UNITED STATES DISTRICT CONTINUES SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORE (West Palm Beach Division)	0-08392 CV-RYSKAMP		
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,) CASE NO.		
Plaintiff, v.) MAGISTRATE		
WILLIAM S. CORDO, MITCHELL S. DAVIS AND JOHN A. BLOUNT,)) COMPLAINT FOR) INJUNCTIVE AND) OTHER RELIEF		
Defendants,			

Plaintiff, Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. The SEC brings this action to enjoin Defendants from violating the federal securities laws in connection with the sale of unregistered securities in a foreign currency trading program. Between approximately May 1998 and April 1999, International Currency Consultants, Inc. ("ICC"), which is owned by William S. Cordo ("Cordo") and Mitchell S. Davis ("Davis"), used a boiler-room sales operation to raise at least \$1.64 million from individuals nationwide. In the course of soliciting investors to send funds to ICC, the company's top sales agent, John A. Blount ("Blount") made numerous misrepresentations and omissions regarding the profits and losses in individual accounts, the anticipated and past returns of ICC's investment program, the risk of the investment, and the size of ICC's operation.



DEFENDANTS

- 2. <u>William S. Cordo</u>, age 36, is a resident of Delray Beach, Florida. He owns 80% of ICC. Cordo is not registered with the Commission as a broker or dealer.
- 3. <u>Mitchell S. Davis</u>, age 36, is a resident of Royal Palm Beach, Florida. He owns 20% of ICC. Davis is not registered with the Commission as a broker or dealer.
- 4. <u>John A. Blount</u>, age 28, is a resident of Boca Raton, Florida. Blount purported to be ICC's Director of Accounts, and solicited numerous individuals to invest in ICC's trading program. Immediately before working for ICC, Blount worked for at least one other foreign currency trading firm in South Florida. Blount is not registered with the Commission as a broker or dealer.

OTHER

5. <u>ICC</u>, based in Delray Beach, Florida, was incorporated in Florida in March 1998. ICC has never been registered with the Commission in any capacity, nor have any securities offered by ICC ever been registered with the Commission.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 20(b), 20(d) and 22(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(b), 77t(d) and 77v(a), and Sections 21(d), 21(e), and 27 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d), 78u(e) and 78aa.

- 7. Certain of the acts and transactions constituting violations of the Securities Act and the Exchange Act have occurred within the Southern District of Florida. Cordo, Davis and Blount reside within the Southern District of Florida.
- 8. Defendants, directly and indirectly, have made use of the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce, the means and instruments of transportation and communication in interstate commerce, and the mails, in connection with the acts, practices, and courses of business complained of herein.

ICC'S INVESTMENT PROGRAM

- 9. In April 1998, defendants Cordo and Davis formed ICC in order to solicit investors to trade in foreign currencies using ICC's foreign currency trading program. ICC purported to trade investor funds on the Forex or Interbank market, which are shorthand terms used to describe the global foreign exchange market. That market is a highly liquid, continuous global market with no centralized exchange analogous to a stock market. It consists primarily of commercial and investment banks linked by computers, telephones and other telecommunications devices.
- 10. In or about May 1998, ICC established its boiler-room operation and began offering and selling unregistered securities in its foreign currency trading program. Under the supervision and control of Cordo and Davis, ICC hired approximately a dozen sales agents, and engaged a "facilitating" firm which purportedly placed trades for ICC on the Forex or Interbank market.
- 11. ICC pooled investor funds to trade in foreign currencies through ICC's account at the facilitating firm. ICC's investment program purported to generate returns on the investors' funds by taking long or short positions on the dollar versus a particular foreign currency, typically the

Japanese yen. For example, if ICC opened a short position with its facilitating firm, it was betting that the yen would decline in value against the dollar. ICC's investors purportedly made money on that investment if the yen declined in value when ICC "closed out" or "exited" the trade by covering its short position with a purchase of yen. However, if the yen gained strength against the dollar, then ICC's investors would lose money.

