1	KAREN MATTESON, Cal. Bar No. 102103
2	Email: mattesonk@sec.gov  DOUGLAS KOBAYASHI, Cal. Bar No. 205886  Email: kobayashid@sec.gov
3	Louis American MARQT
4	Securities and Exchange Commission  Rosalind R. Tyson, Regional Director
5	John M. McCoy III, Associate Regional Director  John W. Berry, Regional Trial Counsel
6	5670 Wilshire Boulevard, 11th Floor Los Angeles, California 90036
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission Rosalind R. Tyson, Regional Director John M. McCoy III, Associate Regional Director John W. Berry, Regional Trial Counsel 5670 Wilshire Boulevard, 11th Floor Los Angeles, California 90036 Telephone: (323) 965-3840 Facsimile: (323) 965-3908
8.	
9	
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12	
13	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE Case No. 2 0 0 7 5 1 LHY CHANGE
14	
15	Plaintiff, COMPLAINT
16	FARZIN BAZSHUSHTARI,
17	Defendant.
18	Defendant.
19	District Commission ("Commission") allocate
20	Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") alleges:  JURISDICTION AND VENUE
21	1. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections
22	21(d)(1), 21(e), 21A(a)(1)(A) and 27(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934
23	("Exchange Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d)(1), 78u(e), 78u-1(a)(1)(A) & 78aa(a).
24	Defendant has, directly or indirectly, made use of the means or instrumentalities of
25	interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities
26	exchange in connection with the transactions, acts, practices and courses of
27	business alleged in this Complaint.
28	business unegen in uns complaint.

8 9

7

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

2. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to Section 27(a) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78aa(a), because the Defendant resides in and/or transacts business in this district and certain of the transactions, practices, and courses of business constituting violations of the federal securities laws occurred within this district.

#### **SUMMARY**

- 3. This case involves insider trading by Defendant Farzin Bazshushtari, the Director of Industrial Distribution in the sales department of STEC, Inc. On three separate occasions between April and June 2009, the Defendant purchased STEC, Inc. common stock or call options based on material nonpublic information he received as a result of his position at the company. These trades also violated specific company policies known to the Defendant when he made the trades. In particular, the Defendant made his first stock purchase on April 27, 2009, during a "blackout" period when company employees were prohibited from trading in company stock; he made his final purchase of call options on June 10, 2009, on margin; and he made all of his purchases of company securities in a margin account, all in violation of the company's written insider trading and/or ethics policies. As a result of his trades, the Defendant profited by \$76,676.50.
- By engaging in this conduct, the Defendant violated the antifraud provisions of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5. The Commission seeks a permanent injunction prohibiting future violations, disgorgement of ill-gotten gains together with prejudgment interest thereon, and civil penalties under the Insider Trading Sanctions Act of 1984.

## THE DEFENDANT

Farzin Bazshushtari ("Bazshushtari") has been employed by 5. STEC, Inc. since February 1996, and has been the Director of Industrial Distribution in its sales department since mid-2007. He resides in Mission Viejo, California.

#### RELATED ENTITY

6. STEC, Inc. ("STEC") is a California corporation with its principal place of business in Santa Ana, California. STEC designs, manufactures, and markets electronic data storage products used in enterprise applications by original equipment manufacturers. Since September 2000, the securities of STEC have been publicly traded on the NASDAQ Global Select Market. STEC securities are registered with the Commission pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78*l*(b).

#### **BAZSHUSHTARI'S INSIDER TRADING**

- A. STEC Instituted An Ethics Code And Insider Trading Policy Which
  Prohibited Trading By Insiders During "Black-Out" Periods, Trading
  In STEC Options And Buying STEC Securities On Margin
- 7. STEC adopted a Code of Business Conduct and Ethics ("Ethics Code") on or about February 26, 2004. In order to ensure that its officers, directors and employees ("Insiders") did not engage in insider trading, STEC included in its Ethics Code a section entitled "Protecting the Company's Confidential Information," which sets forth in detail the types of company information that STEC considers "proprietary or confidential," explicitly including "financial information." The Ethics Code also included a section entitled "Obligations Under Securities Laws 'Insider Trading,'" which refers to STEC's separate written Insider Trading Policy as "outlin[ing] in greater detail the prohibitions against insider trading and the blackout periods for trading in the Company's securities." As STEC's Ethics Code explained:

All officers, directors and employees of the Company are subject to periodic trading blackout periods as well as to special blackout periods that the Company may impose from time to time.

All officers, directors and employees of the Company may not trade in

Company securities during these blackout periods.

[Emphasis supplied.] Bazshushtari signed an "Acknowledgement of Receipt of Code of Business Conduct and Ethics" on or about May 21, 2004, as required of all STEC Insiders.

- 8. At all relevant times, STEC's written "Insider Trading Policy," which was amended and restated on October 27, 2006, set forth specific "Black-Out" periods when trading by Insiders of STEC stock was prohibited. For most employees, such as Bazshushtari, "Black-Out Periods" included the period "between the sixteenth (16<sup>th</sup>) day of the third calendar month of each fiscal quarter (e.g., March 16, June 16, September 16 and December 16) and the close of business on the second full Nasdaq trading day <u>after</u> the final financial results of STEC's operations for such quarter are publicly announced." [Emphasis original.] STEC's Insider Trading Policy further provides that additional Black-Out periods may be imposed.
- 9. At all relevant times, STEC's written "Insider Trading Policy" included a section entitled "Definition of Material Nonpublic Information," which stated in relevant part that:

It is not possible to define all categories of Material Nonpublic Information. In general, information should be regarded as material if there is a reasonable likelihood that it would be considered important by an investor in making a decision regarding the purchase or sale of STEC Stock. Although it may be difficult under this standard to determine whether certain information is material, there are various categories of information that are particularly sensitive and, as a general rule, should always be regarded as material. Either positive or negative information may be material. Examples of such information are:

1. Financial results

- 2. Known but unannounced future earnings or losses . . .
- 16. Any other factors which would cause STEC's financial results to be substantially different from analyst estimates.

## [Emphasis original.]

- 10. In addition to prohibiting trading by company personnel during certain Black-Out periods, at all relevant times, both the Ethics Code and the Insider Trading Policy prohibited trading by Insiders of a "speculative nature," and defined such trades as including transactions in STEC options. Additionally, at all relevant times, STEC's Insider Trading Policy prohibited purchase by Insiders of STEC securities either on margin or in margin accounts.
- B. <u>Bazshushtari Traded STEC Securities While Possessing Material</u>

  Nonpublic Information, And In Violation Of STEC's Written Policies
  - 1. <u>Bazshushtari Purchased 7,000 Shares Of STEC Stock During A</u>

    <u>Black-Out Period, While In Possession Of Material Nonpublic</u>

    <u>Information Regarding STEC's First Quarter 2009 Results</u>
- 11. Pursuant to STEC's written Insider Trading Policy, the Black-Out period for STEC's first quarter of 2009, ending March 31, 2009, commenced on March 16, 2009, for most STEC employees, including Bazshushtari. Also in accordance with STEC's written Insider Trading Policy, STEC's office of Human Resources transmitted an email to STEC personnel on March 19, 2009, reminding them that "STEC's stock trading window remains closed," and that "this is a reminder that you are prohibited from trading in STEC stock until the window is re-opened." The email further reminded STEC personnel that trading while the window is closed not only violated STEC policy and was grounds for discipline, including termination, but could also constitute "possible violations of securities laws." Finally, the email informed STEC personnel that the window "is expected to reopen sometime in May 2009." Bazshushtari received this email.
  - 12. During the relevant period, the STEC Vice President of Sales to

whom Bazshushtari reported attended weekly senior management meetings jointly led by STEC's CEO and President. In or about April 2009, the Vice President of Sales learned of STEC's positive first quarter financial results in one of these meetings. He then relayed that information to Bazshushtari. This information constituted "financial results," and "known but unannounced future earnings or losses," specifically defined as material nonpublic information by STEC's written Insider Trading Policy.

- 13. After learning the material nonpublic information that STEC's first quarter financial results were positive, on April 27, 2009, Bazshushtari purchased 7,000 shares of STEC common stock for \$66,123.49, through a margin account held at TD Ameritrade in his and his wife's names as joint tenants, knowing that he was making this purchase during a "Black-Out" period. This purchase equaled 55% of Bazshushtari's base annual salary for 2009 of \$120,000.
- 14. At the close of the market on May 11, 2009, STEC announced first quarter results and that those results surpassed its previous revenue and earnings per share guidance. STEC additionally announced its guidance for its second quarter that its revenue would range from \$68 million to \$70 million. STEC's stock price closed at \$13.60 per share on May 12, a 30.89% increase from the May 11 close of \$10.39. Bazshushtari accordingly profited by \$29,086.50 from his purchase of 7,000 shares of STEC stock during the announced quarterly Black-Out period while in possession of material nonpublic information.
  - 2. Bazshushtari Purchased An Additional 5,500 STEC Shares And
    Purchased 200 Call Options On Margin In Violation Of STEC
    Policies, All While Possessing Material Nonpublic Information
    Regarding STEC's Second Quarter 2009 Results
- 15. During the relevant period, Bazshushtari received Weekly Product and Market Update Reports by email before STEC's weekly product and market update meetings, which he attended. The weekly reports contained material

nonpublic financial information, including total "bookings," or sales, of the company from the previous week. Tallying total sales figures for every week based on these reports yielded the revenue to date for the quarter, showing how close STEC was to its quarterly revenue guidance figure.

- 16. On May 18, 2009, Bazshushtari received a weekly sales report that showed \$4,945,264 in total sales for the previous week. The sales figures for each week from the April 6 to the May 18 reports totaled \$47.1 million, or almost 70% of STEC's May 11 guidance of \$68 million to \$70 million. This information was positive and material because there were only six weeks left until quarter end, and because, by comparison, at the same point in the first quarter, STEC's revenues had reached only 50% of its revenue guidance figure. Hence, quarter over quarter, by May 18, STEC was outperforming guidance.
- 17. On May 27, 2009, after receiving the May 18 weekly report, while in possession of the material nonpublic information that STEC was outperforming guidance, Bazshushtari purchased an additional 5,500 shares of STEC common stock for \$96,259.99, through the same margin account held at TD Ameritrade in his and his wife's names as joint tenants. This purchase equaled 80% of his base annual salary of \$120,000.
- 18. The June 8 weekly sales report, which Bazshushtari received on or about June 7, 2009, showed an additional \$3,037,181 in total sales from the prior week. Summing the weekly sales set forth in each weekly report up to that point in the quarter revealed that STEC's revenue for the second quarter was already at almost \$56 million.
- 19. On June 10, 2009, Bazshushtari purchased on margin 200 STEC call options with a strike price of \$22.50 set to expire on August 22, 2009, for \$44,159.99, through the same margin account held at TD Ameritrade in his and his wife's names as joint tenants. In purchasing these options, Bazshushtari violated both STEC's written policy set forth in its Ethics Code and Insider Trading Policy

prohibiting trading in STEC options, and its written policy prohibiting purchase of STEC securities on margin set forth in its Insider Trading Policy. This purchase equaled 37% of Bazshushtari's annual salary.

20. Six days later, on June 16, STEC publicly announced that it "expect[ed] to report revenue in the range of \$82 million to \$84 million, versus the previous estimate of \$68 million to \$70 million." The stock price closed that day at \$22.80, up 26.52% from the previous day's close of \$18.02. Bazshushtari accordingly profited by \$29,590 from his purchase of 5,500 shares of STEC stock, and by \$18,000 from his purchase on margin of 200 STEC call option contracts while in possession of material nonpublic information, for a total of \$47,590.

## 3. Bazshushtari Profited from his Insider Trading by \$76,676.50

21. Defendant Bazshushtari purchased STEC securities on the basis of material nonpublic information about the true financial condition of STEC described in detail above, in breach of a duty of trust or confidence that he owed directly, indirectly, or derivatively to STEC and its shareholders by reason of his position as Director of Industrial Distribution in the sales department of STEC, gaining and realizing profits as set forth above, totaling \$76,676.50.

## **CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

# <u>Fraud In Connection With The Purchase Or Sale Of Securities</u> Violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 Thereunder

- 22. The Commission realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 21 above.
- 23. The Defendant, by engaging in the conduct described above, directly or indirectly, in connection with the purchase or sale of a security, by the use of means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange, with scienter:
  - a. employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud;
  - b. made untrue statements of a material fact or omitted to state a

- 1	
1	material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in
2	light of the circumstances under which they were made, not
3	misleading; or
4	c. engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business which operated
5	or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon other persons.
6	24. By engaging in the conduct described above, the Defendant violated,
7	and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Section 10(b) of the
8	Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, 17 C.F.R. §
9	240.10b-5.
10	PRAYER FOR RELIEF
11	WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court:
12	I.
13	Issue findings of fact and conclusions of law that Defendant committed the
14	alleged violations.
15	II.
16	Issue a judgment, in a form consistent with Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d),
17	permanently enjoining Defendant and his agents, servants, employees and
18	attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them,
19	who receive actual notice of the judgment by personal service or otherwise, from
20	violating Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5
21	thereunder, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5.
22	III.
23	Order Defendant to disgorge all ill-gotten gains from his illegal conduct,
24	together with prejudgment interest thereon.
25	IV.
26	Order Defendant to pay civil penalties for insider trading under Section
27	21 A(a) of the Evelonge Act 15 U.S.C. 8 78y 1(a)

V.

Retain jurisdiction of this action in accordance with the principles of equity and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in order to implement and carry out the terms of all orders and decrees that may be entered, or to entertain any suitable application or motion for additional relief within the jurisdiction of this Court.

VI.

Grant such other and further relief as this Court may determine to be just and

necessary.

DATED: January 13, 2012

KAREN MATTESON

DOUGLAS F. KOBAYASHI

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Securities and Exchange Commission