```
1
   JAMES H. HOLL, III, CA Bar No. 177885
   ALAN I. EDELMAN, DC Bar No. 375495
   1155 21st Street, NW
3
   Washington, DC 20581
   Telephone (202) 418-5000
   Facsimile (202) 418-5523
   jholl@cftc.gov
5
   aedelman@cftc.gov
6
   Attorneys for Plaintiff U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission
7
8
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9
               SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
   UNITED STATES COMMODITY
11
                                            Case No. '13CV2887 DMS NLS
   FUTURES TRADING
   COMMISSION,
12
13
                                       COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE
              Plaintiff,
                                       AND OTHER EQUITABLE
        VS.
14
                                       RELIEF AND PENALTIES UNDER
15
                                     ) THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE
   DIRECT INVESTMENT
                                     ) ACT, AS AMENDED, 7 U.S.C. §§ 1-
   PRODUCTS, INC. and
16
                                       et seq.
   ALEXANDER GLYTENKO,
17
              Defendants.
18
19
                            I.
                                  SUMMARY
20
         1.
              From approximately 2005 until approximately 2010 (the
21
   "relevant period"), Direct Investment Products, Inc. ("DIP"), by and
22
23
   through the actions of its employees and agents, including, but not
24
   limited to, Alexander Glytenko ("Glytenko") (collectively,
25
   "Defendants"), fraudulently solicited approximately $3.9 million
26
27
   from approximately 761 individuals residing in Russia and various
28
```

former republics of the former Soviet Union to become participants in a commodity pool known as DIP Capital Partners (the "Pool") that traded in futures and options on commodities, indices, currencies, treasury bonds and notes, and metals.

- 2. During the course of soliciting prospective participants for the Pool, Defendants, either directly or through their agents, knowingly misrepresented the Pool's performance history by: a) presenting to prospective participants profitable performance figures for various of the Pool's funds for years in which they knew the Pool did not exist; b) presenting to prospective participants hypothetical trading performance without labeling it as such; and c) presenting to prospective participants at least two years of profitable performance results for one of the Pool's funds when, in fact, that fund had experienced losses during those years.
- 3. Defendants, either directly or through their agents, also knowingly misrepresented the Pool's performance to actual participants by: a) providing participants with profitable performance figures the Pool's trading strategy for years in which they knew the Pool did not exist; b) providing to participants hypothetical trading performance without labeling it as such; c) providing to participants

account statements which they knew contained inaccurate or falsified information.

- 4. In November 2009, Defendants misappropriated at least \$464,000 of participants' funds to make a personal loan from the Pool to Glytenko. This loan has never been repaid.
- 5. By virtue of this conduct and the conduct further described herein, Defendants have engaged, are engaging in, or are about to engage in conduct in violation of Sections 4b(a)(2)(i)-(iii) of the Commodity Exchange Act ("Act"), 7 U.S.C. §§ 6b(a)(2)(i)-(iii) (2006), with respect to acts occurring before June 18, 2008, Sections 4b(a)(1)(A)-(C) of the Act, as amended by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-246, Title XIII (the CFTC Reauthorization Act of 2008 ("CRA")), §§ 13101-13204, 122 Stat. 1651(enacted June 18, 2008), 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(A)-(C) (Supp. II 2009), for conduct occurring on or after June 18, 2008, and Sections 4b(a)(1)(A)-(C) of the Act, as amended by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 ("Dodd-Frank Act"), Pub. L. No. 111-203, Title VII (the Wall Street Transparency and Accountability Act of 2010), §§ 701-774, 124 Stat. 1376 (effective July 16, 2011), 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(A)-(C) (Supp. IV 2011), for conduct

occurring on or after July 16, 2011; (ii) Section 4o(1) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 6o(1); and (iii) Commission Regulation 4.41(b), 17 C.F.R. §§ 4.41(b)(2013).

- 6. At all relevant times, the acts and omissions of Glytenko and others were committed within the scope of their employment, agency, or office with DIP and, therefore, DIP is liable for Glytenko's violations, as well as for any other agents' violations of the Act and Regulations pursuant to Section 2(a)(1)(B) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 2(a)(1)(B).
- 7. During the relevant time, Glytenko directly and indirectly controlled DIP, and did not act in good faith or knowingly induced, directly or indirectly, the acts constituting DIP's violations described herein.

