

1 AMY JANE LONGO (State Bar No. 198304)  
Email: longoa@sec.gov  
2 MATTHEW T. MONTGOMERY (State Bar No. 260149)  
Email: montgomerym@sec.gov

3 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
4 Securities and Exchange Commission  
Michele Wein Layne, Regional Director  
5 Alka N. Patel, Associate Regional Director  
Amy Jane Longo, Regional Trial Counsel  
6 444 S. Flower Street, Suite 900  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
7 Telephone: (323) 965-3998  
Facsimile: (213) 443-1904

8  
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
11 SAN JOSE DIVISION  
12

13  
14 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,

15 Plaintiff,

16 vs.

17 MAYANK GUPTA and  
18 PUSHPENDRA AGRAWAL,

19 Defendants.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No.

**COMPLAINT**

1 Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) alleges:

2 **SUMMARY OF THE ACTION**

3 1. This action concerns illegal insider trading by defendant Pushpendra  
4 Agrawal (“Agrawal”) in the securities of the formerly-public company QLogic  
5 Corporation (“QLogic”) in advance of its acquisition through a tender offer by  
6 Cavium, Inc. (“Cavium”). Agrawal traded based on a tip concerning the tender offer  
7 from his cousin-in-law, defendant Mayank Gupta (“Gupta”), who learned about the  
8 tender offer while performing services for Cavium on behalf of his then employer,  
9 PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLP (“PWC”). Gupta is a CPA, who was assigned to  
10 PWC’s Cavium audit team at the time.

11 2. On the morning of June 15, 2016, before the deal was announced to the  
12 public, Gupta called Agrawal, while Agrawal was driving to work. During that call,  
13 Gupta told Agrawal that Cavium was going to acquire QLogic and that QLogic was  
14 therefore a “sure thing.” Upon arriving at work, Agrawal purchased 200 QLogic  
15 calls, based on Gupta’s tip. During his lunch, Agrawal purchased 50 additional  
16 QLogic calls, again based on Gupta’s tip.

17 3. After the markets closed on June 15, 2016, QLogic announced that it  
18 would be acquired by Cavium through a tender offer. On June 16, 2016, the closing  
19 price of QLogic stock rose by 9.31%. Agrawal’s profits totaled of \$23,785.40 on his  
20 trades.

21 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

22 4. The Commission brings this action pursuant to Sections 21(d), 21(e) and  
23 21A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”), 15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d),  
24 78u(e), and 78u-1.

25 5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 21(e),  
26 21A and 27 of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(e), 78u-1 and 78aa.

27 6. Defendants, directly or indirectly, made use of the means or  
28 instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or of the mails, or of the facilities of a

1 national securities exchange in connection with the transactions, acts, practices and  
2 courses of business alleged herein.

3 7. Venue in this District is proper pursuant to Section 27 of the Exchange  
4 Act, because a substantial part of the acts and transactions constituting the violations  
5 alleged in this Complaint occurred within the Northern District of California, and  
6 because at least one Defendant resides or transacts business in the District.

7 **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

8 8. This action is appropriate for assignment to the San Jose Division,  
9 pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-2(e), because a substantial part of the events alleged  
10 herein occurred in Santa Clara County.

11 **DEFENDANTS**

12 9. Pushpendra Agrawal, age 46, resides in Sunnyvale, California. Agrawal  
13 is a master engineer at a publicly traded semiconductor company.

14 10. Mayank Gupta, age 34, resides in Sunnyvale, California. Gupta is a  
15 certified public accountant licensed in California. Gupta was employed by PWC  
16 from September, 2012 to November, 2016. At the time of the conduct alleged in this  
17 complaint, Gupta was an assurance manager at PWC assigned to Cavium's audit  
18 team.

19 **OTHER RELEVANT ENTITIES**

20 11. QLogic Corporation was a California limited liability company located  
21 in Aliso Viejo, California. QLogic was ultimately acquired by Cavium through a  
22 tender offer. Before the acquisition, QLogic's securities were registered pursuant to  
23 Section 12(b) of the Exchange Act and traded on the NASDQ Global Select Market  
24 under the symbol "QLGC."

