

U.S. SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Appeal of

DEPARTMENT OF ENFORCEMENT

Complainant,

**Notice of Appeal of
NAC Decision in
Complaint No. 2018058588501
Christopher Peter Tranchina**

vs.

CHRISTOPHER PETER TRANCHINA

**DATE OF SERVICE
April 20, 2023**

Respondent.

NOTICE OF APPEAL – ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, that pursuant to Securities Exchange Act of 1934 Rule 19d-3, Mr. Christopher Tranchina (“Appellant”) by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby appeals the decision of the National Adjudicatory Council (“NAC”) of the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (“FINRA”) with regard to Complaint No. 2018058588501, which was issued on March 23, 2023.

Appellant appeals:

1. NAC’s decision is clearly in error because: a) NAC’s conclusions and basis for those conclusions are premised upon a misreading of the law and factual determinations not supported by the record; and (b) NAC’s explanation of how its findings of violations inform the sanctions imposed is based upon a misreading of the law and factual determinations not supported by the record;
2. NAC’s finding that Appellant violated FINRA Rule 2010 because he gained unauthorized access to customer files of his former member firm which is clearly in error and premised upon a misreading of the law and factual determinations not supported by the record;
3. NAC’s finding that Appellant violated FINRA By-Laws and Rules by willfully failing to disclose material information on his Form U4 which is clearly in error and premised upon a misreading of the law and factual determinations not supported by the record;
4. NAC’s finding that FINRA Enforcement met its burden of proof which is clearly in error and premised upon a misreading of the law and factual determinations contradicted by the record;

5. NAC's order of a permanent bar from associating with any member firm in any capacity, which is clearly in error, grossly excessive, punitive, and premised upon a misreading of the law and factual determinations not supported by the record;
6. NAC's order of a statutory disqualification, which is clearly in error, grossly excessive, punitive, and premised upon a misreading of the law and factual determinations not supported by the record;
7. NAC's order of a fine of \$10,000, which is clearly in error and premised upon a misreading of the law and factual determinations not supported by the record; and
8. NAC's order of hearing costs of \$4,977.43 and appeal costs of \$1,504.66.

Appellant requests *de novo* review of the decision of the NAC and reversal of the decision. Appellant requests oral argument before the Commission because he believes oral argument will be of assistance to the Commission given the NAC's misapprehension of the record evidence, controlling law, and sanctions.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Jon-Jorge Aras
Jon-Jorge Aras, Esquire
WARREN LAW GROUP
519 8th Avenue
25th Floor
New York, NY 10018
Tel: 866-954-7687
Fax: 212-656-1200
jj@warren.law

Dated: April 20, 2023

VIA EMAIL TO:

The Office of the Secretary
Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F Street, NE
Room 10915
Washington, D.C. 2059-1090
AdministrativeProceedingsFax@sec.gov

Attn: Michael M. Smith
Office of General Counsel
FINRA
1735 K Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20006
michael.smith@finra.org
nac.casefilings@finra.org