```
Jennifer S. Diamond, Illinois ARDC No. 6278482
  1
     Susan J. Gradman, Illinois ARDC No. 6225060
  2
     Rosemary Hollinger, Illinois ARDC No. 03123647
                                                                   CLERK, J.S. DISTRICT COURT
     United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission
 3
     525 West Monroe Street, Suite 1100, Chicago, IL 60661
                                                                      DE;
  4
     Telephone (312) 596-0549-JD
     General Number (312) 596-0700
  5
     Facsimile (312) 596-0714
  6
     idiamond@cftc.gov; sgradman@cftc.gov
 7
                                                                        .. Priority
     Local Counsel:
                                                                        .. Send
 8
     Kent Kawakami, CA Bar No. 149803
United States Attorney's Office, Central District of California
300 North Los Angeles Street Room 7516
                                                                         Clsd
 9
                                                                         Enter
     Los Angeles, CA 90012
                                                  DUPLICATE-
10
     (213) 894-4858
     Facsimile (213) 894-2380
11
     Kent.Kawakami@usdoj.gov
12
     Attome for Plaintiff, United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission
13
        വ
企图
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                                                                NOTE CHANGES MADE BY THE COURT
                      CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
                                WESTERN DIVISION
     U.SECOMMODITY FUTURES
     TRADING COMMISSION,
                                               Case No. CV05 2660 CAS (JWJx)
17
                         Plaintiff.
18
                                               PROPOSED ORDER FOR
                         VS.
                                              DEFAULT JUDGMENT BY
19
                                               COURT AGAINST
     Monica Sue Schiera, also known as
20
                                              DEFENDANTS GEMANCER.
     Monica Schiera-Main and Monica S.
                                              INC., GEMANCER II, INC. AND
    Montes; Brian Main; Gemancer, Inc., a
21
                                              TRADE PRO, INC. AND RELIEF
    Nevada Corporation; Gemancer II, Inc.,
22
                                              DEFENDANTS MONI, ENC., RIA
    a Nevada Corporation; and Trade Pro,
                                              RIVIERA, INC., BODY
    Inc., a California Corporation,
23
                                              BLASTERS, INC., SUCCESS
                         Defendants; and
24
                                              DIRECT, INC., AND TRI LYNX,
    Moni Inc., a Nevada Corporation; Body
                                              INC.
25
    Blasters, a California Corporation; Ria
                                              JUDGE: Christina A. Snyder
26
    Riviera, Inc., a Nevada Corporation:
                                              TIME:
    Success Direct, a Nevada Corporation;
27
                                              DATE:
    and Tri Lynx, Inc., a Nevada
                                              PLACE:
28
    Corporation,
                                                     No Hearing Required
                        Relief Defendants.
```

NOTE CHANGES MADE BY THE COURT

On April 12, 2005, Plaintiff CFTC filed a three count Complaint against Defendants Monica Schiera Main ("Schiera Main"), Brian Main ("Main"), Gemancer I, Inc. ("Gemancer I"), Gemancer II, Inc. ("Gemancer II"), and Trade Pro, Inc. ("Trade Pro"), and against Relief Defendants Moni, Inc., Ria Riviera, Inc., Body Blasters, Inc., Success Direct, Inc., and Tri Lynx, Inc. alleging violations of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended ("Act"), 7 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq. (2001). On that same day, this Court entered a Statutory Restraining Order against all defendants. A Consent Order of Preliminary Injunction and Other Ancillary Relief was entered on April 22, 2005.

On April 14, 2005, Corporate Defendants Gemancer I, Gemancer II, and Trade Pro, and Relief Defendants Moni, Inc., Ria Riviera, Inc., Body Blasters, Inc., Success Direct, Inc., and Tri Lynx, Inc. were served. On August 15, 2006, the Clerk entered a Default against Corporate Defendants Gemancer I, Gemancer II, and Trade Pro, and against Relief Defendants Moni, Inc., Ria Riviera, Inc., Body Blasters, Inc., Success Direct, Inc., and Tri Lynx, Inc. The Corporate Defendants and Relief Defendants have failed to appear or otherwise defend against the Complaint within the time permitted by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Commission has now moved for a default judgment of a permanent injunction and other ancillary relief against them.

The Commission has now submitted its Application for Entry of Default Judgment By Court Against Defendants Gemancer I, Gemancer II, Trade Pro, and Relief Defendants Moni, Inc., Ria Riviera, Inc., Body Blasters, Inc., Success Direct, Inc., and Tri Lynx, Inc. ("Application") pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(b)(2) and Local Rules 55-1, 55-2, and 55-3. The Court has considered the Complaint, the allegations of which are well-pleaded and hereby taken as true, the Application, declarations, exhibits and other papers filed herein, and being fully advised in the premises hereby:

GRANTS the Commissions for Application for Entry of Default, udgment

1 By Court and enters findings of fact and conclusions of law finding the Corporate 2 3 4

Defendants liable as to all violations as alleged in the Complaint. The Court further grants the Commission's request to assess monetary damages, including disgorgement against Corporate Defendants, disgorgement against Relief

defendants, and civil monetary penalties.

