

FINAL ORDER – THIS PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION BECAME THE FINAL ORDER
OF THE COMMISSION WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMANT #2 ON JANUARY 23, 2017
PURSUANT TO RULE 21F-10(f) OF THE EXCHANGE ACT

Notice of Covered Action Redacted

Redacted

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION OF THE CLAIMS REVIEW STAFF

In response to the above-referenced Notice of Covered Action, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission received whistleblower award claims from the following individuals (collectively, the “Claimants”):

Redacted

Redacted

(Claimant 2)

Pursuant to Section 21F of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 21F-10 promulgated thereunder, the Claims Review Staff has evaluated the above claims in accordance with the criteria set forth in Rules 21F-1 through 21F-17. The Claims Review Staff has preliminarily determined to recommend that the Commission deny both of the above award claims. The basis for this determination is as follows:

Neither Redacted nor Claimant 2 provided information that led to the successful enforcement of the above-referenced Notice of Covered Action within the meaning of Section 21F(b)(1) of the Exchange Act and Rules 21F-3(a)(3) and 21F-4(c) thereunder because they did not:

- a. cause the Commission to (i) commence an examination, (ii) open or reopen an investigation, or (iii) inquire into different conduct as part of a current Commission examination or investigation under Rule 21F-4(c)(1) of the Exchange Act; or

FINAL ORDER – THIS PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION BECAME THE FINAL ORDER
OF THE COMMISSION WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMANT #2 ON JANUARY 23, 2017
PURSUANT TO RULE 21F-10(f) OF THE EXCHANGE ACT

Notice of Covered Action Redacted

Redacted

- b. significantly contribute to the success of a Commission judicial or administrative enforcement action under Rule 21F-4(c)(2) of the Exchange Act.¹

By: Claims Review Staff

Date: September 7, 2016

¹ The record demonstrates that neither the information provided by Redacted nor the information provided by Claimant 2 was used either to advance the investigation or to shape the Redacted settlement, and their information did not otherwise contribute to the successful conclusion of the Redacted Matter. Redacted

With respect to Claimant 2's information, upon reviewing it the staff handling the Redacted investigation determined that the allegations contained therein did not warrant any follow-up or other investigative steps because the information was generally duplicative of the information that the Commission had already received from Redacted as part of the company's earlier self-reporting and/or did not rise to the level of warranting any further investigative efforts on the staff's part given what the staff had already learned directly from Redacted .