MAR 07 2016
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

February 8, 2016

Ms. Polly Atkinson, Senior Trial Counsel Securities and Exchange Commission 1961 Stout Street, Suite 1700 Denver, Colorado 80249-1961

RE: RAHFCO Management Group, LLC; File No. 3-17049

Dear Ms. Atkinson:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 1, 2016, in reference to the above subject. However, I call to your attention that first case against myself and RAHFCO, brought by yourself and RAHFCO, which is presently pending appeal with the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. I believe that the SEC Secretary and yourself have no standing at this time.

Please find enclosed my Motion and Memorandum of Law, which specifically hinges on the long standing doctrines of collateral estoppel and resjudicata. Where you and the SEC have had a full and fair opportunity to have litigated the same issues in the first action, I believe that you are barred from again bringing the second action (present) requesting the same relief as in the case on appeal.

Therefore, I do not believe that there is a need to waste further taxpayer money in the paying of your wages and the SEC and Administrative Law Judges to bring this instant pretended action.

If I had had an attorney you, nor the SEC Secretary would be doing what you are presently doing, which is an abuse of authority and of the system, which you as a Senior Trial Attorney, are going to be held fully accountable for all of the costs, disbursements and expenses involved in defending your frivolous actions, which are clearly meant to harass.

In concluding, I sent you an email advising that you would have to call Mr. Millich, Counselor to arrange for me to call you to discuss this, which you'd suggested in your letter. If you make the call to Millich, I will be able to discuss this with you.

I have copied the SEC and Court in this action, as I wish all involved to understand my position, I will not allow you or others to harass me or abuse the system.

11/11

Randal Kent Hansen

Enclosures

c: w/enc: SEC Secretary

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Before the SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION



A	Dì	11	NIST	RAT	IME	PR	OCE	EDI	NG
F	i	le	No.	3-	170	49			

In the Matter of

RAHFCO MANAGEMENT GROUP: LLC

Respondent.

MOTION TO DISMISS BASED ON COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND RES JUDICATA

Comes now, Randal Kent Hansen and RAHFCO Management Group with its Motion to dismiss based upon the long standing doctrines of Collateral Estoppel and Res Judicata, which resolve this isse and newly-filed case against RAHFCO Management Group, LLC.

WHEREFORE, Randal Kent Hansen and RAHFCO Management Group respectfully move that the Court grant Respondent RAHFCO the following relief:

- 1. Dismiss with prejudice the pretended action of the Securities and Exchange Commission based upon the doctrines of collateral estoppel and res judicata, where the SEC has had a full and fair opportunity to have fully litigated the same isses in a previous action, U.S.Securities and Exchange Commission v. Hansen, et al., SDNY, File No. 1:13-cv-1403, which was presided over by the Honorable IMErnon S. Broderick which is presently pending appeal in the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit; and
- 2. Grant Respondents their costs disbursments and any further relief that is appropriate.

Dated: February 8, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Kent Hansen

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Before the SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING File No. 3-17049

RESPONDENTS MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF DISMISSAL

In the Matter of

RAHFCO MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC

Respondent.

TO: THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE, SEC SECRETARY AND POLLY ATKINSON, SEC TRIAL COUNSEL

the present case must be dismissed based upon the standing doctrines of collateral estoppel and res judicata. The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) had in In the Matter of Randal Kent Hansen, File No. 1:13-cv-1403, SDNY, Honorable Vernon S. Broderick, the full and fair opportunity to have litigated the same issue that they are attempting to re-litigate in the instant case, which must be barred and dismissed.

COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND RES JUDICATA DEMAND DISMISSAL.

This is not new to the SEC, that these doctrines control further litigation after there has been the right to fully and fairly litigate.

In 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22024: Murray v. UBS Sec., LLC, (Feb. 4. 2016). In this case the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) brought an action. As the Murray Court properly held, "The rule ... against duplicative litigation is distinct from but related to the doctrine of claim preclusion or res judicata." Id. (citing and quoting Curtis v. Citi Bank, N.A., 226 F.3d 133, 138 (2nd Cir. 2000).

Because the SEC could and should have, but failed to raise this in the first proceeding they are barred by the rule of preclusion.

General Docket Court of Appeals, 2nd Circuit

Court of Appeals Docket #: 16-74

Nature of Suit: 1850 STATUTES-Secur Comm Exchange

U.S. Securities and Exchange C v. Hansen Appeal From: SDNY (NEW YORK CITY)

Fee Status: due

Case Type Information:

1) Civil

2) United States

3) -

Originating Court Information:

District: 0208-1 : 13-cv-1403

Trial Judge: Vernon S. Broderick, U.S. District Judge

Date Filed: 03/01/2013

Date

Date Order/Judgment

Date NOA

Date Rec'd

Docketed: 01/08/2016

Order/Judgment:

EOD:

Filed:

COA:

12/16/2015

12/16/2015

01/05/2016

01/08/2016

Prior Cases:

None

Current Cases:

None

Panel Assignment:

Not available

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

Plaintiff - Appellee

Michael Andrew Conley, Deputy General

Counsel

Direct: 202-551-5127 [COR NTC US Attorney]

United States Securities and Exchange

Commission 100 F Street, NE

Washington, DC 20549

Rahfco Management Group, LLC

Defendant

Vincent Puma

Defendant

Hudson Capital Partners Corporation

Defendant

			•					
11	t Hansen (-: 12 Defendant - A	,	Randall Kent Hansen, - [NTC Pro Se]					
U.S. Securiti	es and Exchan	ge Commission,						
14	Plaintiff - Appellee,							
v.			•					
Randall Kent	Randall Kent Hansen,							
	Defendant - Appellant,							
Rahfco Mana	agement Group	o, LLC, Vincent Puma	, Hudson Capital Partners Corporation,					
	Defendants.							
01/08/2016	18 pg, 144.37 KB		APPEAL, with district court docket, on behalf of ent Hansen, FILED. [1680196] [16-74] [Entered: //]					
01/08/2016	2 8 pg, 214.3 KB		JUDGMENT, dated 12/16/2015, RECEIVED. Entered: 01/08/2016 04:32 PM]					
01/08/2016	☐ <u>3</u> 17 pg, 111.76 KB	ELECTRONIC INDI [Entered: 01/08/2016	EX, in lieu of record, FILED.[1680204] [16-74] 6 04:32 PM]					
01/08/2016		INSTRUCTIONAL 174] [Entered: 01/08/2	FORMS, to Pro Se litigant, SENT.[1680210] [16-2016 04:33 PM]					

Select All Clear All

- Ocuments and Docket Report
- O Documents and Docket Summary
- O Documents Only
- ☑ Include Page Numbers

		1	
Selected Pages:	0	Selected Size:	0 KB

View Selected