## HARD COPY

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Before the SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

In the Matter of
DONALD J. ANTHONY, JR.,
FRANK H. CHIAPPONE,
RICHARD D. FELDMANN, WILLIAM P. GAMELLO, ANDREW G. GUZZETTI, WILLIAM F. LEX, THOMAS E. LIVINGSTON, BRIAN T. MAYER, PHILIP S. RABINOVICH, and RYAN C. ROGERS,

Respondents.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING

File No. 3-15514

## CAVALIER AFFIDAVIT SUPPORTING MOTION TO CORRECT MANIFEST ERROR OF FACT AND TO SUBMIT ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Roland M. Cavalier, being duly sworn deposes and states as follows:

1. I am the attorney for Respondent Frank Chiappone in the above captioned proceeding. This affidavit is submitted in support of Mr. Chiappone's motion to correct a mathematical error in the Initial Decision of the hearing officer made pursuant to SEC Rule 410, coupled with a Motion to Submit Additional Evidence in connection with the motion to correct, made pursuant to SEC Rule 452. The additional evidence offered relates to the mathematical error referenced herein.
2. Pursuant to the SEC Rules of Fair Practice, the motion to correct is addressed to the hearing officer, Hon. Brenda P. Murray, Chief Administrative Law Judge. The motion to admit additional evidence is directed to the Commission.
3. The disgorgement orders made in this case were all based upon commissions earned by the various Selling Respondents on sales made after a certain date, being February 1, 2008 (the "Cut-Off Date"). (See, Initial Decision, page 115).
4. In his affidavit, Mr. Chiappone points out that some $\$ 40,947$ in commissions that were computed as part of the disgorgement ordered by Hon. Brenda P. Murray, Chief Administrative Law Judge, were in fact commissions that were earned on sales made before February 1, 2008, the date that she determined was a date by which the various McGinn Smith brokers should have known that their bosses were marketing unsuitable private placement offerings. While we disagree with Judge Murray on that issue, that is a matter for another day. ${ }^{1}$ The present motion only seeks to correct the computation made by Judge Murray, on the grounds that she ruled that all commissions with respect to sales made after February 1, 2008 should be disgorged, but then included within her computations commissions paid after February 1, 2008 to Mr. Chiappone, but earned with respect to sales made before the Cut-Off Date.
5. In fairness to Judge Murray, she may not have known that some of the commissions paid after the Cut-Off Date represented compensation for sales made before the Cut-Off Date. This is because the information needed to make that determination, while all contained in Divisions Exhibit 2, were not contained in a single section of that exhibit. Rather, in order to make that determination, the Judge would have had to correlate two different subexhibits within Division Exhibit 2, specifically, Palen Exhibit 4c and Palen Exhibit 4d.

[^0]6. Mr. Chiappone's affidavit explains this error in more detail, and will not be repeated here. He states under oath (via his affidavit) that all commissions circled in Exhibit "A" to his affidavit were from sales made before February 1, 2008, and constituted "trail commissions," which are continuing commissions paid after the initial commission on or about date of sale. For convenience of the court, Chiappone Ex. "A" is also attached as Exhibit "A" to this affidavit.
7. However, it is not necessary for this court to rely exclusively on Mr. Chiappone's word that the circled commissions were made with respect to sales taking place before February 1,2008 , as there is documentary evidence of that fact. And, this evidence is found in exhibits that were introduced into evidence by the Division.
8. By reviewing Exhibit "A" to Mr. Chiappone's affidavit, it is apparent that all of the circled commissions related to sales of the so-called "Four Funds" (FIIN, FEIN, FAIN \& TAIN). By reviewing Palen Exhibit 4 c to Division Exhibit 2, it can be established indisputably that Mr. Chiappone made no sales of the Four Funds after the Cut-Off Date of February 1, 2008.
9. Attached hereto as Exhibit " B " is a three-page excerpt from Palen Ex. 4 c toDiv. Ex 2. As you can see from the highlighted line on the first page of Exhibit "B" (Page 8 of 10 of Palen Ex 4 and page 65 of Div. Ex. 2), the last sale of a Four Funds offering made by Mr. Chiappone took place on January 2, 2008, a full month before Judge Murray's Cut-Off Date for computing disgorgement.
10. The remainder of Exhibit " $B$ " shows all sales made by Chiappone after January 2, 2008 and until McGinn Smith \& Co. was shut down by the SEC. There are no sales of any of the Four Funds made by Mr. Chiappone during that time period.
11. By reason of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the amount of disgorgement computed by Judge Murray should be corrected to subtract out the commissions on Four Funds offering paid after February 2, 2008, but earned on sales made before that Cut-Off Date. This would be in conformity with her own decision that "Selling Respondents, except Gamello, are ordered to disgorge all commissions earned on sales after that date [February 1, 2008] in the following amounts. ... (Initial Decision, page 115)(emphasis supplied).
12. Mr. Chiappone further moves to have Exhibit "A" to his affidavit admitted into evidence under SEC Rule 452, as there were reasonable grounds why it could not have been submitted at time of the hearings. This is because there was no Cut-Off Date established from which Mr. Chiappone could determine which commissions were subject to disgorgement and which were not.
13. However, it is not necessary for this tribunal to grant the Rule 452 motion, as the page containing all of the relevant entries as to trailing commissions is already in evidence. Mr. Chiappone also attached as Exhibit "B" to his affidavit page 2 of 2 of Palen Ex. 4d (page 69 of Div. Ex. 2), which was introduced into evidence by the Division. For convenience, I have attached the same exhibit as Exhibit " C " to this affidavit. That exhibit contains all of the information needed to prove that the $\$ 40,947$ in commissions were with respect to sales of Four Funds, and coupled with Palen Ex. 4c to Div. Ex. 2, shows that all of the sales of Four Funds were made before Judge Murray's Cut-Off Date. Hence, the only function of Chiappone's Exhibits "A" \& "B" are the handwritten circles further identifying the commissions paid on sales made before the Cut-Off Date, and his totaling of the amount. ${ }^{2}$

[^1]14. By reason of the foregoing, a decision by the Commission not to grant the motion to introduce additional evidence should not result in a refusal by Judge Murray to grant the correction in the computational error.

