HARD COPY

RECEIVED

JAN 3 1 2017

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Before the SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING File No. 3-17686

In the Matter of

JAMES Y. LEE,

Respondent.

DECLARATION OF JENNIFER PELTZ

- I, Jennifer Peltz, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, hereby declare as follows:
- I am an attorney and a member in good standing of the bar of the State of Illinois.
 I am employed as a Senior Counsel in the Division of Enforcement by the United States
 Securities and Exchange Commission.
- 2. On February 13, 2014, the Securities and Exchange Commission instituted a civil injunctive action against James Y. Lee ("Lee") in the District Court for the Southern District of California, *SEC v. Lee*, 14-cv-00347-LAB-BGS. A true and correct copy of the complaint is attached as Exhibit A.
- 3. On May 7, 2016, Lee consented to the entry of a final judgment against him. A true and correct copy of Lee's consent is attached as Exhibit B.
- 4. On July 15, 2016, the District Court entered final judgment against Lee. Among other things, the final judgment permanently enjoined Lee from violations of Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, Sections 17(a)(1) and (a)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933, and Sections 206(1) and 206(2) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. A true and correct copy of the final judgment is attached as Exhibit C.

5. On October 9, 2014, the United States Attorney filed a criminal information against Lee in the Southern District of California, *US v. Lee*, 14-cr-02937-BEN. Lee pleaded guilty to the information. A true and correct copy of Lee's plea agreement is attached as Exhibit D. A true and correct copy of the transcript of Lee's Change of Plea Hearing is attached as Exhibit E. A true and correct copy of the criminal judgment is attached as Exhibit F.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 30, 2017, in Chicago, Illinois.

Jennifer Peltz

Exhibit A

1 John Birkenheier (IL Bar No. 6270993) Email: birkenheierj@sec.gov
Michael D. Foster (IL Bar No. 6257063)
Email: fostermi@sec.gov 2 Jennifer Peltz (IL Bar No. 6280848) 3 Email: peltzj@sec.gov
Securities and Exchange Commission
175 West Jackson Blvd., Suite 900
Chicago, Illinois 60604
Telephone: (312) 353-7390
Facsimile: (312) 353-7398 4 5 6 7 Local Counsel Karen Matteson(Cal. Bar No. 102103) Email: mattesonk@sec.gov Securities and Exchange Commission 5670 Wilshire Boulevard, 11th Floor 8 9 Los Angeles, California 90036 Telephone: (323) 965-3840 Facsimile: (323) 965-3908 10 11 Attorneys for Plaintiff 12 13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 14 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 15 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE Case No. '14CV0347 LAB BGS 16 COMMISSION, 17 Plaintiff, COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF 18 THE FEDERAL SECURITIES LAWS VS. 19 JAMES Y. LEE **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 20 Defendant, 21 and LARISSA O. ETTORE, ELX INTERNATIONAL, INC., CLAYTON K. LEE, ADVANCED CENTURY CORP., 22 LOLITA GATCHALIAN, ULTRA 23 INTERNATIONAL, INC., and SOT GROUP, INC., 24 Relief Defendants. 25 26 27

28

Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") alleges the following against Defendant James Y. Lee ("Lee") and Relief Defendants Larissa O. Ettore, ELX International, Inc., Clayton K. Lee, Advanced Century Corp., Lolita Gatchalian, Ultra International Inc., and SOT Group, Inc., and hereby demands a jury trial:

SUMMARY OF THE ACTION

- 1. This enforcement action concerns an unregistered investment adviser who gained his clients' trust through deceit and then abused this misplaced trust to further defraud his clients in other ways, after they provided him investment funds to manage on their behalf.
- 2. Defendant Lee misled investors about his background, portraying himself as a highly successful financial industry expert, while failing to disclose a prior criminal conviction for embezzlement and a more recent Commission cease-and-desist order for his role in unlawful penny stock offerings.
- 3. To further entice investors to place retirement or other needed savings in his unclean hands, Lee misrepresented investors' risk of loss. Lee covered up the truth of the undisclosed risks of his speculative options trading strategy with false assurances to protect clients from downside risk through "stop-loss" controls and by partially reimbursing any losses out of his own supposedly "deep pockets."
- 4. Lee also deceived certain clients by providing them with inflated investment returns in order to collect undeserved management fees.
- 5. Finally, Lee traded in penny stocks in some client accounts, which was outside of his discretionary authority, and fraudulently induced one client to enter into a convertible promissory note with another penny stock company.
- 6. Lee was no more interested in sharing in his clients' eventual and substantial losses (as promised) than he was in paying millions of dollars owed to the federal government for his past illegal conduct, so he purposefully avoided holding assets in his own name by funneling monies through the Relief

Defendants. Lee instructed clients to pay his management fees to various shell companies owned by his girlfriend, son, and two long-time associates, respectively. These companies, in turn, disbursed a portion of the funds to Lee and to the friends and family that served as his de facto intermediaries.

- 7. Through the conduct alleged in this Complaint, Lee engaged in: (1) fraudulent or deceptive conduct in connection with the purchase or sale of securities, in violation of Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") and Rule 10b-5 thereunder; (2) fraud in the offer or sale of securities in violation of Section 17(a)(1) and (2) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act"); and (3) fraudulent or deceptive conduct with respect to investment advisory clients, in violation of Section 206(1) and (2) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 ("Advisers Act").
- 8. Accordingly, the Commission seeks the following relief: (a) entry of a permanent injunction prohibiting Lee from further violations of the relevant provisions of the federal securities laws; (b) disgorgement of Lee's ill-gotten gains, plus pre-judgment interest; (c) disgorgement by the Relief Defendants of all unjust enrichment and/or ill-gotten gain received from Lee, plus pre-judgment interest, with Lee jointly and severally liable with the corporate Relief Defendants; and (d) the imposition of a civil monetary penalty against Lee due to the egregious nature of his violations.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 9. The Commission seeks a permanent injunction and disgorgement pursuant to Section 20(b) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(b)], Section 21(d)(1) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(1)], and Section 209(d) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 80b-9(d)].
- 10. The Commission seeks the imposition of a civil monetary penalty pursuant to Section 20(d) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(d)], Section 21(d)(3) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(3)], and Section 209(e) of the

Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 80b-9(e)].

- 11. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 20(d) and 22(a) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(d), 77v(a)], Sections 21(d), 21(e), and 27(a) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d), 78u(e), 77aa(a)],9 and Sections 209(d), 209(e) and 214(a) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 80b-9(d), 80b-9(e), 80b-14(a)].
- 12. Venue is proper pursuant to Section 22(a) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77v(a)], Section 27(a) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78aa(a)], and Section 214(a) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-14(a)].
- 13. A substantial part of the acts and transactions giving rise to the claims alleged herein occurred in this district and, as set forth below, Defendant and one or more Relief Defendants reside and/or transact business in this district.
- 14. In connection with the conduct alleged in this Complaint, Defendant Lee directly or indirectly made use of the means or instrumentalities of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, the facilities of a national securities exchange, or the mails.
- 15. Lee's conduct involved fraud, deceit, or deliberate or reckless disregard of regulatory requirements, and resulted in substantial loss, or significant risk of substantial loss, to other persons.
- 16. Unless enjoined, Lee is likely to continue to engage in the securities law violations alleged herein, or in similar conduct that would violate the federal securities laws.

DEFENDANT

17. **James Y. Lee**, age 58, resides in La Jolla, California. Lee is not registered with the Commission and has never held any securities licenses.

RELIEF DEFENDANTS

18. Larissa O. Ettore ("Ettore"), age 37, is Lee's girlfriend. She is a resident of La Jolla, California, and the sole officer and director of ELX

International Corp., one of the companies that Lee used to collect client management fees and disburse the proceeds. Ettore is not registered with the Commission and has never held any securities licenses.

- 19. **ELX International, Corp.** ("ELX"), is a Texas corporation that maintains an office in San Diego, California. ELX received funds from Lee's clients and made payments to (or for the benefit of) Lee as well his family, friends and/or associates.
- 20. Clayton K. Lee, age 34, is Lee's son. He is a resident of Alameda, California, and the sole officer and director of Advanced Century Corp., one of the companies that Lee used to collect client management fees and disburse the proceeds. Clayton Lee is not registered with the Commission and has never held any securities licenses.
- 21. Advanced Century Corp. ("Advanced Century"), is a California corporation that maintains an office in Alameda, California. Advanced Century received funds from Lee's clients and made payments to (or for the benefit of) Lee as well as his family (including Clayton Lee), friends and/or associates.
- 22. Lolita Gatchalian ("Gatchalian"), age 55, is a long-time associate of Lee. She is a resident of Albany, California, and the sole officer and director of Ultra International Corp., one of the companies Lee used to collect client management fees and disburse the proceeds. Gatchalian is not registered with the Commission and has never held any securities licenses.
- 23. Ultra International, Inc. ("Ultra"), is a Nevada Corporation with its place of business in Albany, California. Ultra received funds from Lee's clients and made payments to (or for the benefit of) Lee and Gatchalian.
- 24. **SOT Group, Inc.** ("SOT"), is a Nevada Corporation with its principal place of business in San Diego, California. SOT's sole officer and director is a long-time associate of Lee. SOT received funds from Lee's clients and made payments to (or for the benefit of) Lee as well as his family, friends and/or

associates.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 25. Starting in December 2008, if not earlier, Lee solicited investors in multiple states (including California, Colorado, and Texas) to open online brokerage accounts, including margin accounts, for purposes of allowing him to trade stock options on their behalf and share in any profits.
- 26. A stock "option" is a security that gives the purchaser the right, but not the obligation, to buy (in the case of a "call" option) or sell (in the case of a "put" option) shares of a company's stock for a specified price (the "strike price") until the expiration date of the option contract.
- 27. Conversely, the party that writes (or "sells to open") the option contract, receiving a payment for doing so, is obligated to sell the shares to, or buy the shares from, the option holder at the specified price if the option is timely exercised.
- 28. Generally, the value of an option will change as the price of the underlying stock changes. When an option expires, it no longer has any value.
- 29. Many of the investors who became Lee's clients had limited investment experience and no prior options trading experience.
- 30. From March 2009 through May 2011, at least 24 clients opened brokerage accounts for purposes of investing in options through Lee.
- 31. Lee's clients funded individual accounts opened in their names at Scottrade OptionsFirst or Charles Schwab, by mailing checks and making wire or other transfers to these online brokers.
- 32. Lee exercised near complete control over client accounts, determining what options should be traded and when. Lee had access to client accounts through use of client user name and password information. Lee executed the trades in the accounts or directed others to do so per his instructions. Lee conducted this activity out of SOT's office in San Diego, among other places.

Lee misled clients about his background

- 33. Lee's clients often were first introduced to him at pre-arranged meetings held in hotel suites or conference rooms, among other places. Most prospective clients were family, friends or acquaintances of one of two early Lee investors, who helped facilitate these meetings.
- 34. To induce prospective clients into believing he was an investment adviser worthy of fiduciary trust, Lee portrayed himself as a wealthy and successful financial industry expert who now enjoyed helping others to make money.
- 35. In terms of his educational background, Lee told investors that he had a law degree, an MBA, PhD and was a CPA.
- 36. In terms of his work history, Lee told investors (among other things) that he had over 20 years of trading experience, including on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange and at large broker-dealers, and advised companies on tax, acquisition and/or financing matters.
- 37. In terms of his trading operation, Lee told investors that he had a large research team in China that helped him to identify profitable options trades. Using this support and his own "proprietary" strategies, Lee said he oversaw options trading in the accounts of select "family and friends." Lee likened himself to a coach that was calling the plays for various "quarterbacks" who executed trades at his direction in client accounts.
- 38. Among other occasions, Lee made these representations (described in paragraphs 34 to 37) to an investor in a meeting held on or about October 8, 2009 in Las Vegas, Nevada; to a different investor in a meeting held on or about October 9, 2009 in Las Vegas, Nevada; and over several meetings held with another investor on or about February 22, 2011, April 20, 2011 and May 2011 in Houston, Texas.
 - 39. The same or substantially similar representations were made by Lee to

numerous other investors between December 2008 and May 2011.

- 40. When touting his purported professional and financial success, Lee failed to disclose past and more recent serious legal troubles.
- 41. Lee had been the chief financial officer of a mortgage company that ceased operating in 1993. Lee failed to disclose to his clients that he had been convicted in 1997 of wire fraud and embezzlement related to the mortgage company's business activities and pension plan. Lee was sentenced to 30 months in prison and ordered to pay \$2,880,000 in restitution. He has made only minimal payments towards this obligation.
- 42. Despite this, Lee described his mortgage-industry background to at least one investor in glowing terms, stating in a December 2008 meeting in Las Vegas that he had built a mortgage company and sold it for a lot of money.
- 43. Likewise, Lee failed to disclose to his clients that in a 2008 administrative proceeding, the Commission entered an order making findings and imposing sanctions by default against Lee related to his involvement in unregistered offerings of billions of shares in penny stock companies. Specifically, after he affirmatively declined to defend the proceeding, Lee was ordered to cease and desist from committing or causing violations of Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act and further ordered to disgorge ill-gotten gains of \$2,866,375 plus prejudgment interest. See In re Alexander & Wade, Inc., and James Y. Lee, Securities Act Release No. 8954 (A.L.J. Aug. 28, 2008). Lee has not made any payments to satisfy this obligation.
- 44. When confronted in a meeting in early 2009 by an investor who learned about the Commission cease and desist order, Lee placated the investor by falsely claiming that his name was later removed from the Commission's lawsuit because he was merely a consultant whose advice had been misused by corporate management. Believing this to be true, the investor later repeated this information to another prospective Lee client in an email sent on June 10, 2010. The next day,

the existing client forwarded this exchange to Lee, but Lee did nothing to correct the false explanation.

45. The information Lee failed to disclose to his clients was material. A reasonable investor would want to know about Lee's prior criminal conviction and securities law violations before entrusting savings to his discretion.

Lee misled clients about their investment risk

- 46. In addition to what Lee's clients, problematically, did not know about his background, the full picture of their investment risk was further obscured by Lee's incomplete and false assurances about the safety of their trading accounts with him.
- 47. In the investor meetings in Las Vegas and Houston described above, as well as in similar pitches to other investors, Lee indicated that he, or one of his "quarterbacks" that submitted trades for execution in client accounts at his direction, would closely monitor account performance to adhere to conservative trading guidelines he established, which ensured consistently positive results.
- 48. Lee, however, did not discuss with clients the risks of options trading, in particular the risks of his preferred strategy—writing (or "selling to open") uncovered (or "naked") option positions. An uncovered position is one in which the option writer does not own shares of the underlying stock. Whereas an option holder's potential loss is limited to the amount paid for the option (should the option expire worthless or "out of the money"), the option writer's potential loss is not so limited (and may be unlimited, if writing uncovered calls) because the writer may have to buy or sell shares of the underlying stock at an unfavorable price compared to the current market price.
- 49. Lee also did not disclose to clients the related risks involved with his trading on "margin." In a margin account, the brokerage firm lends the investor cash, using the account as collateral, to purchase securities. With respect to options trading, margin also refers to the cash or securities required to be deposited

as collateral for the option writer's obligation to buy or sell shares of the underlying stock. Margin requirements for option writing are complex and vary based on option type. An uncovered option writer may be required to provide the broker with additional cash or securities in the event of adverse market movements.

- 50. Lee did not explain to his clients that they could: (a) lose more money than invested in the margin account; (b) have to deposit additional cash or securities in the margin account on short notice to cover market losses; and (c) be forced to sell some or all of the securities held in the account if the account value falls below a certain threshold.
- 51. Instead of making these risk disclosures, Lee made empty guarantees. To attract the business of at least twelve clients, Lee promised that if their accounts actually suffered any realized losses, he would split the losses with them "50/50" and repay them out of his own supposedly "deep pockets." In return, as described further below, Lee asked to share "50/50" in the clients' realized gains.
- 52. This equal sharing of profits and losses was among the representations made in the investor meetings described above in paragraph 38.
- 53. While Lee put few things in writing, he confirmed his agreement to share losses equally with one investor, in a June 24, 2011 email.
- 54. Lee also told certain clients his trading platform included the application of "stop-losses," or risk controls, that prevented clients from losing more than 10%. Lee also told one of these clients that the principal in her account would be safe and not at risk, in their initial meeting held on or about October 8, 2009 in Las Vegas.
- 55. Despite Lee's claims about the safety of client investments, all of Lee's clients faced margin calls and suffered substantial losses in their accounts.
- 56. By early 2012, Lee's clients collectively had lost over \$11 million (out of approximately \$25 million invested) and additionally paid over \$3.3 million

in fees.

- 57. Nonetheless, Lee failed to share in client losses as promised and as demanded by clients. He repaid less than \$200,000 and most clients received nothing.
- 58. Lee's misleading statements about the management of client assets were material. A reasonable investor would want to know the truth about the risks associated with Lee's trading strategy, including the absence of promised safeguards and loss-sharing, when deciding to invest with Lee.

Lee charged fees based on false performance

- 59. Part of Lee's usual pitch to prospective clients was that he would keep their best interests in mind, more so than large, traditional firms that he said spent most of their money on overhead expenses. Lee, however, charged high fees and even defrauded certain clients by knowingly charging fees based on overstated investment results.
- 60. Lee told prospective clients that they would pay 50% of monthly realized profits as management fees. He later reduced his fee to 25% for some clients. Lee told prospective clients that no written contract with him was needed, but if a client did not pay his invoices, he would stop trading in that client's account.
- 61. Lee, or others at his direction, calculated the realized gains or losses in client accounts on a monthly basis. Lee determined the percentage of monthly realized profits that clients would be charged as a management fee and when clients would be invoiced.
- 62. In his zeal to profit at his clients' expense, Lee charged fees to three of his investment advisory clients based on false account performance for February 2011 and concealed from the clients that they had actually incurred net realized losses that month, such that no fees were due.
 - 63. Lee had an arrangement to pay a portion of the fees generated by the

accounts of these three clients to another individual (also a Lee investor) who introduced the clients to Lee and helped manage their accounts at Lee's direction. This individual went along with Lee's plan to spread the realized losses in these client accounts over five months and to charge only one-fifth of the realized losses against the realized gains for February 2011, so it would appear that the clients had net realized profits for which management fees were due. Accordingly, the three clients received invoices for management fees from Lee, and/or the individual that managed their accounts at Lee's direction, based on the false net realized profits for February 2011, which invoices the clients paid.

- 64. As for the supposed deferral of the remainder of the losses to future months, this never came to pass. Lee billed one of the clients for management fees in subsequent months without reducing the client's gains by any offsetting adjustments for the prior February 2011 losses. The other two clients incurred additional losses after February 2011 and did not receive further invoices for the affected accounts.
- 65. By exaggerating gains and minimizing losses, Lee deceived his clients about the true performance of their investments and his associated fees.

Lee traded outside his discretionary authority in penny stocks

66. Lee or others acting at his direction, purchased and sold penny stocks in two client accounts even though Lee only had an agreement with these clients to trade options.

Lee misled a client about another penny stock investment

- 67. In July 2009, Lee advised one of his clients to invest in Axia Group Inc. ("Axia"), which at the time was a Nevada Corporation based in Cave Creek, Arizona.
- 68. Based on Lee's recommendation, the client invested \$15,000 in Axia through a convertible promissory note.
 - 69. Lee said that he served as a consultant to small companies like Axia,

and helped take them public via the over-the-counter market. Lee further claimed that he was compensated only in stock.

- 70. At the time of the client's \$15,000 investment, Axia had less than \$700 in its bank account. There was only one additional deposit in the account (for \$2,490) before it was liquidated in March 2010. Unbeknown to Lee's client, after receiving his \$15,000 investment, Axia began transferring funds to companies and individuals associated with Lee: two payments to ELX totaling \$8,000; two payments to MAKJ Capital Solutions, Inc. totaling \$4,500; and one payment to Ettore's brother for \$1,500. Lee never disclosed these cash payments to his client.
- 71. Lee's deceit about his relationship with Axia and the use of his client's investment proceeds was material. A reasonable investor would want to know that in recommending Axia, Lee stood to be the primary beneficiary from an investment in the company.

Lee diverted fraudulent proceeds to the Relief Defendants

- 72. To avoid having assets in his own name, and to reinforce his contrived image as a successful money manager, Lee's clients were invoiced by and paid management fees to various shell companies controlled by Lee, namely ELX, Advanced Century, Ultra and/or SOT (the "Corporate Relief Defendants").
- 73. Lee, or others at his direction, sent invoices to clients through email and mail. Many client invoices were prepared and sent by an administrative assistant who worked with Lee out of SOT's San Diego office.
- 74. Lee's clients paid the invoices by mailing checks or making wire transfers to the Corporate Relief Defendants.
- 75. During the relevant period, the Corporate Relief Defendants were almost exclusively funded by Lee's clients.
- 76. SOT received over \$990,000 from various Lee clients, plus additional funds from ELX.
 - 77. ELX received over \$900,000 from various Lee clients, plus additional

8

20

23

26

25

funds from Advanced Century and SOT.

- Advanced Century received over \$660,000 from various Lee clients, 78. plus additional funds from ELX.
 - Ultra received over \$130,000 of Lee client funds. 79.
- The Corporate Relief Defendants, in turn, funneled a portion of the 80. client fees to Lee, his family, friends and/or close associates, as well as businesses they controlled.
- Among other individuals and entities, the Corporate Relief 81. Defendants disbursed the monies received from Lee's clients to Ettore, Clayton Lee and/or Gatchalian (the "Individual Relief Defendants").
- Ettore received over \$390,000 from ELX and SOT, in payments made 82. directly to Ettore or for her benefit.
- Clayton Lee received over \$40,000 in payments from SOT and 83. Advanced Century.
 - Gatchalian received over \$69,000 in payments from Ultra. 84.
- The Individual Relief Defendants, and the Corporate Relief 85. Defendants they formed, collaborated with Lee by serving as intermediaries for payments related to his investment advisory business.
- The Corporate Relief Defendants were formed at the request and 86. direction of Lee, and Lee conducted the corporations' businesses.
- The management fees paid by Lee's clients to the Corporate Relief 87. Defendants, and the above-described amounts received by the Individual Relief Defendants, constitute proceeds of Lee's fraud.
- When Lee appeared before Commission staff for investigative 88. testimony, he invoked his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination and refused to answer any questions about his background, his representations to investors, his trading strategy and the other conduct described above.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5

- 89. The Commission repeats and incorporates by reference the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 88 above.
- 90. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendant Lee, directly or indirectly, acting knowingly or recklessly, in connection with the purchase or sale of securities, by the use of means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or of the mails, or a facility of a national securities exchange: (a) employed devices, schemes or artifices to defraud; (b) made untrue statements of material fact or omitted to state a material fact necessary to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; and (c) engaged in acts, practices or courses of business which operated as a fraud or deceit upon certain persons.
- 91. As a result, Defendant violated, and unless enjoined will likely continue to violate, Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)] and Rule 10b-5 [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5] thereunder.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violations of Section 17(a)(1) and (2) of the Securities Act

- 92. The Commission repeats and incorporates by reference the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 88 above.
- 93. Defendant, by engaging in the conduct described above, directly or indirectly, in the offer or sale of securities by use of the means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails: (a) with scienter, employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud; and (b) obtained money or property by means of untrue statements of material fact or omissions to state a material fact necessary to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.
 - 94. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendant violated, and

unless enjoined will likely continue to violate, Section 17(a)(1) and (2) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)(1), (2)].

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Violations of Section 206(1) and 206(2) of the Advisers Act)

- 95. The Commission repeats and incorporates by reference the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 88 above.
- 96. Defendant Lee was an "investment adviser" within the meaning of Section 202(a)(11) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-2(a)(11)].
- 97. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendant, directly or indirectly, while acting as an investment adviser, by use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce: (a) with scienter, employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud clients or prospective clients; and (b) engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon clients or prospective clients.
- 98. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendant has violated, and unless enjoined will likely continue to violate, Section 206(1) and (2) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-6(1), (2)].

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Unjust Enrichment of Relief Defendants)

- 99. The Commission repeats and incorporates by reference the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 88 above.
- 100. Section 21(d)(5) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(5)] states: "In any action or proceeding brought or instituted by the Commission under any provision of the securities laws, the Commission may seek, and any Federal court may grant, any equitable relief that may be appropriate or necessary for the benefit of investors."
- 101. As described above, Relief Defendants ELX, Advanced Century, Ultra, SOT, Ettore, Clayton Lee and Gatchalian received investor funds under

circumstances dictating that, in equity and good conscience, they should not be allowed to retain such funds.

- 102. As a result, each Relief Defendant is liable for unjust enrichment and should be required to return his, her or its ill-gotten gains, in an amount to be determined by the Court.
- 103. Defendant Lee should be held jointly and severally liable for the total amounts received by each of the respective Corporate Relief Defendants as a result of the conduct described above.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court:

- A. Enter a permanent injunction restraining Defendant and each of his agents, servants, employees and attorneys and those persons in active concert or participation with him who receive actual notice of the injunction by personal service or otherwise, including facsimile transmission or overnight delivery service, from directly or indirectly engaging in the conduct described above, or in conduct of similar purport and effect, in violation of:
 - Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)] and Rule 10b-5 thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5];
 - 2. Section 17(a)(1) and (2) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)(1), (2)]; and
 - 3. Section 206(1) and 206(2) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80(b)-6(1), (2)].
- B. Require Defendant to disgorge his ill-gotten gains and losses avoided, plus prejudgment interest;
- C. Order Defendant to pay an appropriate civil monetary penalty pursuant to Section 20(d) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(d)], Section 21(d)(3) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(3)], and Section 209(e) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-9(e)];

- Require the Relief Defendants to disgorge all unjust enrichment D. and/or ill-gotten gain received directly or indirectly from Defendant, plus prejudgment interest, holding Defendant jointly and severally liable with the respective Corporate Relief Defendants;
- Retain jurisdiction over this action to implement and carry out the E. terms of all orders and decrees that may be entered or to entertain any suitable application or motion for additional relief, within the jurisdiction of this Court; and
- Award such other and further relief as the Court deems just and F. proper.

Dated: February 13, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

Securities and Exchange Commission,

By its attorneys,

Michael D. Foster (IL Bar No. 6257063) Email: fostermi@sec.gov

John Birkenheier (IL Bar No. 6270993)

Email: birkenheierj@sec.gov Jennifer Peltz (IL Bar No. 6280848)

Email: peltzj@sec.gov Securities and Exchange Commission 175 West Jackson Boulevard, Suite 900

Chicago, Illinois 60604 Telephone: (312) 353-7390 Facsimile: (312) 353-7398

/s/ Karen Matteson

Karen Matteson (Cal. Bar No. 102103)

mattesonk@sec.gov

Securities and Exchange Commission 5670 Wilshire Boulevard, 11th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90036 Telephone: (323) 965-3840 Facsimile: (323) 965-3908

Local Counsel

Exhibit B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION.

Case No. 14-CV-0347-LAB-BGS

Plaintiff,

CONSENT OF DEFENDANT JAMES Y. LEE

vs.

JAMES Y. LEE

Defendant,

and LARISSA O. ETTORE, ELX INTERNATIONAL, INC., CLAYTON K. LEE, ADVANCED CENTURY CORP., LOLITA GATCHALIAN, ULTRA INTERNATIONAL, INC., and SOT GROUP, INC.,

Relief Defendants.

1. Defendant James Y. Lee ("Defendant" or "Lee") waives service of a summons and the complaint in this action, enters a general appearance, and admits the Court's jurisdiction over Defendant and over the subject matter of this action.

2. Defendant has pleaded guilty to criminal conduct relating to certain matters alleged in the complaint in this action. Specifically, in *United States v. James Yiu Lee*, Case No. 14-cr-2937-BEN (S.D. Cal.), Defendant pleaded guilty to obstruction of justice in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1503. In connection with that plea, Defendant admitted that: (a) he "solicited clients to conduct on-line trading on their behalf in exchange for a share of profits"; (b) he "induced potential clients to hire [Defendant] by fraudulently making false representations and promises, and omitting material information"; (c) he "sent falsified invoices to clients"; (d) he "solicited clients through fraudulent means"; and (e) his "fraudulent conduct caused losses of over \$10 million" for 14 investor victims, all of whom are among Lee's alleged victims in this matter. This Consent shall remain in full force and

4 5

 effect regardless of the existence or outcome of any further proceedings in *United States v. James Yiu Lee*.

- 3. For the purposes of this action, Defendant stipulates that he is liable for the First, Second, and Third Claims for Relief in the complaint in this action. Defendant further stipulates that, as alleged in the complaint in this action, he violated Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") [15 U.S.C. §78j(b)], and Rule 10b-5 thereunder [17 C.F.R. §240.10b-5]; Sections 17(a)(1) and (a)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act") [15 U.S.C. §877q(a)(1) and (a)(2)]; and Sections 206(1) and 206(2) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 ("Advisers Act") [15 U.S.C. § 80b-6(1) and (2)].
- 4. Defendant hereby consents to the entry of the final Judgment in the form attached hereto (the "Final Judgment") and incorporated by reference herein, which, among other things, finds Defendant liable for violating, and permanently restrains and enjoins Defendant from violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §78j(b)], and Rule 10b-5 thereunder [17 C.F.R. §240.10b-5]; Sections 17(a)(1) and (a)(2) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§77q(a)(1) and (a)(2)]; and Sections 206(1) and 206(2) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 80b-6(1) and (2)].
- 5. The Final Judgment further orders Defendant to pay disgorgement in the amount of \$1,880,263.00, plus prejudgment interest thereon in the amount of \$322,762.95, but further orders that Defendant's obligation to pay disgorgement in this matter will be satisfied by payments made to satisfy the restitution order in *United States v. James Yiu Lee*. Based on the 78 month prison sentence and restitution order imposed upon him, the Commission has determined to withdraw its claims for civil monetary penalties against Defendant.
- 6. Defendant waives the entry of findings of fact and conclusions of law pursuant to Rule 52 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
 - 7. Defendant waives the right, if any, to a jury trial and to appeal from

the entry of the Final Judgment.

- 8. Defendant enters into this Consent voluntarily and represents that no threats, offers, promises, or inducements of any kind have been made by the Commission or any member, officer, employee, agent, or representative of the Commission to induce Defendant to enter into this Consent.
- 9. Defendant agrees that this Consent shall be incorporated into the Final Judgment with the same force and effect as if fully set forth therein.
- 10. Defendant will not oppose the enforcement of the Final Judgment on the ground, if any exists, that it fails to comply with Rule 65(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and hereby waives any objection based thereon.
- 11. Defendant waives service of the Final Judgment and agrees that entry of the Final Judgment by the Court and filing with the Clerk of the Court will constitute notice to Defendant of its terms and conditions. Defendant further agrees to provide counsel for the Commission, within thirty days after the Final Judgment is filed with the Clerk of the Court, with an affidavit or declaration stating that Defendant has received and read a copy of the Final Judgment.
- 12. Consistent with 17 C.F.R. 202.5(f), this Consent resolves only the claims asserted against Defendant in this civil proceeding. Defendant acknowledges that no promise or representation has been made by the Commission or any member, officer, employee, agent, or representative of the Commission with regard to any criminal liability that may have arisen or may arise from the facts underlying this action or immunity from any such criminal liability. Defendant waives any claim of Double Jeopardy based upon the settlement of this proceeding, including the imposition of any remedy or civil penalty herein. Defendant further acknowledges that the Court's entry of a permanent injunction may have collateral consequences under federal or state law and the rules and regulations of self-regulatory organizations, licensing boards, and other regulatory organizations. Such collateral consequences include, but are not limited to, a statutory

7

9

8

11

10

1213

14 15

16

17 18

19

2021

2223

24

26

25

2728

disqualification with respect to membership or participation in, or association with a member of, a self-regulatory organization. This statutory disqualification has consequences that are separate from any sanction imposed in an administrative proceeding. In addition, in any disciplinary proceeding before the Commission based on the entry of the injunction in this action, Defendant understands that he shall not be permitted to contest the factual allegations of the complaint in this action.

13. Defendant understands and agrees to comply with the terms of 17 C.F.R. § 202.5(e), which provides in part that it is the Commission's policy "not to permit a defendant or respondent to consent to a judgment or order that imposes a sanction while denying the allegations in the complaint or order for proceedings." As part of Defendant's agreement to comply with the terms of Section 202.5(e), Defendant acknowledges the guilty plea for related conduct described in paragraph 2 above, and: (i) will not take any action or make or permit to be made any public statement denying, directly or indirectly, any allegation in the complaint or creating the impression that the complaint is without factual basis; (ii) will not make or permit to be made any public statement to the effect that Defendant does not admit the allegations of the complaint, or that this Consent contains no admission of the allegations; (iii) upon the filing of this Consent, Defendant hereby withdraws any papers filed in this action to the extent that they deny any allegation in the complaint; and (iv) stipulates for purposes of exceptions to discharge set forth in Section 523 of the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. §523, that the allegations in the complaint are true, and further, that any debt for disgorgement, prejudgment interest, civil penalty or other amounts due by Defendant under the Final Judgment or any other judgment, order, consent order, decree or settlement agreement entered in connection with this proceeding, is a debt for the violation by Defendant of the federal securities laws or any regulation or order issued under such laws, as set forth in Section 523(a)(19) of the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. §523(a)(19). If

- Defendant breaches this agreement, the Commission may petition the Court to vacate the Final Judgment and restore this action to its active docket. Nothing in this paragraph affects Defendant's: (i) testimonial obligations; or (ii) right to take legal or factual positions in litigation or other legal proceedings in which the Commission is not a party.
- 14. Defendant hereby waives any rights under the Equal Access to Justice Act, the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, or any other provision of law to seek from the United States, or any agency, or any official of the United States acting in his or her official capacity, directly or indirectly, reimbursement of attorney's fees or other fees, expenses, or costs expended by Defendant to defend against this action. For these purposes, Defendant agrees that Defendant is not the prevailing party in this action since the parties have reached a good faith settlement.
- 15. Defendant agrees that the Commission may present the Final Judgment to the Court for signature and entry without further notice.
- 16. Defendant agrees that this Court and the Magistrate Judge in this matter shall retain jurisdiction over this matter for the purpose of enforcing the terms of the Final Judgment. Defendant agrees that the Magistrate Judge shall retain jurisdiction over all disputes between and among the parties arising out of the settlement agreement, including but not limited to interpretation and enforcement of the terms of the settlement agreement.

| Dated: | MAS | 17 | ,2016 |
|--------|-----|----|-------|
| - | 7 | | 7 |

James X. Lee

On 5/7/20/6, 2016, James Y. Lee, a person known to me, personally appeared before me and acknowledged executing the foregoing Consent. 9/13/2016 Notary Public Commission expires: Approved as to form: John/D. Kirby, Esq. Offices of John D. Kirby 1010 2nd Ave., Suite 2400 San Diego, CA 92101 619-880-4377 Attorney for Defendant

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

| validity of that document. |
|---|
| State of California |
| County of Kern |
| on 517 2016 before me, SUSANA Landa, Notam Public (insert name and title of the efficer) |
| personally appeared Oames Y. Lee |
| who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument. |
| I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct. |
| WITNESS my hand and official seal SUSANA LANDA COMM. #1988172 NOTARY PUBLIC • CALIFORNIA KERN COUNTY My Comm. Exp. Sep. 13, 2016 Signature (Seal) |
| |



Exhibit C

,

14 ||

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

VS.

JAMES Y. LEE

Defendant,

and LARISSA O. ETTORE, ELX INTERNATIONAL, INC., CLAYTON K. LEE, ADVANCED CENTURY CORP., LOLITA GATCHALIAN, ULTRA INTERNATIONAL, INC., and SOT GROUP, INC.,

Relief Defendants.

Case No. 14-CV-0347-LAB-BGS

FINAL JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT JAMES Y. LEE

The Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") having filed a Complaint and Defendant James Y. Lee ("Defendant") having entered a general appearance; consented to the Court's jurisdiction over Defendant and the subject matter of this action; consented to entry of this Final Judgment; waived findings of fact and conclusions of law; and waived any right to appeal from this Final Judgment:

I.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Defendant is liable for violating, as alleged in the complaint in this matter, and is permanently restrained and enjoined from violating, directly or indirectly, Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act") [15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)] and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5], by using any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce, or of the mails, or of any facility of any national securities exchange, in connection with the purchase or sale of any security:

- (a) to employ any device, scheme, or artifice to defraud;
- (b) to make any untrue statement of a material fact or to omit to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; or
- (c) to engage in any act, practice, or course of business which operates or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon any person.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that, as provided in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(d)(2), the foregoing paragraph also binds the following who receive actual notice of this Final Judgment by personal service or otherwise: (a) Defendant's officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys; and (b) other persons in active concert or participation with Defendant or with anyone described in (a).

II.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Defendant is liable for violating, as alleged in the complaint in this matter, and is permanently restrained and enjoined from violating, Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (the "Securities Act") [15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)] in the offer or sale of any security by the use of any means or instruments of transportation or

communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails, directly or indirectly:

- (a) to employ any device, scheme, or artifice to defraud; or
- (b) to obtain money or property by means of any untrue statement of a material fact or any omission of a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that, as provided in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(d)(2), the foregoing paragraph also binds the following who receive actual notice of this Final Judgment by personal service or otherwise: (a) Defendant's officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys; and (b) other persons in active concert or participation with Defendant or with anyone described in (a).

III.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Defendant is liable for violating, as alleged in the complaint in this matter, and is permanently restrained and enjoined from violating, Section 206(1) and 206(2) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (the "Advisers Act") [15 U.S.C. §§ 80b-6(1) and 80b-6(2)], by making use of the mails or any means of instrumentality of interstate commerce, in connection with the conduct of business as an investment adviser:

- (a) to employ devices, schemes and artifice to defraud investment advisory clients and prospective clients; or
- (b) to engage in any transaction, practice or course of business which operates or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon such clients and prospective clients.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that, as provided in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(d)(2), the foregoing paragraph also binds the following who receive actual notice of this Final Judgment by personal service or otherwise: (a) Defendant's officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys; and (b) other persons in active concert or participation with Defendant or with anyone described in (a).

IV.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Defendant is liable for disgorgement of \$1,880,263, representing profits gained as a result of the conduct alleged in the complaint in this matter, plus prejudgment interest thereon in the amount of \$322,762.95. However, Defendant shall be credited dollar-for-dollar for any payments made to satisfy the restitution order imposed on Defendant in the companion criminal matter, *United States v. James Yiu Lee*, Case No. 14-cr-2937-BEN (S.D. Cal.). Based on the prison sentence imposed in *United States v. Lee*, the Commission has determined to withdraw its claims for civil monetary penalties against Defendant. This Final Judgment, and any payments made hereto, do not affect the disgorgement obligations, if any, of any other parties to this matter.

V.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the Consent of Defendant James Y. Lee is incorporated herein with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein, and that Defendant shall comply with all of the undertakings and agreements set forth therein.

IV.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that, for purposes of exceptions to discharge set forth in Section 523 of the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. §523, the allegations in the complaint are true and admitted by

Defendant, and further, any debt for disgorgement, prejudgment interest, civil penalty or other amounts due by Defendant under this Final Judgment or any other judgment, order, consent order, decree or settlement agreement entered in connection with this proceeding, is a debt for the violation by Defendant the federal securities laws or any regulation or order issued under such laws, as set forth in Section 523(a)(19) of the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. §523(a)(19).

VII.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that this Court and the Magistrate Judge in this matter shall retain jurisdiction of this matter for the purposes of enforcing the terms of this Final Judgment. The Magistrate Judge shall retain jurisdiction over all disputes between and among the parties arising out of the settlement agreement, including but not limited to interpretation and enforcement of the terms of the settlement agreement.

VIII.

There being no just reason for delay, pursuant to Rule 54(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Clerk is ordered to enter this Final Judgment forthwith and without further notice.

Dated: July 15, 2016

Hon. Larry A. Burns

United States District Judge

Camy A. Burn

Exhibit D

| 1 2 3 4 5 | LAURA E DUFFY United States Attorney CHRISTOPHER P. TENORIO Assistant U.S. Attorney California Bar No. 166022 880 Front Street, Room 6293 San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: (619) 546-8413 Fax: (619) 546-0450 |
|----------------------------|---|
| 6 | Email: Christopher.Tenorio@usdoj.gov Attorneys for the United States |
| 7 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 9 | SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 10 | |
| 11 | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, CASE NO. 14 CR 2937 BEN |
| 12 | V. PLEA AGREEMENT |
| 13 | JAMES YIU LEE, |
| 14 | Defendant. |
| 15 | <u> </u> |
| 16 | IT IS HEREBY AGREED between the plaintiff, UNITED STATES OF |
| 17 | AMERICA, through its counsel, Laura E. Duffy, United States Attorney, and |
| 18 | Christopher P. Tenorio, Assistant United States Attorney, and Defendant, James Yiu |
| 19 | Lee, with the advice and consent of John Kirby, counsel for Defendant, as follows: |
| 20 | // |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 25 | // // |
| 24 25 26 27 28 | |
| 27 | // |
| 28 | // |
| | |

3

5 6

7

4

9 10

11 12

13 14

1516

17 18

19

2021

2223

2425

2627

28 |

I

THE PLEA

Defendant agrees to plead guilty to an Information charging one count of obstruction of justice in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1503. In addition, the defendant agrees that the provisions of any attached forfeiture addendum shall govern forfeiture in this case.

The Government agrees to not prosecute the defendant thereafter for conduct outlined in the "Factual Basis" Section of this plea agreement, unless the defendant breaches the plea agreement, or the guilty plea entered pursuant to this plea agreement is set aside for any reason. Defendant expressly waives all constitutional and statutory defenses to the reinstatement of any charges dismissed pursuant to this agreement.

H

NATURE OF THE OFFENSE

A. <u>ELEMENTS EXPLAINED</u>

Defendant understands that the Information charges obstruction of justice, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1503, which has the following elements:

- 1. The defendant influenced, obstructed, or impeded, or endeavored to influence, obstruct, or impede the due administration of justice; and,
- 2. the defendant acted corruptly with the intent to obstruct justice.

B. <u>ELEMENTS UNDERSTOOD AND ADMITTED - FACTUAL BASIS</u>

Defendant has fully discussed the facts of this case with defense counsel. Defendant has committed each of the elements of each of the charged offense, and admits that there is a factual basis for his guilty plea to the charged count. The following facts occurred within the Southern District of California and elsewhere, and are true and undisputed:

Case No.

Def. Initials

- 1. On December 29, 1997, the defendant was convicted of wire fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1343) and pension embezzlement (18 U.S.C. § 664) in United States v. James Yiu Lee, et al., Crim. Case No. 95CR0041-MMC-1 (N.D. CA 1995) ("1997 Conviction").
- 2. On November 10, 1998, the defendant was sentenced to 30 months of custody (both counts running concurrently), 3 years of supervised release, and ordered to pay \$2,880,000 in restitution for the 1997 Conviction. To date, the defendant continues to owe approximately \$2,853,235.
- 3. From approximately April 2007 to July 2013, the defendant acted corruptly and with the intent to obstruct justice by engaging in fraudulent and deceptive conduct designed to hinder and minimize the efforts of the United States to collect on the criminal judgment and restitution order imposed in the 1997 Conviction, by obtaining money from clients in such a way as to conceal such income from the United States. Among other means, the defendant:
 - solicited clients to conduct on-line trading on their behalf in exchange for a share of profits;
 - b) induced potential clients to hire the defendant by fraudulently making false representations and promises, and omitting material information;
 - c) instructed clients to send his management fees to bank accounts he opened in the name of shell corporations;
 - d) used credit cards in the names of relatives to pay for expenses, and paid the corresponding bills from his shell-corporation accounts; and,

- e) sent falsified invoices to clients to ensure that he would continue to fraudulently receive income without the knowledge of the United States.
- 4. The defendant's specific conduct designed to hinder and minimize the efforts of the United States to collect on the criminal judgment and restitution order imposed in the 1997 Conviction included the following:
 - a) On approximately April 12, 2007, the defendant caused the incorporation of ELX Int., Inc. ("ELX") a shell corporation he controlled and ostensibly based in San Diego but omitted any mention of his name as a corporate officer, signatory on the corporation's bank account, or in any other fashion in control of the corporation.
 - b) Between August 2009 and August 2011, the defendant sent invoices to clients on ELX letterhead, directing clients to send payments to the ELX bank account for the defendant's management of the clients' on-line trading accounts.
 - c) The defendant solicited clients through fraudulent means. For example, in approximately September 2009, the defendant misrepresented to Dr. David Calvo that the defendant was a CPA; misrepresented that he had Ph.D., J.D., and M.B.A. degrees; and failed to disclose the 1997 Conviction.
 - d) In approximately September 2009, the defendant told Dr. Calvo that the defendant would share 50% of both realized gains and losses incurred from on-line trading activity on accounts opened in Dr. Calvo's name. In approximately January 2011, the defendant's trading activity created realized

Case No.

losses to Dr. Calvo's accounts, but the defendant restructured billing invoices to spread losses over five months in order to avoid having to immediately pay 50% of realized losses and to permit continued billing and the receipt of income.

- e) Between August 2009 and March 2012, the defendant caused over \$350,000 to be wire transferred from the ELX bank account to other shell accounts under his control, which he would use for personal expenses.
- f) Between August 2009 and July 2013, the defendant caused the production of checks totaling over \$150,000 from the ELX bank account to pay bills for credit cards issued in the name of others, but used by the defendant for personal expenses.
- g) Using these and other fraudulent and deceptive practices, the defendant concealed his control and ownership of income in order to avoid its collection by the United States pursuant to the outstanding judgment and restitution order for the 1997 Conviction. Additionally, the defendant's fraudulent conduct caused losses of over \$10 million for the following additional victims:

| Victim-Investor(s) | Approximate Loss |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| Geraldine & Donald Lacto | \$515,403.34 |
| Dr. David & Dianne Calvo | \$1.8 million |
| Valerie Lee & Pamela Bridgen | \$1 million |
| Dr. Hal & Nancy Blatman | \$60,000 |
| Dr. Lacy & Helen Koonce | \$285,000 |
| Richard L. Brackett, Trustee | \$280,000 |



| Roberto Contreras | \$2 million |
|---------------------|---------------|
| Sunita Jain | \$429,000 |
| Michael Heylum | \$180,000 |
| Lynn Sahin | \$1 million |
| Kathryn Ayers | \$50,000 |
| Joon Lee | \$1.7 million |
| Dr. Labor Jarolimek | \$860,000 |
| Mark Viola | \$476,000 |

III PENALTIES

Defendant understands that the crime to which defendant is pleading guilty carries the following penalties:

- A. a maximum ten years in prison;
- B. a maximum \$250,000 fine; or twice the gross gain or loss caused by the offense;
- C. a mandatory special assessment of \$100 per count;
- D. a term of supervised release of not more than three years. Defendant understands that failure to comply with any of the conditions of supervised release may result in revocation of supervised release, requiring defendant to serve in prison all or part of the term of supervised release;
- E. an order from the Court pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3663A that defendant make mandatory restitution to the victims of the offense of conviction, or the estates of the victims. Defendant also understands that, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3663(a)(1)(A), the Court shall also order, if agreed to by the parties in this plea agreement, restitution to persons other than the victims of the offense of conviction; and,

Case No.

F. forfeiture of any property, real or personal, which constitutes or is derived from proceeds traceable to the offense (18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c)).

Defendant further understands that by pleading guilty Defendant may be become ineligible for federal benefits.

IV

DEFENDANT'S WAIVER OF TRIAL RIGHTS

Defendant understands that this guilty plea waives the right to:

- A. Continue to plead not guilty and require the Government to prove the elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt;
- B. A speedy and public trial by jury;
- C. The assistance of counsel at all stages of trial;
- D. Confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses;
- E. Present evidence and to have witnesses testify on behalf of Defendant;
- F. Not testify or have any adverse inferences drawn from the failure to testify; and,
- G. Defendant knowingly and voluntarily waives any rights and defenses defendant may have under the Excessive Fines Clause of the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution to the forfeiture of property in this proceeding or any related civil proceeding.

V

DEFENDANT ACKNOWLEDGES NO PRETRIAL RIGHT TO BE PROVIDED WITH IMPEACHMENT AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE INFORMATION

The Government represents that any information establishing the factual innocence of Defendant known to the undersigned prosecutor in this case has been turned over to defendant. The Government will continue to provide such information establishing the factual innocence of Defendant.

Case No.



Defendant understands that if this case proceeded to trial, the Government would be required to provide impeachment information relating to any informants or other witnesses. In addition, if Defendant raised an affirmative defense, the Government would be required to provide information in its possession that supports such a defense. Defendant acknowledges, however, that by pleading guilty Defendant will not be provided this information, if any, and Defendant also waives the right to this information. Finally, Defendant agrees not to attempt to withdraw the guilty plea or to file a collateral attack based on the existence of this information.

VI

DEFENDANT'S REPRESENTATION THAT GUILTY PLEA IS KNOWING AND VOLUNTARY

Defendant represents that:

- A. Defendant has had a full opportunity to discuss all the facts and circumstances of this case with defense counsel and has a clear understanding of the charges and the consequences of this plea. Defendant understands that, by pleading guilty, Defendant may be giving up and rendered ineligible to receive valuable government benefits and civic rights, such as the right to vote, the right to possess a firearm, the right to hold office, and the right to serve on a jury. Defendant further understands that the conviction in this case may subject Defendant to various collateral consequences, including but not limited to deportation, removal or other adverse immigration consequences; revocation of probation, parole, or supervised release in another case; and suspension or revocation of a professional license, none of which will serve as grounds to withdraw Defendant's guilty plea;
- B. No one has made any promises or offered any rewards in return for this guilty plea, other than those contained in this agreement or otherwise disclosed to the Court;

Case No. ___

- C. No one has threatened Defendant or Defendant's family to induce this guilty plea; and,
- D. Defendant is pleading guilty because in truth and in fact Defendant is guilty and for no other reason.

VII

AGREEMENT LIMITED TO U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

This plea agreement is limited to the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of California, and cannot bind any other federal, state or local prosecuting, administrative, or regulatory authorities, although the Government will bring this plea agreement to the attention of other authorities if requested by Defendant.

VIII

APPLICABILITY OF SENTENCING GUIDELINES

Defendant understands the sentence imposed will be based on the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a). Defendant understands further that in imposing the sentence, the sentencing judge must consult the United States Sentencing Guidelines ("Guidelines") and take them into account. Defendant has discussed the Guidelines with defense counsel and understands that the Guidelines are only advisory, not mandatory, and the Court may impose a sentence more severe or less severe than otherwise applicable under the Guidelines, up to the maximum in the statute of conviction. Defendant understands further that the sentence cannot be determined until a presentence report has been prepared by the U.S. Probation Office and defense counsel and the Government have had an opportunity to review and challenge the presentence report. Nothing in this plea agreement shall be construed as limiting the Government's duty to provide complete and accurate facts to the district court and the U.S. Probation Office.

Case No.



IX

SENTENCE IS WITHIN SOLE DISCRETION OF JUDGE

This plea agreement is made pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11(c)(1)(B). Defendant understands that the sentence is within the sole discretion of the sentencing judge. The Government has not made and will not make any representation as to what sentence Defendant will receive. Defendant understands that the sentencing judge may impose the maximum sentence provided by statute, and is also aware that any estimate of the probable sentence by defense counsel is a prediction, not a promise, and is not binding on the Court. Likewise, the recommendation made by the Government is not binding on the Court, and it is uncertain at this time what Defendant's sentence will be. Defendant also has been advised and understands that if the sentencing judge does not follow any of the parties' sentencing recommendations, Defendant nevertheless has no right to withdraw the plea.

X

PARTIES' SENTENCING RECOMMENDATIONS

A. <u>SENTENCING GUIDELINE CALCULATIONS</u>

Although the parties understand that the Guidelines are only advisory and just one of the factors the Court will consider under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) in imposing a sentence, the Government will recommend the following Base Offense Level, Specific Offense Characteristics, Adjustments, and Departures:

Fraud:*

| (1) | Base Offense Level [§ 2B1.1(a)(2)]: | 6 |
|-----|--|-----------|
| (2) | Loss (\$7 - \$20 million) [§ 2B1.1(b)(1)(K)] | +20 |
| (3) | More than 10 victims [§ 2B1.1(b)(2)(A)] | +2 |
| (4) | Sophisticated Means [§ 2B1.1(b)(10)(C)] | +2 |
| (5) | Acceptance of Responsibility [§ 3E1.1] | <u>-3</u> |
| | Adjusted Offense Level | 27 |

Case No.



27 || , 28 || ,

*Pursuant to §1B1.2(c), the parties agree that the "Factual Basis section of this plea agreement establishes the commission of an additional offense, that is, conspiracy to commit wire fraud (and obstruction of justice). Accordingly, the parties agree that the Guidelines should be calculated as if the defendant had been convicted of this additional count.

B. ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY

Notwithstanding paragraph A.5 above, the Government will not be obligated to recommend any adjustment for Acceptance of Responsibility if Defendant engages in conduct inconsistent with acceptance of responsibility including, but not limited to a knowing and willful doing of the following:

- 1. Fails to truthfully admit a complete factual basis as stated in the plea at the time the plea is entered, or falsely denies, or makes a statement inconsistent with, the factual basis set forth in this agreement;
- 2. Falsely denies prior criminal conduct or convictions;
- 3. Is untruthful with the Government, the Court or probation officer;
- 4. Materially breaches this plea agreement in any way; or,
- 5. Contests or assists any third party in contesting the forfeiture of property to which the defendant has agreed to forfeit as set forth in any attached forfeiture addendum.

C. ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENTS AND SENTENCE REDUCTIONS INCLUDING THOSE UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 3553

The parties agree that Defendant may request or recommend additional downward adjustments, departures, including Criminal History departures under USSG § 4A1.3, or sentence reductions under 18 U.S.C. § 3553. The Government may oppose any such downward adjustments, departures and sentence reductions not set forth in Section X, Paragraph A above.

Case No.

D. NO AGREEMENT AS TO CRIMINAL HISTORY CATEGORY

The parties have no agreement as to Defendant's Criminal History Category.

E. "FACTUAL BASIS" AND "RELEVANT CONDUCT" INFORMATION

The parties agree that the facts in the "factual basis" paragraph of this agreement are true, and may be considered as "relevant conduct" under USSG § 1B1.3 and as the nature and circumstances of the offense under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(1).

F. PARTIES' RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING CUSTODY

The parties agree that the Government will recommend that Defendant be sentenced to the low end of the advisory guideline range as calculated by the Government pursuant to this agreement.

G. SPECIAL ASSESSMENT

The parties will jointly recommend that Defendant pay a special assessment in the amount of \$100 forthwith at time of sentencing. Defendant shall pay the special assessment through the office of the Clerk of the District Court by bank or cashier's check or money order made payable to the "Clerk, United States District Court."

H. RESTITUTION

Defendant agrees to pay restitution to the victims of the conduct described in the Factual Basis of the Plea Agreement, including the victims specifically identified. Defendant agrees that the amount of restitution ordered by the Court shall include the defendant's total offense conduct, and is not limited to the count of conviction. Defendant understands that the Government estimates restitution to be between \$7 million and \$20 million, and the Court shall order restitution payable forthwith. Defendant agrees and understands that any payment schedule imposed by the Court is without prejudice to the United States to take all actions and take all remedies available to it to collect the full amount of the restitution.

Defendant agrees that the restitution, restitution judgment, payment provisions, and collection actions of this plea agreement are intended to, and will, survive defendant,

Case No.

notwithstanding the abatement of any underlying criminal conviction after the execution of this agreement. Defendant further agrees that any restitution collected and/or distributed will survive him, notwithstanding the abatement of any underlying criminal conviction after execution of this agreement.

The restitution described above shall be paid through the Office of the Clerk of the District Court by bank or cashier's check or money order made payable to the "Clerk, United States District Court."

Further, the restitution described above shall be paid to or on behalf of the victims who will be identified prior to sentencing.

Defendant agrees that, before sentencing, Defendant shall provide to the United States, under penalty of perjury, a financial disclosure form listing all Defendant's assets and financial interests valued at more than \$1,000. Defendant understands that these assets and financial interests include all assets and financial interests in which defendant has an interest (or had an interest prior to September 4, 2012), direct or indirect, whether held in Defendant's own name or in the name of another, in any property, real or personal. Defendant shall also identify all assets valued at more than \$5,000 which have been transferred to third parties since April 10, 2008, including the location of the assets and the identity of the third parties.

The parties will jointly recommend that as a condition of probation or supervised release, Defendant will notify the Collections Unit, United States Attorney's Office, of any interest in property obtained, directly or indirectly, including any interest obtained under any other name, or entity, including a trust, partnership or corporation after the execution of this plea agreement until the fine or restitution is paid in full.

The parties will also jointly recommend that as a condition of probation or supervised release, defendant will notify the Collections Unit, United States Attorney's Office, before defendant transfers any interest in property owned directly or indirectly by defendant, including any interest held or owned under any other name or entity, including trusts, partnerships and/or corporations.

3 4 5

2

6 7

9 10

8

12 13

11

14 15

16

17 18 19

20 21 22

23 24

25

26

27 28

I. FINE

The parties have no agreement regarding the imposition of a fine. Any fine ordered shall be paid through the Office of the Clerk of the District Court by bank or cashier's check or money order made payable to the "Clerk, United States District Court."

J. **FORFEITURE**

Defendant agrees that the provisions of the attached forfeiture addendum shall govern forfeiture in this case.

SUPERVISED RELEASE K.

If the Court imposes a term of supervised release, the defendant agrees that he will not later seek to reduce or terminate early the term of supervised release until he has served at least 2/3 of his term of supervised release and paid the full amount of restitution imposed by the Court.

XI

DEFENDANT WAIVES APPEAL AND COLLATERAL ATTACK

In exchange for the Government's concessions in this plea agreement, Defendant waives, to the full extent of the law, any right to appeal or to collaterally attack the conviction and any lawful restitution order, except a post-conviction collateral attack based on a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel. Defendant also waives, to the full extent of the law, any right to appeal or to collaterally attack his sentence, except a postconviction collateral attack based on a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, unless the Court imposes a custodial sentence above the high end of the guideline range recommended by the Government pursuant to this agreement at the time of sentencing. If the custodial sentence is greater than the high end of that range, Defendant may appeal, but the Government will be free to support on appeal the sentence actually imposed. If Defendant believes the Government's recommendation is not in accord with this plea agreement, Defendant will object at the time of sentencing; otherwise the objection will be deemed waived.



16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

If at any time Defendant files a notice of appeal, appeals, or collaterally attacks the conviction or sentence in violation of this plea agreement, said violation shall be a material breach of this agreement as further defined below.

XII

BREACH OF THE PLEA AGREEMENT

Defendant acknowledges, understands and agrees that if Defendant violates or fails to perform any of Defendant's obligations under this agreement, such violation or failure to perform may constitute a material breach of this agreement.

Defendant acknowledges, understands and agrees further that the following nonexhaustive list of conduct by Defendant unquestionably constitutes a material breach of this plea agreement:

- 1. Failing to plead guilty pursuant to this agreement,
- 2. Failing to fully accept responsibility as established in Section X, paragraph B, above,
- 3. Failing to appear in court,
- 4. Attempting to withdraw the plea,
- 5. Failing to abide by any lawful court order related to this case,
- Appealing or collaterally attacking the sentence or conviction in violation 6. of Section XI of this plea agreement, or
- 7. Engaging in additional criminal conduct from the time of arrest until the time of sentencing.

In the event of Defendant's material breach of this plea agreement, Defendant will not be able to enforce any of its provisions, and the Government will be relieved of all its obligations under this plea agreement. For example, the Government may pursue any charges including those that were dismissed, promised to be dismissed, or not filed as a result of this agreement (Defendant agrees that any statute of limitations relating to such charges is tolled as of the date of this agreement; Defendant also waives any double jeopardy defense to such charges). In addition, the Government may move to set aside

345

6 7 8

10 11

12 13

1415

16 17

18

19

2021

2223

24

252627

28

Defendant's guilty plea. Defendant may not withdraw the guilty plea based on the Government's pursuit of remedies for Defendant's breach.

Additionally, Defendant agrees that in the event of Defendant's material breach of this plea agreement: (i) any statements made by Defendant, under oath, at the guilty plea hearing (before either a Magistrate Judge or a District Judge); (ii) the stipulated factual basis statement in this agreement; and (iii) any evidence derived from such statements, are admissible against Defendant in any prosecution of, or action against, Defendant. This includes the prosecution of the charge that is the subject of this plea agreement or any charges that the prosecution agreed to not file as part of this agreement, but later pursues because of a material breach by the Defendant. Additionally, Defendant knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently waives any argument under the United States Constitution, any statute, Rule 410 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 11(f) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, and/or any other federal rule, that the statements or any evidence derived from any statements should be suppressed or are inadmissible.

XIII

ENTIRE AGREEMENT

This plea agreement embodies the entire agreement between the parties and supersedes any other agreement, written or oral.

XIV

MODIFICATION OF AGREEMENT MUST BE IN WRITING

No modification of this plea agreement shall be effective unless in writing signed by all parties.

XV

DEFENDANT AND COUNSEL FULLY UNDERSTAND AGREEMENT

By signing this agreement, Defendant certifies that Defendant has read it (or that it has been read to Defendant in Defendant's native language). Defendant has discussed the terms of this agreement with defense counsel and fully understands its meaning and effect.

16

Case No.



4 5

3

7

6

9 10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

2627

28

XVI

DEFENDANT IS SATISFIED WITH COUNSEL

Defendant has consulted with counsel and is satisfied with counsel's representation, although Defendant's attorney could not, and did not, advise him in that regard.

LAURA E. DUFFY United States Attorney

10/9/14

DATED

Assistant U.S. Attorney

DATED 10/8/14

JOUN KIRBY Defense Counsel

IN ADDITION TO THE FOREGOING PROVISIONS TO WHICH I AGREE, I SWEAR UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FACTS IN THE "FACTUAL BASIS" SECTION ABOVE ARE TRUE.

DATED 10/6/14

JAMES YIU LEE Defendant

17

Case No.

Exhibit E

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
                     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
2
3
      UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4
                                  ) CASE NO. 14CR2937-BEN(BLM)
5
                  PLAINTIFF,
                                  ) SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
6
      VS.
7
      JAMES YIU LEE,
                                       THURSDAY,
                                       OCTOBER 9, 2014
                                       10:24 A.M.
8
                   DEFENDANT.
9
10
           TRANSCRIPT OF ARRAIGNMENT AND CHANGE OF PLEA HEARING
                 BEFORE THE HONORABLE BARBARA LYNN MAJOR
11
                      UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12
13
      APPEARANCES:
      FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
                               CHRISTOPHER TENORIO
14
                                ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEY
                                880 FRONT STREET
15
                                 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101
16
                                JOHN D. KIRBY
17
      FOR THE DEFENDANT:
                                ATTORNEY AT LAW
                                1010 SECOND AVENUE
18
                                SUITE 2400
                                 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101
19
2.0
      TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY: CLAIRE TAYLOR
21
                             CAMERON P. KIRCHER
22
      TRANSCRIBER:
23
      PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING;
24
       TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY TRANSCRIPTION.
25
```

| 1 | SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2014 |
|----|---|
| 2 | 10:24 A.M. |
| 3 | THE CLERK: ITEMS NO. 1, 2 AND 3 ON I'M SORRY, 1, |
| 4 | 2 AND 3 AND THE ADD ON ON CALENDAR. |
| 5 | (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) |
| 6 | THE CLERK: AND THE ADD ON, ITEM A1, 14CR2937-BEN, |
| 7 | JAMES YIU LEE. |
| 8 | MR. TENORIO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. CHRIS |
| 9 | TENORIO FOR THE UNITED STATES FOR THAT MATTER. |
| 10 | THE COURT: GREAT. THANK YOU. |
| 11 | MR. KIRBY: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. JOHN KIRBY ON |
| 12 | BEHALF OF MR. LEE. HE'S PRESENT. |
| 13 | THE COURT: GREAT. THANK YOU. |
| 14 | COME UP TO THE PODIUM. |
| 15 | ALL RIGHT. WHILE WE WAIT FOR THE OTHER TWO, I CAN |
| 16 | HANDLE THE INFORMATION ON MR. LEE. SO INITIALLY, MR. LEE, I |
| 17 | WANT TO REMIND YOU THAT YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO REQUIRE THE |
| 18 | UNITED STATES TO PRESENT THIS CASE TO THE GRAND JURY AND TO |
| 19 | SEE WHETHER OR NOT THE GRAND JURY WOULD RETURN AN INDICTMENT |
| 20 | CHARGING YOU WITH A CRIME. |
| 21 | IF YOU GIVE UP THAT RIGHT AND AUTHORIZE THE UNITED |
| 22 | STATES TO FILE THIS INFORMATION CHARGING YOU WITH OBSTRUCTION |
| 23 | OF JUSTICE, AIDING AND ABETTING AND CRIMINAL FORFEITURE, THE |
| 24 | UNITED STATES MAY PROCEED ALL THE WAY TO TRIAL ON THAT |
| 25 | CRIME THOSE CRIMES WITHOUT EVER PRESENTING THIS CASE TO |

THE GRAND JURY.

2.0

I UNDERSTAND FROM YOUR LAWYER THAT THAT'S WHAT YOU
WANT TO DO, AND I HAVE A ONE-PAGE WAIVER OF INDICTMENT SIGNED
BY YOU AND YOUR LAWYER IN WHICH YOU GIVE UP THAT RIGHT.

SO I'M NOW GOING TO VERIFY WITH YOU, DO YOU WANT TO GIVE UP YOUR RIGHT TO REQUIRE THE UNITED STATES TO PRESENT THIS CASE TO THE GRAND JURY AND AUTHORIZE THEM TO CHARGE YOU WITH THE CRIME OF AIDING AND ABETTING, THE OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND CRIMINAL FORFEITURE.

THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: I ACCEPT THAT, ORDER THAT THE INFORMATION BE FILED.

IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING YOU ALSO INTEND TO PLEAD GUILTY TO THIS CRIME TODAY; IS THAT CORRECT?

THE DEFENDANT: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: THEN I WANT YOU TO LISTEN CAREFULLY TO MY COURTROOM DEPUTY. WE'RE STARTING YOUR -- I'M SORRY.

YOU'RE GOING TO BE ARRAIGNED ON THE INFORMATION, AND WE'RE STARTING YOUR GUILTY PLEA NOW.

THE CLERK: JAMES YIU LEE, IS THAT YOUR TRUE NAME, SIR?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

THE CLERK: YOU ARE HEREBY INFORMED THAT AN INFORMATION HAS BEEN FILED, CHARGING YOU WITH OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, AIDING AND ABETTING AND CRIMINAL FORFEITURE.

| 1 | COUNSEL, HAVE YOU RECEIVED A COPY AND DO YOU WAIVE |
|----|--|
| 2 | FURTHER READING? |
| 3 | MR. KIRBY: I HAVE AND SO WAIVED. |
| 4 | THE CLERK: YOU ARE FURTHER INFORMED THAT YOU ARE |
| 5 | ENTITLED TO A TRIAL BY JURY, TO BE REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL AT |
| 6 | ALL STAGES OF THE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THIS COURT AND TO HAVE |
| 7 | WITNESSES SUMMONED TO TESTIFY ON YOUR OWN BEHALF. |
| 8 | HOW DO YOU PLEAD TO THE CHARGES AGAINST YOU, GUILTY |
| 9 | OR NOT GUILTY? |
| 10 | THE DEFENDANT: GUILTY. |
| 11 | (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) |
| 12 | THE CLERK: SPEAKING TO ALL THREE OF YOU, INCLUDING |
| 13 | MR. LEE, DO YOU SOLEMNLY SWEAR THAT THE EVIDENCE YOU SHALL |
| 14 | GIVE IN THE CAUSE NOW BEFORE THIS COURT SHALL BE THE TRUTH, |
| 15 | THE WHOLE TRUTH AND NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH? |
| 16 | MR. LEE? |
| 17 | THE DEFENDANT: YES. |
| 18 | (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) |
| 19 | THE CLERK: THANK YOU. |
| 20 | THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I'M SPEAKING TO ALL THREE OF |
| 21 | YOU. |
| 22 | EACH OF YOU ARE PLEADING GUILTY TO A DIFFERENT CRIME |
| 23 | CHARGED IN A DIFFERENT CHARGING DOCUMENT. HOWEVER, MUCH OF |
| 24 | WHAT I HAVE TO SAY APPLIES TO ALL OF YOU, AND I THEREFORE AM |
| 25 | TAKING YOUR GUILTY PLEAS AT THE SAME TIME. |

| 1 | I AM GOING TO DO MY VERY BEST TO MAKE IT CLEAR TO |
|----|---|
| 2 | YOU WHAT IS HAPPENING HERE TODAY. IF, HOWEVER, AT ANY POINT |
| 3 | DURING THIS PROCEEDING YOU DO NOT UNDERSTAND WHAT'S GOING ON, |
| 4 | IT'S UP TO YOU TO LET ME KNOW. AND IT'S OKAY TO INTERRUPT ME |
| 5 | TO TELL ME THAT YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT IS GOING ON. IF I |
| 6 | DON'T HEAR FROM YOU TODAY, I AM GOING TO ASSUME THAT YOU |
| 7 | UNDERSTOOD EVERYTHING THAT HAPPENED HERE TODAY. |
| 8 | MR. LEE, STARTING WITH YOU. HOW OLD ARE YOU, SIR? |
| 9 | THE DEFENDANT: 59. |
| LO | THE COURT: HOW FAR DID YOU GO IN SCHOOL? |
| 11 | THE DEFENDANT: BACHELOR DEGREES, UNDERGRAD. |
| 12 | THE COURT: OKAY. WAS ALL OF YOUR EDUCATION HERE IN |
| 13 | THE UNITED STATES? |
| 14 | THE DEFENDANT: YES. |
| 15 | THE COURT: DO YOU READ ENGLISH FLUENTLY? |
| 16 | THE DEFENDANT: YES. |
| 17 | THE COURT: HAVE YOU TAKEN ANY MEDICATION, DRUGS OR |
| 18 | OTHER SUBSTANCE IN THE PAST 72 HOURS? |
| 19 | THE DEFENDANT: NO. |
| 20 | (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) |
| 21 | THE COURT: SPEAKING TO ALL THREE OF YOU THEN. |
| 22 | I WANT TO REMIND EACH OF YOU THAT YOU JUST AGREED TO |
| 23 | TELL THE TRUTH AND YOU WERE PLACED UNDER OATH |
| 24 | THE DEFENDANT: YOUR HONOR, I TOOK SOME TYLENOL |
| 25 | YESTERDAY FOR MY HEADACHE. DOES THAT COUNT? |

| 1 | THE DEFENDANT: YES. |
|-----|---|
| 2 | (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) |
| 3 | THE COURT: SPEAKING TO ALL THREE OF YOU STILL. |
| 4 | EACH OF YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO HAVE A DISTRICT JUDGE |
| 5 | TAKE YOUR GUILTY PLEA. I AM A MAGISTRATE JUDGE. IN ORDER |
| 6 | FOR ME TO TAKE YOUR GUILTY PLEA, YOU MUST GIVE UP YOUR RIGHT |
| 7 | TO APPEAR IN FRONT OF THE DISTRICT JUDGE AND AUTHORIZE ME TO |
| 8 | GO FORWARD. |
| 9 | I HAVE A TWO-PAGE CONSENT DOCUMENT, A SEPARATE ONE |
| 10 | FOR EACH OF YOU, SIGNED BY YOU, YOUR LAWYER AND THE ATTORNEY |
| 11. | FOR THE UNITED STATES IN WHICH YOU GIVE UP THAT RIGHT. IF |
| 12 | THAT'S WHAT YOU DECIDE TO DO, IT MEANS THAT I WILL TAKE YOUR |
| 13 | GUILTY PLEA TODAY AND ANOTHER JUDGE WILL SENTENCE YOU AT A |
| 14 | LATER DATE. |
| 15 | IS THAT WHAT YOU WANT TO DO? |
| 16 | MR. LEE? |
| 17 | THE DEFENDANT: YES. |
| 18 | (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) |
| 19 | THE COURT: I ACCEPT THE CONSENT FROM EACH OF YOU. |
| 20 | I WANT EACH OF YOU NOW TO LISTEN VERY CAREFULLY, |
| 21 | BECAUSE YOU DO HAVE SOME IMPORTANT CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS THAT |
| 22 | YOU ARE GIVING UP BY PLEADING GUILTY. EACH OF YOU HAS THE |
| 23 | FOLLOWING CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS: |

IN A PROSECUTION FOR PERJURY OR FALSE STATEMENT, WITH REGARD TO MR. LEE, THE GOVERNMENT HAS THE RIGHT TO USE

24

AGAINST YOU ANY STATEMENT THAT YOU MADE UNDER OATH.

2.4

FOR ALL OF YOU, EACH OF YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO

PERSIST IN YOUR PLEA OF NOT GUILTY. YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO A

SPEEDY AND PUBLIC TRIAL BEFORE A JURY, OR YOU MAY GIVE UP

THAT RIGHT AND PERMIT A JUDGE TO TRY YOUR CASE WITHOUT A

JURY.

YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO THE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL
THROUGHOUT ALL PROCEEDINGS, INCLUDING A TRIAL. IF YOU CANNOT
AFFORD TO PAY AN ATTORNEY, APPOINTED COUNSEL WILL REPRESENT
YOU THROUGH TRIAL AT NO COST TO YOU. YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO
CONFRONT AND CROSS-EXAMINE THE WITNESSES AGAINST YOU, TO
TESTIFY, TO PRESENT EVIDENCE AND TO COMPEL WITNESSES TO
ATTEND TRIAL ON YOUR BEHALF. AND YOU HAVE THE RIGHT AGAINST
COMPELLED SELF-INCRIMINATION, WHICH MEANS THAT YOU ARE NOT
REQUIRED TO TESTIFY AT ANY HEARING OR TRIAL AND THE
GOVERNMENT MAY NOT COMMENT ON YOUR SILENCE.

EACH OF YOU HAS ALL OF THESE RIGHTS. IF YOU PLEAD GUILTY TODAY, THERE WILL BE NO TRIAL, AND YOU WILL GIVE UP ALL OF THE RIGHTS THAT I HAVE JUST TOLD YOU ABOUT WITH THE EXCEPTION THAT YOUR LAWYER WILL CONTINUE TO REPRESENT YOU THROUGH SENTENCING. IS THAT WHAT YOU WANT TO DO?

MR. LEE?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

(PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.)

THE COURT: STILL SPEAKING TO ALL THREE OF YOU.

EACH OF YOU ARE PLEADING GUILTY TO A FELONY CRIME.

THE UNITED STATES IS REQUIRED TO PROVE EVERY ELEMENT OF THAT

CRIME TO A JURY TO A STANDARD CALLED BEYOND A REASONABLE

DOUBT.

BY PLEADING GUILTY, YOU WILL BE ADMITTING EVERY ELEMENT, SO IT'S IMPORTANT THAT YOU KNOW WHAT THOSE ELEMENTS ARE. YOU'RE PLEADING TO DIFFERENT CRIMES, SO I'M GOING TO SPEAK WITH YOU SEPARATELY.

MR. LEE, YOU ARE PLEADING GUILTY TO THE CRIME OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THAT CRIME HAS THE FOLLOWING TWO ELEMENTS: FIRST, YOU INFLUENCED, OBSTRUCTED, IMPEDED OR ENDEAVORED TO INFLUENCE, OBSTRUCT OR IMPEDE THE DUE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE; AND, SECOND, YOU ACTED CORRUPTLY WITH THE INTENT TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THOSE ARE THE ELEMENTS THAT THE UNITED STATES WOULD HAVE TO PROVE AND THE ELEMENTS THAT YOU WILL BE ADMITTING BY PLEADING GUILTY?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

THE COURT: IN ADDITION, YOU ARE AGREEING TO FORFEIT -- ARE THERE SPECIFIC ITEMS THAT HE'S AGREEING TO FORFEIT?

MR. TENORIO: NO, YOUR HONOR. JUST UP TO A CERTAIN AMOUNT, IF THERE IS PROPERTY THAT IS TRACED.

THE COURT: OKAY. SO YOU ARE AGREEING TO FORFEIT UP
TO TEN MILLION SIX HUNDRED THIRTY FIVE DOLLARS -- NO.

\$10,635,403.34.

2.

2.5

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

THE COURT: OKAY. AGAIN, YOU WOULD HAVE THE RIGHT
TO HAVE THE GOVERNMENT PROVE THAT AMOUNT, BUT AS PART OF THIS
PLEA, YOU ARE GIVING UP ANY RIGHT THAT YOU HAVE TO ANY
PROPERTY UP TO THAT AMOUNT.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

(PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.)

THE COURT: SPEAKING TO ALL THREE OF YOU AGAIN.

BY PLEADING GUILTY TO THIS CRIME, EACH OF YOU ARE FACING CERTAIN MAXIMUM PENALTIES, AND, AGAIN, IT'S IMPORTANT THAT YOU KNOW WHAT THEY ARE.

MR. LEE, BY PLEADING GUILTY TO THIS CRIME, YOU ARE FACING A MAXIMUM OF TEN YEARS IN PRISON, A MAXIMUM FINE OF \$250,000, OR TWICE THE GROSS GAIN OR LOSS CAUSED BY THIS CRIME. YOU'RE ALSO FACING A MANDATORY SPECIAL ASSESSMENT OF \$100, A MAXIMUM TERM OF SUPERVISED RELEASE OF THREE YEARS, AN ORDER FROM THE COURT FOR MANDATORY RESTITUTION TO THE VICTIMS OF THE CRIMES OR THEIR ESTATES, AND FORFEITURE OF ANY PROPERTY, REAL OR PERSONAL, WHICH CONSTITUTES OR IS DERIVED FROM PROCEEDS TRACEABLE TO THE OFFENSE.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND -- OH, IN ADDITION, YOU MAY BECOME INELIGIBLE FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL BENEFITS, INCLUDING BENEFITS

UNDER THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM. 1 DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THOSE ARE THE MAXIMUM 2 PENALTIES THAT YOU ARE FACING BY PLEADING GUILTY? 3 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 4 (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) 5 THE COURT: SPEAKING TO ALL THREE OF YOU AGAIN. 6 IF YOU RECEIVE A CUSTODIAL SENTENCE, YOU MAY RECEIVE 7 A TERM OF SUPERVISED RELEASE THAT WILL FOLLOW THAT SENTENCE. 8 (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) 9 THE COURT: FOR ALL THREE OF YOU, IF YOU DO RECEIVE 10 A TERM OF SUPERVISED RELEASE, THAT MEANS THAT WHEN YOU ARE 11 12 RELEASED FROM CUSTODY, YOU MUST COMPLY WITH THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS IMPOSED BY THE SENTENCING JUDGE. 13 IF AT ANY TIME DURING THE PERIOD OF SUPERVISED 14 RELEASE YOU ARE FOUND TO HAVE VIOLATED YOUR CONDITIONS OF 15 SUPERVISED RELEASE, AND DEPENDING UPON THE SEVERITY OF THE 16 VIOLATION, YOU COULD BE RETURNED TO PRISON FOR THE FULL 17 AMOUNT OF THE SUPERVISED RELEASE TERM. YOU WOULD NOT RECEIVE 18 CREDIT FOR THE TIME YOU ALREADY SERVED IN CUSTODY AND A NEW 19 TERM OF SUPERVISED RELEASE COULD BE IMPOSED. IF YOU AGAIN 2.0 VIOLATE THE TERMS OF YOUR SUPERVISED RELEASE, THIS PROCESS 21 COULD HAPPEN REPEATEDLY. 22 DO YOU UNDERSTAND ALL OF THAT? 23

MR. LEE?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

24

| 1 | (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) |
|------|---|
| 2 | THE COURT: FOR MR. LEE, DOES THIS PLEA AGREEMENT |
| 3 | CONTEMPLATE THE POSSIBILITY OF PROBATION? |
| 4 | MR. KIRBY: WELL, YOUR HONOR, UNDER THE AGREED |
| 5 | UPON NOT STARTING, BUT I BELIEVE, YES, IT'S POSSIBLE THAT |
| 6 | HE COULD RECEIVE PROBATION. |
| 7 | THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. OH, NO, HIS OFFENSE LEVEL IS |
| 8 | WAY ABOVE THAT. |
| 9 | MR. KIRBY: RIGHT. |
| 10 | THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. LET'S SEE. MR. LEE, ARE YOU |
| 11 | A UNITED STATES CITIZEN? |
| 12 | THE DEFENDANT: YES. |
| 13 | (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) |
| 14 | THE COURT: SPEAKING TO ALL THREE OF YOU AGAIN. |
| 15 | THE SENTENCING JUDGE IN EACH OF YOUR CASES WILL |
| 16 | CONSIDER THE SENTENCING GUIDELINES AS ADVISORY IN DETERMINING |
| 17 | YOUR SENTENCE. HAVE YOU DISCUSSED WITH YOUR ATTORNEY THE |
| 18 | SENTENCING GUIDELINES AND HOW THEY MAY APPLY TO YOU? |
| 19 | MR. LEE? |
| 20 | THE DEFENDANT: YES. |
| 21 | (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) |
| 22 | THE COURT: THE SENTENCING GUIDELINES ARE NOT |
| 23 | MANDATORY, SO SENTENCING JUDGE MAY DEPART FROM THEM AND |
| 24 | SENTENCE YOU ALL THE WAY UP TO THE STATUTORY MAXIMUM. |
| 25 _ | DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? |