25 12. Cavium, Inc. is a Delaware corporation located in San Jose, California.  
26 Cavium's securities are registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Exchange Act and  
27 are traded on the NA SDAQ Global Select Market under the symbol "CAVM."  
28

1 13. PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLP, is a Delaware limited liability  
2 partnership and an auditing firm registered with the Public Company Accounting  
3 Oversight Board. PWC has an office in San Jose, California, at which Gupta was  
4 based. PWC was at all relevant times Cavium's independent auditor.

5 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

6 **A. The Announcement**

7 14. On June 15, 2016, QLogic's shares closed at \$13.54 per share. After the  
8 close of trading on that date, QLogic and Cavium announced that QLogic would be  
9 acquired, through a tender offer, by Cavium (the "Announcement").

10 15. On June 16, 2016, trading volume in QLogic's shares increased by more  
11 than 1,275% compared to the prior day. QLogic's shares ultimately closed at \$14.80,  
12 up \$1.26, or 9.31%, from the prior day's closing price.

13 **B. Gupta's Access to Nonpublic Information about Cavium**

14 16. From July 2013 through November 2016, Gupta performed audit  
15 services for Cavium as part of his employment at PWC. Gupta learned that Cavium  
16 was purchasing QLogic through a tender offer before the Announcement. Gupta  
17 learned of Cavium's impending acquisition of QLogic through his employment at  
18 PWC, including on June 8, 2016, when he assisted an employee of another auditing  
19 firm to perform due diligence related to the acquisition.

20 **C. Gupta's Tip to Agrawal**

21 21. Gupta called Agrawal at 10:10 a.m. on June 15, 2016, as Mr. Agrawal  
22 was commuting by car. Agrawal answered Mr. Gupta's call but quickly hung up to  
23 pull over. Gupta called Agrawal again at 10:11 a.m., and they spoke for  
24 approximately 11 minutes.

25 22. During that call, Gupta told Agrawal that Cavium was buying QLogic.  
26 Gupta went on to tell Agrawal that QLogic shares were a "sure thing."

27 23. Agrawal understood that Gupta was telling him this information so  
28 Agrawal could trade on it. Agrawal also understood that Gupta learned the

1 information he shared through his employment at PWC, and that Gupta was not  
2 supposed to disclose this information to him.

3 **D. Agrawal's Illegal Trades**

4 24. Agrawal knew the information Gupta told him about Cavium's purchase  
5 of QLogic was reliable because Gupta learned it through his work at PWC. Agrawal  
6 also believed news of Cavium's purchase of QLogic would make QLogic's price rise.

7 25. Shortly after his call with Gupta, Agrawal purchased 200 QLogic call  
8 options with an exercise price of \$12.50 and an expiration of July 16, 2016 (*i.e.* the  
9 call options conferred the right to purchase shares of QLogic stock at a price of  
10 \$12.50 on or before July 16). Agrawal paid \$135.23 per options contract for a total  
11 of \$27,046.58.

12 26. At 12:11 pm on the same day, Agrawal purchased 50 additional QLogic  
13 call options with an exercise price of \$12.50 and an expiration date of June 18, 2016,  
14 at \$115.37 per options contract for a total of \$5,768.60.

15 27. Cavium and QLogic first publicly announced the tender offer after the  
16 market closed on June 15. The next day, QLogic stock closed at \$14.80, up \$1.26, or  
17 9.31%, from the prior day's closing price.

18 28. As a result of the increase in the price of QLogic stock after the  
19 Announcement, Agrawal made a profit of \$23,785.40.

20 **E. Gupta was Aware of His Duty to Keep Information He Learned In**  
21 **the Course of His Work Confidential**

22 29. While employed at PWC, Gupta repeatedly completed PWC's Annual  
23 Compliance Confirmation ("ACC"). Gupta submitted his ACC on June 3, 2016, less  
24 than two weeks before tipping Agrawal.

25 30. The ACC states, among other things, that "[a]ll partners and staff are  
26 responsible for maintaining the confidentiality and security of all information in their  
27 possession," including, "[n]on-public firm information and proprietary firm  
28 information including but not limited to knowledge about [...] current or potential

1 clients.” The ACC also states that “Partners and staff are prohibited from engaging in  
2 activities that may constitute insider trading. [...] and are prohibited from sharing any  
3 insider information with a third party.”

4 31. When Gupta completed the ACC on June 3, 2016, he acknowledged in  
5 writing his “responsibility to maintain the confidentiality and security of information  
6 to which I have access.” Gupta also confirmed that he “maintained the  
7 confidentiality of information to which [he] had access. . . .”

8 **F. Gupta and Agrawal Agreed to Reduce Contact after the Trading**

9 32. At 1:23 pm on June 15, 2016, Gupta called Agrawal to see if he  
10 purchased QLogic options. Agrawal confirmed that he did. By the time of that call,  
11 Agrawal was concerned that he would be caught.

12 33. Gupta and Agrawal agreed to reduce their contact after the trading.

13 **G. Gupta Made a Gift of Material Non-Public Information to Agrawal,**  
14 **a Close Family Member**

15 35. Gupta and Agrawal were close family members and they had a history of  
16 doing favors for each other.

17 36. In 2012, Gupta and his wife moved from India to Sunnyvale, the same  
18 city where Agrawal and his wife live. From 2012 forward, Gupta and his wife  
19 became close with Agrawal, his wife, and their son. Gupta referred to Agrawal as  
20 “Jijadi,” or brother in law, and to Agrawal’s wife as “Didi,” or sister.

21 37. The families took at least one vacation with each other, traveling to Los  
22 Angeles and Mexico. The families also took occasional daytrips together, traveling,  
23 for example, to the Muir Woods National Monument. Each family had the other  
24 family over for meals on multiple occasions.

25 38. Gupta looked up to Agrawal and sought his guidance periodically.  
26 Agrawal, who was older than Gupta and had more experience living in the United  
27 States, helped Gupta negotiate the purchase of a car and sent Gupta housing leads  
28 when the Guptas needed a new apartment. Less than a month after Gupta tipped

1 Agrawal, Gupta texted Agrawal to ask him for assistance negotiating the purchase of  
2 another car.

3 39. As part of this close familial relationship, Gupta gifted to Agrawal the  
4 information regarding Cavium's acquisition of QLogic so Agrawal could profit from  
5 it.

6 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

7 **Violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)]**

8 **and Rule 10b-5 [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5] Thereunder**

9 40. The Commission realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1  
10 through 39, as though fully set forth herein.

11 41. Defendants, with scienter, directly or indirectly:

12 a. employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud;

13 b. made untrue statements of material facts or omitted to state  
14 material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in  
15 the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not  
16 misleading; and

17 c. engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business which operated  
18 or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon other persons,  
19 including purchasers and sellers of securities;

20 in connection with the purchase or sale of securities, by the use of means or  
21 instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or the facilities of a national  
22 securities exchange.

23 42. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants violated, and unless restrained  
24 and enjoined will continue to violate, Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §  
25 78j(b)] and Rule 10b-5 thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5].

**SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**Violations of Section 14(e) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78n(e)]  
and Rule 14e-3 [17 C.F.R. § 240.14e-3] Thereunder**

43. Paragraphs 1 through 39 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.

44. After Cavium had taken a substantial step or steps to commence or had commenced a tender offer, Defendants:

- a. Purchased or sold or caused to be purchased or sold the securities to be sought by the tender offer while in possession of material information relating to such tender offer,
- b. which information they knew or had reason to know was nonpublic, and
- c. which they knew or had reason to know had been acquired directly or indirectly from the offering company, the issuing company, or any officer, director, partner or employee acting on behalf of the offering or issuing companies.

45. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Section 14(e) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78n(e)] and Rule 14e-3 [17 C.F.R. § 240.14e-3] thereunder.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that this Court:

**I.**

Permanently enjoin Defendants, and their officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with them who receive actual notice of the injunction by personal service or otherwise, and each of them, from directly or indirectly violating Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)] and Rule 10b-5 [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5] thereunder;



1 **II.**

2 Permanently enjoin Defendants, and their officers, agents, servants, employees,  
3 and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with them who  
4 receive actual notice of the injunction by personal service or otherwise, and each of  
5 them, from directly or indirectly violating Section 14(e) of the Exchange Act [15  
6 U.S.C. § 78n(e)] and Rule 14e-3 [17 C.F.R. § 240.14e-3] thereunder;

7 **III.**

8 Order Defendants to disgorge, with prejudgment interest, all illicit trading  
9 profits and/or other ill-gotten gains received, as a result of the conduct alleged in the  
10 Complaint;

11 **IV.**

12 Order Defendants to pay civil penalties pursuant to Section 21A of the  
13 Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u-1]; and

14 **V.**

15 Grant such other relief as this Court may deem just and appropriate.

16  
17 Dated: September 12, 2017

/s/ Amy Jane Longo  
Amy Jane Longo  
Matthew T. Montgomery  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Securities and Exchange Commission

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-CAND 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 in its original form by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court to initiate the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Amy Jane Longo / Matthew T. Montgomery Securities and Exchange Commission (323) 965-3998 444 S. Flower Street, Suite 900, Los Angeles, CA 90071

DEFENDANTS
MAYANK GUPTA and PUSHPENDRA AGRAWAL

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Santa Clara County (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known) Patrick Murphy, Murphy Cooke Kobrick LLP (415) 231-5761 177 Bovet Road, Suite 600, San Mateo, CA 94402; Cameron G. Stout, Wiand Guerra King (813) 347-5100 520 Lytton Avenue, Suite 200, Palo Alto, CA 94301

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
2 U.S. Government Defendant 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

Table with columns for Plaintiff (PTF) and Defendant (DEF) citizenship: Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation.

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Large table with categories: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, HABEAS CORPUS, OTHER, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding, 2 Removed from State Court, 3 Remanded from Appellate Court, 4 Reinstated or Reopened, 5 Transferred from Another District (specify), 6 Multidistrict Litigation-Transfer, 8 Multidistrict Litigation-Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b) and 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5 thereunder; 15 U.S.C. § 78n(e) and 17 C.F.R. § 240.14e-3 thereunder. Brief description of cause: The Complaint alleges violations of the federal securities laws.

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, Fed. R. Civ. P. DEMAND \$ JURY DEMAND: Yes X No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S), IF ANY (See instructions):

JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (Civil Local Rule 3-2)

(Place an "X" in One Box Only) SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND X SAN JOSE EUREKA-MCKINLEYVILLE

DATE 09/12/2017

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

/s/ Amy Jane Longo

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS-CAND 44

**Authority For Civil Cover Sheet.** The JS-CAND 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 in its original form by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court to initiate 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.)
- c) 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 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), 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.
- (1) United States plaintiff. Jurisdiction based on 28 USC §§ 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
  - (2) United States defendant. When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an “X” in this box.
  - (3) Federal question. This refers to suits under 28 USC § 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.
  - (4) Diversity of citizenship. This refers to suits under 28 USC § 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 cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS-CAND 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.
- (1) Original Proceedings. Cases originating in the United States district courts.
  - (2) Removed from State Court. Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 USC § 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.
  - (3) Remanded from Appellate Court. Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
  - (4) Reinstated or Reopened. Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
  - (5) Transferred from Another District. For cases transferred under Title 28 USC § 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
  - (6) Multidistrict Litigation Transfer. Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 USC § 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.
  - (8) Multidistrict Litigation Direct File. Check this box when a multidistrict litigation case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. Please note that there is no Origin Code 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- 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 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23. 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-CAND 44 is used to identify related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.
- IX. Divisional Assignment.** If the Nature of Suit is under Property Rights or Prisoner Petitions or the matter is a Securities Class Action, leave this section blank. For all other cases, identify the divisional venue according to Civil Local Rule 3-2: “the county in which a substantial part of the events or omissions which give rise to the claim occurred or in which a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is situated.”
- Date and Attorney Signature.** Date and sign the civil cover sheet.