 Glytenko is therefore liable as a controlling person, pursuant to Section 13(b) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13c(b), for DIP's violations.
- 8. Unless restrained and enjoined by this Court, Defendants are likely to continue to engage in the acts and practices alleged in this Complaint or in similar acts and practices, as described more fully below.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Section 6c(a) of the Act, as amended, to be codified at 7 U.S.C. §13a-1(a), which provides that, whenever it shall appear to the Commission that any person has engaged in, is engaging in, or is about to engage in any act or practice

that constitutes a violation of any provision of the Act or any rule, regulation, or order promulgated thereunder, the Commission may bring an action against such person to enjoin such practice or to enforce compliance with the Act.

10. Venue properly lies with this Court pursuant to Section 6c(e) of the Act, as amended, to be codified at, 7 U.S.C. §13a-1(e), because Defendants are found in, inhabit, or transact business in this District, or the acts and practices in violation of the Act occurred, are occurring, or are about to occur within this District, among other places.

III. THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

11. Plaintiff U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission is an independent federal regulatory agency charged by Congress with the responsibility for administering and enforcing the provisions of the Act, as amended, to be codified at 7 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq., and the Commission's Regulations promulgated thereunder, 17 C.F.R. §§ 1 et seq. (2012).

B. Defendants

12. Defendant Direct Investment Products, Inc. is a California corporation incorporated in 2005 with its principal place of business in Carlsbad, California. DIP has been registered with the Commission as a

Commodity Trading Advisor ("CTA") and as a Commodity Pool Operator ("CPO") since April 2007.

13. Defendant Alexander Glytenko is an individual whose last known address was in Carlsbad, California. Glytenko is the Chief Executive Officer and a controlling person of DIP. Since March 2007, Glytenko has been a Principal of DIP, and, since April 2007, he has been registered with the Commission as an Associated Person ("AP") of DIP. Since March 2007, Glytenko has also been a Principal and registered AP of Institutional Capital Management LLC, a registered CPO.

IV. FACTS

- A. Defendants Fraudulently Solicited \$3.9 Million From Approximately 761 Individuals
- 14. From approximately 2005 until approximately 2010, DIP, by and through the actions of its employees and agents, including, but not limited to, Glytenko, fraudulently solicited approximately \$3.9 million from approximately 761 individuals residing in Russia and various former republics of the former Soviet Union to become participants in a commodity pool known as DIP Capital Partners, that traded in futures and options on commodities, indices, currencies, treasury bonds and notes, and metals.
- 15. In approximately 2005, Defendant Glytenko created an entity known as DIP Consulting for the purpose of soliciting individuals to become

participants in DIP Capital Partners. From approximately 2005 until approximately mid-2007, Glytenko was a co-director of DIP Consulting. From approximately mid-2007 until approximately 2010, Glytenko was the sole director of DIP Consulting.

- 16. DIP Consulting conducted "educational seminars" that were held in cities throughout the former Soviet Union. During the course of these seminars, Defendants, either directly or through their agents in DIP Consulting, presented prospective participants with promotional material about DIP, the Pool, and the various funds that were being traded on behalf of the Pool. This promotional material included numerous charts which were represented to be the trading performance history for the Pool and its various funds.
- 17. At various times during the relevant period, Defendant
 Glytenko either directly or through their agents in DIP created, provided
 information that was used in the creation of, and/or approved the
 promotional material that was used at these seminars. At various times
 during the relevant period, Defendant Glytenko also personally attended and
 participated in these seminars.
- 18. During the course of these seminars, Defendants, either directly or through their agents in DIP Consulting, misrepresented and omitted

individuals to become participants in the Pool. For example, one chart showed total growth in profits for the Pool of 252% from January 2003 through December 2008. The chart represented that the Pool made yearly profits in each year during this time period, ranging from 12.60% to 47.20%. The chart represented that the Pool made a yearly profit of 25.20% in 2003 and a yearly profit of 18.09% in 2004.

- 19. A second chart represented the growth in profits for one of the Pool's funds known as the DI-Growth Fund. This chart represented total growth in profits for the DI-Growth Fund of 245% from January 2004 through December 2008. The chart represented that the DI-Growth Fund made yearly profits in each year during this time period, ranging from 12.01% to 41.12%. The chart represented that the DI-Growth Fund made a yearly profit of 41.12% in 2004.
- 20. A third chart represented the growth in profits for another of the Pool's funds known as the ICF Fund. This chart represented total growth in profits for the ICF Fund of 322% from January 2004 through December 2008. The chart represented that the ICF Fund made yearly profits in each year during this time period, ranging from 10.16% to 49.79%. The chart represented that the ICF Fund made a yearly profit of 47.22% in 2004. The

chart also represented that ICF made a yearly profit of 18.83% in 2007 and a yearly profit of 10.16% in 2008.

- 21. Contrary to the representations made by Defendants, either directly or through their agents in DIP Consulting, the Pool's DI-Growth Fund and ICF Fund did not make yearly profits in 2004, nor did the Pool make overall yearly profits in 2003 and 2004, because the Pool did not exist until 2005.
- 22. Also contrary to the representations made by Defendants, either directly or through their agents in DIP Consulting, the Pool's ICF Fund did not make yearly profits of 18.83% in 2007 and 10.16% in 2008; in fact, according to certified financial statements filed with the National Futures Association, the ICF Fund experienced losses of 4.03% in 2007 and 43.15% in 2008.
- 23. Moreover, none of the performance figures represented on the charts presented to prospective participants is reflective of actual trading that was done by or on behalf of the Pool; rather, the figures reflect the theoretical performance of Defendant DIP's proprietary trading strategy known as DI-Portfolio. Despite this fact, Defendants did not, either directly or through their agents in DIP Consulting, include any disclaimer on the

charts informing prospective participants that the performance presented was theoretical as opposed to actual.

- 24. Based on the information presented to them at these seminars, numerous individuals became participants in the Pool. In deciding to become participants in the Pool, participants relied, among other things, upon Defendants' misrepresentations and omissions regarding the performance record of the Pool.
- 25. Defendants, through their own acts and omissions and the acts and omissions of their agents, knowingly and recklessly made the material misrepresentations and omitted the material facts alleged above to induce individuals to become participants in the Pool.

B. Defendants Issued False Statements to Participants

26. During the relevant period, Defendants, either directly or through their agents, maintained an internet website at www.di-holding.com. Defendants, either directly or through their agents, provided Pool participants with ongoing daily access to information pertaining to the performance of the Pool and the Net Asset Value ("NAV") of the Pool through a password-protected portal on the website. At various times during the relevant period, Defendant Glytenko either directly created or provided information that was used in the creation of material that was posted on the

website. At other times during the relevant time period, Defendant Glytenko reviewed and/or verified information prior to its posting on the website.

- 27. Defendants, either directly or through their agents, misrepresented and omitted material facts regarding the performance of the Pool on the password-protected portion of the website in order to induce Pool participants to maintain their funds in the Pool, to invest additional funds in the Pool, and to persuade others to become participants in the Pool. For example, throughout the relevant time period, Defendants, either directly or through their agents, provided participants with information on the password-protected portion of the website that purported to represent the historical returns achieved by the Pool's DI-Portfolio trading strategy. This information consisted of charts that showed overall profitable returns for the strategy going back as far as 2002. The charts listed both monthly and yearly returns and represented that the strategy had achieved yearly returns of 27.12% in 2002, 25.19% in 2003, and 18.07% in 2004.
- 28. Contrary to the representations in these charts, the Pool's trading strategy did not achieve profits in 2002, 2003, and 2004 because the Pool did not exist until 2005. Moreover, none of the performance figures represented on the charts provided to participants is reflective of actual trading that was done by or on behalf of the Pool; rather, the figures reflect

the theoretical performance of DI-Portfolio trading strategy. Despite this fact, Defendants did not, either directly or through their agents, include any disclaimer on the charts informing prospective participants that the performance presented was theoretical as opposed to actual.

29. Throughout the relevant time period, Defendants, either directly or through their agents, also provided participants with information on the password-protected portion of the website as to the Pool's NAV. The Pool's NAV calculation was based on the net asset values of the various funds in which the Pool traded. In or about late 2008, Defendants, either directly or through their agents, received information that one of the funds in which the Pool was invested had sustained substantial losses. These losses would have a significant impact on the NAV of that particular fund and, in turn, on the NAV of the Pool itself. Despite their knowledge of this information, for several months thereafter Defendants neither updated the the Pool's NAV calculation to reflect these losses, nor did they inform the Pool's participants of the losses and their impact on the Pool's NAV. Indeed, for at least several months, Defendants, either directly or through their agents, provided participants with NAV calculations that they knew were false or inaccurate. In addition, during this time period some Pool participants received

redemptions for their interests in the Pool based on NAV calculations that Defendants knew were false or inaccurate.

