

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

**CASE NO.**

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,**

**Plaintiff,**

v.

**CHRISTOPHER D. DANTIN, and**

**CHRIS A. DANTIN,**

**Defendants.**

---

**COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND OTHER RELIEF**

Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) alleges:

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. From no later than October 2015 through July 2018, Defendants Chris A. Dantin and Christopher D. Dantin, father and son, served as unregistered brokers on behalf of 1 Global Capital, LLC (“1 Global” or “the Company”), a South Florida merchant cash advance company. During that time, Christopher D. Dantin raised more than \$8 million for 1 Global from the offer and sale of securities in unregistered transactions to numerous investors in Louisiana and Texas in at least 175 transactions. Dantin earned more than \$2 million in transaction-based commissions from his own sales and renewals and from sales of 15 additional sales agents whom he referred to 1 Global. Chris A. Dantin earned more than \$270,000 in commissions from sales of more than \$3 million in approximately 35 transactions, plus commissions from renewals.

2. 1 Global marketed its investment as a safe and secure alternative to the stock market and baselessly claimed that investing in the Company’s merchant cash advance business would achieve high single-digit or low double-digit annual returns. Like other 1 Global sales agents, the

Dantins repeated those claims to prospective investors. They also repeated 1 Global's false assertions that its notes were not securities.

3. Unbeknownst to the Dantins and their clients, many of whom invested their retirement savings, 1 Global's business was a fraud. 1 Global and its chairman and chief executive officer Carl Ruderman were misrepresenting how they were using investor money, syphoning off millions in investor funds to fund Ruderman's luxury lifestyle and operate unrelated businesses. 1 Global's business came to a crashing halt when it filed for bankruptcy in July 2018, leaving many of the Dantins' customers and thousands of other investors with hundreds of millions of dollars in losses.

4. During the time they offered and sold 1 Global's securities, the Dantins were not registered as broker-dealers with the Commission or associated with a registered broker-dealer. Additionally, 1 Global did not register its securities offering with the Commission, and there was no applicable exemption from registration for this offering.

5. By engaging in this conduct, the Dantins each violated Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act") [15 U.S.C. §§ 77e(a) and 77e(c)], and Section 15(a)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") [15 U.S.C. § 78o(a)(1)]. The Commission seeks injunctions against both Dantins from future violations of these provisions, as well as disgorgement of ill-gotten gains, prejudgment interest on disgorgement, and civil money penalties against both.

## **II. DEFENDANTS**

6. Christopher D. Dantin, 46 ("CD Dantin"), resides in St. Francisville, Louisiana. He held Series 6 and 63 securities licenses from approximately 2000 through 2011 and was associated with two registered broker-dealers during that time. He did not hold any securities licenses when he

offered and sold 1 Global securities. CD Dantin also holds Louisiana real estate and insurance licenses.

7. Chris A. Dantin, 70 (“CA Dantin”), resides in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. He previously held a Series 1 securities license and was associated with three registered broker-dealers, the last in 2011. He did not hold any licenses when he offered and sold 1 Global securities. CA Dantin is licensed in Louisiana, Texas and Indiana to sell insurance and annuity products.

### **III. JURISDICTION**

8. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 20(b), 20(d) and 22(a) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(b), 77t(d) and 77v(a)], and Sections 21(d), 21(e) and 27(a) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d), 78u(e) and 78aa(a)].

9. This Court has personal jurisdiction over both Dantins and venue is proper in the Southern District of Florida. 1 Global transacted business from its headquarters in Hallandale Beach, Florida, and the Dantins both regularly transacted business with 1 Global by email, telephone, and mail from October 2015 through July 2018. These transactions included the sale of securities in an unregistered offering while not being registered as or associated with a broker-dealer, the acts that constituted the violations alleged in this Complaint. Furthermore, CD Dantin visited 1 Global’s headquarters approximately five or six times to discuss 1 Global’s business and finances and the sale of the Company’s notes.

10. In connection with the conduct alleged in this Complaint, the Dantins, directly and indirectly, singly or in concert with others, made use of the means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, the means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, and of the mails.

#### **IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

##### **A. The 1 Global Offering**

11. From 2014 until July 27, 2018, 1 Global and Ruderman fraudulently raised at least \$320 million from the sale of unregistered securities to more than 3,600 investors nationwide. 1 Global was in the business of funding merchant cash advances (“MCAs”) - short-term loans to small and medium-sized businesses. According to its marketing materials and website, 1 Global provided these businesses with an alternative source of funding to traditional bank loans and other financing methods. 1 Global funded its MCA business and operations almost entirely with money from investors, whom the Company referred to alternately as “Lenders” or “Syndicate Partners.”

12. For the vast majority of the four-plus years 1 Global offered and sold its investment, it used instruments entitled either a Syndication Partner Agreement (“SPA”) or a Memorandum of Indebtedness (“MOI”) as the note or contract between the Company and investors. The SPAs termed the investors partners, while the MOIs called investors lenders. The only use of investor funds 1 Global specifically identified in both documents as well as in its marketing materials was for MCAs. After 1 Global received investor funds, it pooled and commingled them together in non-segregated 1 Global bank accounts.

13. The SPAs and MOIs had terms of either nine months or one year. While the MOI stated that it was a nine-month note, for most of the time 1 Global raised money from investors the MOI also stated the note would automatically roll over into a new nine-month term unless the investor expressly informed the Company in writing at least 30 days before the end of the nine months that he or she did not want the note to roll over.

14. 1 Global represented to investors in marketing materials it gave its sales agents to distribute - including the Dantins - that it collected an average of \$1.30 to \$1.40 on each dollar it

advanced in an MCA. This was the means by which 1 Global and investors both purportedly made a profit.

15. Although 1 Global sent investors monthly account statements purporting to show each investor's account credited with interest payments, investors did not receive those payments right away. 1 Global only paid that interest when investors cashed out. Thus, the majority of investors, who allowed their investments to roll after nine months, never received interest payments and ultimately lost their principal. This practice allowed 1 Global and Ruderman to misappropriate investor funds.

16. The profitability of the 1 Global investment was derived solely from the efforts of 1 Global. Investors had no control over how Ruderman and 1 Global used their money. Investors could not and did not manage their MCA loan portfolios; it was solely up to 1 Global whether and when to use an investor's money to fund MCAs and which MCAs to fund. The success of the investment and whether an investor earned profits was solely dependent on 1 Global's decisions on MCA funding and other uses of money, as well as repayment and collection efforts.

### **B. 1 Global and Ruderman's Misrepresentations**

17. 1 Global and Ruderman's false representations to investors in marketing materials and on monthly account statements included: (a) that 1 Global would use their money to fund MCAs; (b) the monthly statements accurately disclosed the existing value of the investment; and (c) that the Company's supposed independent audit firm agreed with 1 Global's method of calculating investors' returns.

18. In reality, 1 Global and Ruderman used a substantial amount of investors' funds for purposes other than making MCAs, including on operations and non-MCA business transactions. In addition, Ruderman misappropriated at least \$32 million in investor funds to enrich himself as

well as several companies in which he or his family members had a direct interest. This included money to help fund a family vacation to Greece, monthly payments for a Mercedes Benz, monthly American Express credit card payments, payments for Ruderman's household staff, \$4 million to his family trust, and \$1 million to one of his sons to invest in cryptocurrency.

19. Furthermore, with Ruderman's knowledge, 1 Global provided every investor with a monthly account statement that falsely showed the investor's portfolio value. The statements reflected the investor's fractional interest in a number of MCAs, and a monetary figure alternatively called "cash not yet deployed," "cash to be deployed," or "cash for future receivables." Regardless of the terminology used, the figure represented the amount of the investment that 1 Global had not yet put into MCAs and was purportedly sitting in 1 Global's bank accounts available for MCA funding.

20. However, starting no later than October 2017, the monthly account statements were false because, due in large part to Ruderman's misappropriation, they overstated by \$23 million to \$50 million the amount of cash available for investors in 1 Global's bank accounts. Because that amount was false, the total value of each investor's portfolio, the increase in the valuation since the original investment, and the rate of return each account statement showed, were all overstated.

21. Finally, each investor's monthly account statement falsely claimed, "Our independent audit firm, Daszkal Bolton L.L.P., has endorsed and agrees with the rate of return formula." However, Daszkal Bolton never audited 1 Global's financial statements, and never endorsed or agreed with 1 Global's rate of return formula.

**C. CD Dantin Acted as an Unregistered Broker-Dealer and Offered and Sold 1 Global Notes in Unregistered Securities Transactions**

22. 1 Global recruited a network of dozens of external, mostly unregistered, sales agents. The first of those agents was CD Dantin, who first heard about 1 Global when he met an

attorney acting as 1 Global's outside counsel at a business seminar in the fall of 2015. The lawyer subsequently headed up 1 Global's network of sales agents.

23. The lawyer told CD Dantin about the Company's business model, and also indicated early investors had been achieving returns as high as 15 to 18 percent annually. He furthermore told CD Dantin that the Company's notes were not securities both because the notes were only for nine months and investors were making loans to 1 Global for a commercial purpose, to fund MCAs. After meeting with Ruderman and other 1 Global officers and reviewing the Company's sales and marketing materials, CD Dantin signed a sales agreement with 1 Global in October 2015 calling for him to receive a four percent commission on all direct sales he made, plus additional percentages for renewals and for the sales of any other sales agents he recruited for the Company. Over the next almost three years CD Dantin referred 15 other sales agents to the Company, including his father.

24. 1 Global regularly provided sales materials to CD Dantin and other sales agents for use in marketing the investment. The materials included a list of Frequently Asked Questions, a history of the Company, and a description of both the MCA program and the investment process. CD Dantin used the materials in soliciting clients to invest, attaching them to emails and using the information when he spoke to prospective investors.

25. The marketing materials touted 1 Global's alleged consistently high returns for investors. The Frequently Asked Questions claimed 1 Global investors had averaged "high single digit" and "low double digit" annual returns. In addition, 1 Global sent copies of monthly investor account statements to CD Dantin to show investors. Those account statements showed returns ranging from 8 to 17 percent a year.

26. Using this information, CD Dantin told investors 1 Global could earn high single

digit to low double digit returns a year. From no later than October 2015 through July 2018, CD Dantin used the 1 Global materials to offer and sell more than \$8 million of 1 Global's securities to investors in 175 transactions via various means, including emails, telephone calls, and in-person meetings. 1 Global paid CD Dantin more than \$2 million in transaction-based sales commissions. During the time he sold 1 Global notes in unregistered securities offerings, CD Dantin was neither a registered broker-dealer nor associated with a registered broker-dealer.

**D. CA Dantin Acted as an Unregistered Broker-Dealer and Offered and Sold 1 Global Notes in Unregistered Securities Transactions**

27. CA Dantin offered and sold 1 Global's securities to his insurance customers, among other individuals, via various means, including emails, telephone calls, and in-person meetings from October 2015 through April 2018. On October 12, 2015, CA Dantin and his son jointly executed a selling agreement with 1 Global to offer and sell 1 Global securities. Pursuant to the agreement 1 Global paid CA Dantin a five percent commission based on investors' principal amounts, and an additional five percent for renewals.

28. 1 Global provided CA Dantin with the same marketing materials it provided his son, and CA Dantin used those materials to offer and sell the Company's notes, repeating many of the false assertions in them about the safety, security, and profitability of the 1 Global investment.

29. CA Dantin sold more than \$5.2 million of 1 Global securities in unregistered transactions to at least 60 investors earning more than \$272,000 in commissions from his sales. During that time, CA Dantin was not registered as a broker-dealer or associated with a registered broker-dealer.



**CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

**COUNT I**

**Violations of Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act**

30. The Commission repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 29 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

31. No registration statement was filed or in effect with the Commission pursuant to the Securities Act with respect to the securities Christopher D. Dantin and Chris A. Dantin offered and sold as described in this Complaint and no exemption from registration existed with respect to these securities.

32. From no later than October 2015 and continuing through July 2018, Christopher D. Dantin and Chris A. Dantin directly and indirectly:

- (a) made use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to sell securities, through the use or medium of a prospectus or otherwise;
- (b) carried or caused to be carried securities through the mails or in interstate commerce, by any means or instruments of transportation, for the purpose of sale or delivery after sale; or
- (c) made use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to offer to sell or offer to buy through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise any security;

without a registration statement having been filed or being in effect with the Commission as to such securities.

33. By reason of the foregoing, Christopher D. Dantin and Chris A. Dantin violated, and unless enjoined are reasonably likely to continue to violate, Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 77e(a) and 77e(c)].

**COUNT II**

**Violations of Section 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act**

34. The Commission repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 29 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

35. From no later than October 2015 and continuing through July 2018, Christopher D. Dantin and Chris A. Dantin, directly or indirectly, by the use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce effected transactions in, or induced or attempted to induce the purchase or sale of securities, while they were not registered with the Commission as brokers or dealers or not associated with an entity registered with the Commission as a broker-dealer.

36. By reason of the foregoing, Christopher D. Dantin and Chris A. Dantin violated, and unless enjoined are reasonably likely to continue to violate, Section 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78o(a)(1)].

**RELIEF REQUESTED**

**WHEREFORE**, the Commission respectfully requests the Court find Christopher D. Dantin and Chris A. Dantin committed the violations alleged, and:

**A.**

**Permanent Injunctive Relief**

Issue permanent injunctions enjoining both Dantins from violating Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act and Section 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act.

**B.**

**Disgorgement and Prejudgment Interest**

Issue an Order directing both Dantins to disgorge all ill-gotten gains or proceeds received as a result of the acts and/or courses of conduct complained of herein, with prejudgment interest thereon.

C.

**Civil Money Penalty**

Issue an Order directing both Dantins to pay a civil money penalty pursuant to Section 20(d) of the Securities Act and Section 21(d) of the Exchange Act.

D.

**Further Relief**

Grant such other and further relief as may be necessary and appropriate.

E.

**Retention of Jurisdiction**

Further, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court retain jurisdiction over this action in order to implement and carry out the terms of all orders and decrees that it may enter, or to entertain any suitable application or motion by the Commission for additional relief within the jurisdiction of this Court.

March 17, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

Robert K. Levenson, Esq.  
Senior Trial Counsel  
Florida Bar No. 0089771  
Direct Dial: (305) 982-6341  
Email: [levensonr@sec.gov](mailto:levensonr@sec.gov)

Attorney for Plaintiff  
**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION**  
801 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1950  
Miami, Florida 33131  
Telephone: (305) 982-6300