- 12. Cordo and Davis directed all of ICC's trading in foreign currencies. They determined when ICC would trade investors' funds, at what price ICC would enter into a trade, and at what price ICC would exit that trade. After ICC closed each trade, it would apportion the gains or losses from that particular trade among its investors.
- 13. ICC required its investors to execute a Power of Attorney form in favor of ICC at the time they opened their account. The Power of Attorney authorized ICC to "purchase, sell (including short sales) and trade for [the client] in contracts as defined in the Client Agreement, on margin or otherwise . . . with the same force and effect as [the client] might or could do with respect to such purchases, sales and trades."
- 14. Between May 1998 and May 1999, ICC raised between \$1.64 million and \$1.9 million from the public. ICC ceased raising funds in May 1999. By that time, ICC had lost more than one-half of investors' funds as a result of fees and trading losses.

BLOUNT'S FRAUDULENT MISREPRESENTATIONS

15. In the course of soliciting investor funds, Blount, ICC's top sales agent, made misrepresentations to investors, including those detailed below.

Misrepresentations regarding profits and anticipated returns

- 16. Blount made repeated and gross misstatements about the past, present and future profitability of ICC's investment program. In at least three instances, Blount falsely told investors that they had received extraordinary gains from trading in order to induce those investors to send additional funds to ICC. Blount originally solicited these investors to invest in ICC's trading program. Within two or three days of sending their funds to ICC, Blount called the investors and told them that they had made significant profits in their accounts; in one case, Blount told an investor that his account had already shown a 50% profit after one day of trading.
- 17. After making those representations, but before the investors received any written confirmation of their purported gains, Blount solicited the investors to send additional funds to ICC. Two of those investors sent approximately \$30,000 to ICC as a result of Blount's claims. However, none of the investors profited from the purported trades. Moreover, Blount knew that his representations to these investors were untrue.
- 18. Blount also claimed that ICC has a tremendously profitable performance history, and told investors that some of ICC's clients had already made over 800% on their investments.

 However, ICC never generated such returns for its investors.

Misrepresentations regarding ICC's size and background

19. Blount misrepresented ICC's background to investors. For example, Blount stated that ICC had over \$35 million under management, had approximately 550 clients, and approximately 105 employees. In contrast to these representations, ICC raised less than \$2

million from investors, had far fewer than 550 clients, and never had more than 10 to 20 employees.

Misrepresentations regarding risk

20. Blount downplayed the risks associated with investing in ICC's foreign currency trading program, oftentimes making statements that directly contradicted risk disclosures contained in ICC's written materials. For example, Blount told one investor to ignore the written risk disclosures, especially those stating that investors could lose their entire investment. Blount further stated that ICC just had to have the risk disclosures in the documents, and that ICC's investors "just don't lose money." Finally, Blount minimized the risk of the investment by claiming that trading on the Interbank market is more conservative than options trading, and that the Interbank market is larger than the New York Stock Exchange.

COUNT I

(ALL DEFENDANTS)

SALE OF UNREGISTERED SECURITIES IN VIOLATION OF SECTIONS 5(a) AND 5(c) OF THE SECURITIES ACT

- 21. The SEC repeats and realleges all of the foregoing allegations of this Complaint.
- 22. No registration statement was filed or in effect with the Commission pursuant to the Securities Act with respect to the securities and transactions described herein.
- 23. Since a date unknown but since at least May 1998 through May 1999, Defendants Cordo, Davis and Blount, directly or indirectly:

- (a) made use of the means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to sell securities as described herein, through the use or medium of a prospectus or otherwise;
- (b) carried securities or caused such securities, as described herein, to be carried through the mails or in interstate commerce, by any means or instruments of transportation, for the purpose of sale or delivery after sale; and/or
- (c) made use of the means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to offer to sell or offer to buy through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise, as described herein,

without a registration statement having been filed or being in effect with the Commission as to such securities.

24. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants Cordo, Davis and Blount, violated, and unless enjoined, will continue to violate Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77e(a) and 77e(c).

COUNT II

(BLOUNT)

FRAUD IN VIOLATION OF SECTION 17(a)(1) OF THE SECURITIES ACT

- 25. The SEC repeats and realleges all of the foregoing allegations of this Complaint.
- 26. Since a date unknown but since at least May 1998 through May 1999, Defendant Blount, directly and indirectly, by use of the means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce and by use of the mails, in the offer or sale of securities,

as described herein, knowingly, willfully or recklessly employed devices, schemes or artifices to defraud.