- 30. Defendants' misrepresentations and omissions on the passwordprotected portion of the website caused existing participants to maintain their funds in the Pool, to invest additional funds in the Pool, and to persuade others to become participants in the Pool.
 - C. Defendants Misappropriated \$464,000 of Participants' Funds
- 31. Defendant DIP, by and through the actions of its employees and agents, including but not limited to Glytenko, directed Pool participants to deposit funds into bank accounts held in the name of the Pool and controlled by Glytenko or agents under the control of Glytenko.
- 32. As a result of the losses incurred by the Pool in late 2008,
 Defendants, in or about January 2009, either directly or through their agents,
 instituted a freeze on participants' withdrawal of funds from the Pool.
- 33. While the freeze on participants' withdrawals was still in effect, Defendant Glytenko, in or about November 2009, used participants' funds to make a loan of \$464,000 from DIP to himself. Under the terms of the loan agreement, which does not require repayment by Glytenko for five years, there was no limitation on how Glytenko could use this money.

34. To the present time, participants have been unable to withdraw their funds from the Pool.

D. Glytenko Controlled DIP

35. Glytenko is the Chief Executive Officer, principal, and majority shareholder of DIP. He exercised control over the day-to-day operations of DIP. He had authority to hire and fire DIP employees and he oversaw their activities. He entered into agreements and opened bank and trading accounts on behalf of DIP. At various times during the relevant period, he created, reviewed, and/or approved solicitation materials used to solicit potential participants, as well as information provided to actual participants on the DIP website.

V. <u>VIOLATIONS OF THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT</u> <u>COUNT ONE</u>

VIOLATIONS OF SECTIONS 4b(a)(1)(A) AND (C) OF THE ACT: FRAUD BY FRAUDULENT SOLICITATION

- 36. Paragraphs 1 through 35 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.
 - 37. Sections 4b(a)(2)(i) and (iii) of the Act make it unlawful:

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, made, or to be made, for or on behalf of any other person if such contract for future delivery is or may be used for (A) hedging any

transaction in interstate commerce in such commodity or the products or byproducts thereof, or (B) determining the price basis of any transaction in interstate commerce in such commodity, or (C) delivering any such commodity sold, shipped, or received in interstate commerce for the fulfillment thereof—(i) to cheat or defraud or attempt to cheat or defraud such other person. . .; or (iii) willfully to deceive or attempt to deceive such other person by any means whatsoever in regard to any such order or contract or disposition or execution of any such order or contract, or in regard to any act of agency performed with respect to such order or contract for such person.

Similarly, with respect to acts occurring on or after June 18, 2008 and prior to July 16, 2011, Sections 4b(a)(1)(A) and (C) of the Act, as amended by the CRA, make it unlawful:

for any person, in or in connection with any order to make, or the making of, any contract of sale of any commodity in interstate commerce or for future delivery that is made, or to be made, on or subject to the rules of a designated contract market, for or on behalf of any other person... (A) to cheat or defraud or attempt to cheat or defraud the other person...; [or] (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 or execution of any order or contract, or in regard to any act of agency performed, with respect to any order or contract for or, in the case of paragraph (2), with the other person.

Sections 4b(a)(1)(A) and (C) of the Act, as amended by the Dodd-Frank Act, 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(A) and (C) (Supp. IV 2011), make the same conduct unlawful in connection with acts occurring on or after July 16, 2011.

26

27

28

By, among other things: a) presenting to prospective 38. participants profitable performance figures for various of the Pool's funds for years in which they knew the Pool did not exist; b) presenting to prospective participants hypothetical trading performance without labeling it as such; and c) presenting to prospective participants at least two years of profitable performance results for one of the Pool's funds when, in fact, that fund had experienced losses during those years, DIP, by and through the actions of Glytenko, among others, knowingly, willfully, or with reckless disregard for the truth, violated Sections 4b(a)(2)(i) and (iii) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(2)(i) and (iii) (2006), with respect to acts occurring before June 18, 2008, Sections 4b(a)(1)(A) and (C) of the Act, as amended by the CRA, 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(A) and (C) (Supp. II 2009), for conduct occurring on or after June 18, 2008, and Sections 4b(a)(1)(A) and (C) of the Act, as amended by the Dodd-Frank Act, Pub. L. No. 111-203, Title VII (the Wall Street Transparency and Accountability Act of 2010), §§ 701-774, 124 Stat. 1376 (effective July 16, 2011), 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(A) and (C) (Supp. IV 2011), for conduct occurring on or after July 16, 2011.

39. Glytenko committed the acts alleged herein within the course and scope of his employment, office, or agency with DIP. DIP is therefore

liable pursuant to Section 2(a)(1)(B) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 2(a)(1)(B) (2006), and Regulation 1.2, 17 C.F.R. § 1.2 (2010), as principal for Glytenko's violations of the Act.

