IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS AUSTIN DIVISION

SECURITIES AND EXCHAI	NGE COMMISSION,	:	
	Plaintiff,	:	
v.		:	Civil Action No.: 1:19-cv-394
JOEL CRAIG DUNCAN,	Defendant.	:	

COMPLAINT

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

SUMMARY OF THE ACTION

- 1. Beginning in or around February 2014, Defendant Joel Craig Duncan participated in the securities offerings of Intertech Solutions, Inc. ("ITEC") by recruiting several individuals (the "Solicitors") who directly solicited investors in ITEC securities.
- 2. While engaging in this conduct, neither Defendant nor the Solicitors were registered with the Commission as brokers or dealers nor associated with a broker or dealer registered with the Commission.
- 3. ITEC paid the Solicitors and Duncan transaction-based compensation on the investments brought in by the Solicitors.
- 4. Through his conduct, Defendant aided and abetted the Solicitors' violations of Section 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78o(a)(1)] and, unless restrained and enjoined by this Court, may continue to violate said provision.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. The Commission brings this action pursuant to Sections 21(d) and (e) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d) and (e)] to enjoin such acts, practices, and courses of business, and to obtain disgorgement, prejudgment interest, civil money penalties, and such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and appropriate.
- 6. The investments, which took the form of common stock and investment contracts, offered and sold by the Solicitors, are each a "security" as that term is defined under Section 3(a)(10) of the Exchange Act [5 U.S.C. § 78c(a)(10)].
- 7. Defendant and/or the Solicitors, directly or indirectly, made use of the mails or means or instrumentality of interstate commerce in connection with the conduct alleged in this Complaint.
- 8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 21(d) and 27 of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d) and 78aa], and 28 U.S.C. 1331.
- 9. Venue in this District is proper because Defendant is found, inhabits, and/or transacted business in the Western District of Texas and because one or more acts or transactions constituting the violations occurred in the Western District of Texas.

DEFENDANT

10. **Joel Craig Duncan**, born in 1970, is last known to have resided in Austin, Texas. Duncan was retained by an ITEC principal to recruit individuals for the purpose of soliciting investors in ITEC securities.

FACTS

Intertech Solutions, Inc.'s Securities Offerings

- 11. ITEC is a Nevada corporation formed April 2010 with its principal place of business in Scottsdale, Arizona.
- 12. ITEC purports to be a project finance and management company for mining operations.
- 13. In or around November 2013, ITEC entered into an agreement with the mineral rights holder of certain mining claims in La Paz County, Arizona (the "Arizona Claims"). Pursuant to the agreement, ITEC was to obtain the necessary funding to bring the Arizona Claims into commercial gold production in exchange for a percentage interest in the gross proceeds of any gold obtained from the Arizona Claims.
- 14. Purportedly to fulfill its obligations under this agreement, ITEC initiated an offering of its common stock in or around February 2014.
- 15. In or around August 2014, ITEC also began offering "Sale/Purchase and Processing Agreement for In Situ Au Metal" (the "Gold Contracts"), which are investment contracts. The Gold Contracts gave investors the right to purchase a specified amount of gold from the Arizona Claims' future production at a highly discounted price relative to the then spot price of gold. ITEC pooled the funds it received from its sale of Gold Contracts.
- 16. Because the Arizona Claims were undeveloped throughout the duration of the Gold Contract offering, the profitability of the Gold Contracts depended on ITEC's and the mineral rights holder's ability to develop the Arizona Claims and begin commercial-level gold extraction.

The Securities Solicitations

- 17. Defendant, who had been involved in the solicitation of investors in the past, maintained a network of individuals who had also previously been involved in securities solicitations.
- 18. At some point prior to the beginning of ITEC's securities offerings, an ITEC principal became acquainted with Defendant through a mutual business associate and became aware of Defendant's network of securities solicitors.
- 19. The ITEC principal then enlisted Defendant to recruit individuals to solicit investors in ITEC securities.
- 20. Defendant thereafter contacted various individuals in his network and successfully recruited the Solicitors to solicit investors on behalf of ITEC.
- 21. After Defendant recruited the Solicitors, ITEC provided them with offering documents, including private placement memoranda ("PPM").
- 22. The Solicitors then obtained lead lists of prospective investors who resided throughout the United States and Canada and used those lead lists to engage in cold-call solicitations.
- 23. After initiating contact with a prospective investor over the phone, the Solicitors typically mailed or emailed the offering documents to the prospect and directed the prospect to visit ITEC's website.
- 24. If an investor decided to purchase ITEC common stock or Gold Contracts, the Solicitors instructed the investor to execute and submit to ITEC a stock subscription agreement or a Gold Contract and to send investment funds via either check or wire to be deposited in ITEC's bank account.

- 25. While they engaged in these solicitations, the Solicitors were neither registered with the Commission as brokers or dealers nor associated with a broker or dealer registered with the Commission.
- 26. Although Defendant is not currently known to have personally solicited investors in ITEC securities, he facilitated the Solicitors' efforts by managing communications between the Solicitors and ITEC, tracking investments brought in by the Solicitors, and assuring the Solicitors received their commission payments.
- 27. ITEC conducted its unregistered common stock and Gold Contract offerings through December 2016 and raised over \$7 million from hundreds of investors throughout the United States and Canada.

The Solicitors' and Defendant's Compensation

- 28. Using the investment funds it received through its sale of securities, ITEC paid the Solicitors transaction-based compensation ranging from approximately 35% to 50% of the total investment proceeds.
- 29. Defendant received override commission payments from ITEC for all securities sales generated by the Solicitors. These payments generally ranged from 2.5% to 5% of total investment proceeds. Defendant therefore received transaction-based compensation from ITEC.

CLAIM FOR RELIEF Violations, via aiding and abetting of Section 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 780(a)(1)]

- 30. The Commission re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in paragraphs 1–29, inclusive, as if they were fully set forth herein.
 - 31. By engaging in the conduct described above, the Solicitors:

5

- a. engaged in the business of effecting transactions in securities for the account of others; and
- b. directly or indirectly, made use of the mails or the means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce to effect transactions in, or to induce or attempt to induce the purchase or sale of, securities without being registered as a broker or dealer with the Commission or associated with a broker or dealer registered with the Commission, and therefore violated Section 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78o(a)(1)]; and Defendant knowingly or recklessly provided substantial assistance to the Solicitors in their achievement of said violations.
- 32. Pursuant to Section 20(e) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78t(e)], any person that knowingly or recklessly provides substantial assistance to another person in violation of a provision of the Exchange Act, or of any rule or regulation issued under the Exchange Act, shall be deemed to be in violation of such provision to the same extent as the person to whom such assistance is provided.
- 33. By reason of the foregoing, Defendant is liable for violations of Section 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act to the same extent as each of the Solicitors is liable and, unless enjoined, will continue to violate Section 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

I.

Permanently restraining and enjoining Defendant from, directly or indirectly, engaging in conduct in violation of Section 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 780(a)(1)]

II.

Permanently restraining and enjoining Defendant from directly or indirectly, including, but not limited to, through any entity owned or controlled him, soliciting any person or entity to purchase or sell any security;

III.

Ordering Defendant to disgorge all ill-gotten gains or unjust enrichment derived from the activities set forth in this Complaint, together with prejudgment interest thereon;

IV.

Ordering Defendant to pay a civil penalty pursuant to Section 21(d)(3) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(3)];

V.

Permanently and unconditionally restraining and enjoining Defendant from participating in any offering of penny stock pursuant to Section 21(d)(6)(A) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(6)(A)];

VI.

Retaining 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 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; and,

VII.

Granting such other and further relief as this Court may deem just, equitable, or necessary in connection with the enforcement of the federal securities laws and for the protection of investors.

Dated: April 8, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,

Janie L. Frank

Texas Bar No. 07363050

V.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Fort Worth Regional Office

Burnett Plaza, Suite 1900

801 Cherry Street, Unit #18

Fort Worth, TX 76102-6882

(817) 978-6478 (phone)

(817) 978-4927 (facsimile)

Amy J. Oliver (Utah #8785) (*Pro Hac Vice Pending*) U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Salt Lake Regional Office

351 South West Temple, Suite 6.100

Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

(801) 524-5796 (phone)

(801) 524-3558 (facsimile)

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

L (a) PLAINTIFFS SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION			JEFERRANTA	ICAN				
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant				
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Janie L. Frank, Securities and Exchange Commission, Burnett Plaz Ste. 1900, 801 Cherry Street, Unit #18, Fort Worth, TX 76102-6882 (817) 978-6478					Law Firm of Jay Ething , Suite 800, Dallas, TX 7	ton, Mckinney Place, 3131 5204, (214) 740-9955		
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)					RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff		
✓ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State	TF DEF 1 X 1 Incorporated or Pr of Business In T			
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	hip of Parties in Item III)			2	Another State		
				en or Subject of a preign Country	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)						of Suit Code Descriptions.		
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 1510 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEF 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEF 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other:	O 75 O 75 O 75 O 75 O 75 O 75	CABOR LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 10 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 20 Lother Labor Litigation 21 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application 55 Other Immigration Actions	BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XV1 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	OTHER STATUTES □ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC □ 3729(a)) □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and □ Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ □ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
	moved from 3 te Court	Appellate Court			r District Litigation Transfer			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Section 15(a)(1)	of the Exchange Ac		S.C. Section 78o(a)(
AND THE RESIDENCE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE			EMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: ☐ Yes > No			
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE /	1		DOCKET NUMBER			
DATE 04/08/2019	Jau	SIGNATURE OF AT	LANEY (1.				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT /	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUD	DGE		