WHEREFORE, the undersigned has executed this affidavit.

Respectfully submitted,


Roland M. Cavalier, Esq.
Sworn to before me this
3 day of March, 2015.


| Date | Description per Payroll Records | 645 CHIAPPONE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/15/2007 | Firstline (TDML and FIRSTLN) | \$ | 5,900 |
| 11/15/2007 | Firstline, TDML, CMSF 80\% | \$ | 2,400 |
| 11/15/2007 | Firstline 90\% | \$ | 1,350 |
| 12/15/2007 | Firstline 90\% | \$ | 8,168 |
| 12/15/2007 | 2007 Annual FAIN | \$ | 7,860 |
| 1/15/2008 | TDM Verifier 75\% | \$ | 675 |
| 1/15/2008 | 2008 Annual TAIN \& FIIN | \$ | 56,910 |
| 2/15/2008 | TDM Verifier 75\% | \$ | 844 |
| 2/15/2008 | Firstline, TDML, CMSF 80\% | \$ | - 500 |
| 2/15/2008 | Firstline 90\% | \$ | 2,025 |
| 2/15/2008 | 2008 Annual FEIN, tain \& fiin | \$ | 28,173 |
| 3/15/2008 | TDM Verifier 75\% | \$ | 1,875 |
| 3/15/2008 | Firstline, TDML, CMSF 80\% | \$ | 300 |
| 4/15/2008 | TDM 75\% | \$ | 1,875 |
| 5/15/2008 | Firstline, TDM, CMSF 80\% (REALLY VERIFIER) | \$ | 2,000 |
| 6/15/2008 | TDM 75\% | \$ | 188 |
| 6/15/2008 | Firstline 90\% | \$ | 4,320 |
| 8/15/2008 | Net Private (inex and MSTF) | \$ | 1,215 |
| 10/15/2008 | Fort13\% | \$ | 21,000 |
| 11/15/2008 | Fort13\% | \$ | 3,000 |
| 12/15/2008 | Fort13\%, TDM Cable Roll | \$ | 1,200 |
| 1/15/2009 | Firstline, TDM, CMSF 80\% | \$ | 1,920 |
| 1/15/2009 | 2008 FAIN | \$ | 245 |
| 1/15/2009 | 2008 TAIN | \$ | 1,446 |
| 2/15/2009 | Firstline, TDM, CMSF 80\% | \$ | 480 |
| 2/15/2009 | 2008 FAIN | \$ | 245 |
| 2/15/2009 | 2008 TAIN | \$ | 1,446 |
| 3/15/2009 | 2008 FAIN | \$ | 245 |
| 3/15/2009 | 2008 TAIN | \$ | 1,446 |
| 3/15/2009 | Net Private (TDMV07R9\% and TDMM Cable 09) | \$ | 4,218 |
| 4/15/2009 | 2008 FAIN | \$ | 245 |
| 4/15/2009 | 2008 TAIN | \$ | 1,446 |
| 5/15/2009 | 2008 FAIN | \$ | 245 |
| 5/15/2009 | 2008 TAIN | \$ | 1,446 |
| 6/15/2009 | Net Private (TDMM Cable 09 for April and May) | \$ | 5,933 |
| 6/15/2009 | 2008 FAIN | \$ | 245 |
| 6/15/2009 | 2008 TAIN | \$ | 1,446 |
| 7/15/2009 | 2008 FAIN | \$ | 435 |
| 7/15/2009 | 2008 TAIN | \$ | 2,570 |
| 7/15/2009 | Net Private (TDMV07R and TDMMCAB) | \$ | 750 |
| 9/15/2009 | Net Private (TDMM Benchmark) | \$ | 5,023 |
| 9/15/2009 | 2008 FAIN | \$ | 435 |
| 9/15/2009 | 2008 TAIN | \$ | 2,570 |
| 10/15/2009 | Net Private (TDMV and TDMM Benchmark) | \$ | 805 |
| TOTAL |  | \$ | 531,844 |







[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ It is Respondent Chiappone's position that by February 1, 2008, at which time the brokers were aware of the restructuring and interest cuts on the Four Funds (FINN, FEIN, FAIN \& TAIN) and therefore should not have sold any more of the Four Funds offerings, but that this disclosure was not a "red flag" as to the so-called Trust Offerings that followed. This is because the trust offerings were secured by alarm and triple play collateral, and none of the brokers was yet aware that the earlier round of alarm contract offerings had been propped up by funds obtained from later offerings, the hallmark of what was becoming a Ponzi-like scheme.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ For clarification, the transaction on Exhibit " $B$ " hereto, dated 3/17/2008 (2 $2^{\text {nd }}$ line on Div. Ex. 2, page 66 (page 9 of 10 of Ex. 4 c )) is not a sale. It is a transfer of a TAIN note owned by Frank Chiappone to his significant other.

