

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**  
**Before the**  
**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

**SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**  
**Release No. 72423 / June 18, 2014**

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING**  
**File No. 3-15936**

**In the Matter of**

**CHRISTOPHER A.T. PEDRAS (aka  
CHRIS PEDRAS aka ANTONE  
THOMAS PEDRAS),**

**Respondent.**

**ORDER INSTITUTING ADMINISTRATIVE  
PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO SECTION  
15(b) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE  
ACT OF 1934 AND NOTICE OF HEARING**

**I.**

The Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) deems it appropriate and in the public interest that public administrative proceedings be, and hereby are, instituted pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”), against Christopher A.T. Pedras (aka Chris Pedras aka Antone Thomas Pedras) (“Respondent” or “Pedras”).

**II.**

After an investigation, the Division of Enforcement alleges that:

**A. RESPONDENT**

1. Respondent was the sole owner and director of Maxum Gold Bnk Holdings Limited, which he incorporated in New Zealand on July 23, 2010, and FMP Medical Services LLC, which he formed in Nevada on September 7, 2012; the sole director of affiliate Maxum Bnk PCPT Limited; one of three officers of Maxum Gold Bnk Holdings, LLC, which he formed in Nevada on February 22, 2012; the sole director and shareholder of FMP Medical Services Limited, which he incorporated in New Zealand on July 17, 2013; and the sole owner and director of Comptroller 2013, which he incorporated in New Zealand on March 19, 2013. Pedras was either an exclusive signatory or one of two signatories on numerous bank accounts in the United States and New Zealand opened in the names of these entities. Pedras is not registered with the SEC in any

capacity, and acted as an unregistered broker. Pedras, age 62, is a United States citizen and he resides in Turlock, California and Auckland, New Zealand.

## **B. ENTRY OF THE INJUNCTION**

2. On June 10, 2014, a final judgment by default was entered against Pedras, permanently enjoining him from future violations of Sections 5(a), 5(c), and 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”), and Sections 10(b) and 15(a) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, in the civil action entitled Securities and Exchange Commission v. Christopher A.T. Pedras (aka Chris Pedras aka Antone Thomas Pedras), et al., Civil Action Number 13-07932 GAF, in the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

3. The Commission’s complaint alleged that, from at least July 2010 until the Commission filed its action on October 28, 2013, Pedras, through five different U.S. and New Zealand-based entities of which he was an owner, officer and/or director, offered and sold securities in unregistered offerings based on materially false representations and omissions without being registered as a broker, in furtherance of a Ponzi scheme by which more than \$5.6 million was raised from over fifty United States investors. Among other false representations, Pedras told investors that the Maxum Gold Trade Program was a “low risk” investment with returns ranging between 4-8% per month and claimed investor funds would be placed in escrow to facilitate a bank trade program. When Pedras was unable to pay the promised returns, he began promoting the FMP Renal Program to Maxum Gold Trade Program investors, falsely claiming, among other things, that the new program would instantaneously increase the value of Maxum Gold investors’ investments by approximately 80%. In fact, neither investment program was real; instead, they were a Ponzi scheme. Pursuant to the Ponzi scheme, Pedras paid out more than \$2.4 million in investor “returns” directly out of investor funds, misappropriated nearly \$2 million in cash, cars, retail purchases and transfers to and from his related companies, and caused \$1.2 million to be paid in sales commissions to a network of sales agents.

## **III.**

In view of the allegations made by the Division of Enforcement, the Commission deems it necessary and appropriate in the public interest that public administrative proceedings be instituted to determine:

A. Whether the allegations set forth in Section II hereof are true and, in connection therewith, to afford Respondent an opportunity to establish any defenses to such allegations;

B. What, if any, remedial action is appropriate in the public interest against Respondent pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act.

## **IV.**

IT IS ORDERED that a public hearing for the purpose of taking evidence on the questions set forth in Section III hereof shall be convened at a time and place to be fixed, and before an

Administrative Law Judge to be designated by further order as provided by Rule 110 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.110.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall file an Answer to the allegations contained in this Order within twenty (20) days after service of this Order, as provided by Rule 220 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.220.

If Respondent fails to file the directed answer, or fails to appear at a hearing after being duly notified, the Respondent may be deemed in default and the proceedings may be determined against him upon consideration of this Order, the allegations of which may be deemed to be true as provided by Rules 155(a), 220(f), 221(f) and 310 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a), 201.220(f), 201.221(f) and 201.310.

This Order shall be served forthwith upon Respondent personally or by certified mail.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Administrative Law Judge shall issue an initial decision no later than 210 days from the date of service of this Order, pursuant to Rule 360(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice.

In the absence of an appropriate waiver, no officer or employee of the Commission engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions in this or any factually related proceeding will be permitted to participate or advise in the decision of this matter, except as witness or counsel in proceedings held pursuant to notice. Since this proceeding is not "rule making" within the meaning of Section 551 of the Administrative Procedure Act, it is not deemed subject to the provisions of Section 553 delaying the effective date of any final Commission action.

For the Commission, by its Secretary, pursuant to delegated authority.

Jill M. Peterson  
Assistant Secretary