MR. LEE? 1 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 2 (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) 3 THE COURT: NEITHER YOUR ATTORNEY NOR ANYONE ELSE 4 CAN GUARANTY THE SENTENCE THAT YOU WILL RECEIVE. IF THE 5 SENTENCE YOU RECEIVE IS MORE SEVERE THAN YOU EXPECT, YOU WILL 6 STILL BE BOUND BY YOUR GUILTY PLEA AND YOU WILL NOT HAVE A 7 RIGHT TO WITHDRAW YOUR GUILTY PLEA. 8 DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? 9 MR. LEE? 10 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 11 (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) 12 THE COURT: I HAVE IN FRONT OF ME A WRITTEN PLEA 13 AGREEMENT, A SEPARATE ONE FOR EACH OF YOU, AND WE'RE GOING TO 14 1.5 GO THROUGH THOSE NOW. MR. LEE, I'M STARTING WITH YOU, SIR. I HAVE A 16 17-PAGE PLEA AGREEMENT. ON THE LAST PAGE, THERE ARE THREE 17 SIGNATURES, INCLUDING YOURS. 18 BEFORE YOU SIGNED THIS AGREEMENT, DID YOU READ THE 19 ENTIRE AGREEMENT? 20 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 21 THE COURT: DID YOU HAVE ENOUGH TIME TO DISCUSS THIS 22 AGREEMENT WITH YOUR LAWYER? 23 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 24 THE COURT: DID HE EXPLAIN THIS AGREEMENT TO YOU AND 25

ANSWER ALL OF YOUR QUESTIONS? 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: YES. THE COURT: ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE 3 REPRESENTATION THAT YOU HAVE RECEIVED FROM YOUR LAWYER? 4 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 5 THE COURT: BY PLACING YOUR SIGNATURE ON THE LAST 6 7 PAGE, DID THAT SIGNIFY THAT YOU HAD READ THE ENTIRE DOCUMENT, THAT YOU UNDERSTOOD THE ENTIRE DOCUMENT AND THAT YOU AGREED 8 TO BE BOUND BY ALL OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS SET FORTH IN 9 THE DOCUMENT? 10 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 11 (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) 12 THE COURT: SPEAKING TO ALL THREE OF YOU AGAIN. 13 EACH OF YOUR PLEA AGREEMENTS CONTAINS A PROVISION 14 ENTITLED "DEFENDANT WAIVES APPEAL AND COLLATERAL ATTACK." IN 15 THAT PROVISION, YOU WAIVE OR GIVE UP YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL AND 16 COLLATERALLY ATTACK YOUR CONVICTION AND SENTENCE IN SPECIFIC 17 CIRCUMSTANCES. 18 DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT PROVISION, MR. LEE? 19 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 20 THE COURT: AND DO YOU AGREE TO BE BOUND BY IT? 21 22 THE DEFENDANT: YES. (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) 23 THE COURT: SPEAKING TO THE LAWYERS FOR ALL THREE 24 25 DEFENDANTS.

| 1 | HAVE YOU DISCUSSED THIS PLEA AGREEMENT THOROUGHLY |
|----|---|
| 2 | WITH YOUR CLIENT, INCLUDING THE PROVISION REGARDING WAIVER OF |
| 3 | APPEAL AND COLLATERAL ATTACK? |
| 4 | MR. KIRBY: YES AS TO MR. LEE. |
| 5 | (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) |
| 6 | THE COURT: AND IN EACH OF YOUR OPINIONS, DOES YOUR |
| 7 | CLIENT UNDERSTAND THE PLEA AGREEMENT IN ITS ENTIRETY? |
| 8 | MR. KIRBY: YES AS TO MR. LEE. |
| 9 | (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) |
| 10 | THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. RETURNING THEN TO THE THREE |
| 11 | DEFENDANTS. |
| 12 | EACH OF YOUR WRITTEN PLEA AGREEMENTS CONTAINS |
| 13 | WRITTEN PROMISES OR AGREEMENTS. HAVE ANY PROMISES BEEN MADE |
| 14 | TO YOU IN ORDER TO GET YOU TO PLEAD GUILTY THAT ARE NOT |
| 15 | INCLUDED IN THE WRITTEN PLEA AGREEMENT? |
| 16 | MR. LEE? |
| 17 | THE DEFENDANT: NO. |
| 18 | (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) |
| 19 | THE COURT: HAS ANYONE THREATENED YOU OR FORCED YOU |
| 20 | IN ANY WAY TO PLEAD GUILTY? |
| 21 | MR. LEE? |
| 22 | THE DEFENDANT: NO. |
| 23 | (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) |
| 24 | THE COURT: ARE YOU PLEADING GUILTY TO HELP SOME |
| 25 | OTHER PERSON? |

1 MR. LEE? THE DEFENDANT: NO. (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) 3 THE COURT: IS IT TRUE THEN THAT YOU ARE PLEADING 4 GUILTY BECAUSE YOU ARE GUILTY AND FOR NO OTHER REASON? 5 6 MR. LEE? 7 THE DEFENDANT: YES. (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) 8 THE COURT: I'M NOW GOING TO SPEAK WITH EACH OF YOU 9 INDIVIDUALLY ABOUT WHAT IT IS THAT YOU DID THAT MAKES YOU 10 GUILTY OF THIS CRIME. I WANT TO REMIND YOU THAT YOU ARE 11 UNDER OATH, SO YOU MUST TELL ME THE TRUTH. 12 MR. LEE, I'M GOING TO START WITH YOU. IN DECEMBER 13 OF 1997, WERE YOU CONVICTED OF WIRE FRAUD AND PENSION 14 EMBEZZLEMENT IN THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA? 15 16 THE DEFENDANT: YES. THE COURT: AND WERE YOU THEN SENTENCED IN 1998 ON 17 THOSE CONVICTIONS TO 30 MONTHS IN CUSTODY, TO BE FOLLOWED BY 18 THREE YEARS OF SUPERVISED RELEASE AND ORDERED TO PAY 19 RESTITUTION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,880,000.00? 20 THE DEFENDANT: YES. 21 THE COURT: AND TO DATE, DO YOU STILL OWE THE VAST 22 23 MAJORITY OF THAT? THE DEFENDANT: YES. 24 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ACTUALLY, WHAT I'M GOING TO 25

DO TO MAKE SURE THAT WE GET THE FACTS RIGHT, I'M GOING TO
HAVE THE GOVERNMENT STATE THOSE FACTS. AND THEN, MR. LEE, I
WANT YOU TO LISTEN VERY CAREFULLY, BECAUSE I'M GOING TO ASK
YOU WHETHER WHAT HE SAYS IS TRUE.

INITIALLY, HAVE YOU READ EVERYTHING IN THE PLEA
AGREEMENT ON PAGES 3, 4, 5 AND 6 REGARDING WHAT IT'S ALLEGED
YOU'VE DONE?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

1.3

THE COURT: AND IS EVERYTHING IN THIS DOCUMENT TRUE?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IF YOU'LL HIGHLIGHT THE FACTS THAT SET THE FACTUAL BASIS.

MR. TENORIO: I WILL, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.

BETWEEN APPROXIMATELY APRIL 2007 TO JULY 2013, THE DEFENDANT ACTED CORRUPTLY WITH THE INTENT TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE BY ENGAGING IN FRAUDULENT AND DECEPTIVE CONDUCT DESIGNED TO HINDER AND MINIMIZE THE EFFORTS OF THE UNITED STATES TO COLLECT ON THE CRIMINAL JUDGMENT AND RESTITUTION ORDER IMPOSED IN HIS 1997 CONVICTION.

HE DID SO BY OBTAINING MONEY FROM CLIENTS IN A WAY
THAT CONCEALED THE INCOME FROM THE UNITED STATES.

THE COURT: IS WHAT THE LAWYER JUST SAID TRUE IN ALL RESPECTS?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

THE COURT: GO AHEAD, SIR.

MR. TENORIO: HE DID SO, AMONG OTHER MEANS, BY

SOLICITING CLIENTS TO CONDUCT ONLINE TRADING ON THEIR BEHALF

IN EXCHANGE FOR A SHARE OF PROFITS; INDUCING POTENTIAL

CLIENTS TO HIRE HIM BY FRAUDULENTLY MAKING FALSE

REPRESENTATIONS AND PROMISES AND OMITTING MATERIAL

INFORMATION; INSTRUCTING CLIENTS TO SEND MANAGEMENT FEES TO

BANK ACCOUNTS THAT HE OPENED IN THE NAME OF SHELL

CORPORATIONS AND USING CREDIT CARDS IN THE NAMES OF OTHERS TO

PAY FOR EXPENSES AND BILLS FROM HIS SHELL CORPORATION

ACCOUNTS.

HE ALSO SENT FALSIFIED INVOICES TO CLIENTS TO ENSURE

THAT HE WOULD CONTINUE TO FRAUDULENTLY RECEIVE INCOME WITHOUT

THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE UNITED STATES.

THE COURT: IS WHAT THE LAWYER JUST SAID TRUE IN ALL RESPECTS?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. TENORIO: HIS SPECIFIC CONDUCT TO OBSTRUCT

JUSTICE INCLUDED THE INCORPORATION OF THE CORPORATION ELX IN

APRIL OF 2007, A SAN DIEGO-BASED SHELL CORPORATION, WHICH

OMITTED ANY MENTION OF HIS NAME AS A CORPORATE OFFICER OR

SIGNATORY ON THE BANK ACCOUNT OR IN ANY OTHER FASHION TO SHOW

CONTROL OF THE CORPORATION.

THE COURT: IS THAT TRUE, SIR?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

2.1

MR. TENORIO: BETWEEN AUGUST 2009 AND AUGUST 2011,
HE SENT INVOICES TO CLIENTS ON THE ELX LETTERHEAD DIRECTING
THEM TO SEND PAYMENTS TO THE ELX BANK ACCOUNT FOR HIS
MANAGEMENT OF THE CLIENTS' ONLINE TRADING ACCOUNTS.

THE COURT: DID YOU DO THAT, SIR?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

MR. TENORIO: HE SOLICITED CLIENTS THROUGH

FRAUDULENT MEANS, SPECIFICALLY REPRESENTING THAT —

MISREPRESENTING THAT HE WAS A CPA, THAT HE HELD PH.D., J.D.

AND MBA DEGREES, AND HE FAILED TO DISCLOSE HIS 1997

CONVICTION.

THE COURT: IS IT TRUE THAT YOU DID ALL OF THOSE THINGS, SIR?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

MR. TENORIO: IN APPROXIMATELY SEPTEMBER 2009, HE INFORMED SPECIFIC CLIENTS AND OTHER CLIENTS THAT HE WOULD SHARE 50 PERCENT OF BOTH REALIZED GAINS AND LOSSES INCURRED FROM ONLINE TRADING ACTIVITY.

IN APPROXIMATELY JANUARY OF 2011, HIS TRADING

ACTIVITY CREATED REALIZED LOSSES, BUT HE RESTRUCTURED BILLING

INVOICES TO SPREAD LOSSES OVER FIVE MONTHS IN ORDER TO

CONTINUE TO RECEIVE PAYMENTS AND PERCEIVED GAINS RATHER THAN

LOSSES.

THE COURT: DID YOU DO THAT, SIR?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

2.4

2.5

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. TENORIO: BETWEEN AUGUST 2009 AND MARCH 2012, HE CAUSED OVER \$350,000 TO BE WIRE TRANSFERRED FROM THE ELX BANK ACCOUNT TO OTHER SHELL ACCOUNTS UNDER HIS CONTROL, WHICH HE WOULD USE FOR PERSONAL EXPENSES.

THE COURT: DID YOU DO THAT, SIR?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

MR. TENORIO: BETWEEN AUGUST 2009 AND JULY 2013, HE CAUSED THE PRODUCTION OF CHECKS TOTALING OVER \$150,000 FROM THE ELX BANK ACCOUNT TO PAY FOR BILLS -- PAY BILLS FOR CREDIT CARDS ISSUED IN THE NAME OF OTHERS BUT WHICH HE USED FOR PERSONAL EXPENSES.

THE COURT: IS IT TRUE THAT YOU DID ALL OF THAT, SIR?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

MR. TENORIO: AND, FINALLY, YOUR HONOR, THESE AND OTHER FRAUDULENT, DECEPTIVE PRACTICES WERE UTILIZED TO CONCEAL HIS CONTROL AND OWNERSHIP OF INCOME IN ORDER TO AVOID PAYING THE COLLECTION FROM HIS 1997 CONVICTION AND SPECIFICALLY THE LOSSES ENUMERATED HEREIN.

THE COURT: IS THAT CORRECT, SIR, THAT YOU ENGAGED

IN ALL OF THIS FRAUDULENT AND DECEPTIVE ACTIVITIES IN ORDER

TO PREVENT THE UNITED STATES FROM COLLECTING ON THE

OUTSTANDING RESTITUTION ORDER?

| 1 | THE DEFENDANT: YES. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. TENORIO: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. |
| 3 | THE COURT: AND DO YOU SPECIFICALLY ADMIT THE LOSSES |
| 4 | SET FORTH ON PAGES 5 AND 6? |
| 5 | THE DEFENDANT: YES. |
| 6 | THE COURT: IS THE UNITED STATES SATISFIED WITH THE |
| 7 | FACTUAL BASIS? |
| 8 | MR. TENORIO: WE ARE, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU. |
| 9 | THE COURT: AND IS THIS PLEA MADE VOLUNTARILY AND |
| 10 | WITH YOUR CONCURRENCE, COUNSEL? |
| 11 | MR. KIRBY: YES, YOUR HONOR. |
| 12 | (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) |
| 13 | THE COURT: WHILE THEY ADDRESS THAT, THE NEXT ISSUE |
| 14 | THAT I HAVE TO ADDRESS WITH MR. LEE OBVIOUSLY IS COUNSEL. |
| 15 | AND MR. KIRBY, YOU'VE BEEN PRESENT THROUGHOUT THIS |
| 16 | PROCEEDING REPRESENTING HIM. ARE YOU RETAINED ON THIS |
| 17 | MATTER? |
| 18 | MR. KIRBY: I AM, YOUR HONOR. |
| 19 | THE COURT: OKAY. MR. LEE, I WANT YOU TO UNDERSTAND |
| 20 | THAT IF YOU DID NOT HAVE THE ABILITY TO HIRE A LAWYER, I |
| 21 | WOULD APPOINT A LAWYER TO REPRESENT YOU. |
| 22 | IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING THAT YOU HAVE HIRED MR. KIRBY |
| 23 | TO REPRESENT YOU AND HE IS REPRESENTING YOU BOTH PRIOR TO |
| 24 | YOUR APPEARANCE IN COURT TODAY, AND HE WILL CONTINUE TO |
| 25 | REPRESENT YOU; IS THAT ACCURATE? |

THE DEFENDANT: THAT IS ACCURATE. 1 THE COURT: OKAY. AND YOU ARE MAKING A GENERAL 2 APPEARANCE, SIR? 3 MR. KIRBY: YES, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: GREAT. THANK YOU. 5 (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) 6 THE COURT: SPEAKING TO ALL THREE OF YOU THEN. 7 UNDERSTANDING THE MAXIMUM PENALTIES THAT YOU ARE 8 FACING, THE RIGHTS THAT YOU HAVE AND ARE GIVING UP AND ALL OF 9 THE OTHER CONSEQUENCES OF YOUR GUILTY PLEA, DO YOU STILL WANT 10 TO PLEAD GUILTY? 11 12 MR. LEE? 13 THE DEFENDANT: YES. (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) 14 THE COURT: MR. LEE, HOW DO YOU PLEAD TO THE 15 ONE-COUNT INFORMATION CHARGING YOU WITH OBSTRUCTION OF 16 JUSTICE, GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY? 17 THE DEFENDANT: GUILTY. 18 19 THE COURT: AND DO YOU AGREE TO FORFEIT ANY AND ALL RIGHT THAT YOU MAY HAVE IN ANY AND ALL PROPERTY UP TO THE 2.0 AMOUNT OF \$10,635,403.34? 21 22 THE DEFENDANT: YES. (PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.) 23 24 THE COURT: SPEAKING TO ALL THREE OF YOU. I FIND -- BASED UPON EVERYTHING THAT HAS HAPPENED 2.5

HERE IN COURT TODAY, AS WELL AS ALL OF THE WRITTEN DOCUMENTS
IN FRONT OF ME, I FIND THAT EACH OF YOUR GUILTY PLEAS IS MADE
KNOWINGLY AND VOLUNTARILY, WITH A FULL UNDERSTANDING OF THE
NATURE OF THE CHARGE, THE RIGHTS THAT YOU HAVE AND ARE GIVING
UP AND ALL OF THE OTHER CONSEQUENCES OF YOUR GUILTY PLEA.

I ALSO FIND THAT THERE IS A FACTUAL BASIS FOR YOUR GUILTY PLEA, AND I THEREFORE RECOMMEND TO THE DISTRICT JUDGE IN EACH OF YOUR CASES THAT HE OR SHE ACCEPT YOUR GUILTY PLEA. AND I'M GOING TO SET THIS FOR SENTENCING IN FRONT OF THAT JUDGE.

SO, MR. LEE, YOUR CASE IS ASSIGNED TO JUDGE BENITEZ.

AND YOU ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR IN HIS COURT FOR SENTENCING ON
JANUARY 19TH OF NEXT YEAR AT 9:00 A.M.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT YOU MUST APPEAR IN HIS COURTROOM ON THAT DATE AND TIME?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

(PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.)

THE COURT: SPEAKING TO ALL THREE OF YOU.

I FIND THE TIME BETWEEN TODAY AND THE SENTENCING
HEARING DATE, WHICH I JUST SET, EXCLUDABLE UNDER THE SPEEDY
TRIAL ACT ON THE GROUNDS THAT THE DISTRICT JUDGE WILL BE
CONSIDERING THE PROPOSED PLEA AGREEMENT. I HEREBY VACATE ALL
HEARING DATES OTHER THAN THE SENTENCING HEARING WHICH I JUST
SET.

I ORDER PROBATION TO PREPARE A PRE-SENTENCE REPORT

FOR EACH DEFENDANT. AND THERE DO NOT APPEAR TO BE ANY MOTIONS.

2.0

(PAUSE WHILE THE COURT HEARD OTHER MATTERS.)

THE COURT: MR. LEE, THIS IS YOUR INITIAL APPEARANCE, SO NOW THE FINAL THING THAT WE NEED TO ADDRESS WITH YOU IS BAIL.

WHAT'S THE POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES?

MR. TENORIO: YOUR HONOR, AFTER SPEAKING WITH

DEFENSE COUNSEL, WE AGREE THAT THE BOND WOULD BE APPROPRIATE

AT \$40,000, SECURED BY HIS SIGNATURE AND THAT OF TWO

FINANCIALLY-RESPONSIBLE ADULTS.

AND IN ADDITION TO THAT, THERE ARE TWO PROPOSED SURETIES THAT COUNSEL HAS PROPOSED TO ME THAT SEEM TO BE ACCEPTABLE, BARRING ANY BACKGROUND REVIEW OF PRIORS.

THE COURT: OKAY. AND WOULD YOU SUGGEST GIVING THE DEFENDANT A WEEK TO GET THESE DOCUMENTS IN? YOU HAVEN'T SEEN THE DOCUMENTS YET.

MR. TENORIO: YES. THAT WOULD BE FINE WITH THE GOVERNMENT.

THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. TELL ME SOMETHING ABOUT YOUR CLIENT, MR. KIRBY.

MR. KIRBY: YES, YOUR HONOR. HE IS A LONG-TIME
RESIDENT OF CALIFORNIA. HE HAS STRONG TIES TO CALIFORNIA,
PRIMARILY SACRAMENTO, WHERE HIS FATHER AND SEVERAL SIBLINGS
RESIDE. HE HAS OTHER SIBLINGS THAT RESIDE ELSEWHERE IN THE

UNITED STATES.

HIS LONG-TIME -- AND REALLY THE TERM "GIRLFRIEND"

DOESN'T REALLY FIT WHEN YOU'VE BEEN WITH SOMEBODY FOR EIGHT

YEARS. HIS GIRLFRIEND OF EIGHT YEARS LIVES HERE IN SAN

DIEGO.

THE COURT: WHERE IS THE DEFENDANT GOING TO LIVE?

MR. KIRBY: HE ACTUALLY GOES BETWEEN TWO DIFFERENT

RESIDENCES CURRENTLY.

THE COURT: THE ONE IN LA JOLLA AND THE ONE IN ALAMEDA?

MR. KIRBY: YEAH.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. KIRBY: HE DOES HAVE BUSINESS TIES TO THE COMMUNITY AS WELL. AND THIS IS SOMETHING I WANTED TO STRESS.

WE'VE BEEN IN NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE GOVERNMENT FOR SEVERAL MONTHS.

THE COURT: I ASSUMED THAT TO BE THE CASE.

MR. KIRBY: AND MR. LEE, WITH PLEA AGREEMENT IN HAND, TRAVELED TO HONG KONG FOR BUSINESS AND CAME BACK JUST VERY RECENTLY; SO HE'S NOT GOING TO FLEE IN THIS MATTER. HE KNOWS ABOUT HOW MUCH TIME HE'S LOOKING AT AND HE CAME BACK FROM HONG KONG IN ANY EVENT.

THE PROPOSED SURETIES ARE HIS SON AND HIS

DAUGHTER-IN-LAW. AND AS I SAID, WE AGREED TO 40,000 AS A

BOND AMOUNT. IT'S ABOVE WHAT PRETRIAL IS ASKING FOR, BUT

WE'VE ALREADY NEGOTIATED THAT. AND THE SON AND DAUGHTER-IN-LAW SHOULDN'T HAVE ANY PROBLEM WITH THAT.

THE ONE THING I WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS, YOUR HONOR,

AND PRETRIAL SUGGESTS IT, AND I WOULD ASK AS WELL THAT HE

BE -- HE HAS TAX CLIENTS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES. HE

ALSO HAS A DAUGHTER IN NEW YORK, SO I WOULD LIKE HIS TRAVEL

OPTIONS TO BE THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES. AND --

THE COURT: GO AHEAD.

MR. KIRBY: AND LIKE -- AS I SAID, THAT'S WHAT

PRETRIAL IS RECOMMENDING. AND HE DOES HAVE -- I MEAN, HIS

PRIMARY BUSINESS TRAVEL IS TO EITHER NEVADA OR NEW YORK.

HE'S ALSO GOT A DAUGHTER IN NEW YORK.

THE COURT: I ACTUALLY AM VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THIS INDIVIDUAL. I APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT HE CAME BACK KNOWING THIS. HOWEVER, THE CONDUCT THAT HE JUST ADMITTED TO IS OBVIOUSLY FRAUDULENT. I MEAN, HE KNEW HE OWED MONEY AND HE DID EVERYTHING TO AVOID IT. HE WASN'T HONEST WITH CLIENTS THAT HE WAS REPRESENTING. AND SO I AM QUITE CONCERNED ABOUT HIS HONESTY AND I AM NOT GOING TO ALLOW HIM TO TRAVEL INTERNATIONALLY WHILE WE'RE AWAITING THE END OF THIS CASE.

I WANT YOU TO LISTEN CAREFULLY, SIR. I'M IMPOSING
THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS -- THE FOLLOWING
CONDITIONS ON YOU:

YOU MUST NOT COMMIT A FEDERAL, STATE OR LOCAL CRIME DURING THE PERIOD OF RELEASE;

| 1 | YOU MUST MAKE ALL OF YOUR COURT APPEARANCES; |
|----|---|
| 2 | YOUR TRAVEL IS RESTRICTED TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA |
| 3 | AND YOU MAY NOT ENTER MEXICO; |
| 4 | YOU MUST REPORT FOR SUPERVISION TO THE PRETRIAL |
| 5 | SERVICES AGENCY AS DIRECTED BY THE ASSIGNED PRETRIAL SERVICES |
| 6 | OFFICER AND PAY FOR THE REASONABLE COST OF SUPERVISION IN AN |
| 7 | AMOUNT TO BE DETERMINED BY THE PRETRIAL SERVICES AGENCY AND |
| 8 | APPROVED BY THE COURT; |
| 9 | YOU MAY NOT POSSESS OR USE ANY NARCOTIC, DRUG OR |
| 10 | CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE WITHOUT A LAWFUL MEDICAL PRESCRIPTION; |
| 11 | YOU MAY NOT POSSESS ANY FIREARM, DANGEROUS WEAPON OR |
| 12 | DESTRUCTIVE DEVICE DURING THE PENDENCY OF THE CASE; |
| 13 | YOU MUST READ OR HAVE EXPLAINED TO YOU AND THEN |
| 14 | ACKNOWLEDGE UNDERSTANDING OF THE ADVICE OF PENALTIES AND |
| 15 | SANCTIONS FORM; |
| 16 | YOU MUST PROVIDE A CURRENT RESIDENCE, ADDRESS AND |
| 17 | TELEPHONE NUMBER PRIOR TO YOUR RELEASE FROM CUSTODY AND KEEP |
| 18 | IT CURRENT WHILE THE CASE IS PENDING; |
| 19 | YOU MUST ACTIVELY SEEK AND MAINTAIN FULL-TIME |
| 20 | EMPLOYMENT, SCHOOLING OR A COMBINATION THEREOF; |
| 21 | YOU MUST EXECUTE A PERSONAL APPEARANCE BOND IN THE |
| 22 | AMOUNT OF \$40,000 THAT'S SECURED BY YOUR SIGNATURE AND THE |
| 23 | SIGNATURES OF TWO FINANCIALLY-RESPONSIBLE ADULTS WHO MUST BE |
| 24 | RELATED TO YOU: |

YOU MUST SURRENDER YOUR PASSPORT TO PRETRIAL

25

SERVICES, AND YOU MAY NOT APPLY FOR ANY NEW TRAVEL DOCUMENTS WHILE THIS CASE IS PROCEEDING.

YOU MUST NOTIFY -- I'LL STATE THIS AS A CONDITION I INTEND TO ADD, AND THEN I'LL HEAR FROM COUNSEL ON IT.

AS I INDICATED, I AM QUITE CONCERNED BY THE CONDUCT
THAT HE HAS JUST ADMITTED TO, AS WELL AS THE CONDUCT THAT WAS
FOUND IN THE PRIOR CASE, AND SO I AM INCLINED TO REQUIRE HIM
TO NOTIFY HIS CLIENTS THAT HE HAS PLED GUILTY TO THIS CRIME.

DO YOU WANT TO BE HEARD ON THAT?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

MR. KIRBY: IF I COULD HAVE ONE MOMENT.

THE COURT: YOUR LAWYER IS WHO SHOULD TALK ABOUT IT.

(ATTORNEY/CLIENT DISCUSSION.)

MR. KIRBY: YOUR HONOR, ASIDE FROM THE CONDUCT, THE BUYING AND SELLING OF SECURITIES, MR. LEE HAS A LEGITIMATE TAX CONSULTING BUSINESS, AND IT MAY, IN FACT, DESTROY THAT BUSINESS IF HE HAS TO TELL EACH OF HIS PEOPLE WHO ARE TOTALLY UNRELATED TO BUYING AND SELLING OF STOCKS THAT HE JUST PLED GUILTY.

HE'S OBVIOUSLY GOING TO HAVE TO DO THAT AT SOME POINT, BECAUSE HE'S GOING TO GO INTO CUSTODY AT SOME POINT, BUT HE WOULD LIKE TO WRAP THINGS UP BEFORE HE HAS TO DO THAT.

THE COURT: WHAT'S THE THOUGHTS OF THE GOVERNMENT ON THAT ISSUE?

MR. TENORIO: YOUR HONOR, I SHARE THE COURT'S

CONCERNS. MY SUSPICION IS THAT THESE CLIENTS PROBABLY WERE NOT EVEN AWARE OF THE 1998 CASE, AND IT WAS SIMILAR IN THAT IT WAS EMBEZZLEMENT CASES OR AN EMBEZZLEMENT CASE AND OTHER FRAUDS; SO, YEAH, WE WOULD STRONGLY REQUEST THAT THAT CONDITION BE IMPOSED.

THE COURT: I HAVE TO SAY, MR. KIRBY AND MR. LEE, I
REALLY DO FEEL QUITE STRONGLY ABOUT THIS. I AM CONCERNED
ABOUT MR. LEE'S CONDUCT OVER THE PAST WHENEVER IT WAS, THE
END OF THE '90S, UP UNTIL NOW.

I HEAR WHAT MR. KIRBY IS SAYING ON BEHALF OF

MR. LEE, AND THAT IS THAT HE HAD THIS FRAUDULENT ACTIVITY

THAT HE AGREED -- THAT HE JUST ADMITTED IN THIS CASE, BUT HE

ALSO HAS THIS LEGITIMATE TAX CONSULTING BUSINESS. I DON'T

SEE THE TWO OF THEM AS CLEARLY DIFFERENT AS I BELIEVE MR. LEE

WOULD LIKE THE -- LIKE TO BELIEVE THEY ARE.

AND SO HE HAS NOW ADMITTED THIS ACTIVITY IN FRONT OF ME, AND I BELIEVE THAT HIS CLIENTS HAVE A RIGHT TO KNOW THAT.

I AM CONCERNED THAT IF I DON'T REQUIRE IT, THAT THE COURT WOULD THEN BE ENABLING HIM TO ENGAGE IN ONGOING POTENTIALLY FRAUDULENT CONDUCT. AND SO CERTAINLY HE CAN ADVISE HIS CLIENTS, HIS TAX CLIENTS THAT HE THINKS THE TWO OF THE ACTIVITIES ARE COMPLETELY DIFFERENT, BUT I DO BELIEVE THAT HE MUST NOTIFY THEM OF THE FACT THAT HE HAS PLED GUILTY.

SO I'M ADDING THAT AS A CONDITION. DEFENDANT MUST NOTIFY ALL CLIENTS THAT HE HAS PLED GUILTY TO THIS CRIME.

AND AS I INDICATED, THE TRAVEL IS RESTRICTED TO --1 HIS TRAVEL IS RESTRICTED TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. I AM 2 SPECIFICALLY NOT ALLOWING HIM TO GO -- TO TRAVEL 3 INTERNATIONALLY FOR ANY REASON. IF THERE IS SOME REASON THAT 4 HE HAS TO TRAVEL WITHIN THE UNITED STATES FOR WORK, HE CAN 5 SUBMIT THAT THROUGH YOU, COUNSEL, TO ME AS A REQUEST. I 6 DON'T WANT IT TO BE SOMETHING WHERE IT WOULD JUST BE 7 CONVENIENT, AND HE'D LIKE TO GO TO A CONFERENCE OR HE WOULD 8 LIKE TO MEET WITH SOMEONE. 9 IF HE CAN CONDUCT HIS BUSINESS OVER THE PHONE, 10 THAT'S THE WAY YOU SHOULD DO IT. IF THERE IS SOME REASON 11 THAT HE ACTUALLY NEEDS TO TRAVEL, THAT CAN BE PRESENTED TO ME 12 IN A WRITTEN REQUEST. THE SURETIES HAVE TO AGREE TO IT. 13 MR. KIRBY: YOUR HONOR, MAY I ASK THAT -- CAN IT 14 15 ALSO BE TO VISIT FAMILY? THE COURT: NO. WHY DOES HE NEED TO TRAVEL TO VISIT 16 17 FAMILY? MR. KIRBY: HIS DAUGHTER IS IN NEW YORK. 18 THE COURT: RIGHT. SHE CAN TRAVEL HERE. 19 MR. KIRBY: AND HIS LONG-TIME GIRLFRIEND'S PARENTS 20 ARE IN NEVADA AND VERY ILL. CAN HE, ON PRIOR APPROVAL, GO 21 22 SEE THEM AS WELL?

23

24

25

THE COURT: IF THERE IS A MEDICAL EMERGENCY, I WOULD

AND THE REASON, ONE OF THE REASONS I'M IMPOSING THIS

IS I DON'T BELIEVE THAT THIS DEFENDANT HAS TAKEN HIS

CONVICTION SERIOUSLY. I AM CONCERNED THAT HE BELIEVES HE CAN

CONTINUE TO CONDUCT LIFE IN ANY WAY HE WANTS. HE HAS PLED

GUILTY TO A SECOND VERY SERIOUS CRIME. DESPITE APPARENTLY

MAKING A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF MONEY, HE HAS NOT MADE ANY

SIGNIFICANT EFFORT TO PAY BACK THE FINE OR RESTITUTION THAT

WAS ORDERED IN THE ORIGINAL CASE.

AND THIS CRIMINAL CONDUCT HAS CONSEQUENCES. AND SO
HE DOESN'T GET TO JUST GO VISIT FAMILY AS HE WANTS. I'M
CONCERNED ABOUT WHAT HE'S DOING WHILE HE'S THERE AND WHO HE
IS SEEING AND WHAT HE'S SAYING, FRANKLY.

AND SO IF THERE IS AN EMERGENCY AND HE NEEDS TO GO,

I'D BE WILLING TO CONSIDER THAT. BUT THE FACT THAT HE WOULD

JUST LIKE TO TRAVEL TO VISIT THEM, NO, I'M NOT APPROVING IT.

DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

MR. KIRBY: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: OKAY. MR. LEE, DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT YOU MUST COMPLY WITH ALL OF THE CONDITIONS THAT I HAVE JUST SET?

THE DEFENDANT: YES.

THE COURT: OKAY. AND I AM GIVING YOU ONE WEEK TO SUBMIT THE BOND PAPERWORK. SO THE BOND PAPERWORK MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THIS COURT BY OCTOBER 16TH.

YOU MUST GO DOWN RIGHT NOW AND BE FINGERPRINTED AND

2.2

2.4

Exhibit F

Case 3:14-cr-02937-BEN Document 44 Filed 05/21/15 Page 2 of 4

| AO 245B (CASD) (Rev. 12/11) Judgment in a Criminal Case Sheet 2 — Imprisonment | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| THE AND AND AND THE PERIOD | Judgment — Page 2 of 4 |
| DEFENDANT: JAMES YIU LEE (1) CASE NUMBER: 14CR2937-BEN | |
| IMPRISONM | PAT |
| The defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the United S SEVENTY-EIGHT (78) MONTHS. | |
| | |
| Sentence imposed pursuant to Title 8 USC Section 1326(b). | |
| The court makes the following recommendations to the Bureau of F DEFENDANT BE INCARCERATED WITHIN THE WESTER! | |
| | |
| The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States | Marshal. |
| The defendant shall surrender to the United States Marshal for | this district: |
| as notified by the United States Marshal. | • |
| ☐ The defendant shall surrender for service of sentence at the ins ☐ before | - |
| as notified by the United States Marshal. | |
| as notified by the Probation or Pretrial Services Office. | |
| RETURN | |
| I have executed this judgment as follows: | |
| Defendant delivered on | to |
| at, with a certified copy of | this judgment. |
| | UNITED STATES MARSHAL |
| Ву | |
| БУ | DEDUTY INITED STATES AGADSIAL |

AO 245B (CASD) (Rev. 12/11) Judgment in a Criminal Case Sheet 3 — Supervised Release

| Judgment-Page | 3 | of _ | 4 |
|---------------|---|------|---|

DEFENDANT: JAMES YIU LEE (1) CASE NUMBER: 14CR2937-BEN

SUPERVISED RELEASE

+

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be on supervised release for a term of: THREE (3) YEARS.

The defendant shall 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.

For offenses committed on or after September 13, 1994:

The defendant shall not illegally 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. Testing requirements will not exceed submission of more than ______ drug tests per month during the term of supervision, unless otherwise ordered by court.

| | The above drug testing condition is suspended, based on the court's determination that the defendant poses a low risk of |
|-------------|---|
| | future substance abuse. (Check, if applicable.) |
| X | The defendant shall not possess a firearm, ammunition, destructive device, or any other dangerous weapon. |
| \boxtimes | The defendant shall cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample from the defendant, pursuant to section 3 of the DNA Analysis |
| | Backlog Elimination Act of 2000, pursuant to 18 USC sections 3563(a)(7) and 3583(d). The defendant shall comply with the requirements of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. § 16901, et seq.) as directed |
| ш | 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.) |
| | The defendant shall participate in an approved program for domestic violence. (Check, if applicable.) |

If this judgment imposes a fine or restitution obligation, it is a condition of supervised release that the defendant pay any such fine or restitution that remains unpaid at the commencement of the term of supervised release in accordance with the Schedule of Payments set forth in this judgment.

The defendant must comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this court. The defendant shall also comply with any special conditions imposed.

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;
- 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 permission 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;
- 12) 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
- 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.

Case 3:14-cr-02937-BEN Document 44 Filed 05/21/15 Page 4 of 4

AO 245B (CASD) (Rev. 12/11 Judgment in a Criminal Case Sheet 4 — Special Conditions

Judgment—Page 4 of 4

DEFENDANT: JAMES YIU LEE (1) CASE NUMBER: 14CR2937-BEN

SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION

| X | Submit person, residence, office or vehicle to a search, conducted by a United States Probation Officer at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner, based upon reasonable suspicion of contraband or evidence of a violation of a condition of release; failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation; the defendant shall warn any other residents that the premises may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition. |
|---|---|
| | If deported, excluded, or allowed to voluntarily return to country of origin, not reenter the United States illegally and report to the probation officer within 24 hours of any reentry to the United States; supervision waived upon deportation, exclusion or voluntary departure. |
| | Not transport, harbor, or assist undocumented aliens. |
| | Not associate with undocumented aliens or alien smugglers. |
| | Not reenter the United States illegally. |
| | Not enter the Republic of Mexico without written permission of the Court or probation officer. |
| | Report all vehicles owned or operated, or in which you have an interest, to the probation officer. |
| | Not possess any narcotic drug or controlled substance without a lawful medical prescription. |
| | Not associate with known users of, smugglers of, or dealers in narcotics, controlled substances, or dangerous drugs in any form. |
| | Participate in a program of mental health treatment as directed by the probation officer, take all medications as prescribed by a psychiatrist/physician, and not discontinue any medication without permission. The Court authorizes the release of the presentence report and available psychological evaluations to the mental health provider, as approved by the probation officer. Allow for reciprocal release of information between the probation officer and the treatment provider. May be required to contribute to the costs of services rendered in an amount to be determined by the probation officer, based on the defendant's ability to pay. |
| X | Comply with the Court ordered requirements for restitution obligations in Case No. 95CR0041-45-01-MMC. |
| X | Provide complete disclosure of personal and business financial records to the probation officer as requested. |
| X | Be prohibited from opening checking accounts or incurring new credit charges or opening additional lines of credit without approval of the probation officer. |
| X | Employment must be approved by the probation officer. |
| | Resolve all outstanding warrants within days. |
| | Complete hours of community service in a program approved by the probation officer within |
| | Reside in a Residential Reentry Center (RRC) as directed by the probation officer for a period of |
| X | Notify the Collections Unit, United States Attorney's Office, before transferring any interest in property owned, directly or indirectly, including but not limited to any interest held or owned under any other name, or entity, including a trust, partnership or corporation. |
| X | Notify the Collections Unit, United States Attorney's Office, of any interest in property obtained, directly or indirectly, including but not limited to any interest obtained under any other name, or entity, including a trust, partnership or corporation until the fine or restitution is paid in full. |

+