In the Matter of

DELTA GLOBAL ADVISORS, INC. AND CHARLES P. HANLON,

Respondents.

ORDER MAKING FINDINGS AND IMPOSING REMEDIAL SANCTIONS AND A CEASE-AND-DESISS CT ORDER PURSUANT TO SECTION 15(b) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934, SECTIONS 203(f) AND 203(k) OF THE INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940, AND SECTION 9(b) OF THE INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940 AS TO CHARLES P. HANLON

I.


II.

Respondent has submitted an Offer of Settlement (the “Offer”) which the Commission has determined to accept. Solely for the purpose of these proceedings and any other proceedings brought by or on behalf of the Commission, or to which the Commission is a party and without admitting or denying the findings herein, except as to the Commission’s jurisdiction over him
and the subject matter of these proceedings, which are admitted, Respondent consents to the
entry of this Order Making Findings and Imposing Remedial Sanctions and a Cease-and-Desist
Order Pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Sections 203(f) and
203(k) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, and Section 9(b) of the Investment Company Act
of 1940 as to Charles P. Hanlon (“Order”), as set forth below.

III.

On the basis of this Order and Respondent’s Offer, the Commission finds\(^1\) that:

**SUMMARY**

1. This proceeding involved numerous materially misleading statements and
omissions by Delta Global Advisors, Inc. (“Delta”), an investment adviser registered with the
Commission, and Hanlon, Delta’s principal and control person. During the relevant period,
Delta misrepresented to existing and prospective investors its eligibility for Commission
registration, including that it served as an investment adviser to a registered investment company
and managed as much as $1.5 billion. In fact, Delta did not advise any such client and had at
times no more than $9 million under management. These misrepresentations vastly exaggerated
the significance and status of the firm. Moreover, Delta failed to disclose its poor financial
condition, a default judgment entered against it in a breach of fiduciary duty lawsuit brought by a
client, and that Hanlon had been the subject of disciplinary action by the Financial Industry
Regulatory Authority (“FINRA”). As a result of these misleading statements and omissions,
Delta appeared to be operationally sound and much larger and more established than it really
was.

2. Although Hanlon represented to Commission examination staff that Delta would
disclose its poor financial condition to clients, Delta never did so. In addition, even after
Commission examination staff asked Delta to correct its Form ADV to accurately reflect its
assets under management and deregister, Delta continued to misrepresent its assets under
management and did not withdraw its registration.

**RESPONDENTS**

3. **Delta** is a suspended California corporation based in Huntington Beach,
California that registered with the Commission as an investment adviser on July 10, 2006.
Hanlon wholly owns Delta. In 2009, Delta was providing discretionary advisory services to 209
accounts belonging to individuals, pension and profit-sharing plans, trusts, and corporations.

4. **Hanlon** is Delta’s founder, president, and sole control person. At all relevant
times, Hanlon was responsible for the management of Delta’s business. From January 2005

\(^1\) The findings herein are made pursuant to Respondent's Offer of Settlement and are not binding on any
other person or entity in this or any other proceeding.
through February 2007, Hanlon was associated with a registered broker-dealer, Delta Equity Services Corporation. FINRA suspended Hanlon from all registration capacities on June 29, 2010 for violating FINRA rules for failing to comply with an arbitration award.

**BACKGROUND**

**RESPONDENTS MISREPRESENTED DELTA’S STATUS AS AN INVESTMENT ADVISER TO A REGISTERED INVESTMENT COMPANY AND ITS ASSETS UNDER MANAGEMENT**

5. Between 2006 and 2008, Delta and Hanlon filed materially false Forms ADV that vastly exaggerated the significance and status of the firm. Specifically, Delta falsely claimed that it was eligible for registration with the Commission, that it served as an investment adviser to a registered investment company, and that it managed assets far in excess of its actual assets under management.

6. From September 1, 2006 through March 27, 2008, Delta’s Form ADV filings claimed that the firm was eligible for investment adviser registration with the Commission because it served as the investment adviser to a registered investment company. During the relevant time period, Delta had entered into several consulting agreements with the sponsor of unit investment trusts (the “trusts”), which were registered under the Investment Company Act. Pursuant to the consulting agreements, Delta assisted the sponsor in selecting a portfolio of securities for the trusts and received a one-time fee for these services. While Delta served as an investment adviser to the trusts’ sponsor for the limited period in which Delta advised on selection of securities for the trusts, Delta did not have an advisory contract with the registered investment company. Thus, contrary to what it represented in its Form ADV filings, Delta was not acting as an investment adviser to a registered investment company (the trusts) and Delta was not eligible for registration on that basis.

7. From March 7, 2007 through July 6, 2008, Delta’s Form ADV filings improperly included the trusts’ assets as Delta’s advisory assets under management, even though Delta did not provide continuous and regular supervision of the trusts’ assets. The inclusion of the trusts’ assets vastly overstated the firm’s reported size: in four separate filings Delta claimed to manage between $656 million and $1.49 billion in assets. In fact, during this period, Delta’s assets under management dropped to as low as $9 million.

8. For nearly every period reflected in Delta’s Form ADV filings, Delta did not have $25 million or more in advisory assets under management and therefore was not eligible for registration with the Commission.

---

2 Section 4(2) of the Investment Company Act defines a UIT as “an investment company, which (A) is organized under a trust indenture, contract of custodianship or agency, or similar instrument, (B) does not have a board of directors, and (C) issues only redeemable securities . . . .” Typically, these trusts do not have corporate officers, or an investment adviser. These trusts generally do not actively trade their investment portfolios – that is, a unit investment trust buys a relatively fixed portfolio of securities (for example, five, ten, or twenty specific stocks or bonds), and holds them with little or no change for the life of the trust.
registration on that basis. In addition, as of June 30, 2009 (the date of its most recent Form ADV filing), Delta did not have $25 million or more in advisory assets under management.

9. Delta similarly misrepresented its assets under management through its website. Delta’s website included a section containing articles from Bloomberg, Reuters, and other news sources quoting Delta’s employees, including Hanlon. Many of these articles falsely stated that Delta had assets under management of $1 billion or more. For example, Delta’s website included a January 23, 2009 Bloomberg article that stated: “‘Everybody wants to buy gold, and these have been very healthily subscribed issues,’ Michael Pento, who helps oversee $1.5 billion at Delta Global Advisors . . . said in an interview.” Similarly, a March 2, 2009 Bloomberg article on Delta’s website stated: “‘Silver’s woken up recently, but it isn’t flying yet,’ said Chip Hanlon, president of Delta Global Advisors Inc. in Huntington Beach, California, which manages $1 billion.”

10. At the time Delta filed its Forms ADV and posted articles to its website, Hanlon knew or was reckless in not knowing that the representations made about assets under management and providing advisory services to a registered investment company were materially false. In addition, even after Hanlon was advised by an investment advisory compliance firm and Commission staff that Delta was not acting as an investment adviser to a registered investment company and that it should not consider the trusts’ assets as Delta’s assets under management, Delta and Hanlon continued to post additional articles on Delta’s website that included the trusts’ assets as its assets under management.

11. In its July 7, 2008 Form ADV filing, Delta excluded the trusts’ assets from its assets under management and no longer indicated that it provided investment advisory services to a registered investment company. In this filing, Delta indicated that it had $26 million in assets under management, but this was false. At that time Delta only had $16 million in assets under management.

12. Commission examination staff brought this matter to Hanlon’s attention and, on March 31, 2009, Delta amended its Form ADV to reflect $16 million in assets under management, which was well below the $25 million threshold for registration. Only one day before Delta was required to file a Form ADV-W withdrawing its registration, Delta amended its Form ADV once again to reflect $26 million in assets under management. Hanlon admitted to Commission examination staff that Delta included $10 million in “hopeful” assets in this Form ADV filing as assets under management. Without these additional “hopeful” assets, Delta would not have been eligible for registration as an investment adviser. However, even after Commission examination staff requested that Delta correct its Form ADV and deregister, Delta continued to misrepresent its assets under management and did not withdraw its registration.
RESPONDENTS FAILED TO MAKE REQUIRED DISCLOSURES ABOUT DELTA’S POOR FINANCIAL CONDITION AND HANLON’S DISCIPLINARY HISTORY

13. In August 2009, Delta’s financial condition was seriously impaired because it had minimal liquid assets and several overdue bills. On November 13, 2009, Delta informed Commission examination staff by letter that it was “in the process of communicating with all clients on this matter and will have completed this process by December 9, 2009.” However, contrary to Delta’s representations, Hanlon never disclosed Delta’s financial condition to any clients.

14. On June 28, 2010, a default judgment was entered against Delta and Hanlon in a lawsuit filed by one of Delta’s clients relating to Delta’s advisory services. The lawsuit alleged breach of fiduciary duty, negligence, failure to supervise, negligent misrepresentation, and breach of contract, all relating to Hanlon and Delta’s activities as investment advisers. Among other things, the plaintiff claimed that Delta and Hanlon (i) did not follow plaintiff’s investment guidelines and objectives, and (ii) failed to disclose certain conflicts of interest. The judgment ordered Delta and Hanlon to pay $353,706 in damages. Neither Delta nor Hanlon has satisfied the judgment. In addition, Delta did not disclose the existence of this judgment to Delta’s clients or its precarious financial condition as a result of the unsatisfied judgment, even though it was required to do so.

15. In June 2010, a FINRA arbitration panel ordered Hanlon to pay compensatory damages of $272,290 and $5,500 in fees arising from a complaint against him alleging breach of contract, slander, and fraud. Hanlon failed to comply with this arbitration award and consequently on June 29, 2010 FINRA suspended Hanlon from acting in any registered capacity. Delta did not disclose this disciplinary action to its clients, even though it was required to do so.

VIOLATIONS

16. As a result of the conduct described above, Hanlon willfully aided, abetted, and caused Delta’s violations of, Section 203A of the Advisers Act for having improperly registered with the Commission.

17. As a result of the conduct described above, Hanlon willfully violated Sections 206(1) and 206(2) of the Advisers Act by employing devices, schemes or artifices to defraud clients or engaging in transactions, practices or courses of business that defrauded clients or prospective clients.

18. As a result of the conduct described above, Hanlon willfully violated Section 207 of the Advisers Act by making untrue statements of a material fact in registration applications or reports Delta filed with the Commission and willfully omitting to state in such applications or reports material facts which were required to be stated therein.
19. As a result of the conduct described above, Hanlon willfully aided, abetted, and caused Delta’s violations of, Section 206(4) of the Advisers Act and Rules 206(4)-1(a)(5) and 206(4)-4(a)(1) and (2) thereunder by engaging in the following acts, practices or courses of business which were fraudulent, deceptive or manipulative: (a) publishing, circulating or distributing advertisements that contained untrue statements of material facts, or that were otherwise false or misleading; (b) failing to disclose to clients or prospective clients all material facts regarding the financial condition of the adviser that are reasonably likely to impair the adviser’s ability to meet its contractual commitments to clients; and (c) failing to disclose a legal or disciplinary event that is material to an evaluation of the adviser’s integrity or ability to meet contractual commitments to clients.

IV.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission deems it appropriate and in the public interest to impose the sanctions agreed to in Respondent Hanlon’s Offer.

Accordingly, pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act, Sections 203(f) and 203(k) of the Advisers Act, and Section 9(b) of the Investment Company Act, it is hereby ORDERED that:

A. Respondent Hanlon shall cease and desist from committing or causing any violations and any future violations of Sections 203A, 206(1), 206(2), 206(4), and 207 of the Advisers Act and Rule 206(4)-1(a)(5) promulgated thereunder.

B. Respondent Hanlon be, and hereby is:

barred from association with any broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer, municipal advisor, transfer agent, or nationally recognized statistical rating organization;

prohibited from serving or acting as an employee, officer, director, member of an advisory board, investment adviser or depositor of, or principal underwriter for, a registered investment company or affiliated person of such investment adviser, depositor, or principal underwriter; and

barred from participating in any offering of a penny stock, including: acting as a promoter, finder, consultant, agent or other person who engages in activities with a broker, dealer or issuer for purposes of the issuance or trading in any penny stock, or inducing or attempting to induce the purchase or sale of any penny stock

with the right to apply for reentry after five (5) years to the appropriate self-regulatory organization, or if there is none, to the Commission.
C. Any reapplication for association by the Respondent will be subject to the applicable laws and regulations governing the reentry process, and reentry may be conditioned upon a number of factors, including, but not limited to, the satisfaction of any or all of the following: (a) any disgorgement ordered against the Respondent, whether or not the Commission has fully or partially waived payment of such disgorgement; (b) any arbitration award related to the conduct that served as the basis for the Commission order; (c) any self-regulatory organization arbitration award to a customer, whether or not related to the conduct that served as the basis for the Commission order; and (d) any restitution order by a self-regulatory organization, whether or not related to the conduct that served as the basis for the Commission order.

D. Respondent Hanlon shall pay civil penalties of $50,000.00 to the United States Treasury. Payment shall be made in the following installments: $25,000.00 within 10 days of the entry of this Order; $6,250.00 within 90 days of the entry of this Order; $6,250.00 within 180 days of the entry of this Order; $6,250.00 within 270 days of the entry of this Order; and $6,250.00 within 360 days of the entry of this Order. If any payment is not made by the date the payment is required by this Order, the entire outstanding balance of civil penalties, plus any additional interest accrued pursuant to SEC Rule of Practice 600 or pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3717, shall be due and payable immediately, without further application. Payments shall be: (A) made by wire transfer, United States postal money order, certified check, bank cashier's check or bank money order; (B) made payable to the Securities and Exchange Commission; (C) hand-delivered or mailed to the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Financial Management, 100 F St., NE, Stop 6042, Washington, DC 20549; and (D) submitted under cover letter that identifies Charles P. Hanlon as a Respondent in these proceedings, the file number of these proceedings, a copy of which cover letter and money order or check shall be sent to Bruce Karpati, Co-Chief, Asset Management Unit, New York Regional Office, Securities and Exchange Commission, 3 World Financial Center, Suite 400, New York, NY 10281-1022.

By the Commission.

Elizabeth M. Murphy
Secretary