UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Before the SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
In the Matter of: Visionary Trading, LLC, et al.
Respondent: Eugene Giaquinto
Administrative Proceeding File No. 3-15823

RESPONDENT EUGENE GIAQUINTO'S NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY

Respondent Eugene Giaquinto, appearing *pro se*, respectfully submits this Notice of Supplemental Authority to alert the Commission to a significant legal development that occurred after the filing of Respondent's Reply Brief on September 22, 2025.

On January 9, 2026, the Supreme Court of the United States granted a petition for a writ of certiorari in *Sripetch v. Securities and Exchange Commission*, No. 25-466. This case is directly pertinent to the arguments raised in Respondent's pending Motion to Vacate or for Equitable Relief regarding the proper scope and legality of SEC-ordered disgorgement.

The Supreme Court in *Sripetch* is expected to clarify whether the SEC may seek disgorgement in cases where it has not established "pecuniary harm" to identifiable victims—a central issue in Respondent's challenge to the $118,601.96 disgorgement ordered in the 2014 Final Order. Respondent has argued that the current disgorgement is inequitable and constitutionally flawed under the standards set forth in *Liu v. SEC* and *Kokesh v. SEC*, as it failed to account for legitimate business expenses and included time-barred conduct.

Because the Supreme Court's eventual ruling in *Sripetch* may fundamentally alter the legal landscape for disgorgement remedies in SEC administrative proceedings, Respondent respectfully requests that the Commission take notice of this development when considering the pending motion.

Respondent also notes that the U.S. Department of the Treasury temporarily paused wage garnishment pending review of the legal and constitutional objections raised in connection with this matter. However, Treasury later issued a final agency action rejecting these objections as outside the scope of its hearing authority. Treasury's determination relied in part on the SEC's assertion that all motions to vacate the final order had failed—despite the fact that Respondent's Rule 60(b) motion remains pending and undecided. This misrepresentation underscores the importance of accurate adjudication by the Commission itself.

Dated: January 19, 2026

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Eugene Giaquinto

Eugene Giaquinto
[redacted]

OS Received 01/19/2026

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE AND COMPLIANCE

I, Eugene Giaquinto, hereby certify that on this 19th day of January 2026, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing Notice of Supplemental Authority to be filed with the Commission through the eFAP filing system and served via electronic mail on the following:

Office of the Secretary Securities and Exchange Commission
APfilings@sec.gov
Ben Kuruvilla, Esq. Division of Enforcement
kuruvillabe@sec.gov

I further certify that I have omitted or redacted any sensitive personal information from this filing as required by Rule of Practice 151(e).

/s/ Eugene Giaquinto

Eugene Giaquinto

OS Received 01/19/2026