- 40. Glytenko, directly or indirectly, controlled DIP and did not act in good faith, or knowingly induced, directly or indirectly, the acts constituting DIP's violations of the Act. Therefore, pursuant to Section 13(b) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13c(b) (2006), Glytenko is liable for DIP's violations of the Act.
- 41. Each act of fraudulent solicitation, misappropriation and false statement or report, including but not limited to those specifically alleged herein, is alleged as a separate and distinct violation of Sections 4b(a)(2)(i) and (iii) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(2)(i) and (iii) (2006), with respect to acts occurring before June 18, 2008, Sections 4b(a)(1)(A) and (C) of the Act, as amended by the CRA, 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(A) and (C) (Supp. II 2009), for conduct occurring on or after June 18, 2008, and Sections 4b(a)(1)(A) and (C) of the Act, as amended by the Dodd-Frank Act, Pub. L. No. 111-203, Title VII (the Wall Street Transparency and Accountability Act of 2010), §§ 701-774, 124 Stat. 1376 (effective July 16, 2011), 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(A) and (C) (Supp. IV 2011), for conduct occurring on or after July 16, 2011.

COUNT TWO

VIOLATIONS OF SECTIONS 4b(a)(1)(A) AND (C) OF THE ACT: FRAUD BY MISAPPROPRIATION

- 42. Paragraphs 1 through 41 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.
- 43. By using funds solicited and accepted for the purpose of trading commodity futures to make a personal loan to Glytenko, Defendants knowingly and willfully misappropriated funds in violation of Sections 4b(a)(1)(A) and (C) of the Act, as amended by the CRA, 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(A) and (C) (Supp. II 2009), for conduct occurring on or after June 18, 2008.
- 44. The foregoing acts of misappropriation by Glytenko occurred within the course and scope of his employment, office, or agency with DIP. DIP is therefore liable pursuant to Section 2(a)(1)(B) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 2(a)(1)(B) (2006), and Regulation 1.2, 17 C.F.R. § 1.2 (2010), as principal for Glytenko's violations of the Act.
- 45. Glytenko, directly or indirectly, controlled DIP and did not act in good faith, or knowingly induced, directly or indirectly, the acts constituting DIP's violations of the Act. Therefore, pursuant to Section 13(b) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13c(b) (2006), Glytenko is liable for DIP's violations of the Act.

5

COUNT THREE

VIOLATIONS OF SECTIONS 4b(a)(1)(B) OF THE ACT: FRAUD BY FALSE STATEMENTS

- 46. Paragraphs 1 through 45 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.
 - 47. Section 4b(a)(2)(ii) of the Act makes it unlawful:

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, made, or to be made, for or on behalf of any other person if such contract for future delivery is or may be used for (A) hedging any transaction in interstate commerce in such commodity or the products or byproducts thereof, or (B) determining the price basis of any transaction in interstate commerce in such commodity, or (C) delivering any such commodity sold, shipped, or received in interstate commerce for the fulfillment thereof... [to] (ii) willfully to make or cause to be made to such other person any false report or statement thereof....

Similarly, with respect to acts occurring on or after June 18, 2008 and prior to July 16, 2011, Section 4b(a)(1)(B) of the Act, as amended by the CRA, makes it unlawful:

for any person, in or in connection with any order to make, or the making of, any contract of sale of any commodity in interstate commerce or for future delivery that is made, or to be made, on or subject to the rules of a designated contract market, for or on behalf of any other person... [to] (B) willfully to make or cause to be made to the other person any false report or statement or willfully to enter or cause to be entered for the other person any false record....

Section 4b(a)(1)(B) of the Act, as amended by the Dodd-Frank Act, 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(B) (Supp. IV 2011), makes the same conduct unlawful in connection with acts occurring on or after July 16, 2011.

- By making, or causing to be made, false statements to 48. participants in the form of communications on the password-protected portion of the website that: a) misrepresented and omitted material facts about the performance history of the Pool's DI-Portfolio trading strategy; and b) reported false and inaccurate NAV calculations for the Pool, DIP, by and through the actions of Glytenko, among others, knowingly, willfully, or with reckless disregard for the truth, violated Section 4b(a)(2)(ii) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(2)(ii) (2006), with respect to acts occurring before June 18, 2008, Sections 4b(a)(1)(B) of the Act, as amended by the CRA, 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(B) (Supp. II 2009), for conduct occurring on or after June 18, 2008, and Sections 4b(a)(1)(B) of the Act, as amended by the Dodd-Frank Act, Pub. L. No. 111-203, Title VII (the Wall Street Transparency and Accountability Act of 2010), §§ 701-774, 124 Stat. 1376 (effective July 16, 2011), 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(B) (Supp. IV 2011), for conduct occurring on or after July 16, 2011.
- 49. Glytenko committed the acts alleged herein within the course and scope of his employment, office, or agency with DIP. DIP is

therefore liable pursuant to Section 2(a)(1)(B) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 2(a)(1)(B) (2006), and Regulation 1.2, 17 C.F.R. § 1.2 (2010), as principal for Glytenko's violations of the Act.

- 50. Glytenko, directly or indirectly, controlled DIP and did not act in good faith, or knowingly induced, directly or indirectly, the acts constituting DIP's violations of the Act. Therefore, pursuant to Section 13(b) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13c(b) (2006), Glytenko is liable for DIP's violations of the Act.
- 51. Each act of false statement or report, including but not limited to those specifically alleged herein, is alleged as a separate and distinct violation of Section 4b(a)(2)(ii) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(2)(ii) (2006), with respect to acts occurring before June 18, 2008, Sections 4b(a)(1)(B) of the Act, as amended by the CRA, 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(B) (Supp. II 2009), for conduct occurring on or after June 18, 2008, and Sections 4b(a)(1)(B) of the Act, as amended by the Dodd-Frank Act, Pub. L. No. 111-203, Title VII (the Wall Street Transparency and Accountability Act of 2010), §§ 701-774, 124 Stat. 1376 (effective July 16, 2011), 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(B) (Supp. IV 2011), for conduct occurring on or after July 16, 2011.

CPO:

COUNT FOUR

VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 40(1)(A) AND (B) OF THE ACT: FRAUD AS A CPO AND ASSOCIATED PERSON OF A CPO

- 52. Paragraphs 1 through 51 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.
- 53. Sections 4o(1)(A) and (B) of the Act as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6o(1)(A) and (B) make it unlawful:

for commodity trading advisor, associated person of a commodity trading advisor, commodity pool operator, or associated person of a commodity pool operator by use of the mails or any means or instrumentality 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 client or participant.

54. Section la(5) of the Act defines a CPO as:

any person engaged in a business that is of the nature of an 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 any commodity for future delivery on or subject to the rules of any contract market....

As defined by Commission Regulation 1.3(aa)(3), 17 C.F.R. § 1.3(aa) (2013), an AP of a CPO is a natural person who is associated with a

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) 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[.]

- 55. By engaging in a business that is of the nature of an investment trust, syndicate, or similar form of enterprise and by soliciting, accepting, or receiving funds from others for the purpose of, among other things, trading in futures, Defendant DIP acted as the CPO of the DIP Capital Partners Pool. As a partner, officer, employee, or agent of DIP in a capacity that involved the solicitation of funds, securities, or property for a participation in a commodity pool or the supervision of persons so engaged, Defendant Glytenko acted as an AP of a CPO.
- 56. By the acts of fraudulent solicitation, misappropriation, and false statements and reports set forth above, DIP, by and through the actions of Glytenko, among others, and while acting as a CPO, and Glytenko, while acting as an AP of DIP, violated Sections 40(1)(A) and (B) of the Act as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§ 60(1)(A) and (B).
- 57. Glytenko committed the acts alleged herein within the course and scope of his employment, office, or agency with DIP. DIP is therefore liable pursuant to Section 2(a)(1)(B) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 2(a)(1)(B)

(2006), and Regulation 1.2, 17 C.F.R. § 1.2 (2010), as principal for Glytenko's violations of the Act.

- 58. Glytenko, directly or indirectly, controlled DIP and did not act in good faith, or knowingly induced, directly or indirectly, the acts constituting DIP's violations of the Act. Therefore, pursuant to Section 13(b) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13c(b) (2006), Glytenko is liable for DIP's violations of the Act.
- 59. Each act of fraudulent solicitation, misappropriation, and false statement or report, including but not limited to those specifically alleged herein, is alleged as a separate and distinct violation of Sections 40(1)(A) and (B) of the Act as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§ 60(1)(A) and (B).

COUNT FIVE

VIOLATIONS OF COMMISSION REGULATION 4.41(b): ADVERTISING BY COMMODITY POOL OPERATORS, COMMODITY TRADING ADVISORS, AND PRINCIPALS THEREOF

60. Commission Regulation 4.41(b), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b)(2012), provides that "[n]o person may present the performance of any simulated or hypothetical commodity interest account, transaction in a commodity interest or series of transactions in a commodity interest of a commodity pool operator, commodity trading advisor, or any principal thereof" unless such performance is accompanied by a statement that identifies the results as

simulated or hypothetical and describes the inherent limitations of simulated or hypothetical trading.

- 61. By presenting simulated or hypothetical performance results to prospective participants in its solicitation material and to participants in the password-protected section of DIP's website without including the required statement, DIP, by and through the actions of Glytenko, among others, violated Commission Regulation 4.41(b), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b)(2012).
- 62. Glytenko committed the acts alleged herein within the course and scope of his employment, office, or agency with DIP. DIP is therefore liable pursuant to Section 2(a)(1)(B) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 2(a)(1)(B) (2006), and Regulation 1.2, 17 C.F.R. § 1.2 (2010), as principal for Glytenko's violations of the Act.
- 63. Glytenko, directly or indirectly, controlled DIP and did not act in good faith, or knowingly induced, directly or indirectly, the acts constituting DIP's violations of the Act. Therefore, pursuant to Section 13(b) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13c(b) (2006), Glytenko is liable for DIP's violations of the Act.
- Each act of presenting simulated or hypothetical performace results without including the required statement, including but not limited to

those specifically alleged herein, is alleged as a separate and distinct violation of Commission Regulation 4.41(b), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b)(2012).

VI. RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that this Court, as authorized by Section 6c of the Act, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §13a-1, and pursuant to its own equitable powers enter:

- A. An order finding Defendants violated: 1) Sections 4b(a)(2)(i)-(iii) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(2)(i)-(iii) (2006), with respect to acts occurring before June 18, 2008, Sections 4b(a)(1)(A)-(C) of the Act, as amended by the CRA, 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(A)-(C) (Supp. II 2009), for conduct occurring on or after June 18, 2008, and Sections 4b(a)(1)(A)-(C) of the Act, as amended by the Dodd-Frank Act, Pub. L. No. 111-203, Title VII (the Wall Street Transparency and Accountability Act of 2010), §§ 701-774, 124 Stat. 1376 (effective July 16, 2011), 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(A)-(C) (Supp. IV 2011), for conduct occurring on or after July 16, 2011; 2) Sections 4o(1)(A) and (B) of the Act as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6o(1)(A) and (B); and 3) Commission Regulation 4.41(b), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b)(2012);
- B. An order of permanent injunction enjoining Defendants and all persons insofar as they are acting in the capacity of their agents, servants, employees, successors, assigns, and attorneys, and all persons insofar as they

are acting in active concert or participation with Defendants who receive actual notice of such order by personal service or otherwise, from directly or indirectly:

- 1. Engaging in conduct in violation of Sections 4b(a)(1)(A)-(C) of the Act, as amended by the Dodd-Frank Act, Pub. L. No. 111-203, Title VII (the Wall Street Transparency and Accountability Act of 2010), §§ 701-774, 124 Stat. 1376 (effective July 16, 2011), 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(A)-(C) (Supp. IV 2011); 2) Sections 4o(1)(A) and (B) of the Act as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§ 6o(1)(A) and (B); and 3) Commission Regulation 4.41(b), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b)(2012);
- 2. Trading on or subject to the rules of any registered entity (as that term is defined in Section 1a(29) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 1a(29) (2006));
- 3. Entering into any transactions involving commodity futures, options on commodity futures, commodity options (as that term is defined in Regulations 1.3(hh) and 32.1(b)(1), 17 C.F.R. §§ 1.3(hh) and 32.1(b)(1) (2013)) ("commodity options"), security futures products, swaps (as that term is defined in Section 1a(47) of the Act, as amended, 7 U.S.C. § 1(a)(47) (2012) and as further defined by Commission Regulation 1.3(xxx), 17 C.F.R. § 1.3(xxx) (2013)) ("swaps") and/or foreign currency (as

described in Sections 2(c)(2)(B) and 2(c)(2)(C)(i) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. §§ 2(c)(2)(B) and 2(c)(2)(C)(i) (2012)) ("forex contracts")), for their own personal or proprietary account or for any account in which they have a direct or indirect interest;

- Having any commodity futures, options on commodity futures, commodity options, security futures products, swaps, and/or forex contracts traded on their behalf;
- Controlling or directing the trading for or on behalf of any other person or entity, whether by power of attorney or otherwise, in any account involving commodity futures, options on commodity futures, commodity options, security futures products, swaps, and/or forex contracts;
- Soliciting, receiving, or accepting any funds from any person for the purpose of purchasing or selling any commodity futures, options on commodity futures, commodity options, security futures products, swaps, and/or forex contracts;
- 7. Applying for registration or claiming exemption from registration with the Commission in any capacity, and engaging in any activity requiring such registration or exemption from registration with the Commission, except as provided for in Regulation 4.14(a)(9), 17 C.F.R. § 4.14(a)(9) (2010); and

- 8. Acting as a principal (as that term is defined in Regulation 3.1(a), 17 C.F.R. § 3.1(a) (2010)), agent or any other officer or employee of any person registered, exempted from registration or required to be registered with the Commission, except as provided for in Regulation 4.14(a)(9), 17 C.F.R. § 4.14(a)(9) (2010).
- C. Enter an order directing Defendants, as well as any successors to any Defendant, to disgorge, pursuant to such procedure as the Court may order, all ill-gotten gains and/or benefits received from the acts or practices that constitute violations of the Act and Regulations, as described herein, and pre- and post-judgment interest thereon from the date of such violations;
- D. Enter an order requiring Defendants to make full restitution to every person or entity whose funds Defendants received or caused another person or entity to receive as a result of acts and practices that constituted violations of the Act, as described herein, and pre- and post-judgment interest thereon from the date of such violations;
- E. Enter an order directing each Defendant to each pay civil monetary penalties of not more than the higher of \$130,000 for each violation of the Act or Regulations occurring between October 23, 2004 and October 22, 2008, and \$140,000 for each violation of the Act or Regulations occurring on or after October 23, 2008, or triple the monetary gain to

Case 3:13-cv-02887-DMS-NLS Document 1 Filed 12/05/13 Page 30 of 32

Defendants, plus post-judgment interest thereon from the date of such 1 2 violations; 3 F. Enter an order requiring Defendants to pay costs and fees as 4 permitted by 28 U.S.C. §§ 1920 and 2412(a)(2) (2006); and 5 6 Enter any order providing such other and further relief as this G. 7 Court may deem necessary and appropriate under the circumstances. 8 9 10 Respectfully submitted, 11 12 13 14 James H. Holl, III 15 Chief Trial Attorney Alan I. Edelman 16 Senior Trial Attorney 1155 21st Street, NW 17 Washington, DC 20581 18 Telephone: (202) 418-5000 19 Facsimile: (202) 418-5523 jholl@cftc.gov 20 aedelman@cftc.gov 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

12/5/2013

JS 44 Reverse (Rev. 12/12)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (e) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below. United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box. Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.
 - Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litization transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.

 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

Case 3:13-cv-02887-DMS-NLS Document 1 Filed 12/05/13 Page 32 of 32

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by Law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN US_PLAINTIFF_CASES)			DEFENDANTS Direct Investment Products, Inc. and Alexander Glylenko County of Residence of First Listed Defendant San Diego (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place on "X" in C	Inc Box (Inly)	I. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place on "X" in One Box for Plants
X 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	D 3 Tederal Question (US Government Not a Party)			TF DEF 1 D 1 Incorporated or Pr of Business In T	
Defendant D4 Diversity ### Content of Parties D4 Diversity		op of Parties in hom III)	Critzen of Another State		
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 D 3 Foreign Nation	0 6 0 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI					
O 110 Inquirance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY	71 625 Drug Related Science	D 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	O 375 False Claims Act
D 120 Marine D 130 Miller Act D 140 Negotiable Instrument	310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability	D 365 Personal Injury • Product Liability D 367 Health Care	of Property 21 USC 881	3 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	400 State Reapportisonment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical		PROPERTY RIGHTS	O 450 Commerce O 460 Deportation
Cl 151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability		☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent	1 470 Racketeer Influenced and
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability 340 Marine	368 Ashestos Personal Injury Product		□ 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations 3 480 Consumer Credit
(Excludes Veterans)	345 Marine Product	Liability	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	O 490 Cable Sat TV
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Henefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	Liability 3 350 Motor Vehicle 3 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 3 360 Other Personal Injury 3 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice	FERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Frand 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability	710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor Management Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWCDIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Trilg XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	850 Securities Commodities Exchange S90 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL/RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS	791 Employee Retirement	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	899 Administrative Procedure
210 Land Condemnation 220 Forcelosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Tosts to Land 245 Test Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	Employment 146 Amer w Disabilities Other 148 Education	Other:	Income Security Act	□ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Act Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
			IMMIGRATION 3 462 Naturalization Application 465 Other Immigration Actions		
		Remanded from Appellate Court	Reinstated or Reopened 7 5 Transfe	District Litigation	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	17 U.S.C. & 6b(a)(1)(A)-(C): 7 U.S.C. §§	ling (Do not cite jurisdictional state 60(1)(A) and (B); 17 C.F.	utes unless diversity) R. § 4.41(b)	
		S IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND S		CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint JURY DEMAND:	
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See natrictions)	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
12/5/2013		SIGNATUR OF THOM	RECORD		
RECEIPT # AN	JOUNI	APPLYING IEP	лоск	MAG JU)GE