LYNN M. DEAN (Cal. Bar No. 205562) Email: deanl@sec.gov			
Attorneys for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission Michele Wein Layne, Regional Director Alka N. Patel, Associate Regional Director Jennifer Barry, Acting Regional Trial Counsel 444 S. Flower Street, Suite 900			
		Los Angeles, California 90071 6   Telephone: (323) 965-3998	
		Facsimile: (213) 443-1904	
UNITED STATES 1	DISTRICT COURT		
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  DISTRICT OF NEVADA			
	Case No.		
Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT		
VS.			
TRADESMART SOFTWARE RIC			
,			
Defendants.			
	· · ("CEO") 11		
Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") alleges:			
JURISDICTION AND VENUE  The Court has jurisdiction even this action runguant to Sections 20(b)			
Corporation ("TradeSmart") have, directly or indirectly, made use of the means or			
	Email: deanl@sec.gov  Attorneys for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission Michele Wein Layne, Regional Director Alka N. Patel, Associate Regional Director Jennifer Barry, Acting Regional Trial Cour 444 S. Flower Street, Suite 900 Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (323) 965-3998 Facsimile: (213) 443-1904  UNITED STATES I  BISTRICT COMMISSION, Plaintiff, vs.  DEREK J. SLATTERY AND TRADESMART SOFTWARE RIC CORPORATION, Defendants.  Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Composition  1. The Court has jurisdiction over 20(d)(1) and 22(a) of the Securities Act of 77t(b), 77t(d)(1) & 77v(a), and Sections 21 Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Ruches) Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Ruches) 2. Defendants Derek J. Slattery (1986)		

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.

3. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to Section 22(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77v(a), and Section 27(a) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78aa(a) because certain of the transactions, acts, practices, and courses of conduct constituting violations of the federal securities laws occurred within this district. In addition, venue is proper in this district because Defendant Slattery in this district, and Defendant Tradesmart is domiciled in this district.

#### **SUMMARY**

- 4. This matter involves an offering fraud orchestrated by Slattery through his company TradeSmart. From October 2018 to March of 2020, Slattery and TradeSmart raised over \$1.8 million from as many as 300 investors in the United States, Europe, Asia, and Australia through a fraudulent offering of securities in the form of "redeemable units" purportedly in a "fixed portfolio" consisting solely of Apple, Inc. stock options.
- 5. Slattery and Tradesmart falsely claimed that TradeSmart used specialized, proprietary software that he created to trade Apple options and generate guaranteed annual returns of 30% or more.
- 6. In fact, Defendants were not trading in Apple options or any other securities.
- 7. Slattery and TradeSmart induced investors to invest by making materially false and misleading statements and omissions concerning, among other things, that investor proceeds would be used to trade Apple options, and that investors could withdraw profits, sell or redeem units, or "cash out" and withdraw their entire investment every 15-30 days.
- 8. Contrary to theses representations, Slattery misappropriated all of the investor funds and used them to pay his living expenses, to pursue other potentially

illicit "business" activities like credit card fraud, and to make small Ponzi-like payments to investors requesting withdrawals from their accounts.

- 9. By their conduct, Defendants violated Section 17(a) of the Securities Act and Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder.
- 10. The SEC seeks permanent injunctions against future violations of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act and Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder; disgorgement with prejudgment interest; and civil penalties against all Defendants.

#### THE DEFENDANTS

- 11. **Derek Slattery**, age 42, is a resident of Las Vegas, NV. Slattery founded TradeSmart and as its president, treasurer and director. Slattery has never been registered with the SEC in any capacity or associated with a registered entity.
- 12. **TradeSmart Software RIC Corporation** is a Nevada corporation formed in 2018 by Slattery, based in Las Vegas, NV. According to its website and information given to prospective investors, TradeSmart is a "(UIT) Unit Investment Trust Corporation." In the "Frequently Asked Questions" tab of the website, under the heading "Who Regulates us [sic.]?" TradeSmart claims to be "registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) as a Registered Investment Company (RIC)." The website also indicates that TradeSmart Capital is the "product" of TradeSmart Software. In communications with investors, the names TradeSmart Capital and TradeSmart were frequently used interchangeably. TradeSmart and/or its securities are not registered with the SEC in any capacity.

## **THE ALLEGATIONS**

# A. The Offering

- 13. Slattery formed and controls TradeSmart.
- 14. According to its website, TradeSmart utilized a fully "automated trading platform" and purportedly offered a fixed portfolio that only traded Apple stock options.

- 15. Investors were told they were purchasing redeemable units for a specific time period, called a "Trade Cycle," that purportedly lasted approximately 15-30 market trading days. Investors were told that at the end of each Trade Cycle, a TradeSmart investor could elect to sell their units during a 48 hour period, which would allow members to take profits every 15-30 market trading days.
- 16. The Tradesmart Terms and Conditions on its website stated that "At the end of each Trade Cycle a TradeSmart member may elect to sell their units during a 48 hour period, which allows members to take profits every 15-30 market trading days."
- 17. According to the Tradesmart website, at the end of each trading day, depending on the number of units owned, every investor's account would reflect the amount of money that could be withdrawn from the account that day. The website described this amount as the Net Asset Value ("NAV"), and the NAV Rate was determined by dividing the NAV by the total number of units in the fund. TradeSmart also defined NAV as money that is "settled" or not being traded.
- 18. The Tradesmart website indicated that when an investor submitted a NAV withdrawal request, the funds would be "pulled to escrow" and transferred to the member's bank account within seven business days. TradeSmart claimed that it used the NAV withdrawal process to maximize the amount of funds available for trading for as long as possible, thereby maximizing profits. Depending on the value of their account, investors were told that they might be required to make a few daily withdrawals in order to "close out" their investments.
- 19. The Tradesmart website told prospective investors that withdrawing funds would be very easy to do, and would typically take three to five business days.
- 20. Slattery also personally made this same representation to investors. He indicated that the process was like any well-known investment fund.

- 21. Defendants also described the process of becoming a TradeSmart investor as very simple and easy. According to TradeSmart's website, those desiring to become TradeSmart "members" could simply open accounts online and then immediately begin buying "units" from TradeSmart and could later sell the "units" back to TradeSmart at the end of the purported trade cycle.
- 22. Defendants did not circulate hardcopy documents such as offering memoranda, investment contracts, monthly account statements, trade confirmations or withdrawal requests. Instead, essentially all investor activity was purportedly reflected electronically, by means of password protected, investor-specific dashboards at Tradesmart's website.
- 23. Investors accessed their accounts, bought and sold "units," tracked purported transactions and investment performance, and submitted withdrawal requests through their own personal dashboards. Investors could also generate account activity reports from their dashboards.
- 24. On the Tradesmart website, under the heading "How are the funds invested and divided?" Defendants claimed that: "All units that are purchased get bundled together to form the fund. These funds are invested from escrow, to our trading accounts, positioned by our "Expert System," and traded. The algorithm determines the exact weighting strategy, but typically the Expert System straddle will be approximately leaning towards one particular side in Apple futures during trading."

#### B. Defendants Raised As Much As \$1.8 Million

- 25. Between October 2018 and March 2020, Slattery and TradeSmart raised as much as \$1.8 million from as many as 300 investors in amounts ranging from \$2,000 to more than \$175,000 each.
- 26. Defendants tapped a variety of sources to solicit investors including family, friends and acquaintances, referrals, online chat rooms, golf courses, casinos, and employees as well as customers of bars and restaurants that Slattery frequented.

- 27. Investors remitted their funds to TradeSmart using a variety of methods including credit cards, online money transfer platforms, money orders and wires to bank accounts in Slattery's or TradeSmart's name.
  - 28. None of the money raised by Defendants was used to trade securities.
- 29. The money raised by Defendants was misappropriated and dissipated by Slattery for his personal living expenses, to fund other Slattery's other business schemes and to make Ponzi-like payments to investors.

## C. Defendants Made Material Misrepresentations and Omissions

# 1. The Misrepresentation and Omissions

- 30. Slattery and TradeSmart made numerous material misrepresentations of fact and omitted material facts regarding what they were doing with investor funds including that:
  - a. TradeSmart would pool investor funds to trade Apple options on behalf of investors;
  - b. Slattery developed a proprietary software containing an algorithm that enabled TradeSmart to make profits for investors by trading Apple options, without risk to their principal, whether the price of the underlying stock increased or decreased;
  - c. Investors could easily withdraw profits or liquidate their accounts entirely on short notice;
  - d. TradeSmart was registered with the SEC as a registered investment company;
  - e. Investors' accounts would be externally audited to verify funds and trading activity; and
  - f. Investors would receive guaranteed returns of at least 30%.
  - 31. None of the above representations were true.
- 32. Defendants did not trade Apple options for investors, either by using a proprietary software or by any other means.

- 33. The amounts shown on the investor "dashboards" were not real profits, since Defendants had not made any trades on their behalf.
- 34. Defendants failed to disclose that they misappropriated investor funds, making redemptions impossible.
- 35. Investors have been unable to obtain a return of their full investments, as promised.
- 36. TradeSmart is not registered with the SECin any capacity, and investors' accounts were not subject to any outside audit.
- 37. Investors relied on Defendants' misrepresentations and omissions. Investors believed that Defendants would use their money to trade Apple stock options on their behalf via Defendants' proprietary trading platform, and that they could withdraw their funds on short notice.
- 38. For example, based on Slattery's personal representations, one investor invested approximately \$12,000 with TradeSmart. In less than one year, Defendants represented to her that the value of the investment had purportedly increased by more than 60% to approximately \$20,000. When the investor sought to withdraw \$10,000 to buy a house, Slattery repeatedly promised to send the money within three to five days. When the \$10,000 failed to arrive, Slattery cited illness or "software glitches," eventually sent the investor a few random payments of \$100 to \$300, and then promised that the full amount would be forthcoming "any day" due to expected big trading gains.

## 2. Defendants' Misrepresentations Were Material

- 39. Defendants' false and misleading statements to investors are material. A reasonable investor would have considered it important to know that their funds were not being used to trade securities but were instead being used to pay Slattery's personal expenses, fund other business activities, and make Ponzi payments.
  - D. Defendants Engaged in a Fraudulent Scheme
  - 40. Defendants engaged in a fraudulent scheme by misappropriating investor

money.

- 41. Slattery used the investor funds raised to pay his personal expenses, to fund other business activities, and to make Ponzi-like payments to investors.
- 42. From example, between August 2018, and December 2019, Slattery disbursed \$471,422 of investor funds from a single JP Morgan Chase account under his control as follows:
  - a. \$230,072 was transferred to Slattery's personal E-trade account from March-November 2019;
  - b. \$88,120 was transferred to Slattery's personal TD Ameritrade account from January-July 2019;
  - c. \$72,838 was transferred to the account of a Slattery affiliated business from August-November 2018. Slattery is the sole signatory on the account and is listed as the entity's president;
  - d. \$48,852 was transferred to Slattery's personal checking account from January–December 2019;
  - e. \$17,254 was transferred to various other Slattery controlled accounts at Chase from January-November 2019;
  - f. \$5,200 was transferred to a second Slattery affiliated business account from July-November 2019;
  - g. \$4,786 was transferred to an unrelated software company account in November 2019;
  - h. In June 2019 \$3,800 was transferred to a third party account where Slattery was added as a signatory 2/20/2019; and
    - i. \$500 was paid to an investor in November 2019.
- 43. In total, Defendants used at least \$5,500 in funds received from new investors to make Ponzi payments to investors requesting withdrawals.
  - E. Defendants Acted With Scienter
  - 44. Defendants acted with scienter. Slattery knew, or was reckless in not

knowing, that he and Tradesmart were not trading Apple options or any other securities for investors. They knew or were reckless in not knowing that they and Tradesmart website made false statements regarding prospective and actual investment returns.

- 45. Moreover, Slattery controlled the bank accounts that received and disbursed investor funds; thus, he knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that he was misappropriating investor funds for his own personal expenses and other illicit purposes, and Ponzi payments.
- 46. In addition, Skinner failed to exercise reasonable care by, among other things, misappropriating investor funds and making materially misleading representations, and thus were negligent.
- 47. Because he controlled it, Skinner's scienter may be attributed to Tradesmart.

### F. Slattery Acted as an Investment Adviser

- 48. Section 202(a)(11) of the Advisers Act defines an investment adviser as a person who, for compensation, engages in the business of advising others regarding investments in securities. Here, Slattery engaged in the business of providing advice regarding investments in securities to the investors and purportedly TradeSmart, which were his clients, using the purported TradeSmart proprietary trading program.
- 49. As compensation, Slattery misappropriated investor money for his own personal use. Slattery's misappropriation of investor funds satisfies the "compensation" element of the Advisers Act definition of an investment adviser.

## FIRST 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 (Against All Defendants)

50. The SEC realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 49 above.

- 51. Defendants made false representations to investors that they would trade securities on their behalf, and that the investments could be redeemed on short notice.
- 52. Despite their representations to investors, Defendants did not trade securities on their behalf. Instead, they misappropriated investor funds to cover Slattery's personal expenses, expenses related to other businesses, and to make Ponzi payments.
- 53. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendants, and each of them, directly or indirectly, in connection with the purchase or sale of a security, and by the use of means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange: (a) employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud; (b) made untrue statements of a material fact or omitted to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; or (c) engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon other persons.
- 54. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendants violated, and unless restrained and 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.

# **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

# Fraud in the Offer or Sale of Securities Violations of Sections 17(a) of the Securities Act (Against All Defendants)

- 55. The SEC realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 49 above.
- 56. Defendants made false representations to investors that they would trade securities on their behalf, and that the investments could be redeemed on short notice.
- 57. Defendants did not trade securities on their behalf. Instead, they misappropriated investor funds to cover Slattery's personal expenses, expenses

related to other businesses, and to make Ponzi payments.

- 58. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendants, and each of them, directly or indirectly, in the offer or sale of securities by the use of means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails (a) employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud; (b) obtained money or property by means of untrue statements of a material fact or by omitting to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; or (c) engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser.
- 59. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendants violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77q(a).

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the SEC respectfully requests that the Court:

T.

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

II.

Issue judgments, in forms consistent with Rule 65(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, preliminarily and permanently enjoining Defendants, and each of them, and their officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them, who receive actual notice of the judgment by personal service or otherwise, and each of them, from violating Section 17(a) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §77q(a)], and 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].

III.

Order Defendants to disgorge all funds received from their illegal conduct,

together with prejudgment interest thereon. IV. Order Defendants to pay civil penalties under Section 20(d) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(d)] and Section 21(d)(3) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(3)]. V. 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. VI. Grant such other and further relief as this Court may determine to be just and necessary. Dated: May 4, 2022 /s/ Lynn M. Dean Lynn M. Dean Jennifer Barry Attorneys for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission