KRISTIN S. ESCALANTE (Cal. Bar No. 16 Email: escalantek@sec.gov	9635)
2 YOLANDA OCHOA (Cal. Bar No. 267993)	
Securities and Exchange Commission	
6 Amy Longo, Regional Trial Counsel	
Los Angeles, California 90036	
	DISTRICT COLIDT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
DISTRICT	OF ARIZONA
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE	
	COMPLAINT
Plaintiff,	
VS.	
LANNY BROWN and SEAN FOX,	
Defendants.	
9 Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") alleges:	
JURISDICTION AND VENUE	
1. The Court has jurisdiction over	this action pursuant to Sections 21(d)(1), 21A,
2 21(e) and 27(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§	
3 78u(d)(1), 78u-1, 78u(e) & 78aa(a).	
2. Defendants have, directly or indirectly, made use of the means or	
5 instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national	
securities exchange in connection with the transactions, acts, practices and courses of	
business alleged in this complaint.	
	Email: escalantek@sec.gov YOLANDA OCHOA (Cal. Bar No. 267993) Email: ochoay@sec.gov Attorneys for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission Michele Wein Layne, Regional Director John W. Berry, Associate Regional Director Amy Longo, Regional Trial Counsel 444 South Flower St, Suite 900 Los Angeles, California 90036 Telephone: (323) 965-3998 Facsimile: (213) 443-1904 UNITED STATES DISTRICT SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, Plaintiff, vs. LANNY BROWN and SEAN FOX, Defendants. Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Con JURISDICTIC 1. The Court has jurisdiction over 21(e) and 27(a) of the Securities Exchange A 78u(d)(1), 78u-1, 78u(e) & 78aa(a). 2. Defendants have, directly or incinstrumentalities of interstate commerce, of t securities exchange in connection with the tra

COMPLAINT

3. Venue is proper in this district under Section 27(a) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78aa(a), because defendants Lanny Brown and Sean Fox reside in this judicial district and because certain of the transactions, acts, practices and courses of conduct constituting violations of the federal securities laws occurred within this district.

SUMMARY

- 4. This case involves insider trading by defendants Lanny Brown and Sean Fox in the securities of International Rectifier Corporation ("International Rectifier"), where Brown worked at the time that he and Fox traded. In August 2014, shortly after learning that International Rectifier would be acquired by another company, Brown tipped his friend, Fox, about the acquisition and then they both acquired International Rectifier call options bets that the stock price would go up once the deal was announced.
- 5. In doing so, Brown and Fox devised a scheme to conceal Brown's involvement in the trading given that he was an International Rectifier employee who was not only prohibited by company policy from trading on material, nonpublic information, but was also subject to a "blackout period" at the time, which barred him from trading while the acquisition deal was being negotiated and finalized. Brown and Fox combined approximately \$12,000 of their funds into one of Fox's brokerage accounts, and used these comingled funds to purchase the call options just a week before the August 20th announcement of the International Rectifier-Infineon deal. When the deal was disclosed on August 20, International Rectifier's stock price jumped over 47%. The next day, Brown and Fox closed out their options positions, collectively reaping \$369,720 in profits from their illicit trading. Then, to further hide Brown's role in the trading, Fox funneled Brown's share of the trading profits by paying several of Brown's personal expenses or writing checks to Brown's adult and minor children and minor stepchildren. Brown and his wife then endorsed these checks and used the funds.
- 6. By engaging in this conduct, the defendants violated Sections 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5. With this complaint, the SEC seeks permanent injunctions, disgorgement of ill-gotten

trading profits together with prejudgment interest, and civil penalties.

DEFENDANTS

- 7. Lanny Brown, age 49, resides in Queen Creek, Arizona. At all relevant times discussed in this complaint, Brown was employed by International Rectifier as director of Epi/Silicon Sourcing and Foundry Service Procurement in International Rectifier's Chandler, Arizona office.
- 8. Sean Fox, age 49, resides in Higley, Arizona. At all relevant times discussed in this complaint, Brown and Fox maintained a close friendship.

RELATED ENTITIES

- 9. International Rectifier is a power management technology and semi-conductor company that manufactures advance circuit devices and integrated power systems and components. Before being acquired by Infineon, International Rectifier was a Delaware Corporation with its principal executive offices in El Segundo, California. International Rectifier's common stock traded on the NYSE under the symbol "IRF" until January 2015, when International Rectifier's merger with Infineon became effective and International Rectifier ceased operating as an independent company.
- 10. Infineon is a German-based semiconductor manufacturer. On January 13,2015, Infineon completed its acquisition of International Rectifier.

FACTS

- A. Brown Acquired Material, Nonpublic Information about the Pending Acquisition of International Rectifier
- 11. On August 20, 2014 at 9:05 am PST, International Rectifier and Infineon issued a joint press release announcing that Infineon would acquire International Rectifier for \$40 per share in an all-cash transaction valued at approximately \$3 billion.
- 12. On the day of the announcement, the trading price of International Rectifier's shares closed at \$39.10, up 47.21% from the prior date's closing price of \$26.56, and the trading volume increased by 19,815%, from 184,189 shares on August 19, 2014 to 36,680,300 shares on August 20, 2014.

COMPLAINT

- 13. In the month leading to this announcement, International Rectifier's executives and its board of directors held several meetings to discuss Infineon's acquisition proposal. To help keep this information confidential, the pending acquisition was referred to internally at International Rectifier under the code name "Project Hawaii."
- 14. International Rectifier shared information about the pending acquisition with employees only on a need-to-know basis, and employees who were informed about the pending acquisition were cautioned that the matter was highly confidential and were told that they were not permitted to share any information about it with anyone who was not involved with Project Hawaii. Employees who were involved with the project were required to sign a non-disclosure agreement acknowledging that all information they obtained regarding Project Hawaii was "non-public, confidential, and proprietary in nature" and that they would maintain the project and related information as confidential.
- 15. Before the August 20, 2014 announcement, International Rectifier provided information about Project Hawaii to only six employees from its Chandler, Arizona office, where Brown worked. Though Brown was not one of these employees, he nevertheless learned about the pending acquisition in early August 2014, in the course of his employment.
- 16. After learning about the pending acquisition, Brown shared this material, nonpublic information with others. In early August, Brown told Fox and another person that he was concerned about his job security because his employer was going to be acquired. During this time, Brown was also conducting job searches and sending out his resume to prospective employers. On or about August 12, 2014, Brown had lunch with a sales representative from one of International Rectifier's suppliers and with a former colleague. At this lunch, Brown told both these individuals that International Rectifier would be an acquisition target.
 - B. Brown Had a Duty to Maintain the Information He Obtained About the International Rectifier Acquisition as Confidential
 - 17. Brown was not a member of the Project Hawaii team. Regardless, based on

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

COMPLAINT

International Rectifier's policies and employee code of conduct, Brown was under a duty as an International Rectifier employee to maintain the confidentiality of any nonpublic information he obtained about the company, and was forbidden from insider trading and tipping.

- 18. International Rectifier's Insider Trading Policy recognized that employees, "as a result of their work with the Company, have access to information concerning the Company that may be [material, nonpublic] information." Hence, the Insider Trading Policy prohibited employees from purchasing or selling International Rectifier securities while in possession of such information, and from furnishing material, nonpublic information to others. Further, International Rectifier imposed strict "insider trading windows," which dictated the date ranges during which employees could engage in securities transactions concerning International Rectifier. Employees were limited to buying and selling International Rectifier securities only during periods within the trading window, and prohibited from engaging in such securities transactions during any date that fell outside of the insider trading windows.
- 19. When Brown joined International Rectifier in July 2004, he signed a document acknowledging that he had received and reviewed the company's code of ethics and its Insider Trading Policy. More recently, Brown again received copies of the Insider Trading Policy on April 25, 2014 and again on August 19, 2014, when the company emailed all employees regarding its trading windows.
- 20. Based on these trading windows, Brown and all other employees were prohibited from trading in International Rectifier securities from June 14, 2014 through August 24, 2014.
- 21. Further, in March 21, 2013 and in April 25, 2014, Brown completed International Rectifier's mandatory, annual online training modules regarding the company's code of ethics, which instructed, "You can't trade Company securities on the basis of [material, nonpublic] information you learn through your job. And you also can't share material nonpublic information with family members, friends, or anyone else." These

training modules also specified that in accordance with the company's policy, an employee who possessed "material nonpublic information relating to International Rectifier or its business" was forbidden from buying or selling International Rectifier securities and could not engage "in any other action to take advantage of or pass on to others that information."

C. Brown and Fox Insider Traded and Engaged in a Scheme to Conceal Brown's Role in the Trading

- 22. Brown and Fox had been friends since at least 2009. They attend the same church and their wives are friends. In fact, in 2012, they had a joint trading account that Fox managed.
- 23. As alleged in more detail below, in early August 2014, after learning that International Rectifier would be acquired by another company, Brown contacted Fox and shared material, nonpublic information about the pending acquisition. Brown and Fox then acquired call options in International Rectifier based on this information and concealed Brown's involvement in this trading by having Fox trade for both of them in Fox's brokerage account. Brown tipped Fox about the pending acquisition with the intention that Fox use this information to trade in the securities of International Rectifier for both of them.
- 24. On several occasions, Brown called Fox shortly after being privy to information about the impending acquisition. For example, on August 6, 2014, a member of Project Hawaii who sat in an office next to Brown held several morning meetings to discuss Infineon's due diligence questions. Early that afternoon, Brown called Fox. This phone call was the first call they had made to each other in over 11 months.
- 25. Then, on August 6, a Project Hawaii team member called Brown to request copies of contracts needed for the project's due diligence. Less than an hour after emailing those contracts to the project team member, Brown again called Fox and they talked for about 30 minutes.
- 26. On August 11, 2014, Brown called Fox again. Within hours of that call, Brown withdrew \$6,000 in cash from one of his bank accounts, and gave this money to Fox for the purchase of call options in International Rectifier. Then, early that evening, Fox

13

15

14

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26 27 28 deposited \$8,000, including the \$6,000 in cash he received from Brown, into a bank account he jointly holds with his wife.

- 27. The next day, on August 12, 2014, at Fox's direction, Fox's wife deposited an additional \$4,000 into her and her husband's account. Fox then wired his and Brown's combined \$12,000 into his options trading brokerage account. Brown and Fox called each other six times during the day. And throughout the day, Fox logged online to his options trading brokerage account and attempted, unsuccessfully, to purchase International Rectifier call options.
- 28. On August 13, 2014, Fox once again logged on to his options trading brokerage account at about 4:40 am PST, and submitted an order to purchase International Rectifier call options, but this order also was not filled. At 8:12 pm PST, Fox re-submitted orders to purchase International Rectifier call options with a \$30 strike price and September 2014 expiration, which were successfully filled by the next morning.
- 29. Fox purchased 380 International Rectifier call option contracts for \$11,400 (excluding commission and fees) for Brown and himself in his options trading brokerage account. In addition, Fox purchased another 40 International Rectifier call options for \$1,200 (excluding commission and fees) for himself in a separate IRA brokerage account using the funds he already had in this second account.
- 30. On August 20, 2014, International Rectifier and Infineon issued a joint press release announcing that Infineon would acquire International Rectifier in an all-cash transaction valued at approximately \$3 billion.
- 31. One day after the announcement, on August 21, 2014, Fox exited all of his and Brown's positions in International Rectifier options, making \$369,720 in illicit trading profits. The next day, on August 22, 2014, Brown and Fox met at about 6:30 am.
- 32. From September 2014 through at least mid-2015, Fox funneled a proportion of the illicit profits to Brown. From September 2, 2014 through June 2, 2015, Fox (and in a couple of instances, his wife), wrote nineteen checks totaling \$148,160.48 to Brown's minor stepchildren, minor and adult children, former son-in-law, contractors who were renovating

Brown's home, and to pay other entities for services provided to Brown. Brown and Fox structured these check payments to parcel a large payment to Brown into a series of smaller transactions over a period of about a year, in order to conceal that Brown was the intended payee. Brown or his wife cashed many of the checks that were made out to Brown's children. Most of the checks made to Brown's minor stepchildren were deposited into accounts these minors hold jointly with their mother, and then transferred to Brown's bank account or used to cover household expenses or other of Brown's obligations.

D. Brown and Fox Traded on Material, Nonpublic Information

- 33. Brown and Fox relied on material, nonpublic information about the pending acquisition of International Rectifier to trade in the company's options.
- 34. A reasonable investor would have viewed the information about the pending acquisition of International Rectifier as important to his or her investment decision. In fact, when International Rectifier's pending acquisition was publicly announced on August 20, 2014, its stock price rose approximately 47.21% and its trading volume increased by 19,815% from 184,189 shares on August 19, 2014 to 36,680,300 shares on August 20, 2014.
- 35. Defendants harmed members of the investing public when they gained an advantageous market position by trading in the securities of International Rectifier Corporation based on material, nonpublic information.

E. Brown Breached the Duty Owed to His Employer

- 36. Brown owed a duty of trust and confidence to his employer, International Rectifier, including a duty to abstain (i) from trading on the material, non-public information he acquired during the course of his employment concerning the acquisition, and (ii) from disclosing such information to others.
- 37. Brown knowingly, or recklessly, breached this duty of trust and confidence when he traded in the securities of International Rectifier based on material, nonpublic information regarding the pending acquisition. Brown had Fox execute Brown's trades in Fox's account in order to conceal his unlawful trading.
- 38. Brown also breached the duty of trust and confidence he owed International COMPLAINT 8

Rectifier when he tipped Fox material, nonpublic information with the intention that Fox trade on that information. Brown received a personal benefit from tipping Fox.

F. Fox Is Liable as a Tippee

- 39. Fox knew, or had reason to know, that Brown's disclosure of material, nonpublic information regarding International Rectifier's pending acquisition was a breach of the duty Brown owed his employer. Fox understood that Brown was improperly tipping him inside information for a personal benefit.
- 40. While in knowing possession of material, nonpublic information about International Rectifier, Fox intentionally or recklessly used the information to trade.

CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Fraud in Connection With the Purchase or Sale of Securities Violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 Thereunder (Against Brown and Fox)

- 41. The SEC realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 40 above.
- 42. Brown acquired information concerning the pending acquisition of International Rectifier in the course of his employment at a time when this information was nonpublic and held by International Rectifier as confidential information.
- 43. By trading on, and disclosing that material, nonpublic information concerning International Rectifier to Fox, Brown breached a duty of trust and confidence owed to his employer, International Rectifier.
- 44. Brown tipped Fox by providing material, nonpublic information concerning the pending acquisition of International Rectifier to Fox with the intent that Fox trade on this information, and thereby, with the intent to generate profits for Fox.
- 45. Brown also tipped Fox for a personal benefit. Brown, directly or indirectly, personally benefited, or expected to personally benefit, from disclosing material, nonpublic information concerning International Rectifier to his friend, Fox.
- 46. At the time that Fox traded in the securities of International Rectifier, Fox COMPLAINT 9

knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that he was in possession of material, nonpublic information concerning International Rectifier's securities.

- 47. By engaging in the conduct described above, Brown and Fox, directly or indirectly, in connection with the purchase or sale of securities, by use of the means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or the mails, or the facilities of a national securities exchange: (a) employed devices, schemes or artifices to defraud; and/or (b) engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon any person in connection with the purchase or sale of any security.
- 48. By engaging in the foregoing conduct, Brown and Fox violated, and unless enjoined will continue to violate, 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.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the SEC respectfully requests that the Court:

I.

Issue findings of fact and conclusions of law that Brown and Fox committed the alleged violations.

II.

Issue judgments, in forms consistent with Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d), permanently enjoining Brown, Fox and their agents, servants, employees, attorneys and those persons in active concert or participation with them, who receive actual notice of the order by personal service or otherwise, from violating Sections 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5.

III.

Order Brown and Fox to disgorge, on a joint and several basis, their illegal trading profits described herein, plus prejudgment interest.

IV.

Retain jurisdiction of this action in accordance with the principles of equity and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in order to implement and carry out the 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. V. Grant such other and further relief as this Court may determine to be just and necessary. Dated: December 14, 2017 /s/ Yolanda Ochoa Yolanda Ochoa Kristin S. Escalante Attorneys for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission

COMPLAINT 11