AMY J. LONGO (Cal Bar No. 198304) 1 Email: longoa@sec.gov ROBERT C. STILLWELL (Cal. Bar No. 308630) 2 Email: stillwellr@sec.gov 3 Attorneys for Plaintiff 4 Securities and Exchange Commission Michele Wein Layne, Regional Director 5 Alka N. Patel, Associate Regional Director Amy Longo, Regional Trial Counsel 6 444 South Flower St, Suite 900 7 Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (323) 965-3998 8 Facsimile: (213) 443-1904 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 12 Case No. 19-cv-2069 13 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, 14 **COMPLAINT** Plaintiff, 15 VS. 16 CAROL ANN PEDERSEN, 17 18 Defendant. 19 Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") alleges: 20 21 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE** 22 1. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 20(b), 23 20(d)(1) and 22(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act") [15 U.S.C. 24 §§ 77t(b), 77t(d)(1) & 77v(a)], Sections 21(d)(1), 21(d)(3)(A), 21(e) and 27(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d)(1), 25 78u(d)(3)(A), 78u(e) & 78aa(a)], and Sections 209(d), 209(e)(1) and 214(a) of the 26 Investment Advisers Act of 1940 ("Advisers Act") [15 U.S.C. §§ 80b-9(d), 27 28 80b-9(e)(1) & 90b-14(a)]. **COMPLAINT** 1

5

6 7 8

9 10

11 12

14

15

13

16

17 18

19 20

22

21

23 24

25

26 27

28

- 2. Defendant has, directly or indirectly, made use of the means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange in connection with the transactions, acts, practices and courses of business alleged in this complaint.
- 3. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to Section 22(a) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77v(a)], Section 27(a) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78aa(a)], and Section 214(a) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 90b-14(a)], because certain of the transactions, acts, practices and courses of conduct constituting violations of the federal securities laws occurred within this district and the defendant resides in this district.

#### **SUMMARY**

- This case involves a decades-long Ponzi scheme carried out by Carol 4. Ann Pedersen ("Pedersen"), a former CPA and unregistered investment adviser based in Long Beach, California. From 1991 until 2017, Pedersen solicited at least \$29.3 million from 25 investors. For many years, Pedersen solicited investor funds by offering to purchase fixed-rate securities on behalf of certain of her accountancy clients. In 2008, Pedersen created the CA Pedersen Client Investment Pool ("CAPCIP") and, in her capacity as general partner and investment adviser to CAPCIP, advised prospective investors that she would invest CAPCIP's assets in securities and other financial instruments and that they could expect to earn a significant return.
- 5. With one known exception, Pedersen did not make any of the promised investments. Rather, Pedersen operated her enterprise as a pure Ponzi scheme, using about \$25.6 million of the investor funds to make distributions to investors and the remaining funds to pay personal expenses, including car payments and home renovation costs. To conceal her fraudulent scheme, Pedersen provided investors with fabricated account statements that falsely represented that their money had been invested and was earning a return.

2

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

6. By engaging in this conduct, Pedersen violated Sections 17(a)(1), 17(a)(2), and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act, Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, and Sections 206(1), 206(2), and 206(4) of the Advisers Act and Rule 206(4)-8 thereunder. With this complaint, the SEC seeks a permanent injunction, disgorgement of ill-gotten gains together with prejudgment interest, and a civil penalty.

#### **DEFENDANT**

7. Carol Ann Pedersen, age 65, is a resident of Long Beach, California. Pedersen became licensed as a CPA in the state of California in 1977; she retired her license in September 2017. For thirty years, Pedersen provided accounting services to individuals and families in Southern California. From at least 1991 until 2017, Pedersen served as an investment adviser to certain of her accountancy clients. From 2008 until 2017, Pedersen also served as an investment adviser to the CA Pedersen Client Investment Pool. Pedersen has never been registered with the SEC and has never held any securities licenses.

