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## I. INTRODUCTION

The Division of Enforcement ("Division") moves pursuant to Rule 250 of the Commission's Rules of Practice for summary disposition in this follow-on proceeding against Gary Harrison Lane ("Lane") brought pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") and Section 203(f) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 ("Advisers Act"). The Division requests that Lane be barred from association with any broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer, municipal advisor, transfer agent, and nationally recognized statistical rating organization, and from participating in any offering of penny stock.

## II. ARGUMENT

## A. Summary Disposition Is Appropriate Based On Lane's Felony Conviction

The Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") instituted this proceeding with an Order Instituting Proceedings ("OIP") on September 11, 2014, pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act and Section 203(f) of the Advisers Act. This proceeding is a follow-on proceeding based upon the criminal proceeding United States of America v. Gary H. Lane, 3:12-CR-00078-RCJ-VPC (D. Nev.). In that criminal proceeding, Lane was indicted on 12 counts of mail fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 1341 and five counts of attempt to evade or defeat tax in violation of 26 U.S.C. Section 7201. Declaration of Christine Connolly ("Connolly Dec."), Ex. 1. On September 3, 2013, Lane pleaded guilty to all counts in the indictment. Connolly Dec., Ex. 2. On February 20, 2014, the court entered a judgment sentencing Lane to 120 months in prison, followed by five years of supervised release, and restitution of $\$ 2,103,226$. Connolly Dec., Ex. 3 .

Lane was served with the OIP on September 11, 2014 by USPS Certified Mail, which was delivered on September 15, 2014. On September 15, 2014, the Division also served Lane by USPS Certified Mail, which was delivered on September 18,2014 , with a letter offering the Division's
investigative files for inspection and copying pursuant to Rule of Practice 230. Connolly Dec., Ex. 4. As of the date of this Motion, Lane has not filed an Answer. Further, the only contact the Division has had with Lane is a voice message from Lane on October 21, 2014. Division counsel has been unable to reach Lane at the number provided in the voice message. Connolly Dec., at 6 .

At a prehearing conference on October 28, 2014, the Administrative Law Judge granted the Division leave to file a motion for summary disposition. Rule 250(a) of the Commission's Rules of Practice permits a party to move "for summary disposition of any or all allegations of the order instituting proceedings" before hearing with leave of the hearing officer. 17 C.F.R. § 201.250(a). Rule 250(b) provides that a hearing officer may grant a motion for summary disposition if there is no genuine issue with regard to any material fact and the party making the motion is entitled to summary disposition as a matter of law. 17 C.F.R. § 201.250 (b); see also In the Matter of Kent D. Nelson, S.E.C. Release No. 371, 2009 WL 454556 at * 1 (February 24, 2009) (citing 17 C.F.R. § $201.250(\mathrm{~b})$ ). Moreover, it is well-established that:

By analogy to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a factual dispute between the parties will not defeat a motion for summary disposition unless it is both genuine and material. See Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 247-48 (1986). Once the moving party has carried its burden, 'its opponent must do more than simply show that there is some metaphysical doubt as to the material facts.' Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 586 (1986). The opposing party must set forth specific facts showing a genuine issue for a hearing and may not rest upon the mere allegations or denials of its pleadings. At the summary disposition stage, the hearing
officer's function is not to weigh the evidence and determine the truth of the matter, but rather to determine whether there is a genuine issue for resolution at a hearing. See Anderson, 477 U.S. at 249.

Nelson, 2009 WL 454556 at *2.
Summary disposition is appropriate based on Lane's guilty plea and felony conviction in the criminal proceeding United States of America v. Gary H. Lane, 3:12-CR-00078-RCJ-VPC (D. Nev.). There is no genuine issue with regard to any material fact and pursuant to Section 15(b)(6) of the Exchange Act and Section 203(f) of the Advisers Act, the Division is entitled, as a matter of law, to an order permanently barring Lane from association with any broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer, municipal advisor, transfer agent, and nationally recognized statistical rating organization, and from participating in any offering of penny stock. The Commission has repeatedly upheld use of summary disposition in cases such as this, where the respondent has been enjoined or convicted and the sole determination concerns the appropriate sanction. See In the Matter of Gary M. Kornman, S.E.C. Release No. 2840, 2009 WL 367635 at *3, *10-11 (February 13, 2009), pet. denied, 592 F.3d 173 (D.C. Cir. 2010); In the Matter of Jeffrey L. Gibson, S.E.C. Release No. 2700, 2008 WL 294717 at *5-6 \& nn.21-24 (collecting cases) (February 4, 2008), pet. denied, 561 F.3d 548 (6th Cir. 2009). Under Commission precedent, the circumstances in which summary disposition in a follow-on proceeding involving fraud is not appropriate "will be rare." In the Matter of John S. Brownson, S.E.C. Release No. 46161, 2002 WL 1438186 at *2 n. 12 (February 22, 2002), pet. denied, 66 Fed.Appx. 687 (9th Cir. 2003).

## B. The Court Should Bar Lane From The Securities Industry <br> 1. Legal Standard For Imposition Of A Bar

Section 15(b)(6)(A) of the Exchange Act, as amended by Section 925 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 ("Dodd-Frank") provides, in part: "With respect to any person ... at the time of the alleged misconduct, who was associated ... with a broker or dealer ... the Commission, by order, shall censure, place limitations on the activities or functions of such person, or suspend for a period not exceeding 12 months, or bar any such person from being associated with a broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer, municipal advisor, transfer agent, or nationally recognized statistical rating organization, or from participating in an offering of penny stock, if the Commission finds, on the record after notice and opportunity for a hearing, that such censure, placing of limitations, suspension, or bar is in the public interest and that such person - ... (ii) has been convicted of any offense specified in subparagraph (B) of [Section $15(\mathrm{~b})(4)$ ] within 10 years of the commencement of the proceedings under this paragraph ... ." Section 15(b)(4)(B) defines such offense, in part, as "any felony ... which the Commission finds - (i) involves the purchase or sale of any security, $\ldots$ the making of a false report, ... perjury, ... (ii) arises out of the conduct of the business of a broker, dealer ... (iii) involves the larceny, theft ... forgery ... fraudulent conversion, or misappropriation of funds ... or (iv) involves the violation of section ... $1341 \ldots$ of title 18 [of United States Code] ... ."

Similarly, Section 203(f) of the Advisers Act, as amended by Section 925 of Dodd-Frank, authorizes the Commission to censure, place limitations on the activities of, or suspend or bar a person associated with an investment adviser at the time of the alleged misconduct from acting as or being associated with an investment adviser, broker, deater, municipal securities dealer, municipal advisor, transfer agent, or nationally recognized statistical rating organization, if such sanctions are in the public interest and the person has been convicted of certain crimes described in Section 203 (e), including violations of section 1341 of the United States Code.

With respect to Lane's felony conviction for tax evasion, the Commission has long barred individuals based on convictions involving dishonesty that are not securities-related. See Kornman v. $S E C, 592$ F.3d 173, 180 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (citing with approval the Commission's policy that "the importance of honesty for a securities professional is so paramount that [the Commission has] barred individuals even when [a respondent's] conviction was based on dishonest conduct unrelated to securities transactions or securities business") (quoting Kornman, 2009 WL 367635 at *7); In the Matter of Don Warner Reinhard, S.E.C. Release No. 3139, 2011 WL 121451 at *5-6 \& n. 27 (January 14, 2011) (holding conviction for tax violation relevant to determine whether an individual is fit to work in an industry where honesty and rectitude concerning financial matters is critical); In the Matter of Ahmed Mohamed Soliman, S.E.C. Release No. 1482, 1995 WL 237220 at *2-3 (April 17, 1995) (revoking registration and imposing broker-dealer and investment adviser bars based on a misdemeanor conviction for submitting false documents to the Internal Revenue Service); In the Matter of Bruce Paul, S.E.C. Release No. 21789, 1985 WL 548579 at *2 (February 26, 1985) (imposing broker-dealer bar with right to reapply for conviction of making false statements on income tax returns). The securities business is "a field where opportunities for dishonesty recur constantly." Soliman, 1995 WL 237220 at *3.

## 2. Imposition Of A Bar Is Appropriate

There are three elements for determination of whether the Division's proposed sanction is proper: (a) whether Lane was associated with a broker-dealer and/or investment adviser at the time of his misconduct; (b) whether Lane was convicted of an applicable felony; and (c) whether it is in the public interest to bar him.

## a. Lane Was Associated With A Registered Entity

According to the criminal indictment to which Lane pleaded guilty, the criminal conduct occurred between May 2002 and May 2011, while Lane was a financial advisor with Banc of America Investments Services, Inc. ("BAI") and subsequently Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner \& Smith Incorporated ("Merrill Lynch"). Connolly Dec., Ex. 1. FINRA records confirm Lane's association with BAI and Merrill Lynch during this period. Connolly Dec., Ex. 5. Further, according to FINRA records, BAI and Merrill Lynch were dually registered with the Commission as a broker-dealer and as an investment adviser during the time that Lane was associated with them. Connolly Dec., Ex. 6 and 7.

## b. Lane Was Convicted Of A Felony

On August 8, 2012, Lane was indicted on 12 counts of mail fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 1341 and five counts of attempt to evade or defeat tax in violation of 26 U.S.C. Section 7201. Connolly Dec., Ex. 1. The mail fraud counts of the criminal indictment alleged, among other things, that Lane with intent to defraud, devised a scheme and artifice to defraud and obtain money by materially false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises. This criminal conduct occurred between May 2002 and March 2011, while Lane was a financial advisor with BAI and subsequently Merrill Lynch. The attempt to evade or defeat tax counts of the criminal indictment alleged, among other things, that Lane willfully attempted to evade and defeat a large part of the income tax due and owing by him to the United States of America by preparing and causing to be prepared and by signing and causing to be signed false and fraudulent income tax returns. This criminal conduct occurred between April 2007 and March 2011. Connolly Dec., Ex. 1. On September 3, 2013, Lane pleaded guilty to all counts in the indictment. Connolly Dec., Ex. 2. On February 20, 2014, the court entered a judgment sentencing Lane to 120 months in prison, followed by five years of supervised release, and restitution of $\$ 2,103,226$. Connolly Dec., Ex. 3 .

## c. An Industry Bar Is In The Public Interest

In determining whether an administrative sanction is in the public interest, the Commission considers the factors outlined in Steadman v. SEC, 603 F.2d 1126, 1140 (5th Cir. 1979): (1) the egregiousness of a respondent's actions; (2) the isolated or recurrent nature of the violations; (3) the degree of scienter involved; (4) the respondent's assurances against future violations; (5) the respondent's recognition of the wrongful nature of his conduct; and (6) the likelihood the respondent's occupation will present opportunities for future violations. See also In the Matter of KPMG Peat Marwick, LLP, S.E.C. Release No. 1360, 2001 WL 47245 at *2326 (January 19, 2001), aff'd sub nom KPMG v. SEC, 289 F.3d 109 (D.C. Cir. 2002); Peak Wealth Opportunities, 2013 WL 812635 at *9-10; Christopher Seeley, 2013 WL 5561106 at *14. No one factor controls. SEC v. Fehn, 97 F.3d 1276, 1295-96 (9th Cir. 1996).

Lane's actions were egregious. During his guilty plea, Lane agreed to the following facts (Connolly Dec., Ex. 2): During his employment with BAI and Merrill Lynch, Lane devised a scheme to route investor money to his spouse's $\mathrm{E}^{*}$ Trade account. Lane told investors that their funds would be invested in U.S. Treasury Bonds and corroborated the investments with false confirmations. Lane gave investment monies to his spouse who mailed them to her E*Trade account. The monies were subsequently withdrawn for Lane's personal use or used to pay other investors. Lane never purchased any U.S. Treasury Bonds. Under this fraudulent scheme, Lane obtained in excess of $\$ 4.4$ million and diverted in excess of $\$ 2.7$ million to his/his family's personal use. Lane also filed false and fraudulent individual tax returns for the years 2006 through 2010 by substantially underreporting his taxable income. The gross income not reported was the funds that Lane obtained from investors under the fraudulent scheme.

Lane's actions were recurrent and occurred over several years, from about May 2002 to about March 2011. For the same reasons as discussed in the preceding paragraph, Lane showed a high level of scienter. Lane never purchased any U.S. Treasury Bonds, knowingly created false confirmations, and used investor money for his personal use or to make payments to other investors.

Lane has not appeared or defended in this case, and so has not given any assurances against future violations of the securities laws. The fifth factor, Lane's recognition of his wrongful conduct, is the one factor that may not weigh in favor of a bar. Lane pleaded guilty in the criminal case, which involved acknowledging his misconduct. Further, during the sentencing hearing on February 10, 2014, Lane made a statement, including that he was "deeply saddened and sorry...for involving such truly decent people in this nightmare." Connolly Dec., Ex. 8 . Lastly, unless Lane is barred from the securities industry he will have the chance to reoffend.

Lane's conduct extended well beyond Dodd-Frank's enactment. Dodd-Frank was signed into law on July 21, 2010. Lane's conduct continued to about March 2011. Thus, there is no question of retroactivity in the application of any Dodd-Frank provisions to Lane's conduct. Indeed, imposition of the Dodd-Frank collateral bars is especially appropriate here given the need to protect the investing public prospectively from Lane.

## III. CONCLUSION

Based on the undisputed fact that Lane has been convicted of an applicable felony per Section 15(b)(4)(B) of the Exchange Act and Section 203(e) of the Advisers Act, and the undisputed facts establishing that the Steadman factors favor imposition of a bar, the Division's motion for summary disposition should be granted and Lane should be barred pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act and Section 203(f) of the Advisers Act.

Dated: November 24, 2014
Respectfully submitted,
Christine Connolly (323)965-3301
Marc J. Blau $\quad(323) 965-3975$
Securities and Exchange Commission
Los Angeles Regional Office
444 S. Flower Street, Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA 90071
COUNSEL FOR
DIVISION OF ENFORCEMENT
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I, Christine Connolly, declare pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 as follows:

1. I am one of the attorneys representing the Division of Enforcement in this action. I have personal knowledge of the following facts and, if called as a witness, would testify competently thereto.
2. Attached as Exhibit 1 is a certified copy of the Indictment in United States of America v. Gary H. Lane, 3:12-CR-00078-RCJ-VPC (D. Nev.).
3. Attached as Exhibit 2 is a certified copy of the September 3, 2013 Minutes of Proceedings in United States of America v. Gary H. Lane, 3:12-CR-00078-RCJ-VPC (D. Nev.).
4. Attached as Exhibit 3 is a certified copy of the Judgment in United States of America v. Gary H. Lane, 3:12-CR-00078-RCJ-VPC (D. Nev.).
5. Attached as Exhibit 4 is a copy of the September 15, 2014 letter to Lane offering the Division's investigative files for inspection and copying pursuant to Rule of Practice 230.
6. On October 21, 2014, Lane left a voicemail message for me at my Commission telephone number. Lane indicated that he had received several communications from the Division and was wondering what the complaint and sanctions were. Lane provided a call back telephone number. However, Division counsel was unable to reach Lane at the number provided. Lane is currently incarcerated at the Federal Correctional Institution in Sheridan, Oregon and may not receive incoming telephone calls.
7. Attached as Exhibit 5 is a copy of a FINRA record regarding Lane.
8. Attached as Exhibit 6 is a copy of a FINRA record regarding BAI.
9. Attached as Exhibit 7 is a copy of a FINRA record regarding Merrill Lynch.
10. Attached as Exhibit 8 is a certified copy of the February 10, 2014 Minutes of Proceedings in United States of America v. Gary H. Lane, 3:12-CR-00078-RCJ-VPC (D. Nev.).

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
Executed on November 24, 2014, in Los Angeles, California.


EXHIBIT 1

DANIEL G. BOGDEN United States Attomey
RONALD C. RACHOW
Assistant United States Attorney
100 West Liberty Street, Suite 600 Reno, Nevada 89501
Tel: (775) 784-5438
Fax: (775) 784-5181


Attorneys for Plaintiff

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Criminal No.
INDICTMENT FOR VIOLATION OF:
TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE
SECTION 1341-Mail Fraud (Counts 1 thru 12)
TITLE 26, UNITED STATES CODE
SECTION 7201 - Attempt to Evade or Defeat Tax (Counts 13 through 17)

THE GRAND JURY CHARGES THAT:


1. At all times relevant to this indictment, GARY H. LANE, Defendant herein, was a financial advisor employed by Bank of America Investment Services which later merged with Merrill Lynch, hereinafter referred to as "BAI/MER". The Defendant was employed in this position until March, 2011. During the course of his employment, Defendant developed a scheme to fraudulently entice investors to invest monies with him through the use of an E-Trade account rather than following appropriate BAI/MER procedures. The Defendant looked for investors who were elderly or lacked investing experience and had a desire for high returns and aversion to risk.
2. As part of the scheme, LANE told each of these prospective investors that their funds were to be invested in United States Treasury Bonds which would pay better than six percent interest ( $6.0 \%$ ) and

which would mature within two years. Upon receiving investment monies from the victims, the Defendant would corroborate the putative trade by creating false confirmations and distributing these false confirmations by mail. Lane also directed his spouse to open and maintain an E-Trade account in her own name. The Defendant would then take the investment monies and give them to his spouse who mailed them directly to her E-Trade account through use of the United States Mail. Once the funds were in the E-Trade account, they were withdrawn at the direction of the Defendant and used for his own use or to "pay" other investors' "interest" on their investments in order to continue the scheme.
3. The Defendant's promises of purchasing United States Treasury Bonds for the investors were never fulfilled and in fact, there was never in existence during the relevant time period any United States; Treasury Bond with a rate of return in excess of six percent and a maturity period of two years or less.
4. At a time unknown to the grand jury but no later than May 16, 2002 and continuing through March 7, 2011 in the District of Nevada and elsewhere, the Defendant GARY H. LANE, with the intent to defraud devised the above described scheme and artifice to defraud and obtain money by materially false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises.
5. On or about January 15, 2010 in the District of Nevada for purposes of executing or attempting to execute the above-described scheme and artifice to defraud and deprive, Defendant knowingly deposited and caused to be deposited into, and to be sent and delivered by the United States Mail a check received from SEF to E-Trade account ${ }^{* * * *}$ - 7536 in the amount of $\$ 200,000$; all in violation of Title 18 , United States Code, Section 1341.

COUNTS 2 through 12 incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1 through 4 of Count One and Paragraph 5 as if fully described therein, except for date of offense, transaction type and description, amount and investor.

| A | 0 | C | D | E | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Count | Date | Transaction <br> Type | Description | Deposits | Investor |
| 2 | $03 / 24 / 2010$ | Deposit | Check Deposit | 50,000 | RB |
| 3 | $04 / 05 / 2010$ | Deposit | Check Deposit | 100,000 | RAS |
| 4 | $06 / 04 / 2010$ | Deposit | Check Deposit | 200,000 | SEF |


| 5 | $06 / 28 / 2010$ | Deposit | Check Deposit | 500,000 | HA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| 6 | $09 / 23 / 2010$ | Deposit | Check Deposit | 500,000 | MW |
| 7 | $11 / 15 / 2010$ | Deposit | Check Deposit | 250,000 | MW |
| 8 | $11 / 22 / 2010$ | Deposit | Check Deposit | 200,000 | SEF |
| 9 | $12 / 08 / 2010$ | Deposit | Check Deposit | 50,000 | RB |
| 10 | $12 / 20 / 2010$ | Deposit | Check Deposit | 78,000 | RYA |
| 11 | $02 / 07 / 2011$ | Deposit | Check Deposit | 100,000 | RB |
| 12 | $03 / 07 / 2011$ | Deposit | Check Deposit | 50,000 | RB |

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1341.

## COUNT 13

Evasion of Income Tax
On or about April 14, 2007 in the District of Nevada, GARY H. LANE, Defendant herein, a resident of Washoe County, Nevada, did willfully attempt to evade and defeat a large part of the income tax due and owing by him to the United States of America for catendar year 2006 by preparing and causing to be prepared and by signing and causing to be signed a false and fraudulent U.S. Individual Income Tax Return, Form 1040, which was filed with the Internal Revenue Service wherein for said calendar year he listed as adjusted gross income the sum of $\$ 109,644$, taxable income of $\$ 762$, and that the amount of tax due and owing thereon was a sum of $\$ 38$ whereas, as he then and there well knew and believed, his taxable income for the said calendar year was substantially in excess of that heretofore stated and that upon said additional taxable income, an additional tax was due and owing to the United States of America; all in violation of Title 26, United States Code, Section 7201.




RENO, NEVADA, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 2013, 8:46 A.M. ---000----

THE COURT: In the matter of Gary Lane.

MR. DIGESTI: Good morning, your Honor.
THE COURT: Good morning. Appearances, please,
Mr. Rachow.
MR. RACHOW: Ron Rachow for the government, your
Honor.

MR. DIGESTI: Larry Digesti, your Honor, on
behalf of Gary Lane who is present.
THE COURT: Thank you. And this is the time, I
understand, for a change of plea?
MR. DIGESTI: Correct, your Honox.
THE COURT: In order to take a valid change of
plea, Mr. Lane, I do have to ask you questions under oath. If
you would raise your right hand and be sworn, please.
(The defendant was sworn. )
THE COURT: And, counsel, defendant has been
furnished with a copy of the indictment, of course.

MR. DIGESTI: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: This is to the 17 th count?
MR. DIGESTI: Correct.

THE COURT: Mr. Rachow, does this in any way
limit -- two questions before I proceed to take a plea. Does

MARGARET E. GRIENER, RDR, CCR NO. 3, OEETCIAL REPORTER (775) 329-9980
this in any way limit the related conduct that may be
considered under our PSR?
MR. RACHOW: The only limitation would be is if
there were any relevant conduct for restitution purposes
outside the terms of this plea, but I think everything is
covered in here, your Honor.
THE COURT: So, in other words, for restitation
purposes it's limited to the 17 th count.
MR. RACHOW: That's correct.
I would note that the victims themselves received
recovery from the bank so it's the Bank of America that's left
holding the bag.
THE COURT: I see. You know, you're aware, I'm
sure, with Mr. Sullivan I had another case similar just
recently where the parties entered into a plea agreement that
thereby limited the restitution amount on a fraud type case to
the single count, and $I$ required $M r$. Sullivan to notice it up.
I could approve it, but $I$, in essence, needed input from
victims before I permitted that to go forward.
MR. RACHOW: In this case, your Honor, there's
no limitation because he's pleading straight up.
The only thing the law would prohibit the court from
doing would be to order restitution in excess of what he pled
to under the statute, but I believe it's somewhere around
$\$ 4$ million as alleged in the indictment, and there's no way

MARGARET E. GRIENER, RDR, CCR NO. 3, OEFICIAL REPORTER (775) 329-9980
anyone is ever going to see it anyway.
THE COURT: And he's pleading straight up, not
pursuant to an agreement.
MR. RACHOW: There's no agreement.
THE COURT: So, of course, when he's sentenced you'll be dismissing the other counts.

MR. RACHOW: There are no other counts, he's
pleading to everything.
THE COURT: Oh. Well, then, I'm a little
confused. Of course, I don't look at the plea agreement until the hearing on purpose, but the 17 th count -- what do you mean pleading to everything?

MR. RACHOW: He's pleading to all 17 counts.
THE COURT: Oh, okay.
MR. RACHOW: There's no deal at all.
MR. DIGESTI: Your Honor, there's no plea
agreement that was signed in this case.
THE COURT: I misunderstood.
MR. DIGESTI: Upon review, the one that was originally presented by the government, in my opinion it was overly burdensome and there was just too many waivers that the government was asking Mr. Lane to agree to --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. DIGESTI: -- so it was decided to just come in and plead to the 17.

MARGARET $\mathcal{Z}$. GRIENER, RDR, CCR NO. 3, OPFICIAL REPORTER (775) 329-9980

THE COURT: Okay. Very good.
And do you waive a reading of the indictment at this time, counsel?

MR. DIGESTI: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: And, sir, Mr. Lane, do you
understand the charges against you, sir?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
THE COURT: Okay. And just for the record, I
apologize for asking, do you read, write and understand the
English language, sir?

THE DEEENDANT: Yes, I do.
THE COURT: Okay. And how does he intend to
plead?

MR. DIGESTI: Mr. Lane, your Honor, will enter a plea of guilty.

THE COURT: And is that correct, sir, to the 17
counts?

THE DEEENDANT: Yes, it is.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let me proceed with these questions then. The main purpose is to make sure you understand that you have the right to a trial as opposed to a guilty plea so I'll just go through this list of questions.

Eirst, a little bit about yourself. How old are

```
you?
```

MARGARET E. GRIENER, RDR, CCR NO. 3, OFETCIAL REPORTER (775) 329-9980

THE DEFENDANT: I'm 60 years old.
THE COURT: And how far did you go in school?
THE DEFENDANT: I've got a bachelor's degree.
THE COURT: In the last 24 hours have you taken
any drugs, medicine, pills of any kind or drunk any alcoholic beverages?

THE DEEENDANT: No alcohol, but I have
medication that the jail provides me.
THE COURT: Okay.
THE DEEENDANT: Blood pressure medication.
THE COURT: Blood pressure. Does any of it
affect your ability to comprehend or understand?
THE DEFENDANT: No, it does not, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. And have you ever been
treated for any mental illness of any kind?
THE DEFENDANT: No, I have not, your Honor.
THE COURT: And do you, in fact, understand what
is happening here today?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
THE COURT: And, counsel, do either of you have
any doubt as to the defendant's competence to plead?
MR. DIGESTI: No, your Honor.
MR. RACHOW: Not by the government, your Honor.
THE COURT: Based upon those representations I
find the defendant competent to plead in this matter.

MARGARET E. GRIENER, RDR, CCR NO. 3, OEFICTAL REPORTER (775) 329-9980

The second matter has to do with your attorney, Mr. Digesti. Have you had ample opportunity to discuss your case with him, and are you satisfied to have him represent you here?

THE DEFENDANT: I certainly am, your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you. The third area has to do with your right to a trial. You do understand that under our constitution and laws instead of a guilty plea you are entitled to a trial by jury, that in order to convict you unanimously 12 of them would have to ali agree that you are guilty.

THE DEEENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: And that during such a trial there's a presumption of innocence. That means that you don't have to prove that you are innocent, the government has to prove your guilt by competent evidence and beyond a reasonable doubt. Do you understand that?

THE DEEENDANT: I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: Also that witnesses for the
government have to come here to court on the stand in your presence and testify. Your attorney could cross-examine them. Yes?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: And also that your attorney could
call witnesses on your betalf as well. You understand that.

MARGARET E. GRIENER, RDR, CCR NO. 3, OEEICIAL REPORTER (775) 329-9980

THE DEFENDANT: I certainiy do.
THE COURT: And also at such a trial there's à
right to remain silent. That means you don't have to testify
if you don't want to, and no one can take any negative
inference from that fact.

Do you understand that right?
THE DEEENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: If we proceed with a guilty plea, you understand you will waive those rights as we have discussed them.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: Also, for example, you'll be
admitting -- instead of a jury verdict, you'll be admitting that you committed the offenses charged here. You understand that.

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: And also you will be waiving your right to remain silent because in a few minutes I will ask you what you did, you'll be telling me under oath. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: Are you willing today to give up
your right to remain silent in order for me to accept your guilty plea?

THE DEFENDANT: I am, your Honor.
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THE COURT: You've read a copy of the charges against you?

THE DEEENDANT: I have.
THE COURT: And you've discussed them with your
attorney, he's explained them to you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, he has.
THE COURT: I'm also required to explain to you the same charges, especially the elements that make them up which the government would have to prove at trial.

You've been charged in Counts 1 through 12 of the indictment with a violation of Title 18 US code 1341. This section makes it a crime for anyone to be guilty of mail fraud.

This is mail fraud, right, not wire fraud, mail

```
fraud?
```

MR. RACHOW: That's correct, your Honor.
THE COURT: The elements of this offense are fourfold:

Eirst, the defendant knowingly participated in or devised a scheme or plan to defraud, or a scheme or plan for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations or promises;

Second, the statements made or facts omitted as part of the scheme were material, that is, they had a natural tendency to influence or were capable of infiuencing a person
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to part with money or property.
Third, the defendant acted with the intent to
defraud, that is, the intent to deceive or cheat; and
Fourth, the defendant used or caused to be used the
mails to carry out or attempt to carry out an essential part
of the scheme. That's why we're here in federal court.

You've been charged in Counts 13 through 17 of the indictment with a violation of 18 USC 1341 . This section makes it a crime for anyone to be guilty of attempting to evade or defeat a tax.

Four elements again:
First, the defendant owed more federal income tax for the calendar year listed than was declared due on the defendant's income tax return for that calendar year;

Second, the defendant knew that more federal income tax was owed than was declared due on the defendant's income tax return;

Third, the defendant made an affirmative attempt to evade or defeat such additional tax; and

Fourth, in attempting to evade or defeat such additional zax, the defendant acted willfully.

You understand that that's what the government would
have to prove in all of those Counts 1 through 17.
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: And that by pleading guilty you're
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admitting to me that they could prove it.
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Are you aware of the maximum penalty
and fine for those counts?
THE DEFENDANT: I am, your Honor.
THE COURT: For example, are you aware that the
maximum possible penalty under the 17 counts is a fine of
250,000, or a term of imprisonment of 20 years, or both?
THE DEEENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: And this is in the aggregate,
Mr. Rachow?
MR. RACHOW: Pardon me?
THE COURT: This is in the aggregate? In other
words, he can't be sentenced separately on each count.
MR. RACHON: He can, your Honor, but the Court
would normally run them all concurrently.
THE COURT: Right.
Okay. Do you understand that, sir?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: Also, that an assessment fee,
special assessment fee of $\$ 100$ per count will be imposed,
1700, at the time of sentencing. You understand that.
THE DEFENDÄNT: Yes, $I$ do, your Honor.
THE COURT: You also understand in every
criminal case in which a defendant may be sentenced to more
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than a year in prison, in addition the court can order
supervised release to follow that imprisonment, in this case
not to exceed three years.
THE DEEENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: And that while on supervised release
you're required to abide by conditions specified by the Court.
If you violate those conditions, the court can send you back
for additional internment time.
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: And while on supervised release, if
you -- again, if that release is revoked for any reason, you
can be in prison for the full term, up to the full term
without credit for the time you'd already spent in that
condition. You understand that.
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Now, then, this is not
pursuant to a plea agreement, correct, counsel?
MR. DIGESTI: Correct, your Honor.
THE COURT: But any and all offers received from
the government counsel, did you convey those to the defendant?
MR. DIGESTI: I did.
THE COURT: And do you acknowledge receiving any
and all offers and negotiations for plea through your
attorney, sir?
THE DEEENDANT: Yes, I do.
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THE COURT: And you are, in fact, acting here on
the advice of your attorney?

THE DEEENDANT: I am, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Let's see. A few other questions.

You understand that the court can order you to make restitution to any victim of this offense. You understand that.

THE DEEENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: And that the offenses you're
pleading guilty to are felony offenses, you understand that.
THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: If your plea is accepted, you will be adjudged guilty of a felony, and that may deprive you of valuable civil rights such as the right to vote, the right to serve on a jury, the right to possess any kind of a firearm. Yes?

THE DEEENDANT: I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: And, counsel, is your client a US

```
citizen?
```

MR. DIGESTI: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Has anyone threatened you or forced
you to plead guilty, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: No, they have not.
THE COURT: And this is a voluntary plea on your

MARGARET E. GRIENER, RDR, CCR NO. 3, OEFICIAL REPORTER (775) 329-9980

```
part then, sir?
```

    THE DEFENDANT: It is indeed, your Honor.
    THE COURT: Okay. Has anybody made any promise
    to you regarding sentence or otherwise that caused to you
plead guilty?
THE DEFENDANT: No, they have not.
THE COURT: You understand it's up to the Court
to set the sentence.
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. There is a Sentencing Reform
Act of 1984 that guides our conclusions on sentencing. It
sets up a Sentencing Commission which issues guidelines for
judges to consult. They're not binding on the Court, but they
establish for each type of offense and for each type of
background a guideline range for sentences.
Have you and your attorney discussed those
guidelines --
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, we have, your Honor.
THE COURT: -- and he's answered all of your
questions?
THE DEEENDANT: He certainly has.
THE COURT: Okay. And you understand that it
takes about 90 days. We submit the matter to our probation
department, not the government's but the US Court's probation
department. They interview you to give a report on your
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background and also to make recommendations regarding that guideline.

But, again, once the guideline is determined at sentencing, it's for the Court, again, to determine that sentence. You understand that.

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: And whether I go above or below the guideline, you would still be obligated and bound by your guilty plea. You understand that.

THE DEEENDANT: I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. You understand, too, that
both you -- in the situation where there is no plea agreement,
both you and the government retain your rights to appeal any
sentence. . You understand that.

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Last question in this regard
is relevant conduct. You understand that if the government
doesn't prosecute any of these charges, or doesn't prosecute
other charges, still any and all relevant conduct to these
present charges can be considered in that presentence report
and could affect your sentence.
THE DEEENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Counsel, in the plea
memorandum from the government there is a section on facts to
support a guilty plea. Have you read that and reviewed it

MARGARET E. GRIENER, RDR, CCR NO. 3, OFEICIAL REPORTER (775) 329-9980
with the defendant?
MR. DIGESTI: Your Honor, we've looked at it, but it's not a plea memo, this is just a memo by the government so --

THE COURT: That's correct.
MR. DIGESTI: But we did review it.
THE COURT: And is there any reason why he cannot allocute to any or all of these facts as listed, namely that they're not true? MR. DIGESTI: No, we're not disputing the facts, your Honor. We'll stipulate that there's a factual basis for the plea.

THE COURT: Okay. And, let's see. Mr. Lane, you've read that section on facts supporting a guilty plea, have you not, sir?

THE DEEENDANT: Yes, I have.
THE COURT: I'm going to read it to you and ask you under oath if it's all true.

The defendant was a financial adviser employed by Bank of America investment Services which later merged with Merrill Lynch. The defendant was employed in this position until March 2011.

During the course of this employment the defendant developed a scheme to fraudulently entice investors to invest moneys with him through the use of an e-Trade account rather
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than following his employer's procedures.
The defendant looked for investors who were elderly or lacked investing experience and had a desire for high returns and an aversion to risk. The defendant told each of these prospective investors that their funds were to be invested in United States Treasury bonds which would pay better than six percent and which would mature within two years.

Upon receiving investment moneys from the victims, the defendant would corroborate the putative trade by creating false confirmations and distributing these false confirmations by mail.

The defendant also directed his spouse to open and maintain an e-Trade account in her own name. The defendant would then take the investment moneys and give them to his spouse who mailed them directly to her e-Trade account through use of the US mails. Once the funds were in that account, they were withdrawn at the direction of the defendant and used for his own use or to pay other investors interest on their own investments in order to further the scheme.

The defendant's promises of purchasing US treasury bonds for the investors was never fulfilled and, in fact, there were never in existence during the relevant time period any United States Treasury bond with a rate of return in excess of six percent and a maturity period of two years or
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```
eldexly, but, likewise, they did not necessarily lack
investing experience. They could have been elderly and
sophisticated investors. And we're not prepared to stipulate
to that as being a factually correct statement.
THE COURT: Now, you understand that at
sentencing, and based upon even hearsay in the probation's
sentencing report, the court can make a finding to that
effect. You understand that.
    MR. DIGESTI: We understand that, your fonor,
we're just not prepared to stipulate to that at this point.
    THE COURT: Okay. Without that stipulation as
to the last sentence, is that a sufficient allocution,
Mr. Rachow?
```

    MR. RACHOW: It is, your Honor. I believe the
    defendant is just saying that there were numerous investors
who were sophisticated, the factual pattern that the
government believes occurred, he was looking for elderly and
unsophisticated investors, but he also had more sophisticated
investors.
THE COURT: Okay. And if that makes a
difference in sentencing, everybody understands the court will
decide that based upon what's presented to me at the time of
sentencing. Do you understand that, counsel?
MR. DIGESTI: Yes, your fonor.
THE COURT: And do you understand that,
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Mr. Lane?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is all the rest of it, other than that sentence, true and correct, sir?

MR. DIGESTI: In that entire statement of facts, your Honor?

THE COURT: Right.
MR. DIGESTI: There's one other thing we're not agreeing to, and that's the tax loss to the IRS. We're not stipulating to that amount.

THE COURT: Do you admit that there is a tax loss to the IRS?

MR. DIGESTI: We admit that there is a tax loss, but we're not prepared to stipulate that it's \$1.01 million.

I believe that that's an element of the offense
which directly impacts and can impact sentencing in terms of the offense level, and $I$ do not have sufficient documentation in my discovery file that would allow us to stipulate to that amount.

THE COURT: Well, see, I still have to approve your guilty plea, and $I$ have to make a finding that all of the elements are included within the four corners of his allocution.

So, let's see. The elements include knew that more federal incone tax was owed than was declared due on the
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defendant's income tax return.
MR. DIGESTI: Your Honor, we're not disputing --
THE COURT: And it certainly has to be more than
a dollar.

MR. DIGESTI: I agree, and there's a lot of
territory between a dollar and a million.
We're not disputing the fact that there's income tax
returning [sic], we're just not prepared to stipulate to the
actual amount that the government is claiming at this point in
time as restitution for that offense.
And that's -- we're not denying it, obviously, but,
again, the amount that's due and owing in my opinion is not an
element of the offense.
THE COURT: It is to the extent it's immaterial
or material.
MR. DIGESTI: Well --
THE COURT: In other words, I'm not going to
accept his guilty plea if he just deprived the government of
5,000 bucks.

MR. DIGESTI: Well, your Honor, we're being placed in a situation where we're being asked to stipulate to an amount.

THE COURT: I'm not asking you to stipulate to the amount, but there is an element here of materiality. I haven't listed it, but I'm not going to accept his guilty plea
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```
unless it's in a material amount, and, in my mind, it's got to
```

be more than five or ten grand.

MR. DIGESTI: No, I understand, your Honor, but
it also, if I understand correctly, could impact the offense
level in this case.

THE COURT: That's correct.
MR. DIGESTI: And then that precludes us at time
of sentencing, perhaps, to argue for something less if we
stipulate to --
THE COURT: Okay. Let me repeat what I said.
MR. DIGESTI: Okay.
THE COURT: Hopefully you'll get it this time.
I won't accept his guilty plea unless he's willing
to stipulate or allocute to -- I don't care about the amount,
but whatever the amount is, it's in excess of, or well in
excess of five or $\$ 10,000$.
MR. DIGESTI: I can stipulate to that.
THE COURT: And do you stipulate to that,
Mr. Lane?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. You tell me first with
respect to the 17 counts, sir -- I'm sorry, I through 12 , what
you did in your own words, please.
THE DEFENDANT: I solicited funds from clients
and told them that $I$ was going to be purchasing treasury
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```
securities with those funds when, in fact, they were indeed,
as the -- you just read, deposited into an e-Trade account
where the money -- some of the moneys were withdrawn. Most of
the funds were used for trading higher-risk securities,
derivatives and options and some stock.
    THE COURT: Okay. And with regard to the latter
    counts, attempting to evade or defeating the tax, what did you
do, sir?
    THE DEEENDANT: I did not claim those funds that
    I received from the clients on my income tax.
    THE COURT: Okay. And then there's a chart in
the indictment, Counts 2 through 12.
    MR. DIGESTI: May I have just a moment, your
Honor?
            THE COURT: Yes.
            MR. DIGESTI: Thank you, your Honor.
            THE COURT: And is that chart correct, sir?
            Counts 2 through 12 incorporate by reference
paragraphs one through four except for date of offense, and
these are deposit amounts that were made.
                            THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it looks accurate. I don't
have a way to be absolutely certain, but it does look
accurate, yes, your Honor.
    THE COURT: Okay. And then there's a chart in
Count 13, evasion of income tax, and it says Counts 14 through
```
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17 incorporate all of count 13, and except for the calendar year, date filed, adjusted gross income, taxable income and amount of tax due and owing, and then it lists what was actually filed, 2007 through 2010 , the date of Eiling, the adjusted gross income as reported on the return, taxable income, and the amount of tax due and owing per those returns.

Is all of that accurate?
THE DEEENDANT: Again, I'm --
THE COURT: Not sure.

THE DEFENDANT: No, not certain that's accurate. THE COURT: Okay. Here's what 13 says.

On or about April 14, Gary Lane did willfully attempt to evade and defeat a large part of the income tax due and owing by him to the United States of America for calendar year 2006.

And you understand that under tax law willfully has an important meaning. It means that you knew that additional moneys were owing and you did intend to evade the tax.

Do you understand that meaning, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand the meaning, yes, sir.

THE COURT: In other words, we don't convict people of tax evasion for innocently not paying their taxes, you understand that. This requires an element of willful, in other words, you knew you owed additional amounts and you
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```
intended not to pay it or to evade it.
    MR. DIGESTI: Can I have a moment, your Honor?
        THE COURT: You bet.
            (Discussion held off the record.)
    THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.
    THE COURT: Okay. Without listing the million
dollar amount at all, it goes on to say that you listed as
adjusted gross income the sum of 109,000 some odd taxabie
income of $762 for that year described there, and whereas he
then and there well knew and believed his taxable income was
substantially in excess of that.
    Is that a true statement, sir?
        THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
    THE COURT: Okay. All right. Is that a
sufficient allocution for the government?
    MR. RACHOW: It is, your Honor.
    We would ask that the Court also include an
admission from the defendant as to the counts that aren't
listed in the table which would be Count I and Count 13.
    THE COURT: That they are, in fact, true.
    MR. RACHOW: Right.
    THE COURT: The allegations of the grand jury
are in fact true.
    MR. RACHOW: Correct.
    THE COURT: And will your client so affirm,
```
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    ```
counsel?
```

MR. DIGESTI: Just a moment, your Honor.
(Discussion held off the record.)
MR. RACHOW: Your Honor, that's not necessarily
as to all the facts of the scheme, only to the amounts that
they -- in the intent.

MR. DIGESTI: Yes, your Honor. He's prepared to
admit to the allegations in Count 1.
THE COURT: And is that correct, sir, Mr. Lane?
THE WITNESS: Yes, it is, your Honor.
THE COURT: Is that sufficient?
MR. RACHOW: It is, your Honor. The Court went
through Count 13 with him line by line.
THE COURT: Yeah. Okay.
All right. How do you plead then, sir, guilly or
not guilty, to all 17 counts?
THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor.
THE COURT: And are you pleading guilty because
in truth and fact you are guilty and not for any other reason?
THE DEFENDANT: I'm guilty.
THE COURT: Okay. Since you know your right to
a trial, since this is a voluntary plea, since you know the
punishment and the maximum penalties that can be imposed, I
conditionally accept your guilty plea at this time.
By conditional it just means that $I$ will first look
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at that presentence report, you'll look at it, too, and then at the sentencing hearing about 90 days hence $I$ will accept the guilty plea finally.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's see. It is for this reason
that I ask you to sign this form because under our criminal rules I can't look at the presentence report, you can't either, until after I finally accept the guilty plea, but I'm not willing to do that unless, of course, you consent in writing. You can give me permission to look at the presentence report before $I$ finally accept the guilty plea.

Do you understand that purpose for the form?
THE DEEENDANT: I do, your Honor.
THE COURT: And, counsel, is there any reason why he shouldn't sign this?

MR. DIGESTI: No, not at all, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. If you'll sign it then, please, I will also approve it.

MR. DIGESTI: Your Honor, the document shows a date in the month of August. Do you want me to interlineate --

THE COURT: Would you, please. Yes, please.
It is the finding of the Court in the case of the United States versus Gary $H$. Lane that the defendant is fully competent and capable of entering ari informed plea, that his
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plea of guilty is a knowing and voluntary one and supported by
an independent basis in fact containing all of the essential
elements of the offense charged, therefore the plea is
conditionally accepted at this time.

Mr. Lane, I will now order that presentence investigation report. Again, it takes about 90 days or so.

In the meantime, the probation officer will make an appointment to interview you for the report. I do urge your full cooperation in giving information to the officer because the report is, frankly, very important in determining your sentence. However, you do have the right to have your counsel
with you when you give information to the officer.

And you will have the opportunity to read the report, object to its contents or comment on its contents prior to the time of sentencing, and at sentencing, if you wish, you may address the Court relative to an appropriate sentence, or you may ask counsel simply to speak on your behalf.

A sentencing date, please.
THE CLERK: Your Honor, sentencing is set for Monday, December 16th, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

THE COURT: Your attorney will remind you of that date and time.

If there's no objection, I'll just simply continue defendant in current custody status.
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MR. RACHOW: That's fine, your Honor.
MR. DIGESTI: Thank you, your Honor. Was that
$9: 30$ on the 16 th of December?
THE CLERK: Yes, 9:30 a.m.
MR. DIGESTI: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Lane.
THE DEEENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.
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|  |  | America [3]-3:11. | bet (1)-25:3 | 14:12 |
|  |  | 16:20, 24:14 amount [13]-3 | better (11-17:7 between [1]-21:6 | committed [1]-8:14 <br> competence (1)-6:2 |
|  |  | $20: 10,20: 19,21 ; 9$ | beverages $111-6: 6$ | competent [3]-6:25, |
| 2 |  | $1: 12,21: 22,21: 24$ | beyond [1]-7:16 | 7:16, 27:25 |
| 2[2]-23:12, 23:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { accept }\{\text { घ1 }-8: 23 . \\ & 21: 18,21: 25,22: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $24: 3,24: 6,25: 7$ | $\text { bit }[1]-5: 24$ | comprehend (1) - |
| 2.7[1]-18:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 24,27: 2,27: 8 \\ & 27: 11 \end{aligned}$ | amounts $[4]-18: 8$, | blood $[2]-6: 10,6: 11$ | 6:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20[1]-11: 8 \\ & 2006[2]-18: 7,24: 15 \end{aligned}$ |  | 23:20, 24:25, 26:5 | bond [1] - 17:24 | conclusions [1] - |
|  | accepted $\{2$ - 13: 13. | ample[1]-7:2 <br> answered (1] - 14:19 | bonds [] - 17:6. $17: 22$ | concurrently 11 - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2010[2]-18: 7,24: 4 \\ & 2011(1)-16: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $28: 4$ | anyway [1]-4:1 | bound [1]-15:8 | $11: 18$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { account }[5]-16: 25 \\ & 17: 14,17: 16,17: 17 \\ & 23: 2 \end{aligned}$ | apologize []-5:9 | bucks[1]-21:19 | condition (1)-12:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2013[3]-1: 6,2: 1 \\ & 28: 21 \end{aligned}$ |  | appeal[ 1$]$ - 15:13 | burdensome[1] - | conditional [1]-26:25 |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { accurate }[5]-18: 21, \\ 23: 21,23: 23,24: 7 \end{array}$ | appearances [1]-2:6 | 4.21 | conditionally [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24[1]-6: 4 \\ & 250,000[1]-11: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $24: 10$ | APPEARANCES [1]- $1: 13$ | C | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:24, } 28: 4 \\ & \text { conditions [2]-12:6 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 3 | $12: 22$ | 28:8 | c | conduct [4]-3:1, 3:4. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3[4]-1: 6,1: 21,2: 1 . \\ & 29: 12 \\ & 3: 12-C R-78-R C J- \\ & \text { VPC }[1]-1: 5 \end{aligned}$ | ```Act \(\{11\) - 14:11 acted [2]-10:2, 10:21 acting [1]-13:1 actual 11 - \(21: 9\) addition(1)-12:1 additional (5) - 10:19, 10:21, 12:8, 24:17, \(24: 25\) address [1]-28:16``` | appropriate [1] | $\text { cannot } 11-16: 8$ | $15: 17,15: 19$ <br> confirmations [2] |
|  |  | approve (3)-3:18. | capable [2] - 9:25 | $17: 11$ |
|  |  | $20: 20,27: 18$ | 27:25 | confused [1] - 4:10 |
|  |  | April ${ }^{\text {a }}$ - $24: 12$ | care [1]-22:14 | consent [1]-27:9 |
| 4 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { area }[1]-7: 6 \\ & \text { argue }[1]-22: 3 \end{aligned}$ | case (9)-3:14, 3:16. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { considered [2]-3:2, } \\ & 15: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4[1]-3: 25 \\ & 4.4[1]-18: 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { assessment [2] - } \\ 11: 20,11: 21 \end{gathered}$ $\text { Assistant }[1]-1: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 25,12: 2,22: 5 \\ & 27: 23 \end{aligned}$ | constitution [1]-7:8 <br> consult [1] - 14.13 <br> containing [1]-28:2 |
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|  |  | $17: 2,17: 4,17: 10$, 17:13, 17:14, 17:18, 18:2, 18:6, 18:16. 19:15, 25:18, 27:24, 28:25 <br> DEFENDANT 1631 - <br> 1:17, 5:7, 5:11. 5:18, 6:1, 6:3. 6:7, 6:10, 6:13, 6:16, 6:19, 7:5. 7:12, 7:18, 7:23, 8:1. 8:7, 8:11, 8:16, 8:21. 8:25, 9:3, 9:6, 10:24, $11: 2,11: 5,11: 9$ 11:19, 11:23, 12:4, 12:9, 12:15. 12:25, 13:3, 13:9, 13:12, 13:18. 13:24. 14:2. 14:6, 14:9, 14:18, 14:21, 15:6, 15:10. 15:15, 15:22, 16:16, 20:2, 22:20, 22:24. 23:9. 23:21, 24:8. 24:10. 24:20, 25:5, 25:13, 26:17, 26:20, 27:4, 27:13, 29:7 <br> defendant's 5 5]-6:21. 10:14, 10:16, 17:21. 21:1 <br> defraud [2]-9:20, 10:3 <br> degree $[1]-6: 3$ <br> denying [1]-21:11 <br> department $[21$ - <br> 14:24, 14:25 <br> deposit $[1]-23: 20$ <br> deposited [1]-23:2 <br> deprive $[1]-13: 14$ <br> deprived $[1]-21: 18$ <br> derlvatives $[1]-23: 5$ <br> described [1] - 25:9 <br> desire [1]-17:3 <br> determine [1]-15:4 <br> determined [1]-15:3 <br> determining [1] - <br> 28:10 <br> developed (1] - 16:24 <br> devised [1]-9:20 <br> difference (1)-19:21 <br> Digesti[ 2 ] - 2:10, 7:2 <br> DIGESTI (44)-1:17. <br> 2:5, 2:10, 2:14, 2:21, <br> 2:23, 4:16, 4:19, <br> 4:24, 5:4, 5:14, 6:22, <br> 12:18, 12:21. 13:21. <br> 16:2, 16:6, 16:10, <br> 18:11, 18:14, 18:19. 18:25, 19:9, 19:24, 20:5, 20:8. 20:13. 21:2. 21:5, 21:16, 21:20, 22:3, 22:7. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  | ```offers [2]-12:19, 12:23 officer [31-28:7, 28:9, 28:12 Official [2]-1:21, 29:13 old [2]-5:24, 6:1 omitted [1]-9:23 once [2]-15:3, 17:17 one [5]-4:19, 8:4, 20:8, 23:19, 28:1 open \(11-17: 13\) opinlon[2]-4:20. 21:12 opportunlty [2]-7:2. 28:13 opposed [1]-5:21 options [1]-23:5 order \([8]-2: 15,3: 23\), 7:9, 8:23, 12:1, 13:6, 17:20, \(28: 5\) originally \([1]-4: 20\) otherwise [1]-14:4 outside [1]-3:5 overly [1] - 4:21 owed [4] - 10:12. 10:16, 20:25, 24:25 owing \(16 \mid-18: 8\), 21:12, 24:3, 24:6, 24:14, 24:18 own [5]-17:14, 17:19, 17:20, 18:4, 22:23 part (5) - 9:23, 10:1. 10:5, 14:1, 24:13 participated \([1]\) - 9:19 parties [1]-3:15 pattern 11 - 19:16 pay 141-17:6. 17:19, 18:7. 25:1 paying 11 - \(24: 23\) penalties [1] - 26:23 penalty [2] - 11:3, 11:7 people [1]-24:23 per [2]-11:21, 24:6 percent[2]-17:7. 17:25 perhaps [1]-22:8 perlod [2]-17:23. 17:25 permission [1] - 27:10 permitted (1)-3:19 person[1]-9:25 pills (1)-6:5 placed [1] - 21:21``` |  | ```10:1 prosecute [2] - 15:18 prospective [1]-17:5 prove (5) - 7:15, 9:9, 10:23, 11:1 provides \{1]-6:8 PSR[1]-3:2 punishment \({ }^{1]}\) - 26:23 purchasing (2) - 17:21, 22:25 purpose \([3]-4: 71\), 5:20. 27:12 purposes \([\) 2]-3:4, 3:8 pursuant [2]-4:3, 12:17 putative [1]-17:10 \begin{tabular}{c} \hline\(Q\) \\ \hline questions \([6]-2: 16\), \\ \(2: 25,5: 20,5: 23\), \\ \(13: 5,14: 20\) \\ \hline \end{tabular} R RACHOW [20]-1:14. 2:8, 3:3, 3:9. 3:20. 4:4, 4:7. 4:13, 4:15, 6:23, 9:16, 11:12, 11:15, 19:14, 25:16, 25:21, 25:24, 26:4. 26:12. 29:1 Rachow [5] - 2:7. 2:8, 2:24, 11:17, 19:13 ralse [1]-2:17 range [1]-14:15 rate[1]-17:24 rather [1] - 16:25 \(\operatorname{RDR}\{2]-1: 21,29: 12\) read \([7]-5: 9,9: 1\). 15:25, 16:14, 16:17, 23:2, 28:13 reading [1] - \(5: 2\) reads [1]-18:16 reason (5)-12:11. 16:7, 26:19, 27:5, 27:14 reasonable [1] - 7:16 received \((3)-3: 10\), 12:19. 23:10 receiving [2]-12:22. 17:9 recently \([1]-3: 15\) recommendations [1] - \(15: 1\) record (4)-5:8, 25:4, 26:3, 29:10 recovery \(11-3: 11\)``` | ```reference[1]-23:18 Reform[1]-14:10 regard [2]-15:16, 23:6 regarding [2]-14:4, 15:1 related [1]-3:1 relative [1]-28:16 release [4]-12:2. 12:5, 12:10, 12:11 relevant [4]-3:4; 15:17, 15:19, 17:23 remain [3]-8:3, 8:18, 8:23 remind [1-28:22 Reno[4]-1:7, 1:15. 1:18, 1:22 RENO[1]-2:1 repeat [1]-22:10 report[10]-14:25, 15:20, 19:7, 27:1, 27:7, 27:11, 28:6, 28:8, 28:10, 28:14 Reported [1] - 1:21 reported [2]-18:6, 24:5 Reporter (2] 1:21. 29:13 represent[1]-7:3 representations [2] - 6:24, 9:22 required [3]-3:17. 9:7. 12:6 requires [1]-24:24 respect[1]-22:22 rest[1]-20:3 restitution[6] - 3:4, 3:7, 3:16, 3:23, 13:7, 21:10 retain [1]-15:13 return [5] - 10:14, 10:17, 17:24, 21:1, 24:5 returning [1]-21:8 returns [3] - 17:4, 18:6, 24:6 review [2]-4:19, 16:6 reviewed [{] - 15:25 revoked [1] - 12:11 rights [3]-8:9,13:15, 15:13 risk[2]-17:4, 23:4 ROBERT[1]-1:2 Ron[1]-2:8 RONALD (1) - 1:14 rules [1]-27:7 run [1]-11:16``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| $4: 16,4: 19,4: 24,5: 4$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 12:18, 12:21, 13 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 18:11, 18:14, 18: |  |  |  |  |
| 18:25, 19:9. 19:14 |  |  |  |  |
| 18:24, 20:5, 20:8 |  |  |  |  |
| 20:13, 21:2, 21:5, |  |  |  |  |
| 11, 22:17 |  |  |  |  |
| 7, 22:11, 22:17 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $26: 2,26: 4,26: 7$ $26: 12,27-16.27$ |  |  |  |  |
| ,16, 27 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RENO }[1]-2: 1 \\ & \text { repeat }[1]-22: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| nam |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 7,27: 11,28: 6 \\ & 28: 8,28: 10,28: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pled }[1]-3: 23 \\ & \text { point }[2]-19: 10,21: 9 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| natural |  |  |  | Reported [1] - 1:21 <br> reported [2]-18:6, 24:5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| (1) $-3: 1$ |  | position[1]-16:21 | RACHOW [20]-1:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reporter }[2]-1: 21 \\ & 29: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | possess [1]-13:16 |  |  |
| negotiations (1) 12:23 |  | possible [1] - 11:7 | $4: 4,4: 7,4: 13,4: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 13 \\ & \text { represent }[1]-7: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | precludes [1]-22:7 |  | $6: 24,9: 22$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { required }[3]-3: 17 \\ & 9: 7,12: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| never (2)-17:22 |  | presence [1]-7:21 | Rachow 15] - 2:7, 2:8, | requires [1] - $24: 24$ respect [1]-22:22 |
| normally [1]-11:16 <br> note [1]-3:10 <br> notice [1]-3:17 <br> numerous [1] - 19:15 |  | $15: 20$ | $2: 24,11: 17,19: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rest }[1]-20: 3 \\ & \text { restitution }[6]-3: 4 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | ralse [1]-2:17 <br> range $[1]-14: 15$ |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { presented }[2]-4: 20 \text {, } \\ & 19: 22 \end{aligned}$ |  | $3: 7,3: 16,3: 23,13: 7,$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { presentence } \\ & 15: 20,27: 1,27: 7 \text {. } \\ & 27: 11,28: 5 \end{aligned}$ | te [1]-17:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:10 } \\ & \text { retain } 11]-15: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pressure [2]-6:10, } \\ & 6: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $15: 25,16: 14,16: 17$ | $24: 5$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { oath [3 }-2: 16,8: 19 \\ & 16: 18 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | presumption [1] - $7: 14$ | $\text { reading }[1]-5: 2$ | returning $[1]-21: 8$ <br> returns [3]-17:4, |
| objection (1) - 28 |  | pretenses[1]-9:22 | reads [1]-18:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:6, } 24: 6 \\ & \text { review }[2]-4: 19,16: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| - |  | prison [2]-12:1. | reason [5]-12:11. <br> 16:7, 26:19, 27:5 |  |
| Ob |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | probation [3]-14:23, $14: 24,28: 7$ <br> probation's (1]-19:6 | reasonable [1] - 7:16 |  |
|  |  |  | $\text { received }[3]-3: 10$ | $\text { rights }[3]-8: 9,13: 15$ |
| obviously (1)-21:1 |  |  |  |  |
| occurred $[1]-19: 17$ |  | probation's [1]-19:6 <br> procedures [1]-17:\{ | $12: 19,23: 10$ | risk [2]-17:4, 23:4 |
| (1) |  |  |  |  |
| (4) $-1: 1,1: 4,1: 1$ |  |  |  |  |
| offense (10) - 9:17. $13: 7.14: 14,20: 15$ |  |  |  |  |
| $13: 7,14: 14,20: 15$ $20: 17,21: 10,21: 13$ |  |  |  |  |
| 4, 23:19, $28: 3$ |  |  |  |  |
| Of |  |  |  |  |
| 13:10, 13:11 |  |  |  |  |
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EXHIBIT 3

# United States District Court 

## District of Nevada

| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | ) | JUDGMENT IN A CRIMINAL CASE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ) |  |  |
| v. | ) |  |  |
|  | ) | Case Number: | 3:12-CR-0 |
| GARY H. LANE | ) |  |  |
|  | ) | USM Number: | 47674-048 |
|  | ) |  |  |
|  | ) | Laurence Dige Defendant's Atio |  |

## THE DEFENDANT:

X pleaded guilty to count(s) One through Seventeen as charged in the Indictmentpleaded nolo contendere to count(s)
which was accepted by the court.
was found guilty on count(s)
After a plea of not guilty.
The defendant is adjudicated guilty of these offenses:

Title \& Section
18 U.S.C. § 1341
26 U.S.C. § 7201

Nature of Offense<br>Mail Fraud<br>Attempt to Evade or Defeat Tax

| Offense Ended |  | Count(s) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $03 / 2011$ |  | $1-12$ |
| $03 / 2011$ |  | $13-17$ |

Count(s)
13-17

The defendant is sentenced as provided in pages 2 through 6 of this judgment. The sentence is imposed pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984.
$\square$ The defendant has been found not guilty on count(s) $\qquad$
$\square$ Count(s) $\qquad$is $\square$ are dismissed on the motion of the United States.

It is ordered that the defendant must notify the United States attorney for this district within 30 days of any change of name, residence, or mailing address until all fines, restitution, costs, and special assessments imposed by this judgment are fully paid. If ordered to pay restitution, the defendant must notify the court and Unifex ghtatymey of material changes in economic circumstances.


February 10, 2014

$\overline{\text { Date }}$ February 20, 2014

## IMPRISONMENT

The defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of: 120 months as to Counts One through Twelve; and 60 months as to Counts Thirteen through Seventeen, all counts concurrent.

X The court makes the following recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons:
-that the defendant be designated to a FCI facility near Eugene, Oregon.

X The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal.
$\square$ The defendant shall surrender to the United States Marshal for this district:
$\square$ at $\qquad$ $\square$ a.np.m. on $\qquad$ .
$\square$ as notified by the United States Marshal.
$\square$ The defendant shall surrender for service of sentence at the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons:
$\square$ before $2 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. on $\qquad$ -.
$\square$ as notified by the United States Marshal.
$\square$ as notified by the Probation or Pretrial Services Office.

## RETURN

I have executed this judgment as follows:

Defendant delivered on $\qquad$ to $\qquad$ a $\qquad$
$\qquad$ with a certified copy of this judgment.
$\qquad$

