

Amy J. Oliver (Admitted *pro hac vice*)
Laurie E. Abbott (Admitted *pro hac vice*)
Securities and Exchange Commission
351 South West Temple, Suite 6.100
Salt Lake City, UT 84101-1950
Tel.: (801) 524-5796
olivera@sec.gov
abbottla@sec.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
COMMISSION

Case No.: 2:19-cv-590

Plaintiff,

COMPLAINT

v.

ALEXANDER BEVIL, an individual;
RICHARD MCCALL BOHNSACK, an
individual; DANIEL THOMAS BROYLES, an
individual; CHARLES CARY DAVIS, an
individual; WILLIAM JAMES ROTH, an
individual; GLENN JOSEPH STORY, an
individual; and HAROLD WASSERMAN, an
individual,

Defendants.

Plaintiff, Securities and Exchange Commission (the “Commission”), alleges as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE ACTION

1. Between February 2014 and December 2016, Defendants Alexander Bevil, Richard M. Bohnsack, Daniel T. Broyles, Charles C. Davis, William J. Roth, Glenn J. Story, and Harold Wasserman (collectively, “Defendants”) collectively solicited hundreds of investors throughout the United States and Canada as part of an unregistered offering of the securities of Intertech Solutions, Inc. (“ITEC”), a Nevada Corporation.

1 8. The Defendants, directly or indirectly, made use of the means or instruments of
2 transportation or communication in interstate commerce, or of the mails, in connection with the
3 conduct alleged in this Complaint.

4 9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Section 22
5 of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77v], Sections 21(d) and 27 of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C.
6 §§ 78u(d) and 78aa], and 28 U.S.C. 1331.

7
8 10. Venue in this District is proper because each of the Defendants is found, inhabits,
9 and/or transacted business in the District of Nevada and because one or more acts or transactions
10 constituting the violations occurred in the District of Nevada.

11 **DEFENDANTS**

12
13 11. **Alexander Bevil**, born in 1972, is last known to reside in Springdale, Arkansas.
14 Bevil was recruited to solicit investors in ITEC securities from a sales office in Dallas, Texas,
15 but eventually separated from the Dallas office and continued soliciting ITEC investors
16 independently under an assumed name.

17
18 12. **Richard McCall Bohnsack**, born in 1959, is last known to reside in Dallas,
19 Texas. Bohnsack was recruited to solicit investors in ITEC securities from the Dallas sales
20 office.

21 13. **Daniel Thomas Broyles**, born in 1957, is believed to currently reside in Mexico.
22 Broyles was recruited to solicit investors for ITEC securities, and, in turn, recruited several
23 additional solicitors to work under him.

24
25 14. **Charles Cary Davis**, born in 1948, is last known to reside in Las Vegas, Nevada.
26 Davis was recruited to solicit investors in ITEC's "Sale/Purchase and Processing Agreement for
27 In Situ Au Metal."
28

1 from the Arizona Claims' future production at a highly discounted price relative to the then spot
2 price of gold.

3 23. Because the Arizona Claims remained undeveloped throughout the duration of the
4 Gold Contract offering, ITEC pooled investor funds, which ITEC claimed it would use to pay for
5 the development of the Arizona Claims. The Gold Contracts' profitability therefore depended on
6 ITEC's and the mineral rights holder's ability to develop the Arizona Claims and begin
7 commercial-level gold extraction.
8

9 **The Securities Solicitations**

10 24. To carry out its offerings of common stock and Gold Contracts, ITEC recruited,
11 directly or indirectly, various individuals, including each of the Defendants, to solicit prospective
12 investors.
13

14 25. Excluding Davis, each of the Defendants primarily solicited investors in ITEC
15 common stock. Davis, conversely, was specifically recruited to solicit investors in ITEC Gold
16 Contracts.
17

18 26. To facilitate its offering of common stock, ITEC provided each of the Defendants,
19 excluding Davis, with offering documents, including private placement memoranda ("PPM").
20 Davis created his own solicitation documents regarding the Gold Contracts.

21 27. Defendants then obtained lead lists of prospective investors who resided
22 throughout the United States and Canada and used those lead lists to engage in cold-call
23 solicitations.
24

25 28. During their phone conversations with prospective investors, Defendant's
26 provided information about ITEC's business and discussed the value of an investment with
27 ITEC.
28

1 36. Instead, the only disclosure regarding commissions that investors received was
2 found in the PPMs. That disclosure stated that ITEC would expend just 10% of investor funds
3 for “Discounts & Commissions.”

4 37. Each of the Defendants, excluding Davis, had access to the PPMs and therefore
5 should have known that the disclosure regarding 10% “Discounts & Commissions” was false or
6 misleading.
7

8 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
9 **Violations of Section 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78o(a)(1)]**
10 ***(Against each of the Defendants)***

11 38. The Commission re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every
12 allegation in paragraphs 1–37, inclusive, as if they were fully set forth herein.

13 39. By engaging in the conduct described above, each of the Defendants:

14 a. engaged in the business of effecting transactions in securities for the
15 account of others; and

16 b. directly or indirectly, made use of the mails or the means or
17 instrumentalities of interstate commerce to effect transactions in, or to induce or attempt to
18 induce the purchase or sale of, securities without being registered as a broker or dealer with the
19 Commission or associated with a broker or dealer registered with the Commission.
20

21 40. By reason of the foregoing, each of the Defendants violated and, unless enjoined,
22 will continue to violate Sections 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78o(a)(1)].
23

24 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
25 **Violations of Sections 5(a) and (c) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77e(a) and (c)]**
26 ***(Against each of the Defendants)***

27 41. The Commission re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every
28 allegation in paragraphs 1–37, inclusive, as if they were fully set forth herein.

1 42. By engaging in the conduct described above, each of the Defendants, directly or
2 indirectly:

3 a. made use of means or instruments of transportation or communication in
4 interstate commerce or of the mails to sell ITEC securities, as to which no registration statement
5 was in effect, through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise;

6 b. carried or caused to be carried through the mails or in interstate
7 commerce, by any means or instrument of transportation, ITEC securities, as to which no
8 registration statement was in effect, for the purpose of sale or for delivery after sale; and,

9 c. made use of any means or instruments of transportation or
10 communications in interstate commerce or of the mails to offer to sell or offer to buy through the
11 use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise ITEC securities as to which no registration
12 statement had been filed.
13
14

15 43. In regard to the sale of ITEC securities described herein, no exemption validly
16 applied to the registration requirements described above.

17 44. By reason of the foregoing, each of the Defendants violated and, unless enjoined,
18 will continue to violate Sections 5(a) and (c) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77e(a) and (c)].
19

20 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

21 **Violations of Section 17(a)(2) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)(2)]**
22 ***(Against Defendants Bevil, Bohnsack, Broyles, Roth, Story, and Wasserman)***

23 45. The Commission re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every
24 allegation in paragraphs 1–37, inclusive, as if they were fully set forth herein.

25 46. By engaging in the conduct described above, each of Defendants, Bevil,
26 Bohnsack, Broyles, Roth, Story, and Wasserman, directly or indirectly, individually or in concert
27 with others, in the offer and sale of securities, by use of the means and instruments of
28

1 transportation and communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails have obtained
2 money or property by means of untrue statements of material fact or omissions to state material
3 facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which
4 they were made, not misleading.

5 47. Each of Defendants, Bevil, Bohnsack, Broyles, Roth, Story, and Wasserman was
6 at least negligent in his conduct and in the dissemination of the untrue and misleading statements
7 alleged herein.
8

9 48. By reason of the foregoing, each of Defendants Bevil, Bohnsack, Broyles, Roth,
10 Story, and Wasserman violated and, unless enjoined, will continue to violate Section 17(a) of the
11 Securities Act.
12

13 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

14 WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that this Court enter a final
15 judgment:

16 **I.**

17 Permanently restraining and enjoining each of the Defendants from, directly or indirectly,
18 engaging in conduct in violation of Sections 5(a) and (c) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. §§
19 77e(a) and (c)], Section 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78o(a)(1)] and, excluding
20 Davis, Section 17(a) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)];
21

22 **II.**

23 Permanently restraining and enjoining each of the Defendants from directly or indirectly,
24 including, but not limited to, through any entity owned or controlled by any of them, soliciting
25 any person or entity to purchase or sell any security;
26

27 **III.**

1 Ordering each of the Defendants to disgorge all ill-gotten gains or unjust enrichment
2 derived from the activities set forth in this Complaint together with prejudgment interest thereon;

3 **IV.**

4 Ordering each of the Defendants to pay a civil penalty pursuant to Section 20(d) of the
5 Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(d)] and Section 21(d)(3) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §
6 78u(d)(3)], as applicable;

7 **V.**

8 Permanently and unconditionally restraining and enjoining each of the Defendants,
9 excluding Davis, from participating in any offering of penny stock pursuant to Section 20(g)(1)
10 of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(g)(1)] and Section 21(d)(6)(A) of the Exchange Act [15
11 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(6)(A)], as applicable;

12 **VI.**

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

17 **VII.**

18 Granting such other and further relief as this Court may deem just, equitable, or necessary
19 in connection with the enforcement of the federal securities laws and for the protection of
20 investors.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: April 8, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION



Amy J. Oliver
Laurie E. Abbott
Attorneys for Plaintiff

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
28