come up with a business idea.
 - 49. Coldicutt stated that he could write the business plan.
- 50. Coldicutt suggested that the shell company be a peach-picking company, and the Fund Managers agreed.
- 51. Coldicutt advised the Fund Managers to start looking for a CEO for the shell company.

C. Coldicutt Prepares a Fictitious Business Plan for Issuer A

- 52. After the July 18 meeting, Coldicutt drafted a business plan for Issuer A.
- 53. The business plan described Issuer A as a company that would collect unpicked fruit from homeowners in the Southern California area, consolidate it, and sell it to grocery stores and the public generally.
 - 54. Coldicutt knew, when he drafted the business plan, that it was fictitious.
- 55. Coldicutt knew, when he drafted the business plan, that the Fund Managers planned for Issuer A to operate in the cannabis industry and run a stock

promotion campaign.

D. Coldicutt and the Fund Managers Discuss Issuer A's Source of Funding

- 56. Coldicutt met with the Fund Managers on or about September 27, 2017 in Del Mar, California.
- 57. At the September 27 meeting, the Fund Managers introduced Coldicutt to a consultant who would purportedly provide funding for Issuer A (the "Consultant").
- 58. The Fund Managers told Coldicutt that Consulting Company B was the Consultant's company.
- 59. At the September 27 meeting, the Fund Managers and the Consultant discussed, in front of Coldicutt, that Fund Manager 1's money would go to Consulting Company B, and would then be loaned to Issuer A.
- 60. Coldicutt suggested at the September 27 meeting that Consulting Company B's loans would become convertible to Issuer A stock, which would generate more free trading shares.
- 61. At the September 27 meeting, Coldicutt provided a copy of the Issuer A business plan to the Fund Managers and the Consultant.
- 62. On or about October 16, 2017, the Fund Managers informed Coldicutt that they had selected a puppet CEO ("the Puppet"), to serve as Issuer A's CEO.
- 63. Coldicutt understood that the Puppet was controlled by the Fund Managers.
 - 64. The Puppet was, unbeknownst to Coldicutt, an undercover FBI agent.
- 65. Although the Puppet was the nominal CEO, Coldicutt communicated on decisions concerning Issuer A with the Fund Managers and the Consultant, sometimes including the Puppet and sometimes not including him.

1112

13 14

1516

17

18 19

2021

2324

22

25

2627

28

E. Coldicutt Takes Additional Steps to Make Issuer A Appear Legitimate and Avoid Arousing Regulatory Suspicion

- 66. Between late 2017 and approximately mid-August of 2018, Coldicutt periodically contacted the Fund Managers about Issuer A.
- 67. On or about November 14, 2017, in Del Mar, California, Fund Manager 1 introduced Coldicutt to an associate of his (the "Associate"), whose role he indicated was to help make Fund Manager 1's new companies appear legitimate and to organize stock promotions.
 - 68. On November 20, 2017, Coldicutt incorporated Issuer A in Wyoming.
 - 69. The Associate, unbeknownst to Coldicutt, was a cooperating witness.
- 70. From that point in time, the Associate became Coldicutt's main point of contact regarding Issuer A.
- 71. In or about May 10, 2019, Coldicutt recommended to the Associate an audit firm ("Audit Firm C"), to serve as the outside auditor for Issuer A.
- 72. Coldicutt explained to the Associate that Audit Firm C had experience with microcap issuers, but did not audit so many microcap firms that it might arouse regulatory suspicion.
- 73. Coldicutt explained to the Associate that if the audit fee for Issuer A was too low, that could arouse regulatory suspicion.
- 74. During the same call, Coldicutt suggested to the Associate that the Puppet update his social media profile.
- 75. Coldicutt stated he had done some internet searches on the Puppet and found very little information.
- 76. Coldicutt told the Associate that most people have a biographical profile on social media, and the lack of one for the Puppet "looked strange."
- 77. Coldicutt recommended that the Puppet's profile go back five years and that it should show him "doing something."
 - 78. The Associate later told Coldicutt that the Puppet had created a social

media profile, per his suggestion.

- 79. In or about January 19, 2018, the Fund Managers told Coldicutt that a stock promoter with whom they had met was leery of working with Coldicutt, due to the SEC subpoena enforcement actions against him.
- 80. On May 20, 2019, Coldicutt emailed the Puppet and the Associate, attaching an engagement letter for another attorney ("Attorney D") who would provide the opinion letter for Issuer A's Form S-1, instead of Coldicutt providing it.
- 81. In an email dated June 5, 2019 from Coldicutt to Audit Firm C, Issuer A's bookkeeper, and the Puppet, Coldicutt falsely stated that changing attorneys had been the Puppet's idea.
 - 82. Coldicutt however continued to perform legal work for Issuer A.
- 83. In conversations with the Associate between at least May 15, 2019 and July 30, 2019, the Associate reiterated to Coldicutt that the Fund Managers intended to rebrand Issuer A as a cannabis company and then run a promotional campaign in order to sell its shares at a profit.
- 84. The Associate also told Coldicutt he was working on other similar deals with the Fund Manager, which Coldicutt said he would be interested in working on.
 - F. Coldicutt Prepares and Files with the SEC Issuer A's Materially False and Misleading Registration Statement and Amendments thereto
- 85. Coldicutt had begun to prepare Issuer A's draft Form S-1 as early as October 2017.
- 86. On or about May 10, 2019, Coldicutt sent the draft S-1 by email for review by Issuer A's auditor, bookkeeper, and the Puppet.
- 87. On June 17, 2019, Coldicutt filed Issuer A's initial Form S-1 with the SEC.
- 88. Between June and August, 2019, Coldicutt, on behalf of Issuer A, subsequently responded to several comments on the S-1 from the SEC's Division of

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

24

23

25

26 27

28

Corporation Finance.

- Coldicutt prepared and filed Issuer A's amended Forms S-1 on July 25, 89. August 5, and August 27, 2019.
 - 90. The Issuer A Form S-1 went effective on September 11, 2019.
- 91. The Issuer A Form S-1 was materially false and misleading in several aspects, and gave the false impression that Issuer A was an actual fruit harvesting and distribution business, whereas it was a sham company.

Misstatements regarding Issuer A's business a.

- 92. The Issuer A Form S-1 characterized Issuer A as a development stage company that would go into the fruit harvesting and distribution industry.
 - 93. In reality, Coldicutt had simply made up the company.
- Coldicutt had been told, by the time he prepared the Form S-1, that the 94. Fund Managers' actual plan for Issuer A's business was to convert it into a cannabis company and carry out a stock promotion campaign.
- Coldicutt knew, or was reckless or negligent in not knowing, that the 95. description of the business plan in Issuer A's Form S-1 was false and misleading.
- 96. It would have been important to a reasonable investor to know the true nature of the business that they were investing in and thus important for them to know that Issuer A's actual intended business was to eventually be a cannabis company that would be subject to a stock promotion campaign.

Deceptive sham form agreements b.

- 97. The Issuer A Form S-1 had, as attachments, purported form agreements with third parties, for the fruit harvesting and distribution business.
 - Coldicutt created the sham form agreements. 98.
- 99. One of the sham agreements purported to be between Issuer A and a homeowner, to allow the company to harvest the latter's surplus fruit.
- The other sham agreement purported to be between Issuer A and a fruit picker.

- 101. The form agreements deceptive, because, they gave the impression that Issuer A was focused upon developing as a fruit harvesting and distribution business, even though, and as Coldicutt had been told, the Fund Managers planned to rebrand Issuer A as a cannabis company.
- 102. Coldicutt knew, or was reckless or negligent in not knowing, that the form agreements were deceptive.
- 103. It would have been important to a reasonable investor to know that the agreements did not reflect actual intended business operations of Issuer A.

c. Undisclosed control person/promoter

- 104. The Issuer A Form S-1 stated that the Puppet was Issuer A's sole officer, director, promoter, and control person.
 - 105. The Fund Managers were not mentioned in the S-1.
- 106. Coldicutt knew the Fund Managers were in control of both Issuer A and the Puppet.
- 107. The identification of solely the Puppet as Issuer A's control person and promoter was false and misleading, given Fund Manager 1's control of the company.
- 108. Coldicutt knew, or was reckless or negligent in not knowing, that the Form S-1 was false or misleading in its description of Issuer A's control persons/promoters.
- 109. It would have been important to a reasonable investor to know who was running the company in which they were considering an investment and thus that Issuer A was actually controlled/promoted by the Fund Managers rather than the Puppet.

d. Misleading statements re: funding by the Puppet

- 110. The Issuer A Form S-1 stated that in 2017, the Puppet provided Issuer A \$5,000 in initial funding for 5 million shares of its common stock.
 - 111. This description of Issuer A's funding was false.
 - 112. In reality, Coldicutt recharacterized the \$5,000 retainer that he had

received from Fund Manager 1 on behalf of the Fund as funding by the Puppet.

- 113. Contrary to the statement in the S-1, the Puppet did not provide any initial funding to Issuer A.
- 114. Coldicutt knew, or was reckless or negligent in not knowing, that the Puppet had not provided the \$5,000 referenced in the Form S-1.
- 115. It would have been important to a reasonable investor to know that Issuer A's undisclosed control persons/promoters had actually provided it the \$5,000 referenced, rather than its disclosed CEO.

e. Misleading statements re: funding from Consulting Company B

- 116. The Issuer A Form S-1 stated that, from November 20, 2017 to May 20, 2019, Consulting Company B had provided \$29,000 in funding to Issuer A, in return for promissory notes.
- 117. The statement regarding Issuer A's receipt of funding from Consulting Company B was false and misleading.
- 118. Coldicutt had been told that Consulting Company B was merely a front for Fund Manager 1's financing of the company.
- 119. Coldicutt knew, or was reckless or negligent in not knowing, that the description of the source of Issuer A's startup funding from Consulting Company B was false and misleading.
- 120. It would have been important to investors to know that Issuer A's actual startup funding came from its undisclosed control persons/promoters.

f. Concealment of Coldicutt's identity

- 121. Issuer A's Form S-1 included an attorney opinion letter concluding that the shares to be issued in the offering were validly issued, fully paid, and non-assessable.
 - 122. Attorney D signed the opinion letter.
- 123. Coldicutt had Attorney D sign the opinion letter in order to hide Coldicutt's name from Issuer A's Form S-1 filed with the SEC.

124. Coldicutt wanted to keep his name out of the Form S-1 to avoid arousing the SEC's suspicion, since he was the subject of the two prior subpoena enforcement applications.

G. Coldicutt's Receipt of Funds

- 125. Coldicutt received at least \$39,500 for his role in Issuer A's fraudulent Form S-1.
- 126. First, Coldicutt received approximately \$37,000 in attorneys' fees for preparing the Issuer A Form S-1 and reviewing and answering follow-up questions from the SEC.
- 127. This included, among other fees paid to him, Coldicutt's \$5,000 retainer and the \$5,000 received from Consulting Company B.
- 128. Second, Coldicutt received a bonus or "progress payment" from the Associate, which was paid by Fund Manager 1, and which was tied to the filing of Issuer A's Form S-1.
- 129. On or about May 15, 2019, the Associate told Coldicutt that Fund Manager 1 was going to pay him \$100,000, once Issuer A's registration statement was declared effective and its stock received a trading symbol.
- 130. The Associate also stated to Coldicutt that he was going to try to get progress payments from Fund Manager 1, so he could receive some of the money as soon as Issuer A's registration was filed, and some when it went effective.
- 131. The Associate offered to share a portion of the progress payments with Coldicutt.
- 132. On or about June 28, 2019, approximately one week after Issuer A's initial Form S-1 was filed with the SEC, Coldicutt received \$2,500 from the Associate, half of the first such progress payment.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Fraud in the Offer or Sale of Securities

Violations of Sections 17(a)(1) and (3) of the Securities Act

- 133. The SEC realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 132 above.
- 134. Defendant Coldicutt, a securities attorney, intentionally created a fictitious company with a sham business plan and fake form agreements; prepared and filed with the SEC its Form S-1 registration statement and amendments thereto, which concealed the issuer's true control, business nature and source of funding; and hid his role in the offering, while undertaking other deceptive acts to buttress the company's purported legitimacy and avoid arousing regulatory suspicion.
- 135. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendant Coldicutt, directly or indirectly, in the offer or sale of securities, and by the use of means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails directly or indirectly: (a) employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud; and (b) engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser.
- 136. Defendant Coldicutt, with scienter, employed devices, schemes and artifices to defraud; and, with scienter or negligence, engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser.
- 137. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendant Coldicutt violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Sections 17(a)(1) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77q(a)(1), 77q(a)(3).

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Fraud in the Offer or Sale of Securities

Violations of Section 17(a)(2) of the Securities Act

138. The SEC realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through

132 above.

- 139. Defendant Coldicutt, a securities attorney, obtained money by means of materially misleading statements in Issuer A's Form S-1 registration statements and the amendments thereto. The registration statement falsely portrayed the company's business; its true control and sources of funding; fictitious form agreements for its business operations; and it omitted Coldicutt's role as the company's securities attorney. As a result of his conduct, Coldicutt obtained attorneys fees and a bonus payment.
- 140. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendant Coldicutt, directly or indirectly, in the offer or sale of securities, and by the use of means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails directly or indirectly: (b) obtained money or property by means of untrue statements of a material fact or by omitting to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.
- 141. Defendant Coldicutt, with scienter or negligence, obtained money or property by means of untrue statements of a material fact or by omitting to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.
- 142. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendant Coldicutt violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Section 17(a)(2) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)(2).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the SEC respectfully requests that the Court:

I.

Issue findings of fact and conclusions of law that Defendant committed the alleged violations.

1 || II.

Issue a judgment, in a form consistent with Rule 65(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, permanently enjoining Defendant, and his officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them, who receive actual notice of the judgment by personal service or otherwise, and each of them, from violating Section 17(a) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §77q(a)].

III.

Issue a judgment, in a form consistent with Rule 65(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, permanently enjoining Defendant, and his officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them, who receive actual notice of the judgment by personal service or otherwise, and each of them, from directly or indirectly providing, or receiving compensation from the provision of, professional legal services to any person or entity in connection with the offer or sale of securities by means of a registration statement, prospectus, offering circular, or private placement memorandum, including, without limitation, preparing or issuing any opinion letter relating to such offer or sale.

IV.

Order Defendant to pay a civil penalty under Section 20(d) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(d)].

V.

Bar Defendant from participating in any offering of a penny stock, including: acting as a promoter, finder, consultant, agent or other person who engages in activities with a broker, dealer or issuer for purposes of the issuance or trading in any penny stock, or inducing or attempting to induce the purchase or sale of any penny stock under Section 20(g) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(g)].

VI. Retain jurisdiction of this action in accordance with the principles of equity and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in order to implement and carry out the terms of all orders and decrees that may be entered, or to entertain any suitable application or motion for additional relief within the jurisdiction of this Court. VII. Grant such other and further relief as this Court may determine to be just and necessary. Dated: March 1, 2022 /s/ Amy Jane Longo Amy Jane Longo Roberto A. Tercero Attorneys for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission