UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Before the SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 Release No. 92985 / September 15, 2021

WHISTLEBLOWER AWARD PROCEEDING

File No. 2021-91

In the Matter of the Claims for Awards

in connection with

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Notice of Covered Action

Redacted

ORDER DETERMINING WHISTLEBLOWER AWARD CLAIMS

The Claims Review Staff ("the above-referenced Covered Action recommending that: (1) (a) the Covered Action, (b)	CRS") issued Preliminary Determinant ("Covered Action") and related ("Claimant 1") receive a Redacted	Redacted actions,
(a) the Covered Action, (b) Redacted	("Related Action 1"), and (c)	Redacted
Reda	acted	("Related Action 2"), for
a payout of almost \$110,000,000; ¹ Action 1 submitted by	(2) the award claim for the Covere ("Claimant 2") be denied; and (Dadastad
Related Action 1 and Relate	ed Action 2 were brought by	Redacted

Redacted (the "Other Agency").

("Claimant 3") receive a percent ("%) award in the Covered Action, for a payout of approximately \$4,000,000.

Claimant 1 and Claimant 3 provided written notice of their decisions not to contest the Preliminary Determinations.² Claimant 2 filed a timely response contesting the Preliminary Determinations. For the reasons discussed below, the CRS's recommendations are adopted.

I. Background

A. The Covered Action

On Commission	Redacted	, the Commission instituted the Covered Action. The Redacted ("Company 1")				
		Redacted				
		Redacted				
		Redacted				
		Redacted				
	Redacted					
Redacted						
		Redacted				
	Redacted					
		Redacted				
	Redacted					
		Redacted				
	Redacted					
		Redacted				
		Redacted				
		Redacted				
		Redacted				
		Redacted				
Redacted	id in full.	Redacted				
Po	in in ini.	Redacted				

The CRS also preliminarily determined to recommend that Claimant 1's award claim Redacted and that Claimant 3's related action award claims be denied.

Because Claimant 1 and Claimant 3 did not contest those portions of the Preliminary Determinations, the preliminary denials of those related action award claims are now deemed to be final through operation of law.

Redacted

Redacted

On Redacted , the Office of the Whistleblower posted a Notice for the Covered Action on the Commission's public website inviting claimants to submit whistleblower award applications within 90 days. Claimant 1, Claimant 2, and Claimant 3 each filed a timely whistleblower award claim.

B. Related Action 1

Redacted

paid in full.

C. Related Action 2

Redacted

("Company 2")

Redacted

³ See Exchange Act Rule 21F-10(a), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-10(a).

D. The Preliminary Determinations

The CRS issued Preliminary Determinations recommending that the Commission (1) grant Claimant 1 an award equal to Redacted percent (*** %) of the monetary sanctions collected, or to be collected, in the Covered Action, Related Action 1, and Related Action 2; (2) grant Claimant 3 an award equal to Percent (*** %) of the monetary sanctions collected, or to be collected, in the Covered Action; and (3) deny an award to Claimant 2 in the Covered Action and Related Action 1

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

E. Claimants' Responses to the Preliminary Determinations

Claimant 1 and Claimant 3 provided written notice of their decisions not to contest the Preliminary Determinations.

Claimant 2 submitted a timely, written response contesting the Preliminary Determinations. Claimant 2 argues that the CRS incorrectly concluded that

Redacted

Redacted

.5

Claimant 2 alleges that

Redacted

Redacted Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

⁵ Claimant 2 has only applied for an award in connection with the Covered Action and Related Action 1.

Redacted Redacted In this way, Claimant 2 alleges, Redacted Redacted Claimant 2 asserts that Redacted Instead, Claimant 2 purportedly Redacted Redacted Claimant 2 alleges that Redacted Redacted Redacted In support of these assertions, Claimant 2 points to the fact that Redacted Redacted Redacted Additionally, Claimant 2 argues that Redacted Redacted Redacted Redacted Claimant 2 also argues that Redacted Redacted Further, Claimant 2 asserts that Redacted Redacted Additionally, Claimant 2 makes an equitable argument, asserting that Redacted Redacted Redacted Redacted Redacted Redacted

Redacted

Redacted Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

would be unjust to

Redacted

Redacted

Claimant 2 accordingly believes that Claimant 2 is entitled to a whistleblower award for Redacted

Redacted

II. Analysis

A. Claimant 1

As to Claimant 1, the record demonstrates that Claimant 1 voluntarily provided original information⁸ to the Commission and to the Other Agency, and Claimant 1's original information led to the successful enforcement of the Covered Action,⁹ Related Action 1,¹⁰ and Related

See Exchange Act Section 21F(b)(1), 15 U.S.C. § 78u-6(b)(1); Exchange Act Rule 21F-3(a), 17 C.F.R. §240.21F-3(a).

10 Related Action 1

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Here, Related

Action 1 constitutes a "related action" to the Covered Action within the meaning of Exchange

Claimant 1's information was based on Claimant 1's "independent analysis," a constituent element of "original information." Specifically, Claimant 1 utilized publicly available information in a way that went beyond the information itself and afforded the Commission with important insights into the extent of Company 1's misconduct as well as other relevant conduct. Additionally, Claimant 1's information was derived from multiple sources that were not readily identified and accessed by members of the public without specialized knowledge, unusual effort, or substantial cost. Moreover, the sources that Claimant 1 cultivated collectively raised a strong inference of securities law violations that was not otherwise reasonably inferable from any of the sources individually. In all, Claimant 1's own examination, evaluation, and analysis contributed significant independent information that bridged the gap between certain publicly available information and the possible securities violations that the Commission and the Other Agency were investigating.

Action 2.11 Further, the record reflects that: (1) Claimant 1's information, which included a detailed suggested witness list and other charts reflecting , was important in connection with the Commission's allegations reducted involving Company 1; (2) Claimant 1's information and supporting documents saved the Commission significant time and resources; (3) Claimant 1 provided substantial, ongoing assistance to staff in the Division of Enforcement (the "Staff"), which included multiple written submissions and communications, including in-person meetings; and (4) Claimant 1 suffered personal and professional hardships as a result of Claimant 1's whistleblower activities.

However, while Claimant 1's information was important, it was submitted after the Staff had already opened an investigation and after the Staff had already become aware of potential misconduct by Company 1 . Furthermore, Claimant 1's information assisted the Staff in connection with only some of the misconduct that the Staff was investigating and which the Commission ultimately charged in the Covered Action.

We further find that Related Action 1 and Related Action 2 are "related actions" under Exchange Act Rule 21F-3(b)(1)

Redacted

Claimant 1 satisfies the requirements of Exchange Act Rule 21F-3(b)(2)

for related action awards because Related Action 1 and Related Action 2 were based in part on the same original information that Claimant 1 voluntarily provided to the Commission. Specifically, Claimant 1 voluntarily provided original information to the Commission as well as to the Other Agency, and Claimant 1's information led to the successful enforcement of Related Action 1 and Related Action 2.

Act Section 21F(a)(5), 15 U.S.C. § 78u-6(a)(5), and Exchange Act Rule 21F-3(b) promulgated thereunder, 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-3(b), as it is

and it is based on the same original information that the whistleblower voluntarily provided to the Commission and which led the Commission to obtain monetary sanctions totaling more than \$1,000,000.

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

In light of these considerations and the relevant factors specified in Exchange Act Rule 21F-6,¹² it is appropriate that Claimant 1 receive an award of Redacted (***%) of the monetary sanctions collected, or to be collected, in the Covered Action, Related Action 1 and Related Action 2.

B. Claimant 3

The record demonstrates that Claimant 3 voluntarily provided original information to the Commission, and Claimant 3's original information led to the successful enforcement of the Covered Action. 13 Further, the record reflects that: (1) Claimant 3's information was submitted after the Staff's investigation had been opened and the Staff had undertaken significant investigative steps; and (2) Claimant 3's information and assistance was much more limited as compared to the information and assistance provided by Claimant 1.

In light of these considerations and the relevant factors specified in Exchange Act Rule 21F-6, it is appropriate that Claimant 3 receive an award of percent (***%) of the monetary sanctions collected, or to be collected, in the Covered Action.

C. Claimant 2

We deny an award to Claimant 2 in connection with the Covered Action.

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

In determining the amount of the awards to Claimant 1, we considered the following factors set forth in Exchange Act Rule 21F-6 as they apply to the facts and circumstances of Claimant 1's application: (1) the significance of information; (2) the assistance provided; (3) the law enforcement interest in deterring violations by granting awards; (4) participation in internal compliance systems; (5) culpability; (6) unreasonable reporting delay; and (7) interference with internal compliance and reporting systems.

See Exchange Act Section 21F(b)(1), 15 U.S.C. § 78u-6(b)(1); Exchange Act Rule 21F-3(a), 17 C.F.R. §240.21F-3(a).

Redacted Redacted

Because Claimant 2 is not eligible for an award in the Covered Action, Claimant 2 is not eligible for a related action award. A related action award may be made only if, among other things, the claimant satisfies the eligibility criteria for an award for the applicable covered action in the first instance. *See* 15 U.S.C. § 78u-6(b); Exchange Act Rule 21F-3(b), (b)(l); Exchange Act Rule 21F-4(f) and (g); Exchange Act Rule 21F-11(a).

	Redacted
	Redacted
Redacted	
	Redacted
Redacted	
Redacted	
	Redacted
	Pedacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted Redacted

Redacted

In sum,	we see no	reason	for the	Commission	to
				Podactod	

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

There is no reason to disturb the CRS's preliminary determination that Claimant 2's award claim should be denied because

Redacted

Redacted

III. Conclusion

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that: (1) Claimant 1 shall receive an award of percent (*** %) of the monetary sanctions collected, or to be collected, in the Covered Action, Related Action 1, and Related Action 2; (2) Claimant 3 shall receive an award of percent (*** %) of the monetary sanctions collected, or to be collected, in the Covered Action; and (3) Claimant 2 shall be denied an award in the Covered Action

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

By the Commission.

Vanessa A. Countryman Secretary