### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,	)	
AND EACHANGE COMMISSION,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Case No. 21-cv-6286
	)	
V.	)	
	)	
RONALD T. MOLO,	)	Hon. Manish S. Shah
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

### FINAL JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT AS TO DEFENDANT RONALD T. MOLO

This cause comes before the Court upon Plaintiff United States Securities and Exchange Commission's ("SEC" or "Plaintiff") Motion for Default Judgment ("Motion") as to Defendant Ronald T. Molo ("Molo" or "Defendant"). The Court has considered the Motion, the memorandum of law, declarations, and exhibits filed in support of the Motion, and having been fully advised in the premises, finds:

- 1. That this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this case and the parties to this action;
- 2. That the SEC properly served Defendant with the Complaint and summons in this action. *See* Docket Entry No. 6;
- 3. That Defendant Ronald T. Molo failed to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint;
- 4. That the Court entered a default against Defendant Ronald T. Molo, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(a), on February 14, 2022. *See* Docket Entry No. 12;

- 5. That entry of a Final Judgment against Defendant Ronald T. Molo is appropriate under Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(b)(2);
- 6. That the relief Plaintiff seeks against Defendant is adequately supported in fact and law; and
  - 7. That therefore, the following Order should issue:

I.

### **Judgment By Default**

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(b), final judgment by default is hereby entered against Defendant Ronald T. Molo.

IT IS FUTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED the Court finds in favor of the Plaintiff on all factual allegations and the causes of action asserted by Plaintiff in its Complaint against Defendant Ronald T. Molo for violations of Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") [15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)] and Rule 10b-5(a) and (c) thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5(a), (c)], Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act") [15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)(1), (3)], and Sections 206(1) and (2) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 ("Advisers Act") [15 U.S.C. § 80b-6(1) and 80b-6(2)].

II.

# Permanent Injunction against Participation in the Issuance, Purchase, Offer, or Sale of Any Security

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Defendant is permanently restrained and enjoined from participating, directly or indirectly, in the issuance, purchase, offer, or sale of any security, including inducing or attempting to induce the purchase or sale of any security, or causing any person or entity to engage in any activity for the purpose of inducing or attempting to induce the purchase of sale of any security, or deriving

compensation from any activity engaged in for the purpose of inducing or attempting to induce the purchase or sale of any security, and further including but not limited to, participating in the issuance, purchase, offer, or sale of any security through an entity that Molo owns or controls; provided, however, that such injunction shall not prevent Molo from purchasing or selling securities listed on a national securities exchange for his own personal account.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that, as provided in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(d)(2), the foregoing paragraph also binds the following who receive actual notice of this Final Judgment by personal service or otherwise: (a) Defendant's agents, servants, employees, and attorneys; and (b) other persons in active concert or participation with Defendant or with anyone described in (a).

#### III.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Defendant is ordered to pay disgorgement in the amount of \$778,102, representing net profits gained as a result of the conduct alleged in the Complaint, with prejudgment interest thereon in the amount of \$37,002, for a total amount of disgorgement plus prejudgment interest of \$815,104, which amount shall be offset in an amount equal to any order of restitution that may be entered in *U.S. v. Molo*, Case No. 21-cr-00698 (N.D. III.).

Defendant Molo shall satisfy his monetary obligations set forth in this Final Judgment by paying \$815,104 to the Securities and Exchange Commission within 30 days after entry of this Final Judgment.

Defendant may transmit payment electronically to the Commission, which will provide detailed ACH transfer/Fedwire instructions upon request. Payment may also be made directly from a bank account via Pay.gov through the SEC website at

http://www.sec.gov/about/offices/ofm.htm. Defendant may also pay by certified check, bank cashier's check, or United States postal money order payable to the Securities and Exchange Commission, which shall be delivered or mailed to

Enterprise Services Center Accounts Receivable Branch 6500 South MacArthur Boulevard Oklahoma City, OK 73169

and shall be accompanied by a letter identifying the case title, civil action number, and name of this Court; Ronald T. Molo as a party in this action; and specifying that payment is made pursuant to this Final Judgment.

Defendant shall simultaneously transmit photocopies of evidence of payment and case identifying information to the Commission's counsel in this action. By making this payment, Defendant relinquishes all legal and equitable right, title, and interest in such funds and no part of the funds shall be returned to Defendant.

The Commission may enforce the Court's judgment for disgorgement and prejudgment interest by using all collection procedures authorized by law, including, but not limited to, moving for civil contempt at any time after 30 days following entry of this Final Judgment.

Defendant shall pay post judgment interest on any amounts due after 30 days of the entry of this Final Judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961. The Commission shall hold the funds, together with any interest and income earned thereon (collectively, the "Fund"), pending further order of the Court.

The Commission may propose a plan to distribute the Fund subject to the Court's approval. Such a plan may provide that the Fund shall be distributed pursuant to the Fair Fund provisions of Section 308(a) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. The Court shall retain

jurisdiction over the administration of any distribution of the Fund and the Fund may only be disbursed pursuant to an Order of the Court.

IV.

## **Retention of Jurisdiction**

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that this Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter for the purposes of enforcing the terms of this Final Judgment.

**SO ORDERED** this 27th day of September, 2022.

MANISH S. SHAH, U.S. District Judge

MISCH