#### RELATED ENTITY

8. CA Pedersen Client Investment Pool was a California limited partnership formed in 2008 with its principal place of business in Long Beach, California. Pedersen was the general partner and manager of CAPCIP, a pooled investment vehicle that had about eight investors. CAPCIP was not registered with the SEC or any state regulatory authority. CAPCIP has been defunct since July 2017, when Pedersen dissolved it.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

#### **Pedersen Solicited Millions in Investor Funds** A.

9. From 1991 until 2017, Pedersen acted as a money manager and investment adviser, soliciting funds from her accountancy clients and others on the false pretense that she would invest their money in securities. Pedersen's investors fell into two categories: those who believed Pedersen had purchased securities with

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

specific rates of return on their behalf, and those who believed they were contributing to an investment pool with an extensive stock portfolio, managed by Pedersen.

- 10. First, between 1991 and 2017, Pedersen represented that she would invest in securities that would earn specific rates of return, typically greater than 8%, on behalf of certain of her accountancy clients ("Fixed Return Investors"). When Fixed Rate Investors gave Pedersen money to invest, or when their existing investments purportedly "matured," Pedersen regularly advised the Fixed Rate Investors in written communications as to the comparative merits of the various securities in which they might invest next.
- 11. Separately, in 2008, Pedersen created the CA Pedersen Client Investment Pool and sold limited partnership interests in CAPCIP to investors ("CAPCIP Investors") (collectively with the Fixed Return Investors, "Investors"). Only some of the CAPCIP Investors were accountancy clients. Pursuant to a limited partnership agreement ("LPA") signed by each CAPCIP Investor, Pedersen, as CAPCIP's general partner, had sole authority to "invest the assets of the partnership in securities and other financial instruments." In oral communications, Pedersen advised prospective CAPCIP Investors that she would invest CAPCIP's assets and represented that CAPCIP Investors could expect to receive a significant return.
- 12. In total, from September 2010 through July 2017, Pedersen received approximately \$29.3 million from 25 Investors.

#### В. **Pedersen Made Ponzi-Type Payments to Investors**

- With one known exception, discussed below, Pedersen did not invest any of the funds that she received from Investors. Rather, Pedersen deposited and commingled nearly all Investor funds in a single bank account. She then used new Investor funds to make distributions to Investors – almost from the moment of inception.
- 14. In sum, from September 2010 through July 2017, Pedersen made approximately \$25.6 million in Ponzi payments to Investors.

#### C. Pedersen Misappropriated Investor Funds

- 15. While conducting her scheme, Pedersen misappropriated for personal use a significant portion of the funds raised. From September 2010 through July 2017, Pedersen made net payments of over \$1.9 million to herself, via wire transfers to her personal bank account. Additionally, Pedersen used Investor funds to directly pay for a variety of personal expenses, including car payments, insurance payments, electric bills, medical expenses, and home renovation costs.
- 16. Under the LPA, Pedersen was supposed to receive 0.5% of CAPCIP's average investment balance, computed on an annual basis, for her advisory services. Of course, the LPA did not contemplate that, instead of investing, Pedersen would use CAPCIP's assets to perpetrate a Ponzi scheme.

#### D. Pedersen Made Misrepresentations to Investors

- 17. To entice investors, Pedersen made numerous misrepresentations to both the Fixed Rate Investors and the CAPCIP Investors. Her misrepresentations varied over time and among Investors.
- 18. With respect to the Fixed Rate Investors, Pedersen consistently promised that she would invest their money in instruments with specific rates of return, typically greater than 8%. Pedersen made other misrepresentations about the investments including that the money was in safe investments that were "federally guaranteed" or "federally insured" or in bank-issued certificates of deposit or "secondary market Preferred Executive Paper." Beginning in at least 2005 and continuing until July 2017, Pedersen falsely advised several Fixed Rate Investors that they held certain publicly available asset-backed securities.
- 19. With respect to the CAPCIP Investors, Pedersen represented that she would invest CAPCIP's assets in securities and other financial instruments and that they would earn a significant return.

- 20. To conceal her misappropriation and misuse of funds, Pedersen personally prepared and sent periodic account statements to the Fixed Rate Investors and the CAPCIP Investors that included purported investments that she never made.
- 21. The periodic account statements to the CAPCIP Investors falsely represented CAPCIP's holdings and each CAPCIP Investor's supposed share of the same. According to those statements, CAPCIP owned a large and diverse stock portfolio, which was purportedly worth more than \$350 million by May 2017. In reality, Pedersen had completely fabricated CAPCIP's holdings; Pedersen's total assets under management from <u>all</u> Investors never exceeded \$12.9 million.
- 22. In 2014, a CAPCIP Investor requested a copy of the CAPCIP limited partnership agreement and other documents related to CAPCIP. By way of response, in June 2015, Pedersen opened a brokerage account, purchased a portfolio of securities that resembled the CAPCIP Investor's supposed "share" of the CAPCIP portfolio (as represented in CAPCIP account statements), and advised the CAPCIP Investor that she had segregated the Investor's assets and would transfer the assets upon request. Ultimately, Pedersen liquidated the account's holdings shortly thereafter to make distributions to other Investors. In reality, this was the first and only occasion that Pedersen made actual investments on behalf of CAPCIP.

### E. The Scheme Falls Apart

23. In 2017, Pedersen began to experience chronic cash-flow shortages and could no longer make regular or requested distributions to Investors. Between July 2017 and January 2018, four Investors filed suit against Pedersen. On or about July 14, 2017, Pedersen's primary account for Investor funds was frozen pursuant to a temporary restraining order issued by the Los Angeles Superior Court. In October 2017, the court appointed a receiver, which took possession of Pedersen's accounts and other assets.

#### **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

# Fraud in Connection with the Purchase or Sale of Securities Violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rules 10b-5(a) and (c) (Against Pedersen)

- 24. The SEC realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 23 above.
- 25. As alleged above, Pedersen engaged in a scheme to defraud the Investors, and engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business that operated as a fraud upon the Investors. In carrying out this fraud, Pedersen engaged in a number of deceptive acts in furtherance of the scheme. Pedersen used Investor funds to make regular and/or requested distributions to Investors (up to the levels of their purported principal balances), which reinforced the false appearance that the Investors' funds were profitably invested and available to withdraw, and which enabled Pedersen to convince Investors to keep their money invested and/or re-invest when their existing investments purportedly "matured." At all relevant times, Pedersen acted knowingly or recklessly in carrying out this fraud.
- 26. By engaging in the conduct described above, Pedersen, directly or indirectly, in connection with the purchase or sale of a security, and by the use of means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange: (a) employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud; and (b) engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon other persons.
- 27. Pedersen knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that she employed devices, schemes or artifices to defraud and engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business that operated as a fraud upon other persons by the conduct described above.
- 28. By engaging in the conduct described above, Pedersen violated, and unless enjoined will continue to violate, Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

[15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)], and Rules10b-5(a) and 10b-5(c) thereunder [17 C.F.R. §§ 240.10b-5(a) & 240.10b-5(c)].

#### SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

# Fraud in Connection with the Purchase or Sale of Securities Violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5(b) (Against Pedersen)

- 29. The SEC realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 28 above.
- 30. By engaging in the conduct described above, Pedersen, directly or indirectly, in connection with the purchase or sale of a security, and by the use of means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange, made untrue statements of material fact or omitted to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.
- 31. Pedersen knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that she made untrue statements of material fact or omitted to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.
- 32. By engaging in the conduct described above, Pedersen violated, and unless enjoined will continue to violate, Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)], and Rule 10b-5(b) thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5(b)].

### THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

# Fraud in the Offer or Sale of Securities Violations of Sections 17(a)(1) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act (Against Pedersen)

33. The SEC realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 32 above.

8

- 34. By engaging in the conduct described above, Pedersen, directly or indirectly, in the offer or sale of securities, and by the use of means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails: (a) employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud; and (b) engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchasers.
- 35. Pedersen knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that she employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud and engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business that operated as a fraud or deceit upon the purchasers.
- 36. By engaging in the conduct described above, Pedersen violated, and unless enjoined will continue to violate, Sections 17(a)(1) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 77q(a)(1) and § 77q(a)(3)].

#### FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

# Fraud in the Offer or Sale of Securities Violations of Sections 17(a)(2) of the Securities Act (Against Pedersen)

- 37. The SEC realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 36 above.
- 38. By engaging in the conduct described above, Pedersen, directly or indirectly, in the offer or sale of securities, and by the use of means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails, obtained money or property by means of untrue statements of a material fact or by omitting to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.
- 39. Pedersen knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that she obtained money or property by means of untrue statements of a material fact or by omitting to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.

40. By engaging in the conduct described above, Pedersen violated, and unless enjoined will continue to violate, Section 17(a)(2) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)(2)].

#### FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

#### Fraud by an Investment Adviser

### Violations of Sections 206(1) and 206(2) of the Advisers Act (Against Pedersen)

- 41. The SEC realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 40 above.
- 42. As alleged above, Pedersen had an adviser-client relationship with, and therefore owed a fiduciary duty to, each of the Fixed Rate Investors and CAPCIP.
- 43. By engaging in the conduct described above, Pedersen, directly or indirectly, by use of the mails or means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce: (a) employed devices, schemes or artifices to defraud clients or prospective clients; and (b) engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated as a fraud or deceit upon clients or prospective clients.
- 44. Pedersen knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that she employed devices, schemes or artifices to defraud clients or prospective clients and engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated as a fraud or deceit upon clients or prospective clients.
- 45. By engaging in the conduct described above, Pedersen violated, and unless enjoined will continue to violate, Sections 206(1) and (2) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 80b-6(1) & 80b-6(2)].

### 

#### **SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

#### Fraud by an Investment Adviser

## Violations of Section 206(4) of the Advisers Act and Rule 206(4)-8 (Against Pedersen)

- 46. The SEC realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 45 above.
- 47. Pedersen operated CAPCIP as a pooled investment vehicle under Rule 206(4)-8 of the Advisers Act.
- 48. By engaging in the conduct described above, Pedersen, directly or indirectly, by use of the mails or means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce: (a) engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated as a fraud or deceit upon investors in a pooled investment vehicle; (b) made untrue statements of a material fact or omitted to state a material fact necessary to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading, to investors or prospective investors in a pooled investment vehicle; and (c) otherwise engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business that were fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative with respect to investors or prospective investors in a pooled investment vehicle.
- 49. Pedersen knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that she engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated as a fraud or deceit upon investors in a pooled investment vehicle, made untrue statements of a material fact or omitted to state a material fact necessary to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading, to investors or prospective investors in a pooled investment vehicle, and otherwise engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business that were fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative with respect to investors or prospective investors in a pooled investment vehicle.

	1
	า ว
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	· 5
_	<i>5</i>
	7
1	/
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
	7
	8
_	J

50. By engaging in the conduct described above, Pedersen violated, and unless enjoined will continue to violate, Section 206(4) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-6(4)] and Rule 206(4)-8 thereunder [17 CFR § 275.206(4)-8].

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, the SEC respectfully requests that the Court:

T.

Issue findings of fact and conclusions of law that Pedersen committed the alleged violations.

II.

Issue a judgment, in a form consistent with Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d), permanently enjoining Pedersen and her officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them, who receive actual notice of the judgment by personal service or otherwise, from violating Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 [15 U.S.C. §§ 77q(a)], Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)] and Rule 10b-5 thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5], and Sections 206(1), 206(2) and 206(4) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 [15 U.S.C. §§ 80b-6(1), 80b-6(2), & 80b-6(4)] and Rule 206(4)-8 thereunder [17 CFR § 275.206(4)-8].

III.

Order Pedersen to disgorge all ill-gotten gains from her illegal conduct, together with prejudgment interest thereon.

IV.

Order Pedersen to pay a civil penalty under Section 20(d) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(d)], Section 21(d)(3) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(3)], and Section 209(e) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-9(e)].

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 COMPLAINT 12

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: March 20, 2019 /s/ Robert C. Stillwell Amy J. Longo Robert C. Stillwell Attorneys for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission