

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GERALD P. ALEXANDER,
CJB CONSULTING, INC., and
REGIS FILIA HOLDINGS, INC.,

Defendants.

No. 1:09-cv-0805-HTW

**JUDGMENT INCLUDING PERMANENT INJUNCTION AGAINST
GERALD P. ALEXANDER, CJB CONSULTING, INC., AND REGIS
FILIA HOLDINGS, INC.**

Before the Court is the Motion for Entry of Default Judgment filed by the Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") against Defendants Gerald P. Alexander, CJB Consulting, Inc. ("CJB") and Regis Filia Holdings, Inc. ("Regis Filia") [Docket Entry # 15]. On May 1, 2009, the Clerk of the Court made an entry of default against the Defendants pursuant to Rule 55(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

After considering the pleadings and evidence before the Court, the Court finds that the Motion should be GRANTED and hereby enters Judgment against the Defendants.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 55(a) provides that the clerk must enter a default when the party, against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought, has failed to plead or otherwise defend, and that failure is shown by affidavit or otherwise. Rule 55(b) then requires the plaintiff to apply to the district court in order to obtain a judgment by default. Under Rule 55(b)(2), the

1 court may conduct hearings when, to enter or effectuate judgment, it needs to: (A)
2 conduct an accounting; (B) determine the amount of damages; (C) establish the
3 truth of any allegation by evidence; or (D) investigate any other matter. However,
4 where the amount of damages or costs can be determined with certainty by
5 reference to the pleadings and supporting documents, and where a hearing would
6 not be beneficial, a hearing is not required. Finally, additional requirements for
7 entering a judgment by default apply where judgment is sought against a minor,
8 an incompetent person, a person serving in the military, or the United States, its
9 officers, or its agencies.

10 The Commission filed its Complaint on March 25, 2009, alleging the
11 defendants violated the federal securities laws. [Docket entry (DE) 1].
12 Alexander was served on March 26, 2009, with the summons and Complaint both
13 personally, and as the officer and control person of CJB and Regis Filia. [DE 9,
14 10, 11] The Defendants failed to file an answer or other responsive pleading or
15 otherwise defend against the claims asserted against them. Each Defendant is not
16 a minor or incompetent person, is not in military service, and is not a member of
17 the United States government, a federal officer or agency. Thus the Defendants
18 are in default. Because the Defendants have failed to appear in this case with the
19 time period mandated by the Federal Rules, the Court accepts the Plaintiff's
20 allegations as true. *Buchanan v. Bowman*, 820 F.2d 359, 360 (11th Cir. 1987),
21 citing *Nishimatsu Constr. Co. v. Houston Nat'l Bank*, 515 F.2d 1200, 1206 (5th
22 Cir. 1975) (citations omitted); see also 10A Wright, Miller & Kane, *Federal*
23 *Practice and Procedure: Civil 3d* § 2688, at 58-59 (1998).

24 The Defendants Alexander and CJB offered and sold the securities of thirteen
25 companies, and Alexander and Regis Filia also offered and sold the securities of
26 four of the thirteen companies, through interstate commerce or the mails, when no
27 registration statements were filed or in effect for their transactions. Between March
28 2006 and March 2008, Alexander, CJB, and Regis Filia offered and sold the

1 securities of Trendsetter Solar Products, Inc. (“Trendsetter”), Colusa Biomass
2 Energy Corporation (“Colusa”), Lifeline Biotechnologies, Inc. (“Lifeline”), and
3 Imperia Entertainment, Inc. (“Imperia”). Although the sales of these securities
4 were made through the brokerage accounts of CJB or Regis Filia, Alexander was
5 a necessary participant and substantial factor in the sales, because he made the
6 decision to offer and sell the shares owned by the corporations and directed the
7 stock brokers to sell the shares from the corporate brokerage accounts. CJB and
8 Alexander also sold the securities of nine additional companies, Amelot
9 Holdings, Inc. (“Amelot”), Freehand Systems International, Inc. (“Freehand”),
10 Guestmetrics Inc., Healthsonix Inc., Rheologics Technologies, Inc.
11 (“Rheologics”), Latitude Industries, Inc. (“Latitude”), Muller Media, Inc., and
12 Produce Safety & Security International, Inc. (“Produce Safety”). Alexander
13 collaborated with CJB and Regis Filia in making the sales. No registration
14 statements were filed or in effect for any of their transactions. As a result of these
15 unregistered sales, CJB and Alexander received \$2,082,315 in sales proceeds, and
16 Regis Filia and Alexander received \$339,266 in sales proceeds. The Court finds
17 that the Defendants violated the securities registration provisions of Sections 5(a)
18 and 5(c) of the Securities Act.

19 In addition, the Defendants acted as brokers and dealers by engaging in the
20 business of effecting securities transactions for its own account or the accounts of
21 others by use of interstate commerce or the mails, while the Defendants were not
22 registered as, or associated with a broker-dealer registered with the Commission.
23 From January 2006 through March 2008, Alexander held himself out to the public
24 and to the business community as an “investment banker” and a person who could
25 assist companies in raising capital through the sales of securities. Alexander
26 engaged in the business of offering, buying, selling or otherwise dealing or
27 trading in the securities of the thirteen companies. He purchased shares directly
28 from the thirteen companies and then sold securities through the accounts of CJB

1 and Regis Filia to public investors. CJB and Regis Filia bought and sold
2 securities through their brokerage accounts in the regular course of business. The
3 defendants acted as brokers and dealers in acquiring the shares directly from the
4 companies as part of a distribution to other investors. The defendants are not
5 registered as brokers or dealers with the Commission. The defendants used
6 interstate commerce and the mails in connection with their transactions. The
7 Court finds that the Defendants violated the broker-dealer registration provisions of
8 Section 15(a) (1) of the Exchange Act.

9 The Commission has made a “proper showing” that each Defendant
10 violated Sections 5(a) and (c) of the Securities Act, and Section 15(a)(1) of the
11 Exchange Act, and that unless restrained and enjoined, the Defendants will
12 continue to engage in transactions, acts, practices and courses of business that
13 violated the federal securities provisions. As a result of the nature of the
14 Defendants’ business operations, there is a reasonable likelihood of future
15 violations of these provisions. Section 20(b) of the Securities Act and Section
16 20(d) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(b) and 78t(d); *SEC v. Calvo*, 378
17 F.3d at 1216; *SEC v. Unique Financial Concepts*, 196 F.3d 1195, 1199 n.2 (S.D.
18 Fla. 1998). The Defendants engaged in a continuing course of business of raising
19 money for thirteen companies through unregistered securities offerings that
20 occurred over more than a two year period. From this course of conduct the
21 Court may conclude that there is a reasonable likelihood of future violations.
22 “[T]he likelihood of future illegal conduct is ‘strongly suggested’ by past illegal
23 activity.” *SEC v. American Bd. of Trade*, 750 F. Supp. 100, 104 (S.D.N.Y. 1990);
24 see also *SEC v. Unique Fin. Concepts, Inc.*, 196 F.3d 1195, 1199 n. 2 (11th Cir.
25 1999), citing *SEC v. Management Dynamics, Inc.*, 515 F.2d 801, 807 (2d Cir.
26 1975).

27 Courts have considered the following factors in determining whether the
28 defendants are likely to commit future violations: the "egregiousness of the

1 defendant's actions, the isolated or recurrent nature of the infraction, the degree of
2 scienter involved, the sincerity of the defendant's assurances against future
3 violations, the defendant's recognition of the wrongful nature of the conduct, and
4 the likelihood that the defendant's occupation will present opportunities for future
5 violations." See *SEC v. Carriba Air, Inc.*, 681 F.2d 1318, 1322 (11th Cir. 1982),
6 citing *SEC v. Blatt*, 583 F.2d 1325 (5th Cir. 1978). The Court finds the conduct of
7 each of the Defendants was egregious in that it involved sales of over 4 billion
8 shares of thirteen different companies by Alexander and CJB for which they
9 received over \$2 million, and sales of over 1.3 billion shares of four companies
10 by Alexander and Regis Filia for which they received over \$339,000. The
11 Defendants' conduct was not isolated but rather recurrent with several different
12 companies, involving numerous transactions, and occurring over more than a two
13 year period. Alexander admitted in testimony that he had been engaged in the
14 business of raising money through sales of equity securities since approximately
15 1994. Alexander also admitted that he knew that investors purchasing the shares
16 expected them to be registered, and that he knew of the obligations to register as a
17 broker-dealer.

18 While violations of the registration provisions do not require a showing of
19 scienter, the defendants' business of repeatedly participating in the unregistered
20 distribution of securities for thirteen companies for more than two years
21 demonstrates willful violations of the securities laws. In addition, Alexander
22 attempted to conceal his participation in the unregistered securities offerings by
23 using his daughter as a nominee officer for each of the two corporations and
24 conducting his trading in the accounts of CJB and Regis Filia to hide his own
25 participation in the transactions. Alexander's concealment of his trades through
26 others' accounts evidences a deliberate disregard of statutory and regulatory
27 requirements. See *SEC v. Falbo*, 14 F. Supp. 2d 508, 529 (S.D.N.Y. 1998)
28 (imposing civil penalty for concealed trades through others' accounts).

1 The defendants did not express any recognition of the wrongful nature of
2 their conduct or made any assurances against future violations. Furthermore, the
3 defendants' business of serving as "investment bankers" for companies seeking to
4 raise money through unregistered securities sales presents opportunities for future
5 violations. The Commission has presented evidence of numerous factors that
6 establish the likelihood of future violations of the securities registration, and
7 broker-dealer registration provisions by the Defendants. The Court finds that is
8 appropriate to permanently enjoin the Defendants from further violations of these
9 securities provisions.

10 The Commission also requested an order that the Defendants disgorge their
11 ill-gotten gains received as a result of the activities along with prejudgment
12 interest. The SEC is entitled to disgorgement upon producing a reasonable
13 approximation of a defendant's ill-gotten gains. *SEC v. Calvo*, 378 F.3d at 1217;
14 *SEC v. Blatt*, 583 F.2d 1325, 1335 (5th Cir. 1978). "Disgorgement wrests ill-
15 gotten gains from the hands of a wrongdoer. It is an equitable remedy meant to
16 prevent the wrongdoer from enriching himself by his wrongs." *Allstate Ins. Co. v.*
17 *Receivable Fin. Co.*, 501 F.3d 398, 413 (5th Cir. 2007), quoting *SEC v. Huffman*,
18 996 F.2d 800, 802 (5th Cir. 1993). "The district court has broad discretion in
19 fashioning the equitable remedy of a disgorgement order." *SEC v. Huffman*, 996
20 F. 2d at 803. "In actions brought by the SEC involving a securities violation,
21 'disgorgement need only be a reasonable approximation of profits causally
22 connected to the violation.'" *Allstate Ins.*, 501 F.3d at 413, quoting *SEC v. First*
23 *City Fin. Corp.*, 890 F.2d 1215, 1231 (D.C. Cir. 1989). In the context of an
24 offering of securities in violation of the securities laws, the proper starting point
25 for a disgorgement award is the total proceeds received from the sale of the
26 securities. *See SEC v. Manor Nursing Ctrs., Inc.*, 458 F.2d 1082, 1104 (2d Cir.
27 1972). The Commission has met its burden of showing that its disgorgement
28 figures reasonably approximate the amount of unjust enrichment. The Court

1 finds that CJB and Alexander received \$2,082,315 in ill-gotten gains from the
2 unregistered offerings of securities of the thirteen companies. The Court also
3 finds that Regis Filia and Alexander received at least \$339,266 in ill-gotten gains
4 from the unregistered offerings of the securities of four companies.

5 "Where two or more individuals or entities collaborate or have a close
6 relationship in engaging in the violations of the securities laws, they may be held
7 jointly and severally liable for the disgorgement of illegally obtained proceeds."
8 *SEC v. JT Wallenbrock & Assocs.*, 440 F.3d 1109, 1117 (9th Cir. 2006), quoting
9 *SEC v. First Pac. Bancorp*, 142 F.3d 1186, 1191 (9th Cir. 1998); *see also SEC v.*
10 *Calvo*, 378 F.3d at 1215 (11th Cir. 2004); *SEC v. Hughes Capital Corp.*, 124 F.3d
11 449, 455 (3d Cir. 1997); *SEC v. First Jersey Sec., Inc.*, 101 F.3d 1450, 1475-76
12 (2d Cir. 1996). The court finds that Alexander collaborated with CJB and Regis
13 Filia when he directed the offers and sales of the unregistered securities offerings
14 made by the two entities, and that he is liable jointly and severally for the ill-
15 gotten gains received by CJB and Regis Filia.

16 The Court also finds it appropriate to order the Defendants to pay
17 prejudgment interest on the amounts of disgorgement, which is calculated using
18 the Internal Revenue Service's interest rate for the underpayment of taxes.
19 "Courts have recognized that an assessment of prejudgment interest, like the
20 disgorgement remedy, is intended to deprive wrongdoers of profits they illegally
21 obtained by violating the securities laws." *SEC v. AmeriFirst*, 2008 U.S. Dist.
22 LEXIS 36782 *16 (D. Tex May 5, 2008), citing *SEC v. Sargent*, 329 F.3d 34, 40
23 (1st Cir. 2003) (quotation marks omitted). The Court also finds is appropriate to
24 order post judgment interest, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961, on any delinquent
25 payments of the amounts ordered.

26 The Court finds that the Defendants acted in deliberate or reckless disregard
27 of a regulatory requirement of Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act, which
28 required the Defendants not to offer or sell securities unless a registration

1 statement was filed or in effect for their transactions or they demonstrated an
2 exemption from registration applied. The Defendants acted in deliberate or
3 reckless disregard of a regulatory requirement of Section 15(a)(1) of the
4 Exchange Act, which required the Defendants not to engage in the business of
5 effecting securities transactions for their own account or the accounts of others
6 without registering as a broker or dealer with the Commission. The Court finds
7 that the Defendants' actions resulted directly or indirectly in substantial losses or
8 created a significant risk of substantial losses to investors. The Defendants sold
9 the securities of the thirteen companies when no registration statement had been
10 filed or was effective. This lack of required information created the risk of
11 substantial losses and significant harm to the investors of purchased shares of the
12 thirteen companies from the defendants. Although the investors purchased shares
13 in the thirteen companies from the Defendants at a range of prices, the highest of
14 which for one of the companies was \$2.74, the price of the shares of substantially
15 all of the companies declined after the Defendants' distributions resulting in little
16 or no chance for the investors to recover their initial purchase price, and creating
17 the risk of substantial losses to the investors. The Court finds that Alexander
18 directed the activities of, and collaborated with, CJB and Regis Filia. The Court
19 finds that the Defendants jointly engaged in the violations that "involved . . .
20 deliberate or reckless disregard of a regulatory requirement" that securities
21 offerings be registered and "directly or indirectly resulted in substantial losses or
22 created a significant risk of substantial losses to other persons."

23 In determining the appropriate amount of a civil penalty, the courts have
24 considered several factors similar to those considered for imposing an injunction:

- 25 (1) the egregiousness of the violations at issue; (2) the defendant's
26 scienter; (3) the repeated nature of the violations; (4) the defendant's
27 failure to admit their wrongdoing; (5) whether the defendant's
28 conduct created substantial losses or the risk of substantial losses to

1 other persons; (6) the defendant's lack of cooperation and honesty
2 with authorities, if any; and (7) whether the penalty that would
3 otherwise be appropriate should be reduced due to defendants'
4 demonstrated current and future financial condition.

5 *SEC v. Lybrand*, 281 F. Supp. 2d at 730; see also *SEC v. K.W. Brown & Co.*, 555
6 F. Supp. 2d 1275, 1314-15 (S.D. Fla. 2007). Considering these factors, third tier
7 penalties are warranted against Alexander, CJB, and Regis Filia. The
8 Defendants' conduct was egregious and repeated as discussed above. Alexander
9 and CJB collaborated in a scheme to distribute over 4 billion shares of thirteen
10 companies through unregistered securities offerings that occurred over two years.
11 At the same time, Alexander and Regis Filia collaborated in a scheme to
12 distribute over 1.3 billion shares of four of the same companies through
13 unregistered securities offerings. While engaged in the ongoing business of
14 raising funds for public companies, the defendants did not register as brokers or
15 dealers. Alexander acted with scienter knowing that investors want the shares
16 they purchase to be registered and that broker-dealers are obligated to register.
17 Alexander's scienter is imputed to CJB and Regis Filia. *SEC v. Manor Nursing*
18 *Centers, Inc.*, 458 F.2d 1082, 1089 n.3 (2d Cir. 1972). The Defendants'
19 deliberate disregard of these regulatory requirements is further demonstrated by
20 Alexander's use of his daughter as a nominee officer to conceal his involvement
21 in the sales of securities by CJB and Regis Filia. Furthermore, Alexander did not
22 admit his wrongdoing or cooperate during the investigation.

23 The shares of the thirteen companies, which the defendants sold, are penny
24 stocks. At the times relevant to this case, each of these securities traded at prices
25 under \$5.00 per share and therefore each meets the definition of a penny stock
26 provided in Rule 3a51-1, 17 C.F.R. § 240.3a51-1 (2006). The Court has
27 considered the same facts that support entry of the permanent injunction as also
28 supporting entry of a penny stock bar, such as the egregiousness of the violations,

1 the Defendants' long course of conduct, the Defendants' role in the violation, the
2 degree of scienter, the Defendants' economic stake or benefit in the violation, and
3 the likelihood that the misconduct will recur. See *SEC v. Wolfson*, 2006 U.S.
4 Dist. LEXIS 29543 *28-29, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P 93,864 (D. Utah 2006),
5 aff'd, 249 Fed. Appx. 701, 2007 U.S. App. LEXIS 22745 (10th Cir. 2007), citing
6 *SEC v. Steadman*, 603 F.2d 1126, 1140 (5th Cir. 1979) and *SEC v. Patel*, 61 F.3d
7 137, 141 (2d Cir. 1995).

8 The Court finds that Alexander, CJB, and Regis Filia engaged in recurring
9 violations of the securities registration and broker-dealer registration provisions
10 over a two-year period. They engaged in numerous sales of the securities of
11 thirteen companies while touting their ability as investment bankers to raise
12 money for the companies. Alexander has engaged in similar business since 1994.
13 CJB and Regis Filia obtained over \$2 million and \$339,000 respectively from
14 their illegal conduct, with Alexander directing how those funds were disbursed.
15 Alexander exhibited a high degree of scienter by using CJB and Regis Filia to
16 conceal his trading activities. The defendants' sole business activity was the sale
17 of unregistered securities, which creates the likelihood that misconduct will recur.
18 Where the Defendants have engaged in wrongdoing while participating in a
19 penny stock offering, the Court finds it is appropriate to bar the Defendants from
20 participating in the offer of penny stocks.

21 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:**

22 1. Defendants Gerald P. Alexander, CJB Consulting, Inc., and Regis
23 Filia Holdings, Inc., their officers, directors, members, agents, servants,
24 employees, attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with
25 them who receive actual notice of this Order by personal service or otherwise,
26 and each of them, are permanently enjoined and restrained from violating Section
27 5 of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77e, directly or indirectly, in the absence of
28 any applicable exemption:

1 (a) unless a registration statement is in effect as to a security, making use
2 of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate
3 commerce or of the mails to sell such security through the use or medium of any
4 prospectus or otherwise;

5 (b) unless a registration statement is in effect as to a security, carrying or
6 causing to be carried through the mails or in interstate commerce, by any means
7 or instruments of transportation, any such security for the purpose of sale or for
8 delivery after sale; or

9 (c) making use of any means or instruments of transportation or
10 communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to offer to sell or offer to
11 buy through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise any security,
12 unless a registration statement has been filed with the Commission as to such
13 security, or while the registration statement is the subject of a refusal order or stop
14 order or (prior to the effective date of the registration statement) any public
15 proceeding of examination under Section 8 of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77h.

16 2 Defendants Gerald P. Alexander, CJB Consulting, Inc., and Regis
17 Filia Holdings, Inc., their officers, members, agents, servants, employees and
18 attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with them who
19 receive actual notice of this Order by personal service or otherwise, and each of
20 them, are permanently enjoined and restrained from, directly or indirectly,
21 violating Section 15(a) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78o] by acting as a
22 broker or dealer unless registered as provided by law.

23 3. Defendants Gerald P. Alexander and CJB Consulting, Inc. are liable
24 jointly and severally for disgorgement of \$2,082,315 representing ill-gotten
25 gained as a result of the conduct alleged in the Complaint, together with
26 prejudgment interest thereon in the amount of is \$269,405, for a total of
27 \$2,351,720. Defendants Gerald P. Alexander and CJB Consulting, Inc. shall
28 satisfy this obligation by paying jointly or severally \$2,351,720 within fourteen

1 days of entry of this Order to the Clerk of the Court, together with a cover letter
2 identifying either Gerald P. Alexander and CJB Consulting, Inc. as a defendant in
3 this action, setting forth the title and civil action number of this action and the
4 name of this Court and specifying that the payment is made pursuant to this
5 Order. By making this payment, Defendants Gerald P. Alexander and CJB
6 Consulting, Inc. relinquish all legal and equitable right, title, and interest in such
7 funds and no part of the funds shall be returned to the Defendants.

8 4. Defendants Gerald P. Alexander and Regis Filia Holdings, Inc. are
9 liable jointly and severally for disgorgement of \$339,266 representing ill-gotten
10 gained as a result of the conduct alleged in the Complaint, together with
11 prejudgment interest thereon in the amount of \$56,992, for a total amount of
12 \$396,258. Defendants Gerald P. Alexander and Regis Filia Holdings, Inc. shall
13 satisfy this obligation by paying jointly or severally \$396,258 within fourteen
14 days of entry of this Order to the Clerk of the Court, together with a cover letter
15 identifying either Gerald P. Alexander or Regis Filia Holdings, Inc. as a
16 defendant in this action, setting forth the title and civil action number of this
17 action and the name of this Court and specifying that the payment is made
18 pursuant to this Order. The Defendants shall simultaneously transmit photocopies
19 of such payment and letter to the Commission's counsel in this action. By
20 making this payment, Defendants Gerald P. Alexander and Regis Filia Holdings,
21 Inc. relinquish all legal and equitable right, title, and interest in such funds and no
22 part of the funds shall be returned to the Defendant.

23 5. The Clerk shall deposit the funds received from the Defendants into
24 an interest bearing account with the Court Registry Investment System ("CRIS")
25 or any other type of interest bearing account that is utilized by the Court. These
26 funds, together with any interests and income earned thereon (collectively, the
27 "Fund"), shall be held in the interest bearing account until further order of the
28 Court. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1914 and the guidelines set by the

1 Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the Clerk is
2 directed, without further order of this Court, to deduct from the income earned on
3 the money in the Fund a fee equal to ten percent of the income earned on the
4 Fund. Such fee shall not exceed that authorized by the Judicial Conference of the
5 United States. The Commission may propose a plan to distribute the Fund
6 subject to the Court's approval.

7 6. Defendants Gerald P. Alexander and CJB Consulting, Inc. shall
8 jointly and severally pay a civil penalty in the amount of \$130,000 pursuant to
9 Section 20(d) of the Securities Act and Section 21 of the Exchange Act, 15
10 U.S.C. § 77t(d)(2)(C)(ii); 15 U.S.C. § 78u (d)(3)(B)(iii); 17 C.F.R. § 201.1003
11 (2007). Defendants Gerald P. Alexander and Regis Filia Holdings, Inc. shall
12 jointly and severally pay a civil penalty in the amount of \$130,000 pursuant to
13 Section 20(d) of the Securities Act and Section 21 of the Exchange Act, 15
14 U.S.C. § 77t(d)(2)(C)(ii); 15 U.S.C. § 78u (d)(3)(B)(iii); 17 C.F.R. § 201.1003
15 (2007). Defendants shall pay the civil penalties within fourteen days after entry
16 of this Order by certified check, bank cashier's check, or United States postal
17 money order payable to the Securities and Exchange Commission. The payment
18 shall be delivered or mailed to the Office of Financial Management, Securities
19 and Exchange Commission, Operations Center, 6432 General Green Way, Mail
20 Stop 0-3, Alexandria, Virginia 22312, and shall be accompanied by a letter
21 identifying [Defendant's name] as a defendant in this action; setting forth the title
22 and civil action number of this action and the name of this Court; and specifying
23 that payment is made pursuant to this Final Judgment. The Commission shall
24 remit the funds paid pursuant to this paragraph to the United States Treasury.

25 7. Defendants shall pay post-judgment interest on any delinquent
26 amounts pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961.

27 8. Defendants Gerald P. Alexander, CJB Consulting, Inc., and Regis
28 Filia Holdings, Inc. are permanently barred from participating in an offering of

1 penny stock, including engaging in activities with a broker, dealer, or issuer for
2 purposes of issuing, trading, or inducing or attempting to induce the purchase or
3 sale of any penny stock. A penny stock is any equity security that has a price of
4 less than five dollars, except as provided in Rule 3a51-1 under the Exchange Act,
5 17 C.F.R. § 240.3a51-1.

6 9. The Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter for all purposes.

7 SO ORDERED this 4th day of January, 2010.

8
9
10
11 s/HORACE T. WARD

12 HORACE T. WARD

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28