

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940
Release No. 4321 / January 27, 2016

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-17067

In the Matter of

**MOAZZAM “MARK”
MALIK,**

Respondent.

**ORDER INSTITUTING ADMINISTRATIVE
PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO SECTION
203(f) OF THE INVESTMENT ADVISERS
ACT OF 1940 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 203(f) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (“Advisers Act”) against Moazzam “Mark” Malik (“Malik” or “Respondent”).

II.

After an investigation, the Division of Enforcement alleges that:

A. RESPONDENT

1. From May 2011 through February 2015, Malik acted as an investment adviser and sold investors limited partnership interests in his hedge fund, variously known as Seven Sages Capital, LP, American Bridge Investment Group, LLC, currently d/b/a Wolf Hedge, LLC (“ABIG”). Malik is 34 years old and resides in New York, New York.

B. RESPONDENT'S CRIMINAL CONVICTION

2. On December 4, 2015, a jury found Malik guilty of five felony counts of grand larceny in violation of New York Penal Law Sections 155.40 and 155.35, seventeen felony counts of forgery in violation of New York Penal Law Section 170.10, five felony counts of securities fraud in violation of New York General Business Law Section 352-c(6) and one felony count of scheme to defraud in violation of New York Penal Law Section 190.65(1)(b) in the New York State Supreme Court, Criminal Term, in *State v. Moazzam Malik*, Indictment No. 96/2015. On December 18, 2015, Malik was sentenced to a prison term of between five and fifteen years.

3. The indictment on which Malik was convicted alleged, among other things, that Malik stole money that investors had entrusted to him to invest. During the time of the conduct underlying the conviction, Malik was acting as an investment adviser.

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 203(f) of the Advisers 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 as provided for in the Commission's Rules of Practice.

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.

Brent J. Fields
Secretary