

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-22165

In the Matter of

**Invesco Distributors, Inc. and
Invesco Advisers, Inc.**

Respondents.

**Respondents Invesco Distributors, Inc.
and Invesco Advisers, Inc.’s Motion to
Stay Implementation of Order
Instituting Proceedings**

Respondents Invesco Advisers, Inc. (“IAI”) and Invesco Distributors, Inc. (“IDI,” and with IAI “Respondents” or “Invesco”), by and through their undersigned counsel, Ropes & Gray LLP, hereby move pursuant to Rule 401 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.401, to stay the implementation of Paragraphs 7, 35a-j, 36, 37, 38, 40, and 41, as well as Section IV.D of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission’s (the “SEC” or the “Commission”) September 24, 2024 Order Instituting Administrative Cease-and-Desist Proceedings Pursuant to Sections 15(b) and 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Sections 203(e) and 203(k) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, Making Findings, and Imposing Remedial Sanctions and a Cease-and-Desist Order (the “Order”).

In support of Respondents’ motion, pursuant to Rule 154(a) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.154, Invesco concurrently files a brief in support of the motion.

Dated: February 5, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ R. Daniel O’Connor
R. Daniel O’Connor

Abraham Lee
Ropes & Gray LLP
800 Boylston St.
Boston, Massachusetts 02199-3600
617-951-7260
Daniel.OConnor@ropesgray.com
Abraham.Lee@ropesgray.com

*Counsel for Respondents Invesco
Distributors, Inc. and Invesco Advisers, Inc.*

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-22165

In the Matter of

**Invesco Distributors, Inc. and
Invesco Advisers, Inc.**

Respondents.

**Respondents Invesco Distributors, Inc.
and Invesco Advisers, Inc.'s Brief in
Support of Motion to Stay
Implementation of Order Instituting
Proceedings**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Factual Background	2
III. Argument.....	5
IV. Conclusion.....	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
 Regulations	
17 C.F.R. § 201.154	1, 2
17 C.F.R. § 201.200	1, 5
17 C.F.R. § 201.401	1, 2, 5, 7
 Administrative Decisions and Orders	
<i>In the Matter of the Application of Bloomberg L.P. for Rev. of Action Taken by the Consol. Tape Ass’n in Its Role as a Registered Sec. Information Processor, Release No. 83755 (July 31, 2018)</i>	5
<i>In the Matter of Millenium Partners et al., Release No. 34-78364 (July 19, 2016)</i>	6
<i>In the Matter of Putnam Inv. Mgmt., Release No. 3600 (May 3, 2013)</i>	6
<i>In the Matter of Scottsdale Capital, Release No. 34-83783 (Aug. 6, 2018)</i>	5
Order Instituting Administrative Cease-and-Desist Proceedings (Invesco), Exchange Act Release No. 101141 (Sept. 24, 2024)	<i>passim</i>
 Other Authorities	
Reuters Article (Nov. 9, 2022), https://tinyurl.com/36kctx22	2
WSJ Article (May 28, 2024), https://tinyurl.com/yc589r8b	3
<i>Twelve Firms to Pay More Than \$63 Million Combined to Settle SEC’s Charges for Recordkeeping Failures, SEC (Jan. 13, 2025), https://www.sec.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2025-6</i>	3

I. Introduction

Respondents Invesco Advisers, Inc. (“IAI”) and Invesco Distributors, Inc. (“IDI,” and with IAI “Respondents” or “Invesco”), by and through their undersigned counsel, Ropes & Gray LLP, hereby move pursuant to Rule 401 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.401, to stay the implementation of Paragraphs 7, 35a-j, 36, 37, 38, 40, and 41, as well as Section IV.D of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission’s (the “SEC” or the “Commission”) September 24, 2024 Order Instituting Administrative Cease-and-Desist Proceedings Pursuant to Sections 15(b) and 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Sections 203(e) and 203(k) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, Making Findings, and Imposing Remedial Sanctions and a Cease-and-Desist Order (the “Order”).

