

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
Before the  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20549

Administrative Proceedings Rulings  
Release No. 6937 / May 16, 2025

Administrative Proceeding  
File No. 3-20828

In the Matter of  
  
**Gregory Lemelson<sup>1</sup>**

**Order Granting Motion for  
Subpoena**

The Division of Enforcement requests the issuance of a subpoena directing third party Clear Street, LLC, to produce documents. The documents sought are substantially similar to documents that a previously issued subpoena sought from Respondent: “All documents filed and served by the parties in the FINRA arbitration proceeding titled *The Amvona Fund, LP v. Clear Street, LLC*, No. 20-01555, and any transcripts or audio/visual recordings of Respondent’s testimony in that proceeding and exhibits to that proceeding including Clear Street’s exhibits 128, 130, 132, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, and 139.” *Cf.* Order on Subpoena Request, at 4, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 6921 (ALJ Jan. 30, 2025), <https://www.sec.gov/files/alj/aljorders/2025/ap-6921.pdf>. While this request is outside the time allotted for discovery requests in the original scheduling order, that delay is largely attributable to Respondent’s refusal to comply with the previously issued subpoena.<sup>2</sup> The request to Clear Street is a facially reasonable attempt to discover the evidence

---

<sup>1</sup> Respondent goes by his ecclesiastical name, Father Emmanuel Lemelson.

<sup>2</sup> Absent an order from the district court excusing Respondent from complying with the subpoena, the parties should consider what steps are appropriate in this proceeding considering Respondent’s noncompliance. *See UAW v. NLRB*, 459 F.2d 1329, 1338 (D.C. Cir. 1972) (“The adverse inference rule plays a vital role in protecting the integrity of the administrative process in cases where a subpoena is ignored.”); *see also Lucia v. SEC*, 585 U.S. 237, 248 (2018) (recognizing the power to enforce compliance with discovery orders in SEC administrative proceedings through Rule 180 sanctions).

that Respondent has withheld and meets the standards for issuance under Rule 232. *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.232.

For these reasons, and for the reasons explained in the Order on Subpoena Request dated January 30, the Division's motion is granted. Clear Street, LLC, or Respondent may move to quash the subpoena by May 23, 2025. *See* 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.111(d), .161(a), .232(e). The Division must serve this order on Clear Street along with the subpoena.

/s/ Jason S. Patil  
Administrative Law Judge