

New Evidence

I want to explain the check that I am labeling as new evidence. As I have said all along, the DWP retirees have extremely generous deferred compensation plans also known as pensions. Upon retirement, they have several choices/ options. Most pick a lifetime pension. But not all do.

There are certain instances where it does not make sense to take the lifetime pension. As is the case in this situation. They are not in great health and have no spouse to want to take care of should they pass away. Taking the pension option is not at all a desirable option for them because they might die in a few years. For some DWP retirees, the life pension option is fantastic for them and/ or their spouse. They might live 30 years and collect that pension throughout.

But not in all cases such as this one. For some, such as this retiree in poor health, rolling over the entire amount and using the funds as they desire is by far the best option for them. If the DWP rolls over the lump sum or takes the lifetime pension incomes payments, either way it is a tremendously valuable asset that I used in calculating the client's net worth.

It was completely appropriate for me to do that. Let's take two neighbors as an example. Let's say one worked for Walmart and one worked for the DWP. The DWP retiree is going to get a \$10,000 per month pension payment (or the \$2 million lump sum) and the Walmart retiree is just going to get social security. How are their two respective net worths the same?

I have new evidence that I want the SEC to hear and consider. The Professor from Tulane University correctly said in the first hearing that the heart of this matter/ case is suitability. That is absolutely correct. I know that is very inconvenient for FINRA Enforcement, but I actually did the suitability correctly.

I did not do all the paperwork correctly, there were inconsistencies in my paperwork. That was an error on my part. I take full responsibility for all my actions. But the DWP employees do have these very significant assets, and it is very important and necessary to include them in those clients' net worth. If those assets are correctly included, as they should be, I did not cause Western's books and records to be incorrect.

I am aware that the SEC is taking action against Western. I am very interested in being a witness against Western for the SEC. I was the smallest participant in this matter. I want justice to be served here. FINRA's solution was to give the most insignificant participant in all of this the death penalty. I want Western, my OSJ Douglas Weisner, Western compliance department Brad Keiser (that also oversaw and approved every single one of the transactions I made) to be held accountable, as well.

Regarding the impersonating the customer charge, I had obtained prior verbal authorization to call from the customer. Further, both of the clients signed a letter

authorizing me to call. Western has that letter. The client has that letter, and it is in the client's file. Western compliance department has that letter.

Sincerely,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area, with a small white rectangular cutout on the right side.