

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
Before the  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934  
Release No. 96765 / January 30, 2023

WHISTLEBLOWER AWARD PROCEEDING  
File No. 2023-33

---

In the Matter of the Claims for an Award

in connection with

Redacted

Notice of Covered Action Redacted

---

**ORDER DETERMINING WHISTLEBLOWER AWARD CLAIMS**

The Claims Review Staff (“CRS”) issued a Preliminary Determination recommending that <sup>Redacted</sup> (“Claimant 1”) receive a whistleblower award of about \$1 million, which represents <sup>\*\*\*</sup> percent ( <sup>\*\*\*</sup> ) of the monetary sanctions collected in the above-referenced Covered Action. The CRS further recommended the denial of the whistleblower award claim submitted by <sup>Redacted</sup> (“Claimant 2”).<sup>1</sup> Claimant 2 filed a timely response contesting the preliminary denial.<sup>2</sup> For the reasons discussed below, the CRS’s recommendations are adopted.

**I. Background**

**A. The Covered Action**

On <sup>Redacted</sup> the Commission filed the settled covered action against <sup>Redacted</sup> <sup>\*\*\*</sup> (“Firm”), a registered broker-dealer, finding that the Firm <sup>Redacted</sup> <sup>Redacted</sup> In its

---

<sup>1</sup> The CRS also preliminarily determined to recommend that the award applications of two other claimants be denied. Neither of these claimants submitted a request for reconsideration and, as such, the Preliminary Determinations with respect to their award claims became the Final Order of the Commission, pursuant to Rule 21F-10(f) promulgated under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-10(f).

<sup>2</sup> Claimant 1 provided written notice of his/her decision not to contest the Preliminary Determination.  
<sup>Redacted</sup>



information, Claimant 2 was not aware that he/she could submit an award claim based on Commission enforcement actions brought against other entities arising out of the same investigation for which he/she had not provided specific information or given direct testimony. Claimant 2 concludes that it is unfair that Claimant 1, whom, Claimant 2 asserts, used Claimant 2's information, is being rewarded while Claimant 2 is denied an award.<sup>6</sup>

## II. Analysis

### A. Claimant 1

The record demonstrates that Claimant 1 voluntarily provided original information to the Commission that led to the successful enforcement of the Covered Action.<sup>7</sup>

Redacted

Redacted

In reaching this determination, we considered that Claimant 1's tip was the initial source of the underlying investigation and caused the opening of the investigation. Further, Claimant 1 provided the Commission's investigative staff with extensive and ongoing assistance during the course of the investigation, including identifying witnesses, and helping staff understand complex fact patterns and issues related to the matters under investigation. Claimant 1's information and assistance allowed the Commission to devise an investigative plan

---

<sup>6</sup> Claimant 2 contends that, if the Commission were to exercise its discretionary authority to waive the late-filed award claim and consider his/her award claim, it should find that much of the information for which the CRS credited Claimant 1 with having provided first was, in actuality, information Claimant 1 had received from Claimant 2. Since, as discussed below, we have decided it is not appropriate here to exercise our discretionary authority to waive Claimant 2's failure to submit his/her award claim by the deadline set out in the Notice of Covered Action, we have not addressed, and make no findings, on these contentions.

<sup>7</sup> See Exchange Act Section 21F(b)(1), 15 U.S.C. § 78u-6(b)(1); Exchange Act Rule 21F-3(a), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-3(a).

Redacted

Redacted

and to craft its initial document requests from the Firm and other entities. Finally, Claimant 1 was an important source of specific information for the Covered Action.

