Robert Hildum, Esq. (Pro Hac Vice) Timothy Mulreany, Esq. (Pro Hac Vice) ORIGINAL 1155 21st Street, N.W. 3 Washington, D.C. 20581 202-418-5329 (Hildum) 4 FILED CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT 202-418-5306 (Mulreany) 5 202-418-5523 (fax) APR 2 5 2006 6 Kent A. Kawakami (Calif. Bar No. 149803) 7 Office of the US Attorney 8 300 North Los Angeles Street Los Angeles, CA 90012 213-894-4858 10 213-894-2380 (fax) 11 Attorneys for Plaintiff 12 Commodity Futures Trading Commission 13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 14 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA Ω 15 Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Case No.: 03-2979 TJH(RZx) Plaintiff, 18 CONSENT ORDER OF 19 **PERMANENT** v. **INJUNCTION AND** 20 **OTHER EQUITABLE** 21 **RELIEF AGAINST** 22 Richard Swannell, **DEFENDANT** 23 Defendant. ENTERED SOURT 24 25 26 27

28

Pursuant to the agreement of Defendant Richard Swannell ("Swannell") and Plaintiff Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("the Commission") (collectively referred to herein as "Parties"), the Parties hereby agree to entry of an Order of Settlement, Permanent Injunction and Ancillary Relief ("Consent Order") as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

On April 29, 2003, Plaintiff Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("Commission") filed the Complaint in this matter against the Defendant Richard Swannell, alleging, inter alia, violations of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended ("Act"), 7 U.S.C. § 1 et. seq. (2002) and the Regulations promulgated thereunder ("Regulations"), 17 C.F.R. § 1 et. seq. (2005). The Complaint sought injunctive relief, monetary damages and civil monetary penalties, alleging in Count One that Swannell violated the "Order Instituting Proceedings Pursuant to §§ 6(c) and 6(d) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as Amended, Making Findings and Imposing Sanctions" ("Commission Order") dated September 6, 2000 in In the Matter of International Trading Systems, Ltd., et al., [1999-2000 Transfer Binder], Comm. Fut. L. Rep. (CCH) ¶28,238 at 50,467 (CFTC Sept. 6, 2000) and §6(c) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 9, 15 (2002), and further alleging in Count Two that Swannell violated Regulation 4.41(b)(2), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b) (2005) by failing to

prominently display the disclaimer required by Regulation 4.41(b)(1), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b) (2005), while presenting hypothetical trading results.

The Defendant answered the Complaint, denying liability and asserting various affirmative defenses.

II. CONSENTS AND AGREEMENTS

To effect settlement of the matters alleged in the Complaint without a trial on the merits, Defendant Swannell:

- 1. Consents to the entry of this Consent Order of Permanent Injunction and Other Equitable Relief ("Consent Order").
- 2. Affirms that he has read and agreed to this Consent Order voluntarily and that no promise or threat has been made by the Commission or any member, officer, agent or representative thereof, or by any other person, to induce consent to this Order, other than as set forth specifically herein.
 - 3. Acknowledges service of the Summons and Complaint.
- 4. Admits that this Court has jurisdiction over him and the subject matter of this action pursuant to Section 6c of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13a-1 (2002).
- 5. Admits that venue properly lies with this Court pursuant to Section 6c of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13a-1 (2002).
 - 6. Waives:

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

- b. All claims which may be available under the Equal Access to Justice Act, 5 U.S.C. § 504 (2002) and 28 U.S.C. § 2412 (2002), to seek costs, fees and other expenses relating to, or arising from, this action;
- Any claim of Double Jeopardy based upon the institution of this proceeding or the entry in this proceeding of any order imposing a civil monetary penalty or any relief; and
 - All rights of appeal from this Consent Order. d.
- By consenting to the entry of this Consent Order, Swannell neither 7. admits nor denies the allegations of the Complaint or the Findings of Fact contained in this Consent Order, except as to jurisdiction and venue. However, Swannell agrees and intends that the allegations of the Complaint and all of the Findings of Fact made by this Court and contained in Part II of this Consent Order shall be taken as true and correct and be given preclusive effect, without further proof, in the course of any subsequent bankruptcy proceeding filed by, on behalf of, or against Swannell. Swannell shall provide immediate notice of any bankruptcy filed by, on behalf of, or against him in the manner required by Part IV of this Consent Order. No provision of this Consent Order shall in any way limit

or impair the ability of any person to seek any legal or equitable remedy against Swannell or any other person in any other proceeding.

- 8. Swannell agrees that neither he nor any of his agents, servants, employees, contractors or attorneys shall take any action or make any public statement denying, directly or indirectly, any allegation in the Complaint or findings or conclusions in the Consent Order or creating, or tending to create, the impression that the Complaint or this Consent Order is without a factual basis; provided, however, that nothing in this provision shall affect Swannell's (a) testimonial obligations; or (b) right to take legal positions in other proceedings to which the Commission is not a party. Swannell shall take all necessary steps to ensure that all of his agents, servants, employees, contractors and attorneys understand and comply with this agreement.
- 9. Swannell consents to the continued jurisdiction of this Court in order to implement and carry out the terms of all orders and decrees that may be entered herein, to entertain any suitable application or motion for additional relief within the jurisdiction of this Court, and to assure compliance with the Consent Order.

II. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Court, being fully advised in the premises, finds that there is good cause for the entry of this Consent Order and that there is no just reason for delay.

The Court therefore directs the entry of findings of fact, conclusions of law, and a

•

permanent injunction and ancillary equitable relief pursuant to § 6c of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13a-1 (2002), as set forth herein.

A. Procedural Background

The Commission served Swannell with the Complaint on May 9, 2003, in accordance with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(2)(C)(i). Swannell filed a pro se answer to the Complaint on May 30, 2003. Counsel for the defendant filed a second answer to the Complaint on July 25, 2003.

On September 29, 2003, the Commission served Swannell with "First Set of Interrogatories," "Request for Admissions," and "Request for Production of Documents." On January 20, 2004, the Commission filed a motion to compel Swannell to provide full and complete answers to discovery.

On February 4, 2004, Magistrate Judge Zarefsky granted the Commission's motion and ordered Swannell to provide full and complete answers to the discovery propounded by the Commission. Swannell thereafter propounded responses to the discovery propounded by the Commission. On February 19, 2004, the Commission took Swannell's deposition in Los Angeles, California.

On June 30, 2004, Swannell's first attorney moved to withdraw from representation. On July 23, 2004, the Honorable Terry J. Hatter released Swannell's first attorney from further representation. Swannell subsequently obtained other legal

6

7

9

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

representation and is currently represented by the California law firm of Gordon & Rees, LLP.

Findings of Fact В.

1. **Parties**

Plaintiff Commodity Futures Trading Commission is an independent federal regulatory agency charged with the responsibility for administering and enforcing the provisions of the Act and Regulations promulgated under it.

Defendant Richard Swannell, an individual, currently resides in Mount Pleasant, Australia. He has never been registered with the Commission in any capacity.

2. The Prior Commission Order in In the Matter of: International Trading Systems, Ltd., et al.

Swannell was previously the subject of an order issued by the Commission, specifically: an "Order Instituting Proceedings Pursuant to §§ 6(c) and 6(d) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as Amended, Making Findings and Imposing Sanctions" ("Commission Order") dated September 6, 2000 in *In the Matter of* International Trading Systems, Ltd., et al., [1999-2000 Transfer Binder], Comm. Fut. L. Rep. (CCH) ¶28,238 at 50,467 (CFTC Sept. 6, 2000). After the Commission contacted Swannell in 2000 to discuss his activities, he agreed to discontinue the activities at issue and to consent to the entry of the Commission Order dated September 6, 2000, prohibiting further violations of $\S\S$ 4b(a)(i),

	9 - 6	
ı	4b(a)(iii), and 4 <i>o</i> (i) of	the Act and §§4.41(a) & (b) of the Commission's
2	Regulations. The prior Commission Order remains in full force and effect.	
3	Regulations. The prior	Commission Order remains in run force and effect.
4	In pertinent part, the prior Commission Order states:	
5	C.	[Swannell] shall comply with the following
6		undertakings:
7	2.	[Swannell] shall not present the performance
8		of any simulated or hypothetical commodity
9		interest account, transaction in a commodity interest or series of transactions in a
10		commodity interest unless such performance
11		is accompanied by the following statement, as
12		required by 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b):
13		Hypothetical or simulated performance results
14		have certain inherent limitations. Unlike an
15		actual performance record, simulated results do not represent actual trading. Also, since the
16		trades have not actually been executed, the

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- t the performance netical commodity in a commodity ansactions in a such performance wing statement, as
 - (b):

erformance results ations. Unlike an simulated results ng. Also, since the een executed, the results may have under- or over-compensated for the impact, if any, of certain market factors, such as lack of liquidity. Simulated trading programs in general are also subject to the fact that they are designed with the benefit of hindsight. No representation is being made that any account will or is likely to achieve profits or losses similar to those shown.

In doing so, [Swannell] shall clearly identify those hypothetical or simulated performance results which were based, in whole or in part, on hypothetical trading results.

[Swannell] shall not make any representation 3. of financial benefits associated with any commodity futures or options trading system

9 10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

11

13

12

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

As described in more detail infra, on or about November 27, 2001, Swannell registered a new website, www.elliottwaveresearch.com, and began a new business selling trading software.

Swannell's Activities After the Issuance of the September 6, 2000 3. Commission Order in In the Matter of: International Trading Systems, Ltd., et al.

In September 2002, the Commission became aware of Swannell's new website, www.elliottwaveresearch.com, which touted the "Elliott Wave Analyzer," a software trading system. Defendant Richard Swannell is the registered owner of the website's domain name.

After agreeing to the September 6, 2000 Commission Order with the Commission, Swannell signed a licensing agreement with Roxburgh Securities ("Roxburgh") in October, 2001. The agreement between Swannell and Roxburgh was dissolved in the Summer of 2003. Under the agreement, Roxburgh was to be paid between 7.5% and 15 % of the gross sales of the software trading systems. Further, Roxburgh agreed to hire Swannell's associate, Travis Mijat, whose salary and benefits would be paid out of Swannell's percentage of the sales.

When a customer requested more information about the Elliott Wave Analyzer, they received an e-mail from Swannell and his company Elliott Wave Research. Swannell also claimed to be Director of Research for www.elliottwaveresearch.com. In addition, the website prominently featured Swannell's personal story, his research and development of the Elliott Wave Analyzer, and an offer to receive a free copy of his book "Elite Traders (sic) Secrets."

a - 6

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25 -

26

27

28

The website offered a subscription service to traders which provided Elliott Wave Forecasts, stating "[y]ou don't need to spend your valuable time learning to use a new software forecasting system-we do all the work for you. We produce the forecasts using the powerful Elliott Wave Analyzer, our expertise and many years of experience."

The website included numerous claims and statements in support of the software's success, including:

- Software 84.9% accurate-Statistically Proven (a)
- Many Thousands of traders depend on it every day (b) to help establish more profitable trades.
- Tells you when to buy, when to sell, when to exit, (c) and maybe even more importantly, when not to trade!
- We have collected statistical evidence that proves (d) the Elliott Wave Analyzer 3 can accurately forecast market movement.

n.,

5

`26

- (e) Just imagine: You are sitting in front of your computer testing the results of the Elliott Wave Analyzer 3. You notice that 84.9% of the projections have come true when tracking the accuracy of particular Elliott waves. This is not the first time. These findings have remained consistent while analyzing close to 5000 random projections of 33 stocks of the S&P 100.
- (f) How would your trading profits improve with these results available at your fingertips?
- (g) We confidently believe that the Elliott Wave Analyzer 3 WILL be recognized as the world's most accurate market forecasting tool for analyzing stocks, indices, futures and commodities.

While the website did provide a disclaimer regarding hypothetical performance results, the disclaimer had to be accessed separately and the link to the disclaimer first appears on page six of the website. The link is at the bottom of the page, next to the copyright and separate from other links to the rest of the site. The page claiming "Software 84.9% accurate-Statistically Proven" has no disclaimer and no link to the disclaimer.

In January and February 2003, Swannell made numerous changes to both the format and content of the www.elliottwaveresearch.com website. The disclaimer regarding hypothetical trading results remained obscured. The website prominently featured an invitation to attend "the first ever Elliott Trader's

The invitation included the following statements:

- (a) Our goal is to create the ultimate trader's mastermind alliance-One that Rich Swannell will lead and direct. . . . One that helps you identify "screaming" opportunities that you're not taking advantage of at all.
- (b) Elliott Wave Research is the only company in the world to statistically analyze and significantly refine the Elliott Wave Principle-to forecast stocks and commodities markets more accurately, and give you the ability to take more money out of the markets than ever before.
- (c) The exact probability of a forecast being correct can now be calculated accurately, which offers traders, like you, a massive money making advantage previously unseen.
- (d) The total investment required to be involved is only US \$5000... Bear in mind that direct access to our database alone is worth more than a million dollars a year.

Transmittal of these, as well as other statements, individually and/or through Roxburgh, triggered Swannell's obligation under the terms of the September 6, 2000 Commission Order to "first disclos[e], prominently and conspicuously, that futures trading involves high risks with the potential for substantial losses." Swannell's website neither prominently nor conspicuously contained such a disclosure. Rather, the only disclosure regarding the high risk of loss associated

ac

ବହ ଓ

with trading commodity futures or options is located toward the very end of a litany of rhetorical questions that must be accessed separately through a web link that does not appear until after the appearance of several of these statements.

C. <u>CONCLUSIONS OF LAW</u>

The Defendant's activities as alleged in the Complaint were subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission pursuant to the Commission Order of September 6, 2000, § 6(c) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 9, 15 (2002), and Commission Regulation 4.41(b), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b) (2005).

By reason of the aforementioned acts, Swannell violated the Commission Order of September 6, 2000, § 6(c) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 9, 15 (2002), and Commission Regulation 4.41(b), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b) (2005).

Section C(2) of the September 6, 2000, Commission Order states that

Swannell shall not present the performance of any simulated or hypothetical

commodity interest account, transaction in a commodity interest or series of

transactions in a commodity interest unless such performance is accompanied by a

disclaimer, as required by 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b).¹ Commission Regulation 4.41(b), 7

¹ Commission Regulation §4.41(b) provides in pertinent part for the following disclaimer: Hypothetical or simulated performance results have certain inherent limitations. Unlike an actual performance record, simulated results do not represent actual trading. Also, since the trades have not actually been executed, the results may have under- or over-compensated for the impact, if any, of certain market factors, such as lack of liquidity. Simulated trading programs in general are also subject to the fact that they are designed with the benefit of hindsight. No representation is being made that any account will or is likely to achieve profits or losses similar to those shown.

96 ê

i i

 C.F.R. § 4.41(b) (2005) requires such a disclosure to be "prominently disclosed." The required disclaimer present on the September 2002 version of the *www.elliottwaveresearch.com* website is not prominently disclosed, as it can only be accessed through an obscure link on the site itself. Further, there is no disclaimer or link to the disclaimer on the page that claims the Elliott Wave system is "84.9% accurate-statistically proven," in violation of the Commission Order of September 6, 2000, § 6(c) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 9, 15 (2002), and Commission Regulation § 4.41(b), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b) (2005).

The September 6, 2000 Commission Order also requires that in addition to the disclaimer, Swannell must "clearly identify those hypothetical or simulated performance results which were based, in whole or in part, on hypothetical results." No such data is provided on any of the various versions of Swannell's www.elliottwaveresearch.com website, in violation of the Commission Order of September 6, 2000, § 6(c) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 9, 15 (2002), and Commission Regulation § 4.41(b), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b) (2005).

The www.elliottwaveresearch.com website states: "For regulatory reasons we cannot promise you specific, or even general profitability targets. However, we can tell you that I proudly and confidently trade our corporate and private funds using our Refined Elliott Wave pattern recognition technology. Our trading results will soon be posted on our website." No such results of any kind were posted on

12

11

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27 28 the website. On the most recent version of www.elliotwaveresearch.com, Swannell technology-with good success." Again, there is no specific data to support this statement. Swannell's failure to provide the required supporting data and trading results violated the Commission Order of September 6, 2000, § 6(c) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 9, 15 (2002), and Commission Regulation § 4.41(b), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b) (2005).

Section C(3) of the Commission's Order states that Swannell "shall not make any representation of financial benefits associated with any commodity futures or options trading system or advisory service without first disclosing, prominently and conspicuously, that futures trading involves high risks with the potential for substantial losses." The warning set forth in the website owned and controlled by Swannell was not displayed "prominently and conspicuously" and did not include the language required by the Commission Order that "futures trading involves high risks with the potential for substantial losses."

In addition, the "invitation" to the "Mastermind Seminar" hosted by Swannell failed to contain any warning regarding the risk involved with commodity options or futures trading, in violation of the terms of the Commission Order of September 6, 2000, § 6(c) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 9, 15 (2002), and Commission Regulation § 4.41(b), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b) (2005).

Section C(4) of the Commission's order states that Swannell "...shall not misrepresent, expressly or by implication: the performance, profits or results achieved by, or the results that can be achieved by, users, including him/herself, of any commodity futures or options trading system or advisory service." All three versions of www.elliottwaveresearch.com significantly misrepresent the performance and profits that may be achieved by the Elliott wave system. The first website contained the claim "Software 84.9% accurate-Statistically Proven."

Customer testimonials included:

• "I remember going short one afternoon and taking a \$10,000.00 profit in about 2 hours. The best thing I like about The Elliott Wave Analyzer is its projections for market direction and the wave counts;"

કે જુદ છે

এ কর ৪

• "Elliott Wave Analyzer has changed the way I invest. By finding securities with high Elliott Wave scores, coupled with technical analysis, the number of profitable trades I've made has more than doubled! Since purchasing the Elliott Wave Analyzer II, I've become a more interested, focused and successful trader! This has helped me select trades with higher probability of profit."

Another version of the website included the following customer testimonial:

• "Absolutely outstanding. My only concern is that as more people become familiar with the software, the option market as we know it today, may not exist. A win rate of 3 out of 10 trades is probably a livable win rate for the market. However, a win rate of 9 out of 10 trades could become intolerable if enough players owned and used the software. When there is a sure thing, there is no market...there cannot be all winners and no losers."

70 °

(

ļ

rg.

These claims on the three versions of the website are in violation of the Commission Order of September 6, 2000, § 6(c) of the Act, and Commission Regulation 4.41(b), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b) (2005) in that they are misleading statements of profitability that ignore the inherent risks of trading in commodity options or futures.

ያው የ

Under the totality of the circumstances, there is a reasonable likelihood of future violations of the Act, Regulations and Commission Order by Swannell.

Therefore, a permanent injunction should issue in this action.

There is good cause for entry of an order requiring Swannell to pay a civil monetary penalty in the amount of \$140,000.00 as a result of his violations of the Act and Commission Regulations.

III. ORDER FOR PERMANENT INJUNCTION AND OTHER RELIEF Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

A. Defendant Richard Swannell and any person insofar as he or she is acting in the capacity of officer, agent, servant, employer, and/or attorney of Swannell, and any person insofar as he or she is acting in active concert or participation with Swannell who receives actual notice of this Order by personal service or otherwise, is permanently enjoined from directly or indirectly violating §§ 4.41(b) of the Commission's Regulations, 17 C.F.R. §§ 4.41(b) (2005);

\$ 95 g

. P 6

B. Defendant Swannell is permanently restrained, enjoined and prohibited from directly or indirectly:

a. Soliciting, receiving, or accepting in the United States any funds in connection with the purchase or sale of any commodity futures contract or any option on a futures contract;

A 7 B

- b. Controlling or directing the trading of any commodity futures or commodity options account in the United States for or on behalf of any person or entity, directly or indirectly, whether by power of attorney or otherwise;
- c. Applying for registration or claiming exemption from registration with the Commission in any capacity, and engaging in any activity requiring such registration or exemption from registration, except as provided for in Commission Regulation § 4.14(a)(9), 17 C.F.R. § 4.14(a)(9) (2005), or acting as a principal, agent, officer or employee of any person registered, exempted from registration or required to be registered with the Commission, unless such exemption is pursuant to Commission Regulation § 4.14(a)(9), 17 C.F.R. § 4.14(a)(9) (2005);
- d. Trading on or subject to the rules of any registered entity, as that term is defined in § 1a(29) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 1a(29)(2002), and
- e. violating the Commission Order of September 6, 2000 and § 6(c) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 9, 15 (2002).
- C. Defendant Richard Swannell shall pay a civil monetary penalty of \$140,000. He shall pay the total amount within twenty-one (21) days of the date of this Order by electronic funds transfer, or by U.S. postal money order, certified check, bank cashier's check, or bank money order, made payable to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and sent to Dennese Posey, Futures Trading

ି ହେ 🥬

S T C C S P C C

Specialist, Division of Enforcement, Commodity Futures Trading Commission,
Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20581, under
cover of a letter that identifies the name and docket number of the proceeding;
Swannell shall simultaneously transmit a copy of the cover letter and the form of
payment to Director, Division of Enforcement, Commodity Futures Trading
Commission, 1155 21st Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20581;

🕏 কুল 🤄

D. The injunctive provisions of this Consent Order shall be binding upon Defendant Swannell, upon any person insofar as he or she is acting in the capacity of officer, agent, servant or employee of Defendant Swannell, and upon any person who receives actual notice of this Consent Order, by personal service or otherwise, insofar as he or she is acting in active concert or participation with Defendant Swannell.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

ENTIRE AGREEMENT AND AMENDMENTS: This Consent Order incorporates all of the terms and conditions of the settlement among the parties hereto. Nothing shall serve to amend or modify this Consent Order in any respect whatsoever, unless: (1) reduced to writing; (2) signed by all parties hereto; and (3) approved by order of this Court.

PRIOR ORDER REMAINS IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT: The Commission Order entered against Defendant Swannell in *In the Matter of*

py 🎉

International Trading Systems, Ltd., et al., [1999-2000 Transfer Binder], Comm. Fut. L. Rep. (CCH) ¶28,238 at 50,467 (CFTC Sept. 6, 2000) prohibiting further violations of §§ 4b(a)(i), 4b(a)(iii) and 4o(i) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. §§ 4b and 4o (2002) and §§ 4.41(a) & (b) of the Commission's Regulations, 17 C.F.R. § 4.41 (2005), remains in full force and affect.

जी कुद्र कि

09 G

WAIVER: The failure of any party hereto at any time or times to require performance of any provision hereof shall in no manner affect the right of such party at a later time to enforce the same or any other provision of this Consent Order. No waiver in one or more instances of the breach of any provision contained in this Consent Order shall be deemed to be or construed as a further or continuing waiver of such breach or waiver of the breach of any other provision of this Consent Order.

<u>SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS</u>: This Consent Order shall inure to the benefit of and be binding upon the parties hereto and the successors, assigns, heirs, beneficiaries and administrators of the parties hereto.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: Upon being served with copies of this Consent Order after entry by the Court, Defendant Swannell shall sign acknowledgements of such service and serve such acknowledgments on this Court and the Commission within seven (7) calendar days of being served with copies of this Consent Order.

1	NOTICES:	All notices required by this Order shall be sent by certified mail,	
2	return receipt requested, as follows:		
3	return receipt requested, as ronows.		
4	· 1.	Notice to Plaintiff Commission:	
5		Director, Division of Enforcement Commodity Futures Trading Commission	
6		1155 21st St., N.W.	
7		Washington, DC 20581	
8	2.	Notice to Defendant:	
9		James M. Grady	
0		Gordon & Rees, LLP 101 West Broadway, Suite 2000	
1		San Diego, California 92101	
2	INVALIDATION: If any provision of this Consent Order, or the application		
3	it vitalibition. If any provision of this consent of the application		
4	of any provisions or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Consent		
5	Order and the application of the provision to any other person or circumstance		
6			
7	shall not be affected by the holding.		
8	ENTERED THIS 25 of April, 2006.		
9		^	
0	100		
1	Hon Terry I Hatter		
2	Hon. Terry J. Hatter United States District Court		
.3			
4		•	
:5	Consented to and approyed for entry by:		
:6	Miller Miller		
7	Robert J. Wildum, Attorney for the Plaintiff		
.8	U. S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission		
	1155 21 st Street, N	N VV	

1155 21st Street, NW Washington, DC 20581 · 2 Phone (202) 418-5329 Fax (202) 418-5523 Email: rhildum@eftc.gov Defendant Richard Swannell James M. Grady Gordon & Rees, LLP-Attorney for Defendant Richard Swannell