27. By reason of the foregoing, Defendant Blount, directly and indirectly, violated, and unless enjoined, will continue to violate Section 17(a)(1) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)(1).

COUNT III

(BLOUNT)

FRAUD IN VIOLATION OF SECTIONS 17(a)(2) AND 17(a)(3) OF THE SECURITIES ACT

- 28. The SEC repeats and realleges all of the foregoing allegations of this Complaint.
- 29. Since a date unknown but since at least May 1998 through May 1999, Defendant Blount, directly and indirectly, by use of the means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce and by the use of the mails, in the offer or sale of securities, as described herein: (i) obtained money or property by means of untrue statements of material facts and omissions to state material facts necessary to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; and (ii) engaged in transactions, practices and courses of business which operated and will operate as a fraud or deceit upon purchasers and prospective purchasers of such securities.
- 30. By reason of the foregoing, Defendant Blount, directly and indirectly, violated and, unless enjoined, will continue to violate Sections 17(a)(2) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77(q)(a)(2) and 77(q)(a)(3).

COUNT IV

(BLOUNT)

FRAUD IN VIOLATION OF SECTION 10(b) OF THE EXCHANGE ACT AND RULE 10b-5

- 31. The SEC repeats and realleges all of the foregoing allegations of this Complaint.
- 32. Since a date unknown but since at least May 1998 through May 1999, Defendant Blount, directly and indirectly, by use of the means and instrumentality of interstate commerce, and of the mails, and of any facility of any national securities exchange, in connection with the purchase or sale of the securities, as described herein, knowingly, willfully or recklessly: (i) employed devices, schemes or artifices to defraud; (ii) made untrue statements of material facts and omitted to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; and (iii) engaged in acts, practices and courses of business which operated and will operate as a fraud upon the purchasers of such securities.
- 33. By reason of the foregoing, Defendant Blount, directly or indirectly, 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, 17 C.F.R. § 240. 10b-5, thereunder.

COUNT V

(BLOUNT)

OPERATING AS AN UNREGISTERED BROKER-DEALER IN VIOLATION OF SECTION 15(a)(1) OF THE EXCHANGE ACT

34. The SEC repeats and realleges all of the foregoing allegations of this Complaint.

- 35. Since a date unknown but since at least May 1998 through May 1999, Defendant Blount, directly and indirectly, by use of the means and instrumentality of interstate commerce, and of the mails, engaged in the business of effecting transactions in securities for the accounts of others and induced and effected the purchase and sale of securities while not associated with a broker-dealer that was registered with the SEC in accordance with the provisions of Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act.
- 36. By reason of the foregoing, Defendant Blount, directly or indirectly, violated and, unless enjoined, will continue to violate Section 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78o(a)(1).

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, the SEC respectfully requests that the Court:

I.

Declaratory Relief

Declare, determine and find that Defendants Cordo, Davis and Blount, committed the violations of the federal securities laws alleged against them herein.

II.

Permanent Injunctive Relief

Issue a Permanent Injunction, restraining and enjoining:

(a) Defendants Cordo and Davis, their agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, and each of them, from violating Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77e(a) and (c); and

(b) Defendant Blount, his agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and all persons in active concert or participation with him, and each of them, from violating: (1) Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77e(a) and (c); (2) Section 17(a)(1) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77q(a); (3) Sections 17(a)(2) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77(q)(a)(2) and 77(q)(a)(3); (4) Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5, thereunder; and (5) Section 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 78o(a)(1).

III.

Disgorgement

Issue an Order requiring Defendant Blount to disgorge all profits or proceeds that he have received as a result of the acts and/or courses of conduct complained of herein, with prejudgment interest.

IV.

Penalties

Issue an Order directing Defendants Cordo, Davis and Blount, to pay civil fines and/or penalties pursuant to Section 20(d) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77t(d) and Section 21(d) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78(d)(3).

V.