## DEFENDANT: GARY H. LANE <br> CASE NUMBER: 3:12-CR-0078-RCJ-VPC

## SUPERVISED RELEASE

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be on supervised release for a term of: Five years as to Counts One through Twelve; and three years as to Counts Thirteen through Seventeen, all counts concurrent.

The defendant must report to the probation office in the district to which the defendant is released within 72 hours of release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons.

The defendant shall not commit another federal, state or local crime.
The defendant shall not unlawfully possess a controlled substance. The defendant shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance. The defendant shall submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter, as determined by the court, not to exceed 104 tests annually.
$\square$ The above drug testing condition is suspended, based on the court's detemnination that the defendant poses a low risk of future substance abuse. (Check, if applicable.)
$\square \quad$ The defendant shall not possess a firearm, ammunition, destructive device, or any other dangerous weapon. (Check, if applicable.)
X The defendant shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer. (Check, if applicable.)
$\square \quad$ The defendant shall comply with the requirements of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. § 16901 , et seq.) as directed by the probation officer, the Bureau of Prisons, or any state sex offender registration agency in which he or she resides, works, is a student, or was convicted of a qualifying offense. (Check, if applicable.)
$\square \quad$ The defendant shall participate in an approved program for domestic violence. (Check, if applicable.)

If this judgment imposes a fine or restitution, it is a condition of supervised release that the defendant pay in accordance with the Schedule of Payments sheet of this judgment.

The defendant must comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this court as well as with any additional conditions on the attached page.

## STANDARD CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION

1) the defendant shall not leave the judicial district without the permission of the court or probation officer;
2) the defendant shall report to the probation officer in a manner and frequency directed by the court or probation officer;
3) the defendant shall answer truthfully all inquiries by the probation officer and follow the instructions of the probation officer;
4) the defendant shall support his or her dependents and meet other family responsibilities;
5) the defendant shall work regularly at a lawful occupation, unless excused by the probation officer for schooling, training, or other acceptable reasons;
6) the defendant shall notify the probation officer at least ten days prior to any change in residence or employment;
7) the defendant shall refrain from excessive use of alcohol and shall not purchase, possess, use, distribute, or administer any controlled substance or any paraphernalia related to any controlled substances, except as prescribed by a physician;
8) the defendant shall not frequent places where controlled substances are illegally sold, used, distributed, or administered;
9) the defendant shall not associate with any persons engaged in criminal activity and shall not associate with any person convicted of a felony, unless granted pernission to do so by the probation officer;
10) the defendant shall permit a probation officer to visit him or her at any time at home or elsewhere and shall permit confiscation of any contraband observed in plain view of the probation officer;
11) the defendant shall notify the probation officer within seventy-two hours of being arrested or questioned by a law enforcement officer; the defendant shall not enter into any agreement to act as an informer or a special agent of a law enforcement agency without the permission of the court; and
12) as directed by the probation officer, the defendant shall notify third parties of risks that may be occasioned by the defendant's criminal record or personal history or characteristics and shall permit the probation officer to make such notifications and to confirm the defendant's compliance with such notification requirement.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ of $\qquad$
DEFENDANT: GARY H.LANE
CASE NUMBER: 3:12-CR-0078-RCJ-VPC

## SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION

1. Possession of Weapons - You shall not possess, have under your control, or have access to any firearm, explosive device, or other dangerous weapons, as defined by federal, state, or local law.
2. Warrantless Search - You shall submit to the search of your person, property, residence or automobile under your control by the probation officer or any other authorized person under the immediate and personal supervision of the probation officer, without a search warrant to ensure compliance with all conditions of release.
3. Debt Obligations - You shall be prohibited from incurring new credit charges, opening additional lines of credit, or negotiating or consummating any financial contracts without the approval of the probation officer.
4. Access to Financial Information - You shall provide the probation officer access to any requested financial information, including personal income tax returns, authorization for release of credit information, and any other business financial information in which you have a control or interest.
5. Employment Restriction - You shall be restricted from engaging in employment, consulting, or any association with any banking/investment business for the period of five years.
6. Gambling Prohibition - You shall not enter, frequent, or be involved with any legal or illegal gambling establishment or activity, except for the purpose of employment, as approved and directed by the probation officer.
7. Gambling Addiction Treatment - You shall refrain from any form of gambling and shall participate in a program for the treatment of gambling addiction, at your own expense, as approved and directed by the probation officer, based upon your ability to pay.
8. Internal Revenue Service Compliance - You shall cooperate and arrange with the Internal Revenue Service to pay all past and present taxes, interest, and penalties owed. You shall file timely, accurate, and lawful income tax returns and show proof of same to the probation officer.
9. Report to Probation Officer After Release from Custody - You shall report, in person, to the probation office in the district to which you are released within 72 hours of discharge from custody.

Upon a finding of a violation of probation or supervised release, I understand that the court may (1) revoke supervision, (2) extend the term of supervision, and/or (3) modify the conditions of supervision.

These conditions have been read to me. I fully understand the conditions and have been provided a copy of them.

Defendant's signature

Signature of the U.S. Probation Officer/Designated Witness

Date

Date

## DEFENDANT: <br> GARY H. LANE <br> CASE NUMBER: 3:12-CR-0078-RCJ-VPC

## CRIMINAL MONETARY PENALTIES

The defendant must pay the total criminal monetary penalties under the schedule of payments on Sheet 6 .
TOTALS $\quad \$ 1,700.00(\$ 100.00$ per count $) \quad \$ \underset{\text { Assessment }}{\frac{\text { Fine }}{\text { waived }}} \underset{ }{\underline{\text { Restitution }}}$
$\square \quad$ The determination of restitution is deferred until $\qquad$ . An Amended Judgment in a Criminal Case (AO $245 C$ ) will be entered after such determination.
$\square \quad$ The defendant must make restitution (including community restitution) to the following payees in the amount listed below.

If the defendant makes a partial payment, each payee shall receive an approximately proportioned payment, unless specified otherwise in the priority order or percentage payment column below. However, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3664(i), all nonfederal victims must be paid before the United States is paid.
Name of Payce $\quad$ Total Loss* Restitution Ordered
Clerk of the Court
Attention: Finance
Case No. 3:12-CR-0078-RCJ-VPC
333 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Room 1334 or Percentage
Las Vegas, NV 89101

For disbursements to the following:
Bank of America Investment Services
$\$ 2,078,000.00$
c/o Fulbright \& Jaworski LLP
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201-2784
United States Internal revenue Service \$ 25,226.00
c/o Special Agent Mark Terry
200 S. Virginia Street
Reno, Nevada 89501
totals
\$
\$ 2.103.226.00
$\square$ Restitution amount ordered pursuant to plea agreement \$ $\qquad$
$\square$ The defendant must pay interest on restitution and a fine of more than $\$ 2,500$, unless the restitution or fine is paid in full before the fifteenth day after the date of the judgment, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. $\$ 3612(\mathrm{f})$. All of the payment options on Sheet 6 may be subject to penalties for delinquency and default, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § $3612(\mathrm{~g})$.
The court determined that the defendant does not have the ability to pay interest and it is ordered that:
$\square$ the interest requirement is waived for the $\square$ fine $\square$ restitution.
$\square \quad$ the interest requirement for the $\square$ fine $\square$ restitution is modified as follows:

[^0]
## SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

Having assessed the defendant's ability to pay, payment of the total criminal monetary penalties is due as follows:
A $X$
Lump sum payment of \$2,104,926.00 due immediately, balance due

ㅁ Not later than $\qquad$ , or
$\square$ in accordanceC, - D, DE, or X F below; or

B $\square \quad$ Payment to begin immediately (may be combined with $\square \mathrm{C}, \quad \square \mathrm{D}$, or $\square \mathrm{F}$ below); or
C $\square \quad$ Payment in equal (e.g., weekly, monthly, quarterly) installments of $\$$ $\qquad$ over a period of ___ (e.g., months or years), to commence___ 30 or 60 days) after the date of this judgment; or

D $\quad \square \quad$ Payment in equal $\qquad$ (e.g., weekly, monthly, quarterly) installments of \$ $\qquad$ over a period of (e.g., months or years), to commence $\qquad$ (e.g., 30 or 60 days) after release from imprisomment to a term of supervision; or

E $\square \quad$ Payment during the term of supervised release will commence within $\qquad$ (e.g., 30 or 60 days) after release from imprisonment. The court will set the payment plan based on an assessment of the defendant's ability to pay at that time; or

F X Special instructions regarding the payment of criminal monetary penalties:
Any unpaid balance shall be paid at a monthly rate of not less than $10 \%$ of any income earned during incarceration and/or gross income while on supervision, subject to adjustment by the Court based upon ability to pay.

Unless the court has expressly ordered otherwise, if this judgment imposes imprisonment, payment of criminal monetary penalties is due during imprisonment. All criminal nionetary penalties, except those payments made through the Federal Bureau of Prisons' Inmate Financial Responsibility Program, are made to the clerk of the court.

The defendant shall receive credit for all payments previously made toward any criminal monetary penalties inposed.

## $\square \quad$ Joint and Several

Defendant and Co-Defendant Names and Case Numbers (including defendant number), Total Amount, Joint and Several Amount, and corresponding payee, if appropriate.
$\square \quad$ The defendant shall pay the cost of prosecution.
$\square \quad$ The defendant shall pay the following court $\operatorname{cost}(\mathrm{s})$ :
$\square \quad$ The defendant shall forfeit the defendant's interest in the following property to the United States:

Payments shall be applied in the following order: (1) assessment, (2) restitution principal, (3) restitution interest, (4) fine principal, (5) fine interest, (6) community restitution, (7) penalties, and (8) costs, including cost of prosecution and court costs.


UNITED STATES
Securities and Exchange Commission
LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE
444 S. Flower Street, Suite 900
Los Angeles, California 90071

September 15, 2014

## VIA CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Gary Harrison Lane
Inmate Register \# 47674-048
FCI Sheridan


Re: In the Matter of Gary Harrison Lane (LA-4380)
Dear Mr. Lane:
Pursuant to SEC Rule of Practice § 201.230, documents related to this matter are available for inspection and copying at the Securities and Exchange Commission's offices in Los Angeles, California. Please note, however, that pursuant to SEC Rule of Practice § 201.230(f), a respondent in anSEC proceeding is responsible for bearing the cost of copying. If you wish to make arrangements for such inspection and copying, please contact me at

Sincerely,


Christine Connolly
Program Specialist



## EXHIBIT 5

BrokerCheck Report
GARY HARRISON LANE
Report \#55084-80335, data current as of Monday, November 03, 2014.

| Section Title | Page(s) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Report Summary | 1 |
| Broker Qualifications | $2-3$ |
| Registration and Employment History | $4-5$ |
| Disclosure Events | 6 |

BrokerCheck offers information on all current, and many former, registered securities brokers, and all current and former registered securities firms. FINRA strongly encourages investors to use BrokerCheck to check the background of securities brokers and brokerage firms before deciding to conduct, or continue to conduct, business with them.
-What is included in a BrokerCheck report?
BrokerCheck reports for individual brokers include information such as employment history, professional
qualifications, disciplinary actions, criminal convictions, civil judgments and arbitration awards. BrokerCheck reports for brokerage firms include information on a firm's profile, history, and operations, as well as many of the same disclosure events mentioned above.
Please note that the information contained in a BrokerCheck report may include pending actions or allegations that may be contested, unresolved or unproven. In the end, these actions or allegations may be resolved in favor of the broker or brokerage firm, or concluded through a negotiated settlement with no admission or finding of wrongdoing.

- Where did this information come from?

The information contained in BrokerCheck comes from FINRA's Central Registration Depository, or CRD(8) and is a combination of:

- information FINRA and/or the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) require brokers and brokerage firms to submit as part of the registration and licensing process, and
- information that regulators report regarding disciplinary actions or allegations against firms or brokers.
- How current is this information?

Generally, active brokerage firms and brokers are required to update their professional and disciplinary information in CRD within 30 days. Under most circumstances, information reported by brokerage firms, brokers and regulators is available in BrokerCheck the next business day.

- What if I want to check the background of an investment adviser firm or investment adviser representative?
To check the background of an investment adviser firm or representative, you can search for the firm or individual in BrokerCheck. If your search is successful, click on the link provided to view the available licensing and registration information in the SEC's Investment Adviser Public Disclosure (IAPD) website at
http://www.adviserinfo.sec.gov. In the alternative, you may search the IAPD website directly or contact your state securities regulator at http://www.finra.org/Investors/ToolsCalculators/BrokerCheck/P455414.
- Are there other resources 1 can use to check the background of investment professionals?

FINRA recommends that you learn as much as possible about an investment professional before deciding to work with them. Your state securities regulator can help you research brokers and investment adviser representatives doing business in your state.

Thank you for using FINRA BrokerCheck.

This broker is not currently registered.
This report summary provides an overview of the broker's professional background and conduct Additional information can be found in the detailed report.

|  | Disclosure Events |
| :---: | :---: |
| This broker is not currently registered. |  |
|  | All individuals registered to sell securities or provide investment advice are required to disclose customer complaints and arbitrations, regulatory actions, employment terminations, bankruptcy filings, and criminal or civil judicial proceedings. |
| - 1 General Industry/Product Exam <br> - 2 State Securities Law Exams | Are there events disclosed about this broker? Yes |
| Registration History | The following types of disclosures have been reported: |
| This broker was previously registered with the following securities firm(s): | Type Count |
|  | Regulatory Event 2 |
| MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER \& SMITH INCORPORATED <br> CRD\# 7691 | Customer Dispute 3 |
|  | Termination 1 |
| RENO, NV |  |
| 10/2009-03/2011 | Investment Adviser Representative Information |
| INC. <br> CRD\# 16361 <br> RENO, NV $07 / 1999-10 / 2009$ | The information below represents the individual's record as a broker. For details on this individual's record as an investment adviser representative, visit the SEC's Investment Adviser Public |
| BA INVESTMENT SERVICES, INC. <br> CRD\# 12965 <br> OAKLAND, CA <br> 04/1997-07/1999 | Disclosure website at http:/www adviserinfo sec.gov |

## Broker Qualifications

## Registrations

This section provides the self-regulatory organizations (SROs) and U.S. states/territories the broker is currently registered and licensed with, the category of each license, and the date on which it became effective. This section also provides, for every brokerage firm with which the broker is currently employed, the address of each branch where the broker works.
This broker is not currently registered.

## Broker Qualifications

## Industry Exams this Broker has Passed

This section includes all securities industry exams that the broker has passed. Under limited circumstances, a broker may attain a registration after receiving an exam waiver based on exams the broker has passed and/or qualifying work experience. Any exam waivers that the broker has received are not included below.

This individual has passed 0 principal/supervisory exams, 1 general industry/product exam, and 2 state securities law exams.
Principal/Supervisory Exams
Exam Category Date

No information reported.

| General Industry/Product Exams |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Exam | Category | | Date |
| :--- |
| General Securities Representative Examination |
| State Securities Law Exams |
| Exam |
| Uniform Securities Agent State Law Examination |
| Uniform Investment Adviser Law Examination |

Additional information about the above exams or other exams FINRA administers to brokers and other securities professionals can be found at www.finra.org/brokerqualifications/registeredrep/.

## Registration History

The broker previously was registered with the following firms:

| Registration Dates | Firm Name | CRD\# | Branch Location |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/2009-03/2011 | MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER \& SMITH INCORPORATED | 7691 | RENO, NV |
| 07/1999-10/2009 | bANC OF AMERICA INVESTMENT SERVICES, INC. | 16361 | RENO, NV |
| 04/1997-07/1999 | BA INVESTMENT SERVICES, INC. | 12965 | OAKLAND, CA |
| 03/1991-03/1997 | INVEST FINANCIAL CORPORATION | 12984 | TAMPA, FL |
| 1211990-02/1991 | AMERICAN EXPRESS FINANCIAL ADVISORS INC. | 6363 | MINNEAPOLIS, MN |
| 12/1990-02/1991 | IDS LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY | 6321 | MINNEAPOLIS, MN |
| 07/1989-06/1990 | DEAN WTTER REYNOLDS INC. | 7556 | PURCHASE, NY |
| 08/1980-01/1989 | MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER \& SMITH INCORPORATED | 7691 |  |

## Employment History

This section provides up to 10 years of an individual broker's employment history as reported by the individual broker on the most recently fited Form U4.

Please note that the broker is required to provide this information only while registered with FINRA or a national securities exchange and the information is not updated via Form $U 4$ after the broker ceases to be registered. Therefore, an employment end date of "Present" may not reflect the broker's current employment status.

| Employment Dates | Employer Name | Employer Location |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1212003-Present | BANK OF AMERICA, NA | RENO, NV |
| 10/2009 - Present | MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER \& SMITH INCORPORA* | RENO, NV |
| 07/1999-Present | BANC OF AMERICA INVESTMENT SERVICES, INC. | RENO, NV, +, |
| 07/1999-Present | BANC OF AMERICA INSURANCE SERVICES, INC. | RENO, NV |
| 0311991 Present | CENTRAL SQUARE CO INC. | ROSEVILEECA |

## Other Business Activities

This section includes information, if any, as provided by the broker regarding other business activities the broker is currently engaged in either as a proprietor, partner, officer, director, employee, trustee, agent or otherwise. This section does not include non-investment related activity that is exclusively charitable, civic, religious or fraternal and is recognized as tax exempt.

No information reported.

## Disclosure Events

What you should know about reported disclosure events:

1. All individuals registered to sell securities or provide investment advice are required to disclose customer complaints and arbitrations, regulatory actions, employment terminations, bankruptcy filings, and criminal or civil judicial proceedings.
2. Certain thresholds must be met before an event is reported to CRD, for example:

- A law enforcement agency must file formal charges before a broker is required to disclose a particular criminal event.
- A customer dispute must involve allegations that a broker engaged in activity that violates certain rules or conduct governing the industry and that the activity resulted in damages of at least $\$ 5,000$.

3. Disclosure events in BrokerCheck reports come from different sources:

- As mentioned at the beginning of this report, information contained in BrokerCheck comes from brokers, brokerage firms and regulators. When more than one of these sources reports information for the same disclosure event, all versions of the event will appear in the BrokerCheck report. The different versions will be separated by a solid line with the reporting source labeled.

4. There are different statuses and dispositions for disclosure events:

- A disclosure event may have a status of pending, on appeal, or final
§ A "pending" event involves allegations that have not been proven or formally adjudicated.
§ An event that is "on appeal" involves allegations that have been adjudicated but are currently being appealed
§ A "final" event has been concluded and its resolution is not subject to change.
- A final event generally has a disposition of adjudicated, settled or otherwise resolved.
§ An "adjudicated" matter includes a disposition by (1) a court of law in a criminal or civil matter, or (2) an administrative panel in an action brought by a regulator that is contested by the party charged with some alleged wrongdoing.
§ A "settled" matter generally involves an agreement by the parties to resolve the matter. Please note that brokers and brokerage firms may choose to settle customer disputes or regulatory matters for business or other reasons.
§ A "resolved" matter usually involves no payment to the customer and no finding of wrongdoing on the part of the individual broker. Such matters generally involve customer disputes.

For your convenience, below is a matrix of the number and status of disclosure events involving this broker. Further information regarding these events can be found in the subsequent pages of this report. You also may wish to contact the broker to obtain further information regarding these events.

|  | Pending | Final | On Appeal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regulatory Event | - 1 | 1 | 0 |


| Customer Dispute | 0 | 3 | N/A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Termination | N/A | 1 | N/A |

## Disclosure Event Details

When evaluating this information, please keep in mind that a discloure event may be pending or involve allegations that are contested and have not been resolved or proven. The matter may, in the end, be withdrawn, dismissed, resolved in favor of the broker, or concluded through a negotiated settlement for certain business reasons (e.g., to maintain customer relationships or to limit the litigation costs associated with disputing the allegations) with no admission or finding of wrongdoing.

This report provides the information exactly as it was reported to CRD and therefore some of the specific data fields contained in the report may be blank if the information was not provided to CRD.

This type of disclosure event may involves (1) a final, formal proceeding initiated by a regulatory authority (e.g., a state securities agency, self-regulatory organization, federal regulatory such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, foreign financial regulatory body) for a violation of investment-related rules or regulations; or (2) a revocation or suspension of a broker's authority to act as an aftomey, accountant, or federal contractor.
Disclosure 1 of 1

| Reporting Source: | Regulator |
| :--- | :--- |
| Regulatory Action Initiated | FINRA |

By:
Sanction(s) Sought: Other: N/A
Date Initiated: 09/13/2011

Docket/Case Number: 2011027048601
Employing firm when activity BANC OF AMERICA INVESTMENT SERVICES. INC.JMERRILL LYNCH. occurred which led to the PIERCE, FENNER \& SMITH, INC.
regulatory action:
Product Type: Debt-Corporate

Allegations: FINRA RULES 2010, 2150(A), NASD RULES 2110, 2330(A) - GARY HARRISON LANE CONVERTED A TOTAL OF $\$ 4.93$ MILLION IN CHECKS TO HIS PERSONAL USE FROM CUSTOMERS WHO WERE MISLED BY HIM INTO BELIEVING THEY WERE INVESTING IN U.S. TREASURY BONDS AND/OR CORPORATE BONDS AND INSTEAD OF INVESTING THE MONEY, LANE, WITHOUT AUTHORIZATION, DEPOSITED CHECKS DRAWN IN THE ACCOUNTS INTO A RELATIVE'S ACCOUNT TO EFFECTUATE THE ABOVE CONVERSION OF THE CUSTOMERS' FUNDS FOR HIS PERSONAL USE. IN FURTHERANCE OF THIS SCHEME AND IN AN EFFORT TO DISGUISE HIS CONVERSION, LANE MADE A TOTAL OF MORE THAN $\$ 736,000 \mathrm{IN}$

|  | PAYMENTS TO SOME OF THE AFFECTED CUSTOMERS VIA CASH PAYMENTS OR BY TRANSFERRING FUNDS FROM HIS RELATIVE'S ACCOUNT TO A BANK ACCOUNT BEARING THE NAME OF THE UNITED STATES FROM WHICH CASHIER'S CHECKS WERE ISSUED TO THE CUSTOMERS. TO CONCEAL HIS CONVERSION, LANE CREATED AND PROVIDED HIS CUSTOMERS FICTITIOUS RECEIPTS AND TYPED CERTIFICATIONS PURPORTING TO CONFIRM HIS CUSTOMERS' NON-EXISTENT INVESTMENTS IN U.S. TREASURY BONDS ANDIOR CORPORATE BONDS. BY CREATING AND PROVIDING HIS CUSTOMERS FICTITIOUS RECEIPTS AND CERTIFICATIONS CONCERNING THEIR PURPORTED OWNERSHIP IN NON-EXISTENT INVESTMENTS, LANE FAILED TO OBSERVE HIGH STANDARDS OF COMMERCIAL HONOR AND JUST AND EQUITABLE PRINCIPLES OF TRADE IN VIOLATION OF NASD RULE 2110AND FINRA RULE 2010. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Current Status: | Final |
| Resolution: | Acceptance, Waiver \& Consent(AWC) |
| Does the order constitute a final order based on violations of any laws or regulations that prohibit fraudulent, manipulative, or deceptive conduct? | No |
| Resolution Date: | 09/13/2011 |
| Sanctions Ordered: | Bar (Permanent) |
| If the regulator is the SEC, CFTC, or an SRO, did the action result in a finding of a willful violation or failure to supervise? | No |

(1) willfully violated any provision of the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, the Investment Company Act of 1940, the Commodity Exchange Act, or any rule or regulation under any of such Acts, or any of the rules of the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board, or to have been unable to comply with any provision of such Act, rule or regulation?
(2) willfully aided, abetted, counseled, commanded, induced, or procured the violation by any person of any provision of the
Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, the Investment Company Act of 1940, the Commodity Exchange Act, or any rule or regulation under any of such Acts, or any of the rules of
the Municipal Securities
Rulemaking Board? or
(3) failed reasonably to supervise another person subject to your supervision, with a view to preventing the violation by such person of any provision of the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, the Investment Company Act of 1940, the Commodity Exchange Act, or any rule or regulation under any such Acts, or any of the rules of the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board?

Sanction 1 of 1
Sanction Type:
Capacities Affected:
Duration:
Start Date:
End Date:

Regulator Statement

Bar (Permanent)
ANY CAPACITY
N/A
09/13/2011

WITHOUT ADMITTING OR DENYING THE FINDINGS, LANE CONSENTED TO THE DESCRIBED SANCTION AND TO THE ENTRY OF FINDINGS; THEREFORE, HE IS BARRED FROM ASSOCIATION WITH ANY FINRA MEMBER IN ANY CAPACITY.

This type of disclosure event involves a pending formal proceeding initiated by a regulatory authority (e.g., a state securities agency, self-regulatory organization, federal regulatory agency such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, foreign financial regulatory body) for alleged violations of investment-related rules or regulations.

## Disclosure 1 of 1

Reporting Source:
Regulatory Action Initiated By:
Sanction(s) Sought:
Date Initiated:
Docket/Case Number:
Employing firm when activity occurred which led to the regulatory action:

Product Type:
Allegations:

## Current Status:

Regulator Statement

Regulator
UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Other: N/A
09/11/2014
3-16101
BANC OF AMERICA INVESTMENT SERVICES, INC. AND MERRILL IYNCH, PIERCE. FENNER \& SMITH INCORPORATED

No Product
SEC ADMIN RELEASE 34-73077; IA RELEASE 40-3915; / SEPTEMBER 11 , 2014: THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION DEEMS IT APPROPRIATE AND IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST THAT PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS BE, AND HEREBY ARE, INSTITUTED PURSUANT TO SECTION 15(B) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 ("EXCHANGE ACT") AND SECTION 203(F) OF THE INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940 ("ADVISERS ACT") AGAINST GARY HARRISON LANE ("RESPONDENT" OR "LANE"). ON SEPTEMBER 3, 2013, LANE PLEADED GUILTY TO 12 COUNTS OF MAIL FRAUD IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. SECTION 1341 AND FIVE COUNTS OF ATTEMPT TO EVADE OR DEFEAT TAX IN VIOLATION OF 26 U.S.C. SECTION 7201 BEFORE THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA. 3 12-CR-00078-RCJ-VPC. ON FEBRUARY 20, 2014, A JUDGMENT IN THE CRIMINAL CASE WAS ENTERED AGAINST LANE. HE WAS SENTENCED TO A PRISON TERM OF 120 MONTHS FOLLOWED BY FIVE YEARS OF SUPERVISED RELEASE AND RESTITUTION OF $\$ 2,103,226$.
Pending
IN VIEW OF THE ALLEGATIONS MADE BY THE DIVISION OF ENFORCEMENT, THE COMMISSION DEEMS IT NECESSARY AND APPROPRIATE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST THAT PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS BE INSTITUTED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE SHALL ISSUE AN INITIAL DECISION NO LATER THAN 210 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF SERVICE OF THIS ORDER, PURSUANT TO RULE

## Gistomentsurnsemed <br> This type of disclosure event involves a consumer-initiated, investment-related complaint, arbitration proceeding or civil

 suit containing allegations of sale practice violations against the broker that resulted in a monetary settlement to the customer.Disclosure 1 of 3


Amount:

Firm
BANC OF AMERICA INVESTMENT SERVICES, INC. AND MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER \& SMITH INCORPORATED

ATTORNEY FOR THE CUSTOMER ALLEGES THAT INVESTMENTS WERE

## Disclosure 2 of 3

Reporting Source:
Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint:
Allegations:

BANC OF AMERICA INVESTMENT SERVICES, INC. AND MERRILL LYNCH,

THE CUSTOMER ALLEGES THAT THE REGISTERED REPRESENTATIVE MISAPPROPRIATED FUNDS BY LEADING HIM TO BELIEVE HE WAS IN GOVERNMENT BONDS

No
Yes
No
reparation or civil litigation?
Customer Complaint Information

02014 FINRA. All rights reserved. Report\# 55084-80335 about GARY H. LANE. Data current as of Monday, November 03, 2014.

|  | MADE IN U.S. TREASURY BONDS THROUGH THE FINANCIAL ADVISOR IN THE AMOUNT OF $\$ 950,000$. ATTORNEY FOR THE CUSTOMER BELIEVES THAT THE MONEY HAS BEEN MISAPPROPRIATED. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Product Type: | Debt-Government |
| Alleged Damages: | \$950,000.00 |
| Is this an oral complaint? | No |
| Is this a written complaint? | Yes |
| Is this an arbitration/CFTC reparation or civil litigation? | No |
| Customer Complaint Information |  |
| Date Complaint Received: | 04/25/2011 |
| Complaint Pending? | No |
| Status: | Settled |
| Status Date: | 12108/2011 |
| Settlement Amount: | \$987,094.33 |
| Individual Contribution Amount: | \$0.00 |
| Disclosure 3 of 3 |  |
| Reporting Source: | Firm |
| Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint: | MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER \& SMITH INCORPORATED |
| Allegations: | CUSTOMER ALLEGES THAT INVESTMENTS WERE MADE IN U.S. TREASURY BONDS THROUGH THE FINANCIAL ADVISOR IN THE AMOUNT OF \$250,000. CLIENT BELIEVES THAT THE MONEY HAS BEEN MISAPPROPRIATED. |
| Product Type: | Debt-Government |
| Alleged Damages: | \$250,000.00 |
| Is this an oral complaint? | No |
| Is this a written complaint? | Yes |
| Is this an arbitration/CFTC reparation or civil litigation? | No |
| ©2014 FINRA. All rights reserved. Reporm 55084-80335 about GARY H. LANE. Data current as of Monday, November 03, 2014. |  |


| Customer Complaint Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Complaint Received: | $04 / 06 / 2011$ |
| Complaint Pending? | No |
| Status: | Settled |
| Status Date: | $04 / 22 / 2011$ |
| Settlement Amount: | $\$ 345.064 .00$ |
| Individual Contribution | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Amount: |  |


This type of disclosure event involves a situation where the broker voluntarily resigned, was discharged, or was permitted to resign after being accused of (1) violating investment-related statutes, regulations, rutes or industry standards of
conduct; (2) fraud or the wrongful taking of property; or (3) failure to supervise in connection with investment-related
statutes, regulations, rules, or industry standards of conduct.
Disclosure 1 of 1
Reporting Source: Firm
Employer Name:
Termination Type:
Termination Date:
Allegations:
Product Type:

MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER \& SMITH INCORPORATED
Discharged
03/23/2011
ALLEGATIONS OF SUSPECTED IMPROPRIETIES IN CLIENT ACCOUNTS
Debt-Government

This page is intentionally left blank.

## EXHIBIT 6

BANC OF AMERICA SECURITIES
LLC


## Main Office Location

ONE BRYANT PARK
NEWYORK, NY 10036

## Mailing Address

ONE BRYANT PARK
NY1-100-17-01
NEWYORK, NY 10036

## Business Telephone Number

646-855-5000

This firm is a brokerage firm and an investment adviser firm. For more information about investment adviser firms, visit the SEC's Investment Adviser Public Disclosure website at: http:/huw adviserinfo.sec gov

This report summary provides an overview of the brokerage firm. Additional information for this firm can be found in the detailed report.

## Firm Profile

This firm is classified as a limited liability company.
This firm was formed in Delaware on 12/03/1997
Its fiscal year ends in December.

## Firm History

Information relating to the brokerage firm's history such as other business names and successions (e.g., mergers, acquisitions) can be found in the detailed report.
Firm Operations
This brokerage firm is no longer registered with FINRA or a national securities exchange.

## Disclosure Events

Brokerage firms are required to disclose certain criminal matters, regulatory actions, civil judicial proceedings and financial matters in which the firm or one of its control affiliates has been involved.

Are there events disclosed about this firm? Yes

The following types of disclosures have been reported:
Type
Regulatory Event 88
Civil Event 2
Arbitration : 4

## Registration Withdrawal Information

This section provides information relating to the date the brokerage firm ceased doing business and the firm's financial obligations to customers or other brokerage firms.

This firm terminated or withdrew registration on:

Does this brokerage firm owe
any money or securities to any customer or brokerage firm?

## EXHIBIT 7

MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER \& SMITH INCORPORATED

Report Summary for this Firm

SEC\# 8-7221
Main Office Location
ONE BRYANT PARK
NEW YORK, NY 10036
Regulated by FiNRA New York Office
Mailing Address
222 BROADWAY
NY3-222-12-05
NEWYORK, NY 10038
Business Telephone Number
800-637-7455

This firm is a brokerage firm and an investment adviser firm. For more information about investment adviser firms, visit the SEC's Investment Adviser Public Disclosure website at: htto:/humw.adviserinfo sec.gov in the detailed report.

This report summary provides an overview of the brokerage firm. Additional information for this firm can be found

| Firm Profile | Disclosure Events |
| :---: | :---: |
| This firm is classified as a corporation. <br> This firm was formed in Delaware on 11/10/1958. Its fiscal year ends in December. <br> Firm History | Brokerage firms are required to disclose certain criminal matters, regulatory actions, civil judicial proceedings and financial matters in which the firm or one of its control affiliates has been involved. |
| Information relating to the brokerage firm's history such as other business names and successions (e.g., mergers, acquisitions) can be found in the detailed report. <br> Firm Operations | Are there events disclosed about this firm? Yes <br> The following types of disclosures have been reported: |
| This firm is registered with: <br> - the SEC <br> - 18 Self-Regulatory Organizations <br> - 53 U.S. states and territories | Regulatory Event 472 <br> Civil Event 5 <br> Arbitration 996 |
| Is this brokerage firm currently suspended with any regulator? No |  |
| This firm conducts 23 types of businesses. |  |
| This firm is affiliated with financial or investment institutions. |  |
| This firm has referral or financial arrangements with other brokers or dealers. |  |

This firm is classified as a corporation.
This firm was formed in Delaware on 11/10/1958.
Its fiscal year ends in December.

## Firm Names and Locations

This section provides the brokerage firm's full legal name, "Doing Business As" name, business and mailing addresses, telephone number, and any alternate name by which the firm conducts business and where such name is used.

MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER \& SMITH INCORPORATED
Doing business as MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER \& SMITH INCORPORATED

SEC\# 8-7221

Main Office Location
ONE BRYANT PARK
NEW YORK, NY 10036
Regulated by FINRA New York Office
Mailing Address
222 BROADWAY
NY3-222-12-05
NEW YORK, NY 10038

Business Telephone Number
800-637-7455

## Other Names of this Firm


$A K, A L, A R, A Z, C A$, $C O, C T, D C, D E, F L$.
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RENO, NEVADA, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2014, I:44 P.M. ----000---

THE COURT: Thank you. In United States versus
Gary H. Lane. Appearances, please.
MR. RACHOW: Ron Rachow for the government, your
Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Rachow.
MR. DIGESTI: Larry Digesti, Your Honor, on
behalf of Gary Lane.
THE COURT: Mr. Digesti, thank you. And
Mr. Lane, thank you, sir.
THE DEEENDANT: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. This is the time set for
imposition of sentence in your case, Mr. Lane, 3:12-CR-78.
On September 3rd of last year you appeared before
the Court and entered a plea of guilty to Counts 1 to 12 , mail
fraud, a violation of 18 USC Section 1341 , and Counts 13 to
17, attempt to evade or defeat tax, 26 USC 7201.

I've reviewed the presentence report -- and this was plea agreement, correct?

MR. DIGESTI: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: No, it was a straightup plea.
And the court accepts your guilty plea and
adjudicates you guilty of these charges.
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Now, let's deal first, Mx. Digesti, with the finding on the guideline range applicable. You've reviewed the presentence report with the defendant?

MR. DIGESTI: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And you filed a formal objection.
The probation department filed an addendum.
Do you have continuing objections that you want to raise on the record? I'm not calling for them yet; do you have.

MR. DIGESTI: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: And do you have additional
objections that you needed to add to our agenda or just what's stated in the objections?

MR. DIGESTI: Just what's stated, your Honor.
THE COURT: And, Mr. Lane, you read the report,
sir, and discussed it with your attorney?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor.
THE COURT: And did you have any additional
objections other than what your attorney stated in the objections?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I did not.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Let's hear the report first, please, and then we'll handle any objections.

PROBATION OFEICER: The guideline range was
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calculated as follows using a multiple-count adjustment based on more than one count of conviction.

The base offense level is 7. There's an 18-level increase for the amount of loss. Two levels are added for sophisticated means, two levels are added for vulnerable victim, and two levels are added for abuse of position of trust, resulting in an adjusted offense level of 31.

Group two, associated with Counts 13 through 17, the base offense level is 22. There's a two-level increase for the amount of tax loss -- excuse me, 22 based on the tax loss, and two levels are added as the defendant failed to report or correctly identify the source of income exceeding $\$ 10,000$ on any year of any criminal activity.

The adjusted offense level is 24 for that group.
The multiple-count adjustment was applied resulting in a combined offense level of 32 .

A three-level reduction for acceptance of
responsibility was applied resulting in a total offense level for all counts of a level of 29.

Defendant's criminal history score was 2 resulting in a criminal history category of II. Combined with a total offense level of 29 , the resulting guideline range is 97 to 121 months.

Probation is precluded in this case. The supervised release range is two to five years. The fine range is 15,000

MARGARET E. GRIENER, RER, CCR NO. 3, OEEICIAL REPORTER (775) 329-9980


Let's see. The Bank of America, restitution in the amount of 25,000 with interest payable to the IRS. So those are the delineated amounts.

PROBATION OFFICER: That's correct.
THE COURT: Okay. And the addendum, the
objections and your response to the objections?

PROBATION OFFICER: Did your Honor want me to go
through those, is that --

THE COURT: Yes, I want your position, and then I want to hear the objections.

PROBATION OFFICER: Okay, your Honor.
The first objection we received was to paragraph 19 which references a two-level increase for sophisticated means.

Our response was as noted in the offense conduct portion of the report, specifically paragraphs 7, 10 and 15, in which the defendant created false confirmations of his fraudulent activity and distributed them to investors by e-mail and United States mail in an attempt to give the appearance of legitimacy of the fraud. The defendant's employer eventually became aware of the fraud through these fraudulent confirmations.

Mr. Lane also a created an e-Trade account using his wife's information unbeknownst to her in order to conceal the fraud from his employer and investors.

MARGARET E. GRIENER, RDR, CCR NO. 3, OPEICIAL REPORTER (775) 329-9980

The second objection we received was to paragraph 20 and the application of a two-level increase for vulnerable victim.

Pursuant to the guideline of 3 AI. 1, application note 2, vulnerable victim means a person, $A$, who is a victim of the offense of conviction for which the defendant is accountable under 1B1. 3 which is relevant conduct, and, $B$, who is unusually vulnerable due to age, physical or mental condition, or who is otherwise particularly susceptible to criminal conduct.

As noted in the indictment and at paragraph 6 of this report, Lane looked for investors who were elderly or lacked investment experience and had desire for high returns and aversion to risk, thus the defendant targeted victims who were particularly vulnerable to this type of fraud.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Let's hear the objections, please.
And you are objecting not only to specific paragraphs, but also to the guideline calculation. MR. DIGESTI: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. MR. DISGESTI: Your Honor, the objections that remain are outlined in the sentencing memorandum that $I$ prepared for the benefit of the court.

I would indicate originally when I received the
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original presentence report there were a number of other additional objections which were made which I was able to resolve directly with the department, and based upon that discussion, then, the revised presentence report was generated, and then $I$ went ahead and filed formally the objections to the revised portion of the presentence report.

Also -- and I'll jump back in a minute, but also attached to the defendant's sentencing memorandum in this case, your Honor, there were three letters from members of the family which I'm sure the Court's had an opportunity to review.

The first objection would be with respect to the two-level enhancement suggested by the department for employing a sophisticated means.

I think the legal analysis and the legal argument is set forth succinctly in the sentencing memorandum with reference to pertinent cases which we believe have some application in this case.

What we have here, Your Honor, basically is a Ponzi scheme, nothing more sophisticated than that.

Mr. Lane approached a number of different investors, people that he had -- that had done business with him in the past, made representations that their money would be invested in bonds, treasury bonds, I believe, and that a certain rate of interest would be returned to them over the term.
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The allegation at paragraph 19 of the presentence report that Mr. Lane took elaborate steps to conceal the offense from his employer at the time just simply do not exist. This was an independent, outside agreement that occurred outside the scope of his employment. There was really not much to be done in terms of concealing anything from his employer because his employer simply was not aware of Mr. Lane's venture.

People would be approached, people invested, the money that was invested was put into an e-Trade account in his wife's name. The money went into the account, never found its way to any purchase of any treasury bonds or any investments.

There was nothing particularly sophisticated about the means that were employed by Mr. Lane in this particular case, and I believe that taking a look at the cases and the argument that we have advanced in our sentencing memorandum requires a little bit more than what is actual and what actually occurred here and what the government has been able to show.

It is the burden of the government I submit, your Honor, and I submit it respectfully, that they must show, the government must show that the fraud in question when viewed as a whole was notably more intricate than that of the garden-variety fraudulent scheme, and the Hance case, which is an Eighth Circuit case, 2007, which is cited, stands for that
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proposition.
And, again, this was a Ponzi scheme. Money comes in, money goes out, and at the end the Pyramid crumbles and there's simply not enough to pay.
"Creating false artifices, such as creating false accounts or renting a post-office box," for example, "under assumed names, are common means of carrying out the fraud and do not qualify as
'sophisticated means' fraud."
And, again, I'm quoting from the Hance case, and even that is far more than what we have here. There were no post-office boxes, there were no false accounts, there was nothing other than receiving the money, cashing the checks and depositing them into an e-Trade account in Gary's -- Leslie, who was at the time Gary's spouse, into her particular account.

I don't know how much more can be said other than the legal analysis, and I think the case law in this case, your Honor, supplies ample argument.

And for the government simply to argue that a two-level enhancement in this case is appropriate because, in the government's opinion, there was a real sophisticated scheme here that was employed by the defendant, I think, is a stretch.

And, again, I reiterate that the government must
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demonstrate something beyond the garden-variety type of fraud. That really is all we have in this case. It was a Ponzi scheme, it was nothing more and it was nothing less than that.

There's also a Second Circuit case, your Honor, that
I've cited that stands for the proposition that,
"The 'sophisticated means' adjustment is
warranted only when the conduct shows a greater -- a greater level of planning or concealment than a 'typical' fraud of its kind."

And that's the United States versus Ghaddar case, it's a Seventh Circuit decision, Your Honor, in 2012.

The government simply relies upon the fact of setting up an e-Trade account and creating false confirmation letters - whatever that means, I don't know what a false confirmation letter is, I haven't seen it -- either by themselves or taken together do not raise the level of intricacy in this case beyond, again, the garden-variety fraudulent offense.

And even putting the money into an e-Trade account that was in an assumed name, it went into the account of his wife, and how easily traceable would that be back to Mr. Lane.

And $I$ would submit that if it did require -- or if we did have the sophisticated means of fraud that the government is relying upon for the two-level enhancement, the least that should have been done or could have been done was

MARGARET E. GRIENER, RDR, CCR NO. 3, OFFICIAI REPORTER
(775) 329-9980
to create a false account under an assumed name making it much more difficult to trace than what actually occurred in this particular case.

The government also goes on to argue that this scheme was so sophisticated that the purpose, of course, was to preclude detection but ultimately also prevent the employer from discovering the fraudulent scheme. And, again, as I indicated in my sentencing memorandum, and this is -- deals specifically, $I$ think, with the tax counts, that in United States versus Stokes, it says that it's irrelevant that -- how long it took his employer or an employer to figure out the scheme.
"In a scheme to evade taxes, the question of when and how his employex discovered an embezzlement does not support a sophisticated means finding."

And also -- that's United States versus Stokes, and that's a Fifth Circuit case, 1993.

And then there's United States versus Hart, an
Eighth Circuit case in 2003, that states,
"For purposes of an evasion case, the issue is whether the transfer of monies between various accounts impeded the IRS's ability to trace the income and outgo."

Well, this account was in his wife's name. How much easier and simple does it get or does it need to be for the
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IRS to trace this money.
And it's our position, respectfully, your Honor, that the two-level enhancement for sophisticated means which is being requested in this case is not appropriate, it's not supported by the evidence in this case, and in my opinion, the government has failed to carry the burden required in order to legitimately and reasonably request the two-level enhancement under the sophisticated means argument.

Do you want me to continue with the other
objections, your Honor, or are you kind of taking these
piecemeal?

THE COURT: No, any and all objections, please. MR. DIGESTI: Okay. The second objection would be the two-level increase for the vulnerable victim argument in this case.

And in the presentence report, paragraph 20 , the allegation, and it's simply that, it's an allegation, and, in my opinion, respectfully, it's not supported by the evidence in this case, that some of the investors, they don't say all, they say some of the investors were elderly and therefore susceptible to Mr. Lane's conduct in enticing them to invest in his fraudulent scheme.

Paragraph six of the report further states that
Mr. Lane looked for investors who were elderly or lacked investing experience and had a desire for high returns and
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aversion to risk. I submit that anyone that invests, regardless of their age, is looking for high returns. After all, that's the purpose of investing for the most part, and also looking at the risk factor.

So those two components in and of themselves really means very, very little. It doesn't just apply to a specific class of investors, but $I$ submit to the Court that it applies reasonably across the board to anyone regardless of age who go forward to invest their moneys with whomever.

The vulnerable victim enhancement, your Honor, I believe in this case fails for three different reasons. First and foremost, the vulnerable victim, the person must have actually suffered a loss, and that's United States versus Wright, a 1993 Sixth Circuit case.

Now, we know in this case that the bank ended up paying restitution to all of the named individuals, and I'm obviously working off of the individuals that are identified in the indictment, and the victims have all been made whole. Their losses have been recouped.

Further, one additional point, and I think it's very, very significant and I certainly would ask this court to take it into account, Mr. Lane actually made interest payments to these various investors over the course of time, and that's not anything that's really been discussed or analyzed in any of the presentence report notes and findings that I've been
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able to look at.
But there's one investor, Hoosha (phonetic) -- I'm going to slaughter the last name -- it's Andsroony. I'm going to spell it, your Honor, $A-n-d-s-r-o-o-n-y$. And she is named or identified in Count 5 of the indictment, and she had invested approximately $\$ 500,000$, I believe, from what $I$ could see in reviewing the reports.

Over the term, she had been paid approximately $\$ 300,000$ in interest payments on her $\$ 500,000$ investment. That's money that she got to keep as far as I know, profit that she made with Mr. Lane for the investment.

And the government emphasizes the vulnerable victim aspect of this case because of the age and the amount of -well, the victim's age and the unsophisticated nature of their investment experiences. The fact of the matter is, your Honor, that these individuals that did invest with Mr. Lane as identified, for the most part were individuals that had known Mr. Lane for a long period of time.

With many of them, it was not only a business relationship that they had, but it was a friendship, a personal relationship. Now, clearly, one might think that, well, with that said, it makes the fraud even more compelling. How could, you know, Gary take care of his friend this way, why would he do that to his friends?

Well, the enhancement that I'm arguing against is
not an enhancement because you defrauded your friend or people that you've known for over 20 years, the enhancement that I'm arguing against is one of the vulnerable victim because of age and the amount of unsophistication that these individuals may have had with their investments.

This Ms. Andsroony, who -- her stated age is 78 years old, and I don't know if that was at the time of the investments or if that's her current age, but, in any event, the government in opposing my sentencing memorandum made note of this particular individual and her age. Well, the fact of the matter is that this individual had known Gary Lane since 1999, they had been friends, and she got to know Gary when her investment accounts were transferred to Bank of America where Gary was an employee.

She said Mr. Lane was a charming individual. She trusted him. Over time, as a matter of fact, she trusted him so much, your Honor, that she made him the executor of her estate in the event of her death.

She admitted that Gary would give her interest payments a little at a time to make up for the loss. She received nothing in the form of mail from Gary, and he delivered everything to her in person at her home. That was the sophisticated means that the government would say justified a two-level increase here. There's nothing in the mail, just went over and talked to her, gave her the
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information that he had available for her.
She made two different investments in the amount of 200,000 to $\$ 300,000$, and over the term she had invested approximately $\$ 1.3$ million with Mr. Lane. She wasn't defrauded that amount, but that's the amount of money she had at her disposal, part of her estate to invest.

Even though she may have been 78 years old, again, I don't know if that's today or if that was back in 2007, but what that does demonstrate and what it tells me is there is a certain amount of sophistication that an individual must have in order to attain and achieve that type of an investment nest egg that you have that type of money and that type of funds available to you to invest.

And, again, over the term she had been paid approximately $\$ 300,000$ in interest payments from Gary Lane as part of this Ponzi scheme.

Another individual, Your Honor, Suellen Fondren (phonetic), she was born in 1942 so I put her age at approximately 68, and she's named in Counts 1,4 and 8 of the indictment. She made her money managing real estate, real estate investments, so she is a sophisticated investor, if you will, had Bank of America maintain her investments after the death of her husband in 2006.

She did not do anything with her investments for approximately a year. She had an investment portfolio of
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approximately 1.6 -- between 1.6 and $\$ 2$ million that she had accumulated. Again, to me, if an individual has the ability to accumulate those types of funds for investment purposes, I do not see how that individual legitimately could be considered to be a vulnerable victim and unsophisticated in the investment community, and, again, here's a relatively young individual. I'd hate to think anyone at age 68 is elderly in that respect.

Mr. Lane had been her financial adviser for 15 to 20 years. He had known this person. And, again, it goes to the trust factor. I mean, are they friends, or was Mr. Lane truly seeking out elderly people, vulnerable victims, in order to approach with this scheme.

Ms. Fondren would receive approximately between 400 and $\$ 500,000$ a year she would receive on her investments with the mini-storage facilities that she owned in Southern California. Again, I submit that that cuts against the argument that she's a vulnerable victim.

She may have been a dear friend who trusted Mr. Lane, and he defrauded a dear friend, but that does not justify, nor is it the basis for, a two-level increase under the vulnerable victim analysis.

Immediately upon discovery, or shortly after the discovery, Ms. Fondren settled with Merrill Lynch for the sum of $\$ 762,000$ which included the amount lost in the e-Trade.
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She got interest, she got attorney's fees and accounting fees, so she actually got more than what she had invested with Mr. Lane.

There's another individual by the name of Robin Barnish (phonetic). I believe she's 56 years old, she was born in 1957. She's mentioned in Counts 2, 9, 11 and 12 of the indictment.

She had met Mr. Lane in 2002, had been doing business with him from 2000 to 2011, and not only, again, had developed a professional business relationship but had developed a personal relationship with Mr. Lane and his wife. She considered Gary to be a good friend.

She provided nine checks over a period of time starting on July 31st, 2007, through February 28th, 2011, and the total amount of her investments was $\$ 950,000$ that she deposited with Mr. Lane with these checks.

College graduate, $B A$ degree. She testified -- or didn't testify, but she indicated to the federal authorities that her decision to invest with Mr. Lane was personal in nature.

From 2007, her first investment, until 2011, she received approximately three to $\$ 5,000$ a month in interest. That's a period of 43 months. She collected anywhere from $\$ 129,000$ all the way up to possibly 200 and -- I believe, if I'm reading my writing correctly, 280 or $\$ 290,000$ in interest
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which she got to keep on her $\$ 950,000$ investment. And this is kind of important because, again, it reinforces the whole theory of the Ponzi scheme of what this is about.

And, secondly, there's a passage in the presentence report that says all of this money that Mr. Lane had invested with him over the period of time was diverted for his own personal use. That's not true; not all of it. A lot of it was paid out to these investors over a period of time consistent with the agreement that Gary had with these different individuals.

Now, this information, your Honor, is information that's available to the government. I received it as part of the discovery, and I got it off of the 302 forms which is the summary of the statements taken by the agents of these different individuals.

So with respect to Ms. Robin Boetsch or Barnish, excuse me, that's not information that I got independently, that's information directly from the government.

Forty-three months of anywhere from three to $\$ 5,000$ a month in interest only she received from this investment that she had with Gary.

Marvin Walburn (phonetic), your Honor, he is another individual that's identified in Count 6 and Count 7 of the indictment, again, information that $I$ obtained from the government's documents in the 302 forms and summary reports
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which were provided. He went to the Bank of America, he was referred to Mr. Lane. He had invested in bonds in the past so he had some experience. He made his money in construction and in investing real estate.

He started with Gary investing in state bonds, insurance bonds and banking investments. Over the period of time, his investments with Gary gradually increased to more than $\$ 900,000$. In September of 2010, he invested $\$ 500,000$. Two months later, because apparently he must have been getting a good return on his $\$ 500,000$ investment by way of interest, he invested another $\$ 250,000$ with Mr. Lane.

The purpose of going through this, your Honor, is to try to demonstrate and give a different picture other than bald allegations as to the vulnerable viotim that the government is attempting to identify here to support a two-level increase enhancement under the sentencing guidelines.

This is all information that $I$ obtained from the government's file. It's not anything new. It should not be at all surprising to anyone.

And what we have here, I think, if we try to put this thing in some type of context, and we can't look at age alone. There's a number of different cases that I've cited in my presentencing -- excuse me, in my sentencing memorandum that speak to that issue.
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It's been held time and again, and by the Ninth Circuit, that the fact that a victim is elderly by itself does not -- I repeat, does not make him a vulnerable victim as a matter of law, and that's United States versus Luca, L-u-c-a, a 1999 Ninth Circuit case.

And it is not enough to support a finding by saying that people of that class are more likely than the rest of the general population to become victims of the particular crime at issue, and that's the Castellanos case, also a Ninth Circuit case, 1996.

And the purpose of going back and informing the Court a little bit more about these individuals, how long they had known Gary, their investment history with him, how much money they had been paid in interest over the term and their dealings -- specific dealings with Gary as they pertain to this case, the amount of financial ability that these individuals had, that they were able -- through theix own means, they were able to accumulate and have the opportunity to invest those sums of money, leads me to believe, and I think reasonably so, your Honor, that these individuals had and they were sophisticated to a certain extent in the investment community.

They made theix money in real estate, other personal investments, to be in a position where they could accumulate that kind of wealth, if you will, to be able to even invest
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any amount of money in this scheme that we have and I have identified as a Ponzi scheme.

You know, there's an old saying your Honor, if it's -- if it looks too good to be true, it's probably not true. And I'm not blaming anybody, I'm not pointing the finger in any way trying to minimize the responsibility and the culpability that my client has.

But these were individuals that were savry in the investment business, they were used to making a lot of money on their investments, and when they were given an opportunity to invest with Gary Lane, an individual that they knew both professionally and on a personal basis, and invest this money and get a rate of return that they were promised that they were going to get, well, I think the rest is history.

They saw an opportunity to make a little bit more money to enhance that nest egg that they had, but to say that they were vulnerable and unsophisticated and didn't know what they were doing, I think, is a real, real stretch based upon the evidence that we have in this case, and, more importantly, what the government, in my opinion, has failed to prove.

The only thing they can point to is the age of one or two of the investors to say that they were elderly, therefore they're automatically vulnerable, and we have a Ninth Circuit case that tells us that if that is the analysis, as a matter of law, that's not the case.
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And there's another passage that $I$ think actually -THE COURT: Counsel, you're going to have to
start winding up, sir. I have other matters set this
afternoon.

MR. DIGESTI: I understand, your Honor.
But this language out of the Luca case is -- I think is telling.
"Based upon the evidence in the record that
the individual was, in fact, unusually vulnerable,"
not just vulnerable, but unusually vulnerable,
"because of the advanced age."
And that's a passage and that's a quote out of the Luca case that I've cited.

With respect to the third objection, it deals with the criminal history of Mr . Lane, your Honor, and we are asking, and I am asking for Mr. Lane on his behalf, for a downward departure from a criminal history category II to a I, and, again, the basis is outlined in my sentencing memorandum to the Court.

And it's our position that the criminal history II overstates his criminal history. Gary is 60 years old. He has, absent the state charges which resulted in the criminal history category II, no other criminal history.

The state charges, your Honor, respectfully,
occurred over a period of 17 days. It was a casino marker,
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March 2nd, 2011, for $\$ 5,000$ at the Atlantis. He had gambled there before. He was able to borrow money to gamble by signing a marker. Two weeks later, 17 days later, $I$ believe, on the 19 th of March, 2011, he signs a $\$ 5,000$ marker at the Grand Sierra. They were not repaid. He was arrested.

And markers in the State of Nevada come under the umbrella of the statutory provision that talks about drawing and passing checks with insufficient funds. That's what he was charged with.

And if you take a look at the pleading very carefully, you will see he was drawing and passing a series of checks within 90 days. Well, first of all, they were not checks, they were not insufficient funds, they were casino maxkers, and there was not a series passed within 90 days.

He ended up pleading to two counts. They charged each transaction separately. They could have charged just as easily, and it would have made much more legal sense to charge both as one transaction that he would have passed two within a period of 90 days. One casino marker is not a series. A series is two or more.

So there was some problems, I submit to the Court, your Honor, in the manner in which a state's charge was handled, and for that, for that criminal activity, he gets a total of, I believe, two or three criminal history points that put him into a Category II.
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When Gary was arrested for those charges, and that was in 2012, I believe it was in August of 2012, he could have easily bailed out on those state charges, but he did not because I am told that there was a federal hold that had been placed on him that would have prevented him from being released from custody.

I have tried, and I can't tell you how many different ways that I have tried and the calls that $I$ have made, to find out when the federal hold was placed on Mr. Lane, and no one had been able to provide and give me that information.

So -- and what happened then, he takes a deal, if you will, through the Washoe County District Attorney's office, and he ends up pleading to the two gross misdemeanor counts, and he is then sentenced to time served which is 182 days that he had been in custody, and then after his sentencing on the state charge he comes into the federal system and he's here.

So respectfully, your Honor, I believe that the circumstances and understanding exactly what the state charge was is important. It's not insufficient funds checks as the government has alleged in opposing my sentencing memorandum. They were casino markers which allowed him to play which he had signed in the past with the casinos, and specifically the Atlantis, and which were always paid back, they were always
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paid back.
So I understand we're under a time crunch, I
apologize for being lengthy, but, as you can see, there's a Iot to this case, and I think the points that I attempted to make on Mr. Lane's behalf are legitimate, your Honor, and I would stand on not only the oral argument that I made here this afternoon, but also the written presentation.

THE COURT: Thank you. Just in determining the guidelines, please, response on those three objections.

MR. RACHOW: Well, your Honor, first, with all
due deference to the defense, I believe they've made the government's case as far as sophisticated means.

We had a scam that went on for a number of years. We had an individual keeping separate accounts. A Ponzi scheme by definition, it seems to me, falls into sophisticated means.

But there's even a little more that comes in here which goes to the second one, vulnerable victims, is he used individuals he courted, made close family friends, individuals who gave gifts to his children, and used that particular relationship to get them to trust him, going so far as to actually tell one these are legal papers, but don't show it to a lawyer because you'll get in trouble.

I think maybe the quickest way to save time concerning arguing about this if it's a disputed matter is to
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call the case agent who is in the back who can describe two or
three victims that they dealt with and our impressions of
them.

I would also note before doing that that the Court only has to find that there was only one vulnerable victim. The Court doesn't have to find that all the victims were vulnerable, and the government has never claimed that they were all vulnerable, but certain ones were.

Before I call the agent, I'm not sure, the court might inquire if there are any victims that are present in the courtroom that would like the opportunity.

THE COURT: I'll give any and all victims an
opportunity to speak but only after I determine the guidelines.

MR. RACHOW: Very well. I will call Special
Agent Erron Terry of the FBI.
THE COURT: Yes, please.
Thank you, sir, just be careful of the step. Please come up by the chair, and raise your right hand.

ERRONTERRY,
called as a witness on behalf of the Government, was sworn and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Please be seated.
Please state your name for the record.
THE WITNESS: My name is Erron, E-r-x-o-n,
Terxy, $T-e-r-x-y$.
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THE CLERK: And city and state you reside in, sir.

THE WITNESS: I reside in Reno, Nevada. THE COURT: Thank you, six. You may ask. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. RACHOW:

Q Sir, what is your business, profession or occupation?
A I am a special agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Q And as such did you become involved in the investigation concerning Mr . Lane?

A I did.
Q And did you work with other agents?
A I did.
Q And did you personally interview any of the victims?
A I did.
Q And could you describe -- well, did you interview a man by the name Mark Walburn?

A I did.
Q Could you describe for the court, please, just his age, his bearing, his ability to relate and your sense of his sophistication?

A Well, his age, as I recall, Mx. Walburn was in his $80 s$, physically doing reasonably well for a man in his 80 s, but as he said to me when $I$ showed up at his apartment door or condo
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to -- or house, rather, to interview him, that basically all he did was ride a stationary bicycle and watch $T V$ now.

He had been a construction site manager, and for years he had invested with his wife in small real estate investments in Hawaii where they resided. They moved here, and this is where I met him.

Q Did he indicate during that interview whether or not he had ever provided anything to Gary Lane in the form of a monetary instrument with no amount filled in because he trusted him?

A Oh, sure. What Mr. Walburn said in terms of -- I don't recall, I'd have to look at my 302 to refresh my memory as to the specifics of the manner in which he made payment. I know that he provided instruments to Mr . Lane and did so out of -on the basis of trust.

And if the question were to vulnerability or
reliance on Mr. Lane's reputation or representations to him, I
think if one reviews my 302s, he was very straightforward in
saying he knew nothing about the investment business.

I won't in this courtroom recite the language he used, but he was really direct.

Q Okay. Let's move on. Did you interview another alleged victim in this case who was a slot attendant?

A Yes, I did.
Q Who was that?
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A That was Rony Abera (phonetic), I believe.
Q Can you spell the last name for the record?
A I believe it is $A-b-e-r-a$.
She was a recent immigrant to the United States who came to know Gary Lane at the casino where she worked. She knew him there because he regularly frequented the place as a client, and, according to her, he approached her, or kind of proposed to her to invest with him saying you ought to invest with me.

And she was extremely naive in investments and gave him everything she had saved in her years of living alone and working here at the casino industry. She just handed it over to him.

Q Where was she from?
A It was Africa, an African nation I should say.
Q And did she have any family here with her?
A She was living alone at the time. She may have had relatives in the United States somewhere, but she was not residing with them. She was on her own and alone to make her big decisions about when and with whom to invest. She had no one to turn to.

Q Did you question her about her background in investing?
A Yes.
Q And what was her response?
$\hat{A}$ It was less colorful than Mr. Walburn's, but it was
extremely direct that she had no history or understanding, she just relied on Mr. Lane and did so because he looked so very, very successful.

Q And, finally, I'll just ask you about one other victim. We have problems pronouncing the name, I think it's

Arasremy --
A Hoosha Andsroony (phonetic).
Q And can you describe her physically.

A Ms. Andsroony is probably in her late 80 s now, is extremely physically fragile, lives in a little tiny place up in Sparks by herself on the -- on her inheritance which she inherited from her father.

She did not make the large amount of money that she had to invest with Gary, she inherited it from her father, and she lives on very little of it, and she herself is very unsophisticated when it comes to investments or financial matters.

Q Did she have anything to say about any documents she may have received from Mr. Lane?

A Oh, yeah, she got a lot of documents from Mr. Lane. We got them in the course of the investigation.

They were guarantees that she was going to make money, that she wouldn't lose money. He gave her notes. She got all sorts of things, frankly, that had nothing to do with proper investments, and it worked, if that's what you're
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asking.
MR. RACHOW: Thank you. That's all the
questions I have. Pass the witness.

THE COURT: Do you have questions?
CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. DIGESTI:
Q What do you mean it worked?
A She was fooled. She thought they were legitimate. She thought the investment she was making with Gary Lane was a legitimate investment.

Q Because she was getting interest payments, right?
A She was getting interest, payments, but that's not the entire question you asked. It worked because Gary fooled her.

Q But she was happy with Gary because --
A She was terrified of Gary, sir.

Q Terrified?

A Scared, yes.
Q But, nevertheless, she was pleased with Mr. Lane's investment because she was getting paid interest, wasn't she?

A She was pleased with the investment payment.
Q Okay. And how much did she get over the term from Gary Lane, do you recall?

A I don't recall. I would have to review some of the documents.

Q Okay. And how long had she known Gary Lane?

A It may be close to what you said.
Q 1999?
A Somewhere in there. She probably met him while he was managing her legitimate investments at Merrill Lynch or whatever preceded Merrill Lynch, and then she carried over with him when it became Merrill Lynch at the Bank of America.

Q So she had an investment history before she ever met
Mr. Lane.
A She was investing in very straightforward, simple securities like Kemper Securities and Kemper Insurance Securities.

It was hardly a sophisticated investment background, it's something people do when they're safeguarding their money. It's a very low-risk, low-interest, very safe kind of investment favored by senior citizens and those who are not sophisticated in investments.

Q Thank you for your comments, but my question was, she had an investment history before she met Mr. Lane, correct?

A She was probably investing at Kemper Securities or something like that. I have to review the documents to be specific.

Q And another individual that you testified to was - - is it
Rony Abera?
A Yes.
Q How old is she?
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A She is probably, what, 50 something. I don't recall.
I'd have to look at my 302 s to see her date of birth.
Q If I came up with 48 , is that close enough?
A That would probably be close, yeah.
Q Okay. When did she meet Mr. Lane?
A I'd have to look at my 302.
Q If I were to represent to you that in your 302 you report
that she met Mr. Lane in 1999, 2000, that time period, is
that --
A That's probably fair.
Q -- consistent with your recollection of what you wrote?
A I don't recall what I wrote actually.
Q okay. And what is the extent of her education?
A I believe she had an education -- I think she got an
education in Africa which she found less than sufficient to do
anything with here, but I believe she had some sort of college
education.
Q She had a college degree, correct?
A From Africa, yes.
Q But a college degree nevertheless?
A Nevertheless, yes.
Q Yes. Okay. And did she also have an investment history
prior to meeting Mr. Lane?
A She might have been investing in something prior to
meeting Gary. I'd have to look at my 302.


All right. The matter on the three objections is submitted. I'll determine the guideline range, make a finding.

I do overrule your objections, sir. On
sophisticated, if I were looking -- first of all, the probation department is a branch -- is part of the third branch, not the government, so any allegations or statements in the presentence report comes from the judiciary's own employees that are hired to help the Court in assessing the guidelines and making a finding in that regard.

Second, more importantly, the sophisticated means enhancement is totally appropriate. If I were looking at this from a brand-new perspective, $I$ would say not only that enhancement but an enhancement for violating a position of trust ought to be applied as well. That's not recommended here, and I'm not adopting that. But a sophisticated means is particularly appropriate here. I adopt the suggested finding of the presentence report and Probation Department regarding facts underlying that.

The Ponzi scheme employed here was a sophisticated means in and of itself. The use of documentations, alleged accounts, confirmation statements, notes and other documents given to victims were evidence of that sophistication whose primary intent was not only to allow the Ponzi scheme to continue for some period of time and prevent its discovery but
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allow it to be used as additional fraudulent representations upon those victims.

The means were very sophisticated. He was in a peculiar position to impose such means, and he used them, and it incurred additional fraud charges, allowed him to set himself up in that position of trust.

With respect to vulnerable victims, I have to overrule the objection. There's, first, not any evidence at all submitted by the defendant that these people were not vulnerable, unsophisticated. There's argument but no evidence at all. There's not a single bit of evidence presented that any of these particular victims claimed as unsophisticated vulnerable victims had sophistication in investment.

The fact that they have accumulated substantial funds has no cut at all one way or the other as to whether they're sophisticated investors.

One woman acquired her funds by inheritance from her husband. Another person acquired their funds through the construction industry, I assume due to good work and investment in real estate, but even investment in real estate, if they're not a real estate broker, doesn't mean that they're sophisticated in real estate investments if they're just enjoying inflationary growth. But, more importantly, it does not indicate sophistication with respect to investments generally, and, in particular, bond or exempt bond

MARGARET E. GRIENER, RDR, CCR NO. 3, OFEICIAL REPORTER (775) 329-9980
opportunities.
Their age is a factor. Their state of physical
condition is a factor. The government has cited just three in
addition to the general conclusion that the Probation
Department arrived at, and I would find for purposes of this
hearing that they were vilnexable both due to age, to lack of
sophistication for which there's no evidence, as well as trust
and long periods of trust inculcated, incurred by the
defendant with respect to some of these participants,
especially the elderly and aged ones and ones that had little
or no prior investment experience.

Finally, the request for downward departure I have
to deny. I make a ruling as a matter of law that probation
correctly calculated prior conviction in calculating their
category level.

Therefore, I make the ultimate finding with respect
to the guidelines that a level 29, I believe it was, an
ultimate level 29, after the various credits that he's
entitled to, is appropriate, and a criminal history category
II is appropriate.
On Counts 1 to 12 there's up to 30 years per count
statutory; on 13 to 17 up to five years per count. The
guideline provisions are 97 to 121 months, and the
recommendation, of course, is 120 months, but that's not part
of the finding.
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The finding is 97 to 121 months. And, again, the recommendation, not the finding, is that they ought to run concurrent. Supervised release, two to five years with restitution in the amount of two million one 0 three two two six.

Let's turn now to finally, to the extent that you haven't already argued them, the 3553 factors, the statutory factors that the Court must consider, anything additional there that you have not covered.

And before you start, please, government and then counsel, are there any victim statements that the government is obligated to tender?

MR. RACHOW: I'm not aware of any, your Honor.
I would inquire if there are any victims in the courtroom that would desire to speak.

THE COURT: Are there any victims in the
courtroom that desire to speak?
(No audible response.)
THE COURT: Okay. One last finding, too, on the victims. The victims clearly include the persons who were defrauded directly by Mr. Lane.

The fact that someone stepped up, like Bank of
America, both on a moral and legal obligation to reimburse those persons, does not accrue to the benefit of Mr. Lane. He doesn't get the benefit of reimbursement by insurance
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companies, by ultimate payers, by someone who recognizes a moral or legal obligation. That benefit does not accrue to him.

It may well count with respect to restitution. It doesn't here, of course, because Bank of America itself ends up as an ultimate victim as well, and the restitution amount is about half of what actually it could have been calculated at based upon the limitation in the complaint.

So that's a finding with respect to restitutionary amounts and victims.

3553 factors, please, and a recommendation of sentence.

MR. RACHOW: Well, Your Honor, this particular sentencing is more detailed than most of them that we usually go through, so $I$ think most of the factors are self-evident.

Just mentioning them as we look at the top, the seriousness of the crime, this is an ongoing crime for a number of years with vulnerable victims involved and substantial amounts of money, so that's about as serious as it can get.

Throw in the fact he didn't pay taxes on it, which maybe is understandable when he's stealing money, but it still is an offense. Under the law, if you have income, no matter how you get it, you've got to pay taxes. So both of those are serious crimes.
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To promote respect for the law, the word needs to go out, not only to this defendant but also to the public and others that might be so situated, that you've got to respect the law. You can't take advantage of people. You can't lie and cheat in order to get their money.

Just punishment actually calls for a substantial amount of confinement in this particular case. Given the length of the ongoing fraud, the sophistication used and the type of victims, we believe that the recommendation by the probation officer is appropriate.

Sometimes prosecutors get a little wrapped up in a case and go for the high end just because they're prosecutors, or they get a personal interest. In this case, after taking a look at the recommendation by the independent probation office, we would submit that that is a reasonable and appropriate recommendation in the case.

Deterrence to criminal conduct, well, it can
obviously deter him by a pretty substantial period of confinement, and hopefully others that learn about it will know that if you engage in conduct like this and get caught, you're going away for a long time.

So that serves a twofold purpose. It's protecting the public from further crimes of the defendant, of course.

As far as providing for his needed education or training, he had education, he had training. He chose to
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abuse it. Right now he just needs -- that should be a very minor consideration. There's probably nothing that's going to come out of the penal system that should affect the sentence one way or the other.

And, finally, to avoid sentencing disparities, generally, as long as you're within the guideline range which has been determined nationwide from the Sentencing Commission, it would seem that would avoid any sentencing disparities.

And on that, I would submit it.
THE COURT: Thank you so much.
I'm not considering anything in excess of the guideline range, counsel, when you answer. If I were to do so, of course, I would have to give you notice and an opportunity to counter it, therefore I'm limiting myself to the guideline range, or below, and we'll allow you, please, to address the 3553 factors.

MR. DIGESTI: Your Honor, I'm not going to go through and address each one individually. I believe they're sufficiently covered in the memorandum that $I$ filed on behalf of Mr. Lane in this case.

By way of correction, or perhaps I misunderstood, but when the Court was entering its findings from the bench, you made reference, or the Court made reference to the abuse of trust which you were not going to considex. I would. indicate to the Court that that's already been considered in
the presentence report, and there was a two-level enhancement for a violation of trust which, of course, Mr. Lane did not object to and did not contest.

THE COURT: Very good. I take your correction. I appreciate that, and, of course, I would conclude that it is properly assessed.

MR. DIGESTI: Thank you, your Honor.
With respect to the recommended sentence, the government makes the argument that the message must be sent and people need to know that if you engage in this type of behavior or conduct, there are consequences, and I agree.

But I think if we're looking at a sentence that's reasonably fashioned, reasonable under the circumstances of this case and falls squarely within the federal sentencing guidelines upon which the Court is relying here today, I would suggest to your Honor that a sentence of 97 months, the low end of the guidelines, would be appropriate. Ninety-seven months is a long time.

And one thing that we cannot escape, and I know the Court has made its rulings in this case, but the fact remains that all of the investors that invested with Mr. Lane in this scheme were promised, I think, a six or seven percent return, and all of them made a significant amount of money by payment of interest on their investments.

```
            Now, that's a fact. We can't hide it, we can't walk
```
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away from it. So, again, I don't want to beat up on anybody, but they had an opportunity to make more money, and sometimes greed will stand in the way of reason, and it cuts both ways.

And I'm not here to beat up on any of these victims and these people, that's not my purpose. But if we are looking at a sentence within the guidelines that's reasonable and just under the circumstances as they apply to this particular case, then $I$ would suggest to your Honor that an appropriate sentence would be 97 months. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you so much. You're not required to make an extra statement, Mr. Lane, but I certainly welcome it. If you wish to make a statement, I will consider it in addition to what your counsel has said, or you may simply stand on your counsel's statement.

Do you wish to make any additional statement, sir? THE DEFENDANT: I would like to read a prepared statement.

THE COURT: If you would, please. If you would just stand right there.

THE DEFENDANT: Stand here?
THE COURT: Yes.
THE DEFENDANT: Upon hearing that a warrant had
been issued for my arrest, I took the first flight I could make out of the Akron airport in Ohio back to Reno. I was arrested just 12 days later on August 31st, 2012, and that was
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the first and only time I have ever been arrested. In the 18 months that have passed since that day, I've spent 12 months in county jail without a single incident.

Additionally, I was granted a release in March of
last year that ended in August 12 th when I remanded myself back to custody to start serving some of my time. During the five and a half months of supervised celease, I followed intently the guidelines set forth by Pretrial Services, again without incident.

It has now been almost three years since I was called into my manager's office at Merrill Lynch and confronted with the questions I knew someday I would be facing.

From that moment $I$ was told not to contact any of my clients. No more lunches, dinners, smoked trout, cleveland Indian baseball games, no longer assisting with personal situations, helping to pick out a new car or painting the front of the home.

I was, indeed, close to those handful of clients that participated, some friendships going back over 20 years. From daily contact for years to a complete severing of any contact leaves a painful emptiness. It has been difficult for each of them and daily anguish and frustration for me.

It goes without saying how deeply saddened and sorry I am for involving such truly decent people in this nightmare.
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It was never my intention.
Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank You, sir. I appreciate your statement. Please be seated there.

The range here is 97 to 121 months. I started this hearing with a conception that we ought to be somewhere down around 97 months. The defendant does not have a criminal history or a background other than the marker checks under state law for which he was convicted.

On the other hand, I'm really persuaded after listening to the arguments on the 3553 factors that it needs to be towards the high end.

You don't have a criminal past, Mr. Lane. In fact, you have a sophisticated and welcome past and experience level and education level. And I believe your statement that you feel sorrow, but obviously that didn't turn you around in the ongoing fraud.

The main things that persuade me that this needs a higher end sentence is that this was a continuing Ponzi scheme. You didn't pay people interest, you paid people with other people's money, and the only way that you could make payments to them in order to defer their discovery was by victimizing new people.

So the fraud accelerated, it grew, because -- not because you felt sorry, you may well have felt sorry --
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THE DEEENDANT: I felt sorry.
THE COURT: -- but not enough to correct or stop
yourself. You paid people because you didn't want to be discovered, and the only way you could do that is to victimize more people.

Many of them, not all of them, many of them were in a very vulnerable position. They trusted you. You were in a position of trust.

And so the main factor that argues to me is the fact it was ongoing. Even though you felt regret and like you were doing something wrong, it didn't cause you to correct your pattern which means that you really need a little more time in prison to think about the problem, and the fact that you really were in positions of trust.

This isn't something that happened one time, I walked into a bank or with a good friend and talked them out of $\$ 500,000$. You did it over a period of time and in a sophisticated way to deter their discovery and lead them on to investing more moneys, and, simply speaking, the law has to stop that on your behalf and has to stop it on behalf of others similarly situated.

I agree with all of the statements of the government on the individual 3553 factors. I've considered every single one of the factors listed there. I agree with the statements and incorporate them here by the government, and, accordingly,
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I have to impose the 120 -month sentence.
I appreciate your surrendering yourself and already serving some of the time. You'll get credit, of course, for all of that, and if you serve in a good manner, as apparently you've started to do, you will get other good time credit. I think it's about 54 days a year for each year sentence.

But, nevertheless, it does need a lengthy sentence, sir, and $I$ just hope and pray that during the course of that incarceration period you'll come to the same conclusion yourself.

You have turned the corner, I believe, in recognizing that it was wrongful and in deciding not to do it again, but, of course, my experience is that sometimes you need reenforcement in the way of a prison sentence to make sure that turning a corner is permanent. Therefore $I$ will impose that.

If you would stand right there with your attorney, please.

I do hereby commit you to the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 120 months. Supervised release is imposed for a term of 60 months. The 120 months is on Counts 1 through 12 concurrent, and 60 months is to Counts 13 to 17 imprisonment, all concurrent with the 120 months for counts 1 to 12 , therefore total time is 120 months.

Supervised release is two to five years. I commit
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you to five years of supervised release on Counts 1 to 12 and
three years as to Counts 13 to 17 , again, all counts
concurrent so the total time is five years.

A fine $I$ an waiving due to the tremendous restitution obligation that's imposed upon you and your own financial condition.

Restitution is ordered in the amount of $\$ 2,103,226$ payable immediately. Of course, the normal sentence recommended balance of payment schedule is agreed to by the Court. You shall pay it at the amount of a monthly rate of not less than ten percent of any income earned during incarceration and/or gross income while on supervised release, so ten percent subject to adjustment by the Court based upon ability to pay.

A special assessment, of course. Here you are obligated for $\$ 1700, \$ 100$ per count, and that's due immediately.

While on supervised release, Mr. Lane, you are obligated to abide by conditions specified by the Court. They involve standard conditions always required and then some special conditions.

The standard conditions are, number one, you shall not commit another federal, state or local crime during the term of supervision.

Second, you shall not possess illegal controlled
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substances. Revocation of supervision is mandatory for possession of illegal controlled substances.

Third, the defendant shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance and shall submit in that regard to one drug test within 15 days of commencement of supervision, and, please, no more than 104 drug tests annually thereafter. Revocation, again, is mandatory for refusal to comply.

Number four, you shall submit to DNA collection and analysis as directed by the probation officer.

In addition, the following special conditions are imposed. First, possession of weapons. You shall not possess, have under your control, or have any access to any firearm, explosive device or other dangerous weapon as defined by federal, state or local law.

Second, warrantless search. You shall submit to the search of your person, property, residence or automobile under your control, and without a search warrant, to ensure compliance with all these conditions of release but only by the probation officer having direct supervision over you or any immediate or authorized person under the immediate supervision of the probation office, and, again, for the purpose of ensuring compliance with just these conditions of release.

Third, debt obligations. You shall be prohibited
from incurring new credit charges, opening additional lines of credit, or negotiating or consummating any financial contracts without the approval of the probation officer.

Access to financial information. You shall provide the probation officer access to any requested financial information including personal income tax returns, authorization for release of credit information, and any other business financial information in which you have a control or interest.

Fifth, employment restriction. Because of the potential gambling problem and the banking investment tie-in, you shall be restricted from engaging in employment, consulting or any association with any banking investment business for the period, the supervised release period, of five years.

Sixth, gambling prohibition. You shall not enter, frequent, or be involved with any legal or illegal gambling establishment or activity except for the purpose of employment as approved and directed by the probation officer.

Seventh, gambling addiction treatment. You shall refrain from any form of gambling and shall participate in a program for the treatment of gambling addiction at your own expense, but only as approved and directed by the probation officer, based upon your ability to pay.

Eighth, Internal Revenue Service compliance. You
shall cooperate and arrange with the Internal Revenue Service to pay all past and present taxes, interest and penalties owed. You shall file timely, accurate and lawful income tax returns and show proof of the same to the probation officer.

And, finally, reporting upon your release. You shall report in person to the probation office in the district to which you are released within 72 hours of discharge from custody.

You have not waived any rights of appeal, sir, in your guilty plea, and therefore I simply notify you that if you wish to file a notice of appeal, you must do it within 15 days of the entry of the judgment. If you could not afford it, an attorney would be appointed to represent you in the appeal and a transcript of these proceedings prepared at government expense.

The record will reflect giving to you a copy of the supervised release conditions, and I welcome any request for recommendation as to placement or otherwise.

MR. DIGESTI: May I have just a moment, your
Honor?

THE DEFENDANT: My family is in Eugene, Oregon, my son, my daughter and my wife.

THE COURT: You would request placement to
Eugene -- near Eugene, Oregon?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, please.
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| 1 | THE COURT: Of course, it's up to the Bureau of |
| 2 | Prisons, but I can make recommendation. They usually follow |
| 3 | that if they can. It also depends on your level of |
| 4 | designation securitywise. So I'll make that recommendation, |
| 5 | please. |
| 6 | THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 7 | THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you, sir, and good |
| 8 | luck. |
| 9 | THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. |
| 10 | MR. DIGESTI: Your Honor, one additional matter |
| 11 | if I may? |
| 12 | THE COURT: Please. |
| 13 | MR. DIGESTI: I was appointed by the Court to |
| 14 | represent Mr. Lane. At this time I would ask to be relieved |
| 15 | as counsel, and I would ask that the Eederal Public Defender's |
| 16 | office be appointed to represent Mr. Lane on appeal. He will |
| 17 | be filing a notice of appeal in this case. |
| 18 | THE COURT: I will do that immediately upon the |
| 19 | expiration of the time period for filing a notice of appeal. |
| 20 | In other words, you have to file a notice of appeal. But I |
| 21 | will release you at that time and designate -- assuming we - |
| 22 | we already have the affidavit and such on file, right, that |
| 23 | was predicate to your appointment? |
| 24 | MR. DIGESTI: Oh, yes |
| 25 | THE COURT: And I will substitute the Public |
|  | MARGARET E. GRIENER, RDR, CCR NO. 3, OFFICIAI. REPORTER $(775) \quad 329-9980$ |

Defender.

MR. DISGESTI: Is there anything in addition to
the notice of appeal which I need to file, your Honor, in
order to be relieved?

THE COURT: I don't believe so. MR. DIGESTI: Very well. Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you, sir. -000-
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| ```themselves [2]- 11:16, 14:5 theory [1]-20:3 thereafter[4]-51:7 therefore [7]-13:20. 23:23. 39:16, 43:14, 49:15, 49:24, 53:10 they've [1]-27:11 third (5)-24:14, 36:1, 37:6, 51:3, 51:25 three \([19]-4: 17,8: 9\), 14:11, 19:22, 20:19, 25:24, 27:9, 28:2, 36:15, 36:19, 36:20. 36:22, 37:1, 39:3, 40:4, 46:10, 50:2 three-level [1]-4:17 throw [1]-41:21 tie [1]-52:11 tie-in \([1]-52: 11\) timely 11 - \(53: 3\) tiny [1]-32:10 today \([2]-17: 8,44: 15\) together \([1]-11: 16\) took [3]-9:2, 12:11. 45:23 top [i] - 41:16 total [6] -4:18, 4:21. 19:15, 25:24, 49:24, 50:3 fotaling [1]-5:13 totally ( 1 ] - \(37: 12\) towards [1] - 47:12 trace [3]-12:2, 12:22, 13:1 traceable [1]-11:21 Trade [6] - 6:23, 9:10, 10:14, 11:13, 11:19, 18:25 training (2) - 42:25 transaction[2]- 25:16. 25:18 TRANSCRIPT打- \(1: 11\) transcript [2]-53:14, 55:10 transfer (1)-12:21 transferred (1] - 16:13 treasury [2]-8:24. 9:12 treatment [2]-52:20, 52:22 tremendous [1]-50:4 tried (2)-26:7, 26:8 trouble \(11-27: 23\) trout in \(^{2}-46: 15\) true \([3]-20: 7,23: 4\). 23:5 truly [2] - 18:12. 46:25 trust [12] -4:7, 18:11.``` |  | 15:14, 18:5, 23:17, <br> 32:16, 38:10, 38:12 <br> unsophistication [1]- <br> 16:4 <br> unusually [3] - 7:8, <br> $24: 9,24: 10$ <br> up [20]-11:13, 14:15, <br> $16: 20,19: 24,24: 3$, <br> $25: 15,26: 14,28: 19$, <br> $29: 25,32: 10,35: 3$, <br> $38: 6,39: 21,39: 22$, <br> $40: 22,41: 6,42: 11$, <br> $45: 1,45: 4,54: 1$ <br> usc $[2]-2: 18,2: 19$ <br>  | ```28:8, 38:7, 38:10, 38:13, 39:6, 41:18. 48:7```  year $[7]$ - 2:16, 4:13, $17: 25,18: 15,46: 5$ $4 x_{0} y$ years $[22]$ c 425,1622 16:7, 177,18:10 19:5, 24:21, 27:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30:4, 31:11, 39:21. } \\ & 39: 22,40: 3,41: 18, \\ & 46: 10,46: 20,46: 21, \\ & 49: 25,50: 1,50: 2, \\ & 50: 3,52: 15 \\ & \text { young }[1]-18: 7 \\ & \text { yourself }[3]-48: 3, \\ & 49: 2,49: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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# In the Matter of Gary Harrison Lane 

Administrative Proceeding File No. 3-16101

## Service List

Pursuant to Commission Rule of Practice 151 (17 C.F.R § 201.151), I certify that the attached:

## MOTION BY DIVISON OF ENFORCEMENT FOR SUMMARY DISPOSITION AGAINST RESPONDENT GARY HARRISON LANE PURSUANT TO COMMISSION RULE OF PRACTICE 250; DECLARATION OF CHRISTINE CONNOLLY; EXHIBITS

was served on November 24, 2014 upon the following in the manner indicated below:

## UPS:

Brent J. Fields, Secretary
Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F Street, N.E. Mail Stop 1090
Washington, DC 20549

## By Email and UPS:

The Honorable James E. Grimes
Administrative Law Judge
Securities and Exchange Commission 100 F Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20549-2557
ALJ@sec.gov

## By USPS Certified Express Mail:

Mr. Gary Harrison Lane



[^0]:    * Findings for the total amount of losses are required under Chapters $109 \mathrm{~A}, 110,110 \mathrm{~A}$, and 113 A of Title 18 for offenses committed on or after September 13, 1994, but before April 23, 1996.

[^1]:    MARGARET E. GRIENER, RDR, CCR NO. 3, OEFICIAL REPORTER
    (775) 329-9980