## B. Claimant 2

The requirement that claimants file whistleblower award claims within ninety days of the posting of a Notice of Covered Action (“NoCA”), set forth in Exchange Act Rule 21F-10, serves important programmatic functions. The deadline ensures fairness to potential claimants by giving all an equal opportunity to have their competing claims evaluated at the same time. The deadline also brings finality to the claims process so that the Commission can make timely awards to meritorious whistleblowers.<sup>10</sup>

Claimant 2 does not dispute that his/her award claim was submitted after the deadline specified in the Notice of Covered Action. Rather, as noted, Claimant 2 argues that the Commission should exercise its authority under Exchange Act Rule 21F-8(a) to waive the ninety-day filing requirement for the Covered Action. Rule 21F-8(a) provides that “the Commission may, in its sole discretion, waive any of the [information submission and claim making] procedures upon a showing of extraordinary circumstances.”<sup>11</sup> We have explained that the “extraordinary circumstances” exception is “narrowly construed” and requires an untimely claimant to show that “the reason for the failure to timely file was beyond the claimant’s control.”<sup>12</sup> Further, we have identified “attorney misconduct or serious illness” that prevented a timely filing as two examples of the “demanding showing” that an applicant must make before we will consider exercising our discretionary authority to excuse an untimely filing.<sup>13</sup> The critical question is whether the facts and circumstances that gave rise to the late-filing or other procedural deficiency were sufficiently beyond the control of the claimant to support an exercise of our discretionary authority under Rule 21F-8(a) to excuse the untimeliness.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, “[e]ven when circumstances beyond the applicant’s control give rise to the delay . . . an applicant must also demonstrate that he or she promptly arranged for the filing . . . as soon as reasonably practical thereafter.”<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> See *Implementation of the Whistleblower Provisions of Section 21F of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934*, Release No. 64545, 76 Fed. Reg. 34300, 34300. See also *Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claim*, Exchange Act Rel. No. 95711 at 2-3 (Sept. 9, 2022); and *Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claim*, Release No. 88464 at 3 (Mar. 24, 2020).

<sup>11</sup> Exchange Act Rule 21F-8(a), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-8(a).

<sup>12</sup> *Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claim*, Exchange Act Rel. No. 95711 at 3 (Sept. 9, 2022); *Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claim*, <sup>Redacted</sup> *pet. for rev. denied sub nom. Cerny v. SEC*, 707 F. App’x 29 (2d Cir. 2017), *cert. denied*, 138 S. Ct. 2005 (2018).

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

<sup>15</sup> *Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claims*, Exchange Act Rel. No. 94398 at 10 (Mar. 11, 2022) (internal citations omitted).

Claimant 2 has failed to meet the demanding standard for showing that there were extraordinary circumstances beyond Claimant 2's control that caused the failure to file his/her award claim by the deadline. Claimant 2's stated belief that a claimant can only be eligible for an award if his or her tip or testimony to the Commission specifically mentioned the subject of the covered action does not excuse Claimant 2's failure to file by the deadline. "[A] lack of awareness about the [whistleblower award] program does not . . . rise to the level of an extraordinary circumstance as a general matter [since] potential claimants bear the ultimate responsibility to learn about the program and to take the appropriate steps to perfect their award applications."<sup>16</sup> Claimant 2's limited understanding of the whistleblower rules is not an "extraordinary circumstance[]" that should trigger the Commission's discretion to excuse the fact that Claimant 2 submitted his/her award application more than a year after the deadline. Further, while Claimant 2 was unrepresented at the time of the deadline for submitting his/her Form WB-APP, he/she still waited nearly a year after obtaining representation to file his/her award application. Accordingly, we do not believe it is appropriate here to exercise our discretionary authority under Rule 21F-8(a) to excuse Claimant 2's untimely filing.

### III. Conclusion

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that Claimant 1 shall receive an award of \*\*\* percent ( \*\*\*) of the monetary sanctions collected in the Covered Action. It is further hereby ORDERED that the whistleblower award application of Claimant 2 in connection with the Covered Action be, and it hereby is, denied.

By the Commission.

Vanessa A. Countryman  
Secretary

---

<sup>16</sup> Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claim, Exchange Act Release No. 95038 at 6 (June 3, 2022) (internal citations omitted).