Further Relief

Grant such other and further relief as may be necessary and appropriate.

VI.

Retention of Jurisdiction

Further, the SEC respectfully requests that the Court retain jurisdiction over this action in order to implement and carry out the terms of all orders and decrees that may hereby be entered, or to entertain any suitable application or motion by the SEC for additional relief within the jurisdiction of this Court.

Respectfully submitted,

May 15, 2000

Mitchell E. Herr Regional Trial Counsel SD Fla. A-5500-259

Ivan P. Harris Branch Chief Florida Bar No. 0085405

Attorneys for Plaintiff
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
COMMISSION
1401 Brickell Avenue, Suite 200

Miami, Florida 33131 Telephone: (305) 982-6336

Facsimile: (305) 536-7465

Plaintiff	(U.S. Governm	ent Not a Party)	of Business In This State				
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citizen of Another State	and Principal Place 5 5 5 In Another State			
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 🗆 3	Foreign Natio	on 🗆 6	
		anded from 🖂 4 Reir	IN ONE BOX ONLY) Transferr instated or	district	□ 6 Multidistr Litigation		
V. NATURE OF SUIT	(PLACE AN "X" IN OF	NE BOX ONLY)					
A CONTRACT	A TO	RTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	A BAN	KRUPTCY	A OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault Libel & Slander	PERSONAL INJURY 362 Personal Injury — Med Malpractice 365 Personal Injury — Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal	B 610 Agriculture B 620 Other Food & Drug B 625 Drug Related Selzure of Property 21 USC 881 B 630 Liquor Laws B 640 R R & Truck	□ 423 Wi	peal 28 USC 158 Indrawal USC 157	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking B☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and	

injury Product Liability B 650 Airline Regs Corrupt Organizations ☐ 151 Medicare Act □ 330 Federal Employers ■ 820 Copyrights B 660 Occupational Safety/Health B 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans Liability ■ 810 Selective Service □ 830 Patent PERSONAL PROPERTY □ 340 Marine Securities/Commodities/ Exchange B40 Trademark Excl Veterans) 345 Marine Product 370 Other Fraud 8 690 Other B ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits Liability ☐ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 ☐ 371 Truth in Leriding **B SOCIAL SECURITY** ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage A LABOR ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 160 Stockholders Suits ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards
Act Product Liability ☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act ☐ 385 Property Damage ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury Product Liability ☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt Relations ■ 894 Energy Allocation Act A REAL PROPERTY A CIVIL RIGHTS B64 SSID Title XVI **PRISONER PETITIONS** □ 895 Freedom of ☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt Reporting & Disclosure Act ■ 865 RSI (405(g)) Information Act ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 441 Voting B 510 Motions to Vacate □ 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice B 220 Foreclosure ☐ 442 Employment HABEAS CORPUS: ☐ 740 Rallway Labor Act **FEDERAL TAX SUITS** 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 443 Housing/ 950 Constitutionality of 240 Torts to Land Accommodations A 535 Death Penalty ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation State Statutes 4□ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff □ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 444 Welfare B 540 Mandamus & Other ■ 890 Other Statutory Actions or Defendant) ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 290 All Other Real Property ▲□ 791 Empl Ret Inc B 550 Civil Rights A 871 IRS - Third Party 26 USC 7609 BI 555 Prison Condition

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (CITE THE U.S. CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE 15 U.S.C. \$5 77e(a) and 77e(c); 15 U.S.C. \$77q(a)(a)(2) and 77(q)(a)(3); 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and 17 C.F. R. § 240.10b-5; 15 U.S.C. § 78o(a)(1). Violations of the LENGTH OF TRIAL via 5 days estimated (for both sides to try entire case) anti-fraud provisions of the federal securities laws.

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION Pe	DEMAND \$ erm. inj., Disgorgement nd civil penlaties JURY DEMAND:	n complaint:
VIII.RELATED CASE(S IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE	DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE	SIGNATURE OF ATTOR	NEY OF RECORD	

Mitchell E. Herr, Kegional

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

_ AMOUNT__ _ APPLYING IFP___ _ JUDGE _ _ MAG. JUDGE _