

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**  
**Before the**  
**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING**  
**File No. 3-19720**

**In the Matter of**

**DANIEL B. VAZQUEZ, SR.,**

**Respondent.**

**DIVISION OF ENFORCEMENT'S MOTION**  
**FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT JUDGMENT AND REMEDIAL SANCTIONS**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. FACTS .....2

    A. Respondent.....2

    B. Entry of the Injunction .....2

    C. Vazquez is in Default.....3

III. ARGUMENT .....4

    A. Vazquez Is In Default and the Allegations of the OIP May Be Deemed To Be True .....4

    B. The Findings in the Underlying Case Are Binding on Respondent.....5

    C. Imposition of a Permanent Bar Is Warranted .....6

        1. At the Time of the Misconduct, Respondent was Associated With a Broker .....7

        2. The District Court Enjoined Dow Against Violations of the Securities Laws.....7

        3. A Bar Is In the Public Interest.....7

            a. Respondent’s violations were egregious, intentional and recurrent .....8

            b. The remaining *Steadman* factors also favor a bar.....8

IV. CONCLUSION.....9

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Delsa U. Thomas and The D. Christopher Capital Management Group, LLC</i> , Initial Dec. Rel. No. 205, 2014 SEC LEXIS 4181 (Nov. 4, 2014).....	9
<i>In the Matter of Gunderson</i> , Exchange Act Release No. 61234, 2009 SEC LEXIS 4322 (Dec. 23, 2009).....	6
<i>James E. Franklin</i> , Exchange Act Rel. No. 56649 (Oct. 12, 2007), 91 S.E.C. Docket 2708, 2713, 2007 WL 2974200, <i>petition for review denied</i> , 285 F. App'x 761 (D.C. Cir. 2008) .....	6
<i>Jonathan D. Havey</i> , CPA, Initial Dec. Rel. No. 959, 2016 SEC LEXIS 522 (Feb. 11, 2016) .....	8
<i>Lonny S. Bernath</i> , Initial Dec. Rel. No. 993 at 4, 2016 SEC LEXIS 1222 (Apr. 4, 2016).....	7
<i>Michael V. Lipkin and Joshua Shainberg</i> , Init. Dec. Rel. No. 317, 88 SEC Docket 2346, 2006 WL 2422652, (Aug. 21, 2006), <i>notice of finality</i> , 88 S.E.C. Docket 2872, 2006 WL 2668516 (Sept. 15, 2006) 8	
<i>Peter J. Eichler, Jr.</i> , Initial Dec. Rel. No. 1032, 2016 WL 4035559 (July 8, 2016).....	5
<i>Robert Burton</i> , Initial Dec. Rel. No. 1014, 2016 WL 3030850 (May 27, 2016).....	6
<i>Siming Yang</i> , Initial Dec. Rel. No. 788, 2015 SEC LEXIS 1735 (May 6, 2015) .....	8
<i>Steadman v. SEC</i> , 603 F.2d 1126 (5th Cir. 1979), <i>aff'd on other grounds</i> , 450 U.S. 81 (1981).....	7, 8, 9
<i>Terrence O'Donnell</i> , Initial Dec. Rel. No. 334, 2007 SEC LEXIS 2148 (Sept. 20, 2007).....	9

### FEDERAL STATUTES

#### Rules

Section 15(b)(4)(C) [15 U.S.C. Section 78o(b)(4)(C)] .....	7
Section 15(b)(6) [15 U.S.C. Section 78o(b)(6)] .....	6, 7

**COMMISSION'S RULES OF PRACTICE**

Rule 141(a)(2)(iii)  
[17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(iii)] ..... 1

Rule 155(a)  
[17 C.F.R. § 201.155(a)]..... 5

Rule 155(a)(2)  
[17 C.F.R. § 201.155(a)(2)] ..... 1

Rule 220(f)  
[17 C.F. R. § 201.220(f)] ..... 1

Pursuant to the October 29, 2021 Order to Show Cause in this matter, Exch. Act Release No. 93481 (Oct. 29, 2021), the Division of Enforcement (“Division”) submits this motion for default judgment and sanctions against Respondent Daniel B. Vazquez, Sr. (“Vazquez” or “Respondent”).

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Vazquez is the founder and CEO of Hoplon Financial Group (“Hoplon”). The Commission’s complaint in the underlying district court action alleged that Vazquez and Hoplon committed fraud with the assistance of Hoplon’s COO. In 2011, Vazquez and Hoplon created the New Economic Opportunities Fund I, LLC (“NEON”) vehicle to pool investors’ funds ostensibly for the purpose of purchasing and flipping residential real estate. Vazquez then misused substantial amounts of NEON funds, resulting in a total loss to investors. By engaging in this conduct, Vazquez committed violations of Section 17(a)(2) of the Securities Act and Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder.

The instant proceedings were commenced on March 3, 2020 based upon the entry of a final judgment against Vazquez, permanently enjoining him from future violations of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”) and Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 thereunder in the civil action entitled *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Daniel Vazquez, et al.*, Civil Action Number 8:18-cv-0047 CJC (KESx), in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. *See* Order Instituting Administrative Proceedings Pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Section 203(f) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (“OIP”) Exch. Act. Rel. 88314 (March 3, 2020).

Pursuant to SEC Rule of Practice 141(a)(2)(iii), the OIP was served on Respondent. Vazquez did not file an answer, and thus is in default. Accordingly, the Division moves, pursuant to Rules 155(a)(2) and 220(f) of the SEC’s Rules of Practice, for a finding that Vazquez is in default and for the imposition of remedial sanctions. The Division specifically requests that

the Commission issue an order barring Vazquez from being associated with a broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer, municipal advisor, transfer agent, or nationally recognized statistical rating organization, or from participating in an offering of penny stock.

## **II. FACTS**

### **A. Respondent**

Vazquez is last known to have resided in Orange Park, Florida. Declaration of Lynn M. Dean (“Dean Decl.”) ¶ 8. He is the founder and CEO of Hoplon and NEON, and has held Series 7, 9, 10, 23, 31, 63, and 65 qualifications in the past. *Id.*, Ex. 1, OIP at ¶ A.1. Vazquez held a California insurance license, which became inactive when it expired in July 2016 and was revoked in January 2017. *Id.* From 1998 through 2016, Vazquez was associated as a registered representative with a series of broker-dealer firms, Vazquez voluntarily resigned from his last firm on or around May 12, 2016, shortly after FINRA notified him of an open investigation involving his firm, Hoplon. *Id.* Vazquez failed to provide requested documents to FINRA and, effective September 12, 2016, FINRA permanently barred Vazquez from associating with any FINRA member in any capacity. *Id.*

### **B. Entry of the Injunction**

On December 11, 2019, a final judgment was entered against Vazquez, permanently enjoining him from future violations of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”) and Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 thereunder in the civil action entitled *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Daniel Vazquez, et al.*, Civil Action Number 8:18-cv-0047 CJC (KESx), in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. *Id.*, Ex. 1, OIP at ¶ B.1; Ex. 3.

The Commission’s complaint alleged that Vazquez and his firm Hoplon committed fraud with the assistance of Hoplon’s COO. *Id.*, Ex. 1, OIP at ¶ B.2. In 2011, Vazquez and Hoplon created the New Economic Opportunities Fund I, LLC (“NEON”) vehicle to pool investors’ funds ostensibly for the purpose of purchasing and flipping residential real estate properties.

Vazquez then misused substantial amounts of NEON funds, resulting in a total loss to investors. *Id.* By engaging in this conduct, Vazquez committed violations of Section 17(a)(2) of the Securities Act and Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder. *Id.*

### **C. Vazquez is in Default**

The instant proceedings were commenced on March 3, 2020 based upon the entry of a final judgment against Vazquez, permanently enjoining him from future violations of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”) and Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 thereunder in the civil action entitled *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Daniel Vazquez, et al.*, Civil Action Number 8:18-cv-0047 CJC (KESx), in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. *Id.* ¶ B.1.

The OIP was served on Respondent by sending a copy of the OIP addressed to Respondent’s last-known addresses in accordance with Commission Rule of Practice 141(a)(2). Respondent did not appear or respond to the OIP. At the time these proceedings were commenced, Vazquez was incarcerated in a Federal Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”) facility located in Adelanto, California. Although the Division has confirmation that the OIP was delivered to the prison, the Division was unable to obtain confirmation that Vazquez personally received the OIP. Dean Decl., ¶ 2.

On July 13, 2021, the General Counsel’s office issued an Order in which it directed the Division to provide status reports regarding its efforts to serve Respondent. Upon receipt of the July 13, 2021 Order, Division counsel conducted a new search of Respondent’s whereabouts and learned that he had been transferred to the custody of Keeton Corrections, a BOP contractor, in Jacksonville, Florida. Dean Decl., ¶ 3.

On July 23, 2021, the Division served the OIP on Respondent at his address in Florida by UPS Overnight delivery. Dean Decl., ¶ 4. Confirmation of delivery was received on July 26, 2021 and provided to the General Counsel’s office on July 27, 2021. *Id.* On July 29, 2021, the

General Counsel's office issued an Order in which it noted that the Commission's Rules of Practice do not provide for service of Orders Instituting Proceedings through commercial courier or express delivery service. *Id.* The Division was directed to provide monthly status updates on its further efforts to serve Respondent. *Id.*

The accompanying Declaration of Lynn M. Dean details the Division's efforts to locate Respondent in transitional housing and immediately after his release. *Id.* at ¶¶ 5-6. Ultimately, Division counsel spoke to David Vazquez, Respondent's brother, by telephone, but Mr. Vazquez declined to provide contact information for Respondent. *Id.* at ¶ 7. He did agree to pass him a message, but Respondent did not contact Division counsel. *Id.*

A database search run by the Division in September 2021 located a new address associated with Respondent that was provided by a utility company in Orange Park, Florida. *Id.* at ¶ 8. On September 22, 2021, the Division served the OIP by certified U.S. postal mail, return receipt requested, at the address in Orange Park, Florida. *Id.* On September 29 2021, the Division received delivery confirmation for service of the OIP. *Id.* at ¶ 9.

On October 29, 2021, the Commission issued an Order to Show Cause ordering Vazquez, by November 12, 2021, to show cause why he should not be deemed to be in default and why this proceeding should not be determined against him due to his failure to file an answer and to otherwise defend this proceeding. Order, Exch Act. Rel. No. 93481 (Oct. 29, 2021). The Order further directed that if Vazquez failed to file a response, the Division should file a motion for default and other relief by December 10, 2021. *Id.* Vazquez did not appear or respond to the OSC. Dean Decl. ¶ 10.

### **III. ARGUMENT**

#### **A. Vazquez Is In Default and the Allegations of the OIP May Be Deemed To Be True**

Because Vazquez has not responded to the OIP, he is in default. Rule 155(a) of the SEC's Rules of Practice states:



A party to a proceeding may be deemed to be in default and the Commission or the hearing officer may determine the proceeding against the party upon consideration of the record, including the order instituting proceedings, the allegations of which may be deemed to be true, if that party fails: . . .

(2) To answer, to respond to a dispositive motion within the time provided, or otherwise to defend the proceeding . . . .

17 CFR § 201.155(a). Moreover, the OIP itself provides: “If Respondent fails to file the directed answer . . . . the Respondent may be deemed in default and the proceedings may be determined against him upon consideration of this Order, the allegations of which may be deemed to be true . . . .” Dean Decl. Ex. 1 (OIP at p. 3).

The Commission has already made findings that Vazquez was properly served with the OIP, and has failed to answer. *See* Order to Show Cause, Exch. Act. Rel. No. 93481 (Oct. 29, 2021). Under Rule 155(a), the allegations of the OIP may thus be deemed to be true and the Commission may determine the proceedings against the party upon consideration of the record, including the OIP. 17 CFR § 201.155(a).

**B. The Findings in the Underlying Case Are Binding on Respondent**

Where, as here, facts have been litigated and determined in an earlier judicial proceeding, those facts may not be revisited in a subsequent administrative proceeding. *See Peter J. Eichler, Jr.*, Initial Dec. Rel. No. 1032, 2016 WL 4035559 (July 8, 2016) (“It is well-established that the Commission does not permit a respondent to relitigate issues that were addressed in a previous civil proceeding against the respondent, whether resolved by summary judgment, by consent, or after a trial”) (collecting cases); *accord Robert Burton*, Initial Dec. Rel. No. 1014, 2016 WL 3030850 (May 27, 2016); *James E. Franklin*, Exchange Act Rel. No. 56649 (Oct. 12, 2007), 91 S.E.C. Docket 2708, 2713 & n.13, 2007 WL 2974200, *petition for review denied*, 285 F. App’x

761 (D.C. Cir. 2008); *In the Matter of Gunderson*, Exchange Act Release No. 61234, 2009 SEC LEXIS 4322 \*15-16 (Dec. 23, 2009).

**C. Imposition of a Permanent Bar Is Warranted**

Based on the record here and in the underlying action, the Division respectfully requests that sanctions be imposed under Section 15(b)(6) of the Exchange Act. That section provides in relevant part:

With respect to any person who is associated, . . . or, at the time of the alleged misconduct, who was associated . . . with a broker or dealer, . . . the Commission, by order, shall censure, place limitations on the activities or functions of such a person, or suspend for a period not exceeding 12 months, or bar any such person from being associated with a broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer, municipal advisor, transfer agent, or nationally recognized statistical rating organization, or from participating in an offering of penny stock, if the Commission finds, on the record after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, that such censure, placing of limitations, suspension, or bar is in the public interest and that such person – . . .

\*\*\*

(iii) is enjoined from any action, conduct or practice specified in subparagraph (C) of such paragraph (4)” of Section 15(b).

Thus, Section 15(b)(6) authorizes the Commission to impose an associational bar against a respondent if: (1) at the time of the alleged misconduct, he was associated with a broker; (2) he is enjoined from any action, conduct or practice specified in Section 15(b)(4)(C); and (3) a bar is in the public interest. Each of these factors is easily met here.

**1. At the Time of the Misconduct, Respondent was Associated With a Broker**

As to the first factor, from 1998 through 2016, Vazquez was associated as a registered representative with a series of broker-dealer firms. Dean Decl. Ex. 1, OIP at ¶ A.1. Vazquez voluntarily resigned from his last firm on or around May 12, 2016, shortly after FINRA notified him of an open investigation involving his firm, Hoplon. *Id.* Effective September 12, 2016, FINRA permanently barred Vazquez from associating with any FINRA member. *Id.*

**2. The District Court Enjoined Dow Against Violations of the Securities Laws**

The second element under Section 15(b)(6) is also established by the record in the underlying district court action, because Respondent was enjoined from conduct specified in Section 15(b)(4)(C). The acts enumerated under Section 15(b)(4)(D) include willful violations of the Securities Act, the Exchange Act or any rules or regulations under such statutes. Here, the district court permanently enjoined Respondent from violating Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”) and Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 thereunder. *See* Dean Decl., Ex. 1, OIP at ¶ B.1.

**3. A Bar Is In the Public Interest**

Finally, the record establishes that a bar is in the public interest. In determining whether an administrative sanction is in the public interest, the Commission considers a number of factors, including (1) the egregiousness of the respondent’s actions; (2) the isolated or recurrent nature of the infraction; (3) the degree of scienter involved; (3) the sincerity of the respondent’s assurances against future violations; (4) recognition of wrongful conduct; and (5) the likelihood that the respondent’s occupation will present future opportunities for violations. *See Steadman v. SEC*, 603 F.2d 1126, 1140 (5th Cir. 1979), *aff’d on other grounds*, 450 U.S. 81 (1981); *Lonny S. Bernath*, Initial Dec. Rel. No. 993 at 4, 2016 SEC LEXIS 1222 \*10-11 (Apr. 4, 2016) (*Steadman* factors used to determine whether a bar is in the public interest). The district court found that all of these factors weighed in favor a permanent injunction against Vazquez. Dean Decl. Ex. 2.

As to whether a bar is appropriate in a follow-on proceeding, “[t]he existence of an injunction can, in the first instance, indicate the appropriateness in the public interest of a suspension or bar from participation in the securities industry.” *Michael V. Lipkin and Joshua Shainberg*, Init. Dec. Rel. No. 317, 88 SEC Docket 2346, 2006 WL 2422652, at \*4 (Aug. 21, 2006), *notice of finality*, 88 S.E.C. Docket 2872, 2006 WL 2668516 (Sept. 15, 2006).

**a. Respondent’s violations were egregious, intentional and recurrent**

The first three *Steadman* factors are met here. As previously noted, in the underlying district court action, the Court found that Vazquez violated the law and that his conduct was “serious and egregious.” Dean Decl. Ex. 2, at p. 8. Further, Respondent’s fraud was not an isolated incident. Instead, he participated in a scheme to defraud over a number of years that raised over \$ 2 million from 27 investors. *Id.* In sum, the egregiousness and extent of Respondent’s fraud clearly favor a bar under *Steadman*.

**b. The remaining *Steadman* factors also favor a bar**

The remaining *Steadman* factors also favor a bar. To begin, Respondent has failed to appear and provide any assurance against future violations or recognition of his wrongful conduct. Dean Decl. ¶ 10. The “absence of recognition by [a respondent] of the wrongful nature of his conduct” favors a permanent bar. *Jonathan D. Havey, CPA*, Initial Dec. Rel. No. 959, 2016 SEC LEXIS 522, at \*11 (Feb. 11, 2016) (granting permanent bar on motion for summary disposition in follow-on proceeding to criminal conviction); *Siming Yang*, Initial Dec. Rel. No. 788, 2015 SEC LEXIS 1735, at \*10 (May 6, 2015) (noting, as part of grant of summary disposition and imposing of permanent bar in follow on proceeding to civil injunction, that, “[c]onsistent with a vigorous defense of the charges, [respondent] ha[d] not recognized the wrongful nature of his conduct”); *Delsa U. Thomas and The D. Christopher Capital Management Group, LLC*, Initial Dec. Rel. No. 205, 2014 SEC LEXIS 4181, at 24 (Nov. 4, 2014) (imposing permanent bar and revoking adviser’s registration on summary disposition following civil fraud injunction, noting that “Respondents do not recognize the wrongful nature

of their conduct. Instead, they deny any culpability, insist that none of their conduct was inappropriate, and accuse the Commission and the Commission's witnesses of bias or lying"); *Terrence O'Donnell*, Initial Dec. Rel. No. 334, 2007 SEC LEXIS 2148, at \*14 (Sept. 20, 2007) (weighing in favor of bar respondent's "protest" that the securities laws were not sufficiently clear, finding this "evidence that [respondent] still seeks to minimize his misconduct"); *Steadman*, 603 F.2d at 1140.

In addition, the final *Steadman* factor considers "the likelihood that the respondent's occupation will present future opportunities for violations." Although the Division lacks evidence of Vazquez's current employment, the other *Steadman* factors strongly favor the imposition of the bar, which is in the public's interest.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Division respectfully requests that Respondent be barred from being associated with a broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer, municipal advisor, transfer agent, or nationally recognized statistical rating organization, or from participating in an offering of penny stock.

December 10, 2021

Respectfully submitted,



---

Lynn M. Dean (323) 965-3245  
Securities and Exchange Commission  
Los Angeles Regional Office  
Securities and Exchange Commission  
444 South Flower Street, Suite 900  
Los Angeles, CA 90071

**In the Matter of Daniel B. Vazquez, Sr.**  
Administrative Proceeding File No. 3-19720  
**SERVICE LIST**

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

**DIVISION OF ENFORCEMENT'S MOTION FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT  
JUDGMENT AND REMEDIAL SANCTIONS**

was served on December 10, 2021, upon the following parties:

Vanessa Countryman, Secretary  
Securities and Exchange Commission  
100 F. Street, N.E., Mail Stop 1090  
Washington, DC 20549-1090

(By eFAP only)

Mr. Daniel B. Vazquez, Sr.  
[REDACTED]

(By UPS Overnight)



Lynn M. Dean

\_\_\_\_\_