In a separate motion, Invesco seeks to amend the Order under Rules of Practice 154 and 200(d)(1), 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.154 and 201.200(d)(1) (the “Motion to Amend”), which, if granted, would significantly alter Invesco’s obligations under the Order and render certain of those obligations moot. Invesco is currently obligated to comply in full with the Order, including by having its independent compliance consultant complete, by February 24, 2025, a comprehensive evaluation of Invesco’s compliance program as it relates to electronic communications and recordkeeping. With that date fast approaching, Invesco is forced to continue to dedicate considerable financial and personnel resources to fulfill its obligations. If the Motion to Amend is granted, which we respectfully suggest is likely, several obligations under the Order would be rendered moot, including the requirement that Invesco continue to retain an independent compliance consultant and complete its comprehensive evaluation. Without a stay, Invesco, and its shareholders, would be forced to incur substantial costs to comply with obligations that may no longer be in force.

Invesco brings this Motion to stay the Order, pursuant to Rules of Practice 154 and 401, 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.154 and 201.401, until the Commission issues a decision on Invesco's Motion to Amend on the grounds that: (i) Invesco is likely to succeed on the merits of its motion; (ii) Invesco, and its shareholders, are likely to suffer irreparable harm without a stay; (iii) no other party will suffer harm, let alone substantial harm, as a result of the stay; and (iv) the stay would serve the public interest.

II. Factual Background

On May 15, 2023, Invesco received document requests (the "Inquiry") as part of the Commission's three-year, industry-wide electronic communications sweep (the "Electronic Communications Sweep") that has to date resulted in over 70 settlements and well over \$2 billion in fines being imposed for violations of certain recordkeeping statutes and regulations. From the outset of the Inquiry, Invesco cooperated in full and pursued a uniquely collaborative approach with the regional staff of the SEC's Fort Worth Office (the "Staff") that resulted in a settlement just over a year later in September of 2024. Invesco's collaboration resulted in Invesco resolving its inquiry prior to other firms whose inquiries began well before Invesco's. For example, certain firms which first announced electronic communications inquiries in November 2022 (before Invesco received its Inquiry), did not reach settlements until January 2025, while Invesco settled its Inquiry in September 2024. *See, e.g.*, Reuters Article (Nov. 9, 2022), <https://tinyurl.com/36kctx22>.

Invesco repeatedly sought to avoid an independent compliance consultant and other remedies found in earlier settlements but understood that the SEC's position, as established by enforcement leadership in the Washington D.C. office and required by the Gensler-led Commission, was that all firms would receive essentially the same settlements. Invesco's belief in the position was justified given that up through the date of Invesco's settlement, there were

nearly 70 settlements, all of which contained ordered remedies that included independent compliance consultants and a requirement to report to the SEC employee violations of recordkeeping policies and procedures. Even firms that self-reported their violations settled on these terms. However, the SEC's stance changed materially, as evidenced by the less prejudicial settlement terms provided to the January 2025 cohort of firms. We note that some of the firms in the recent batch of settlements were negotiating a resolution with the SEC enforcement staff at or about the same time that Invesco was negotiating its resolution with the Staff according to public reports and SEC filings. *See, e.g.,* WSJ Article (May 28, 2024), <https://tinyurl.com/yc589r8b>. Invesco was actively negotiating a potential settlement with the Staff during the summer of 2024 and received from the Staff a draft order instituting proceedings on July 19, 2024. This shift in approach has significantly impacted Invesco in a negative and unfair manner.

As set forth in its Motion to Amend, Invesco seeks to modify the Order to align with the manner of resolution found in orders more recently entered by the Commission for twelve firms on January 13, 2025 (the "January 2025 Settlements"). *See Twelve Firms to Pay More Than \$63 Million Combined to Settle SEC's Charges for Recordkeeping Failures*, SEC (Jan. 13, 2025), <https://www.sec.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2025-6>. These settlements involved the same recordkeeping violations as the nearly 70 settlements that had come before, including Invesco's, but resolved those violations on significantly less prejudicial terms. For example, the January 2025 Settlements did not require the settling firms to hire independent compliance consultants nor did they contain any requirement to report to the SEC employee violations of recordkeeping policies and procedures. Separately, because the Order asserts a willful violation and failure to supervise under Exchange Act Section 15(b) and imposes, via Section IV.D, ongoing undertakings that are "still in effect," the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority ("FINRA")

required IDI (Invesco's broker-dealer) to complete a continuing membership application. In connection with this process, IDI was required by FINRA to consent to a heightened plan of supervision, which imposes additional requirements beyond those contained in the Order and will result in Invesco's shareholders bearing additional costs of compliance over the course of several years. However, the broker-dealers in the January 2025 Settlements were not required under FINRA's rules to complete a continuing membership application because they are not subject to any sanctions "still in effect" and, therefore, are not required to adhere to onerous heightened supervision plans.

Invesco's Motion to Amend is brought on the grounds that being denied an opportunity to reach a settlement on the terms afforded to the similarly situated firms that resolved analogous electronics communications matters in January 2025 is a new matter of fact and "subsequent development" that is fundamentally unfair and has severely prejudiced Invesco and its shareholders, and granting the requested modifications will not prejudice the Commission or the investing public. Invesco is simply seeking to receive the same treatment that was afforded to other firms that settled nearly identical recordkeeping matters in January 2025.

If Invesco's Motion to Amend is granted, the Order would, consistent with the January 2025 Settlements, materially alter Invesco's obligations by: (i) removing all obligations related to the independent compliance consultant in favor of an internal audit review; (ii) removing the obligation to report certain discipline imposed on employees; and (iii) moving any activities that Invesco will complete going forward to be voluntary undertakings. *See* Motion to Amend at 3-5 (including a chart summarizing the proposed changes to the Order).

III. Argument

Pending the Commission's decision on whether to amend the Order, the Commission should stay the implementation of the Order pursuant to its authority under Rule of Practice 401(c), 17 C.F.R. § 201.401(c). "In deciding whether to grant a stay, the Commission traditionally applies the following four-factor test: it considers (i) the likelihood that the moving party will eventually succeed on the merits of [its case]; (ii) the likelihood that the moving party will suffer irreparable harm without a stay; (iii) the likelihood that another party will suffer substantial harm as a result of a stay; and (iv) a stay's impact on the public interest." *In the Matter of the Application of Bloomberg L.P. for Rev. of Action Taken by the Consol. Tape Ass'n in Its Role as a Registered Sec. Information Processor*, Release No. 83755 at 10-11 (July 31, 2018). Importantly, "not all four factors must favor a stay for a stay to be granted." *In the Matter of Scottsdale Capital*, Release No. 34-83783 at 3 (Aug. 6, 2018). "The first two factors are the most critical," although a stay is warranted even if a party has not satisfied the first factor, so long as it has raised "serious questions going to the merits" and "demonstrates irreparable harm that decidedly outweighs any potential harm to the stay opponent if a stay is granted." *Id.* In any case, Invesco easily satisfies all four factors.

First, as fully set forth in the Motion to Amend, Invesco is likely to succeed on the merits. Invesco's motion is based on the fundamental unfairness and prejudice that has flowed from the Commission approving settlements in January 2025 on vastly less prejudicial terms that were not made available to Invesco, despite Invesco's unique cooperation. Per Rule of Practice 201(d), the Commission may amend orders to remedy such prejudice brought by changes in circumstance. *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.200(d)(1) ("Upon motion by a party, the Commission may, at any time, amend an order instituting proceedings to include new matters of fact or law."). The Commission has in the past granted similar amendments to orders such as those requested by

Invesco (*e.g.*, amendments that have significantly modified ongoing compliance consultant obligations). *See, e.g., In the Matter of Millenium Partners et al.*, Release No. 34-78364 at 2 (July 19, 2016) (recognizing that the respondent in that matter had “support[ed] its request by noting that . . . [the Commission has, among other things,] agreed to eliminate similar undertakings in other administrative proceedings related to [similar misconduct].”); *see also In the Matter of Putnam Inv. Mgmt.*, Release No. 3600 at 2 (May 3, 2013) (granting amendment of an order to remove various ongoing obligations, including to “undergo a compliance review by a third party at least once every other year.”). Given the Commission’s clear authority to amend orders and the significant shift in approach represented by the January 2025 Settlements, which diverged from nearly 70 prior electronic communications settlements, Invesco believes it is likely to succeed on the merits.

Second, Invesco and its shareholders will suffer irreparable harm without a stay. As noted, Invesco is currently in the process of dedicating significant financial and personnel resources to fulfill several obligations under the Order. Most notably, less than one month from now, Invesco’s independent compliance consultant must complete a comprehensive evaluation of Invesco’s compliance program as it relates to electronic communications and recordkeeping. While Invesco requested that the Staff grant a modest extension of this deadline pursuant to their authority in Paragraph 40 of the Order, the Staff was unable to offer an extension. Invesco expects to expend significant resources to complete this work. If the Commission grants the Motion to Amend, these obligations would be rendered moot, but the resources used to comply with the obligations would not be recoverable.

Third, no party would suffer any harm from a stay of the Order pending the Commission’s decision for the Motion to Amend. Invesco has already paid an eight-figure civil

monetary penalty and as recognized in the Order, “*Prior* to this action, Respondents enhanced their policies and procedures and increased training concerning the use of approved communications methods and began implementing significant changes to the technology available to personnel.” Order, at ¶34 (emphasis added). Given these enhancements, Invesco is exceedingly well positioned to comply with its recordkeeping obligations on a go-forward basis. There is nothing to indicate that Invesco would not comply with the Order if modified in accordance with its request. On the other hand, Invesco and its shareholders would, by virtue of expending unnecessary costs, suffer significant financial harm if the stay is *not* granted and the Commission grants the Motion to Amend.

Fourth, the Commission’s grant of a stay can only positively impact the public interest and restore fairness in this case. As noted, the only potential harm that could result is harm to Invesco’s shareholders if the stay is *not* granted and Invesco is forced to comply with onerous and costly obligations likely to be rendered moot. Thus, the investing public, which includes Invesco’s shareholders, can only be positively impacted by the grant of a stay.

IV. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Invesco respectfully requests that the Commission stay, under Rule of Practice 401(c), 17 C.F.R. § 201.401(c), the implementation of the Order pending the Commission’s decision on the Motion to Amend.

Dated: February 5, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ R. Daniel O’Connor

R. Daniel O’Connor

Abraham Lee

Ropes & Gray LLP

800 Boylston St.

Boston, Massachusetts 02199-3600

617-951-7260

Daniel.OConnor@ropesgray.com

Abraham.Lee@ropesgray.com

*Counsel for Respondents Invesco
Distributors, Inc. and Invesco Advisers, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

In accordance with Rules of Practice 150 and 151, 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.150 & 201.151, I certify that I filed this document using the eFAP system; I further certify that, on **February 5, 2025**, a copy of **Respondents Invesco Distributors, Inc. and Invesco Advisers, Inc.’s Motion to Stay Implementation of Order Instituting Proceedings** was served via electronic mail on the following:

Office of the Secretary
Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20549
APfilings@sec.gov

Nikolay V. Vydashenko, Esq.
Melanie K. Good, Esq.
Securities and Exchange Commission
Enforcement Division
Fort Worth Regional Office
801 Cherry Street, Suite 1900
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6882
VydashenkoN@sec.gov
GoodM@sec.gov

/s/ R. Daniel O’Connor
R. Daniel O’Connor
Abraham Lee
Ropes & Gray LLP
800 Boylston St.
Boston, Massachusetts 02199-3600
617-951-7260
Daniel.OConnor@ropesgray.com
Abraham.Lee@ropesgray.com

*Counsel for Respondents Invesco
Distributors, Inc. and Invesco Advisers, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

In accordance with Rule of Practice 151(e), 17 C.F.R. § 201.151(e), I certify that on February 5, 2025, I have omitted any sensitive personal information, as required by Rule of Practice 151(e)(3) from this filing.

/s/ R. Daniel O'Connor

R. Daniel O'Connor

Abraham Lee

Ropes & Gray LLP

800 Boylston St.

Boston, Massachusetts 02199-3600

617-951-7260

Daniel.OConnor@ropesgray.com

Abraham.Lee@ropesgray.com

Counsel for Respondents Invesco

Distributors, Inc. and Invesco Advisers, Inc.