7

5

6

8

9

A. Jurisdiction and Venue

10 11

12

14

13

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27

28

I. FINDINGS OF FACTS

This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Section 6c of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13a-1, which authorizes the Commission to seek injunctive relief against any person whenever it shall appear to the Commission that such person has engaged, is engaging, or is about to engage in any act or

practice constituting a violation of any provision of the Act or any rule, regulation or order thereunder.

Venue properly lies with this Court pursuant to Section 6c of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 13-a-(e), because the Corporate Defendants and Relief Defendants are found in, inhabit, or transact business in this District, and the acts and practices conducted in violation of the Act have occurred, are occurring, or are about to occur within this district, among other places.

B. The Parties

1. Plaintiff

Plaintiff United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission is an independent federal regulatory agency that is charged with responsibility for administering and enforcing the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, 7 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq. (2002), and the Regulations promulgated thereunde:, 17 C.F.R. §§ 1 et seq. (2006).

2. Corporate Defendants

Defendant Gemancer, Inc. is a Nevada corporation, incorporated on April 4, 2001 that was created and jointly operated by Schiera Main and Main. Its principal place of business was listed as 28305 Industry Drive, Valencia, California. Gemancer I, among other things, has been engaged in the business of advertising and soliciting clients to purchase commodity futures and options trading advisory services, including software, written materials, and in-person seminars. It has never been registered with the Commission in any capacity. Brian Main is listed as its president, secretary, and treasurer.

Defendant Gemancer II, Inc. is a Nevada corporation incorporated on March 7, 2003, but its corporate status is currently in default. Its principal place of business was listed as 28305 Industry Drive, Valencia, California, the same as Gemancer I. Gemancer II accepted deposits from clients for the purchase of Gemancer I and Trade Pro commodity futures and options trading advisory services. It has never been registered with the Commission in any capacity. Main owns Gemancer II. It shareed offices and employees with Gemancer I, and its funds were commingled with Gemancer I funds.

Defendant <u>Trade Pro, Inc.</u> is a California Corporation, incorporated on May 19, 2003. Initially, Monica Schiera Main was listed as its registered agent. Its principal place of business was 28305 Industry Drive, Valencia, California, the same as the Gemancer entities. Trade Pro created and sold a software program that made specific commodity futures trading buy and sell recommendations. It has been engaged in the business of advertising and soliciting clients to purchase commodity futures and options trading advisory services, including software, written materials, and in-person seminars. It has never been registered with the Commission in any capacity. Trade Pro shared ownership, offices, and employees with Gemancer I. Gemancer I, Gemancer II, and Trade Pro constitute a common enterprise.

3. Relief Defendants

Relief Defendant Moni Inc. is a revoked Nevada corporation, initially incorporated on June 30, 2000. Its listed address was the residential address of Defendant Schiera Main in Castaic, California. Defendant Schiera Main is listed as the president and secretary of Moni and is the sole signatory on the primary Moni bank account, and her name is imprinted on all of the checks. In addition, Moni provided funds that were deposited into commodity futures trading accounts in the name of Monica Schiera. Moni received funds that can be traced directly to Gemancer I and Trade Pro's fraudulent activity, and does not have a legitimate claim to these funds. Schiera Main paid for personal expenses through this entity.

Relief Defendant <u>Ria Riviera</u>, <u>Inc.</u>, is a Nevada corporation, currently in permanent default status, incorporated on January 28, 1998. The address on the checks was a previous residential address of Schiera Main. Ria Riviera received funds that can be traced directly to Gemancer I's fraudulent activity, and does not have a legitimate claim to these funds.

Relief Defendant <u>Body Blasters</u>, <u>Inc.</u> is a California corporation ir corporated on October 29, 2003. Schiera Main is listed as its registered agent. Its a ldress was listed as 28305 Industry Drive, Valencia, California, 91355, the same as Gemancer. Schiera Main is listed as president and "CFO" and is the sole signatory on the Bank of America checking account for Body Blasters. Gemancer and Trade P to pay Body Blasters' general operating expenses. Body Blasters received funds that can be traced directly to Gemancer I and Trade Pro's fraudulent activity, and does not have a legitimate claim to these funds.

Relief Defendant <u>Success Direct</u>, <u>Inc</u>. is a Nevada corporation, currently in default status, incorporated on March 12, 2003. It had the same registered agent and officers as Gemancer II. Schiera Main is listed as president on the Eank of America checking account. Success Direct received funds that can be traced

1

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

2425

26

27

28

directly to Gemancer I and Trade Pro's fraudulent activity, and does not have a legitimate claim to these funds.

Relief Defendant <u>Tri Lynx</u>, <u>Inc.</u>, is a Nevada Corporation, currently in default status, incorporated on March 11, 2003. Defendant Main is the President, Secretary, Treasurer, and Director of Tri Lynx and is listed as the owner on the Bank of American checking account. Tri Lynx received funds that can be traced directly to Gemancer I, Gemancer II, and Trade Pro's fraudulent activity and does not have a legitimate claim to these funds.

C. Background & Operation

As set forth in the well-pleaded allegations of the Complaint, from at least April 2001 to April 2005, Schiera Main and Main incorporated or operated Gemancer I, Gemancer II and Trade Pro, Inc, which Schiera Main and Main collectively operated as a common enterprise. Through this common enterprise, the Defendants were in the business of advising others, through its marketed advisory service mailers, websites, members' only subscription newsletters, and in person or "boot camp" training seminars as to the value or the advisability of trading in commodity futures and options contracts. The advisory services evolved over time and have incorporated binders, bound packets of materials purporting to be manuals, "special reports," audiotapes, videotapes, and newsletters, to provide commodity futures and options trading advice to customers and potential customers. The Corporate Defendants, directly and indirectly, made use of the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce, and the mails, in cornection with the acts, practices and courses of business complained of herein. Additionally, they operated at least four websites to solicit members of the public to obtain commodity futures and options on commodity futures trading advisory services: gemancer.com, commodityfortunes.com, tradeprosoftware.com and tradeprofutures.com.

12

15 16

14

18

17

20

19

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

The Corporate Defendants solicitations yielded at least 1200 clients and took in at least \$3 million.

D. Defendants' Misrepresentations and Omissions

While acting as a CTA, the Corporate Defendants, through Schier a Main and Main, made misrepresentations in the solicitation of potential clients for the purchase of commodity futures and options trading advisory services that generally fell into three areas: (1) fraudulently overstated the profit potential and success of their trading systems and strategies; (2) misrepresented the risk involved in trading commodity futures and options contracts; and (3) misrepresented Schiera's net worth. In addition, they omitted the material facts that Schiera Main had an unprofitable trading record and is a convicted felon.

1. Promotional Materials Misrepresented the Success of the Trading Advisory Services

Gemancer I and Trade Pro misrepresented the success of their tracing system to potential clients and guaranteed profits. The solicitations stated, among other things, that:

- the trading has been "consistently profiting over 90% of [the] (a) trades" following the Gemancer trading strategies;
- (b) the Gemancer "Decoding system" "...guarantees that 90% or more of your trades will make you money;"
- (c) Trade Pro software has "dramatically increased [the] profit percentage" of the trading account of its employee;
- the "Trade Pro [software] will give you the signals you need to (d) successfully trade the highly lucrative stock indices [3&P 500]"; and
- (e) the "Reverse Market Timing System" is a "profitable strategy." Customers relied upon these material misrepresentations to their detriment, believing that the trading advisory services were successful and that following the

recommendations would lead them to become profitable commodity futures traders. The customers were under the impression that the Gemancer and Trade Pro trading advice was tested, used by one of its employees, and produced large profits. In fact, the Gemancer advisory services were a recipe for losses, and the Trade Pro software simply did not work.

2. Promotional Materials Misrepresented Defendant Schiera Main's Commodity Trading Experience, Track Record and Net Worth

From June 2001 to at least April 2005, Gemancer I and Trade Pro misrepresented Schiera Main's commodity futures and options trading experience, her past performance and her allegedly successful use of the Gemancer trading advisory services. The Defendants claimed that over 90% of Schiera Main's trades were profitable, "pulling in millions of dollars to date." In addition, the Trade Pro solicitation materials claimed that Schiera Main utilized the Trade Pro software resulting in a 114% profit "in 2 days with the S&P500." In reality, Schiera Main traded small sums of money and had a negative trading record.

The references in the promotional materials that Schiera Main is a "Millionaire" also are false. On March 19, 2003, Schiera Main filed for individual Chapter 7 bankruptcy, *In re Schiera*, No. 03-12373 (Bankr. C.D. Cal., March 19, 2003). She was discharged from her debts on July 1, 2003.

3. Corporate Defendants' Misrepresented the Risks of Trading Commodity Futures and Options Contracts

From June 2001 to at least April 2005, Gemancer I and Trade Pro misrepresented the risks involved in trading commodity futures and options contracts using the Corporate Defendants' commodity futures and options trading systems and services. Specifically, the materials minimized the risks involved in trading commodity futures and options, making claims such as, trading commodities "is not risky at all", "how to make thousands a week trading options

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

12

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

with almost no risk!", and the statement "although the results of Trade Pro have been extremely effective and profitable," was added to a purported risk disclosure, thus undermining the risk.

E. Material Omissions in the Advisory Services Promotional Material

Gemancer I and Trade Pro claimed that the Gemancer trading strategies produced winning trades while failing to disclose that the trades represented only hypothetical trading results. Specifically, the Advanced Trading Secrets Workshop promotional materials state, "Last year it was calculated that 92.3% of my trades were successful. The year before it was 87.1%. This year, so far, I'm at 90.8%." Customers relied on the 90% accuracy statement, and believed that actual money had been invested and traded. In fact, Main admitted under oath that the touted results concerned only purported "paper trading," and had no records to show even that.

Gemancer I and Trade Pro also failed to disclose Schiera Main's federal felony fraud conviction. Schiera Main and Main knew of, but did not disclose Schiera Main's criminal background to potential customers because they were concerned that they would "lose business" if that material adverse information was out in the open.

F. Gemancer, Inc., Gemancer II, Inc., and Trade Pro, Inc. Constitute a Common Enterprise

Gemancer I and Trade Pro function as one company and frequently advertised the same products and services. Gemancer I, Gemancer II, and Trade Pro all shared employees and office space. Gemancer I and Gemancer II commingled funds and accepted client orders and collected payments from clients and prospective clients for the purchase of commodity futures trading advisory services, software, and seminars. The two companies each paid business expenses attributable to the solicitation of members of the public to purchase the commodity

futures and options trading advisory services. Defendants Schiera Main and Main operated the Corporate Defendants under their common control.

G. Relief Defendants Received Funds Traceable to the Corporate Defendants' Fraud

The Relief Defendants received at least \$600,000 in funds that are directly traceable to the Corporate Defendants' fraud. More specifically, Between June 2001 and March 2005, Moni received \$127,407 from Gemancer I and Trade Pro in funds traceable to the Corporate Defendants' fraud. Between December 2001 and November 2004, Ria Riviera received a net of \$81,820 from Gemancer I in funds traceable to the Corporate Defendants' fraud. From December 2003 th ough March 2004, Body Blasters received a net of \$51,937 from Gemancer I, Gemancer II and Trade Pro in funds traceable to the Corporate Defendants' fraud. From April 2003 through December 2003, Success Direct received a net of \$70,165 from Gemancer I, Gemancer II and Trade Pro in funds traceable to the Corporate Defendants' fraud. From April 2003 to March 2005, Tri Lynx received \$169,868 from Gemancer I, Gemancer II, and Trade Pro in funds traceable to the Corporate Defendants' fraud.

The Relief Defendants did not provide services to or on behalf of the Corporate Defendants and do not have a legitimate claim to the funds. Moreover, the Relief Defendants used some funds received from the Corporate Defendants to pay for personal expenses for Defendants Schiera Main and Main.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Starting in April 2001, Gemancer I and Trade Pro acted as CTAs in that, for compensation or profit, they engaged in the business of advising others as to the value or the advisability of trading in commodity futures and commodity options. As explained in more detail above, Gemancer I, Gemancer II, and Trade Pro acted

as a common enterprise. Accordingly, the three corporate defendants are jointly and severally liable for the acts of the common scheme.

Since April 2001, pursuant to Section 2(A)(1)(B) of the Act, the Corporate Defendants, through the acts of Schiera Main and Main, violated Sections 4o(1)(A) and (B) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 6o(1)(A) and (B) (2002) and Commission Regulation 4.41(a), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(a), by, among other things: (1) using false and misleading promotional material which overstated the profit potential for the trading systems they were selling; (2) failing to adequately warn of the risks inherent in trading commodity futures and commodity options; (3) misrepresenting the level of risk inherent in trading commodity futures and options contracts; and (4) failing to disclose material facts about Schiera Main's past trading performance and history of fraudulent conduct. Each material misrepresentation or deceptive omission made during the relevant time period constitutes a separate and distinct violation of Sections 4o(1)(A) and 4o(1)(B) of the Act.

During the relevant time period, pursuant to Section 2(A)(1)(B) of the Act, Corporate Defendants, through the acts of Schiera Main and Main, presented the performance of simulated and hypothetical commodity interest accounts without prominently including the required disclosure, in violation of Section 4.41(b) of the Regulations, 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(b) (2004).

The Relief Defendants do not have a legitimate claim to the funds they received that are directly traceable to the fraud. Thus, disgorgement is proper relief.

III. PERMANENT INJUNCTION

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

Gemancer I, Gemancer II, and Trade Pro, and all persons insofar as they are acting in the capacity of their agents, servants, employees, successors, assigns, and attorneys and all persons insofar as they are acting in active concert or participation

with them who receive actual notice of such order by personal service or otherwise, are permanently restrained, enjoined and prohibited from directly or indirectly:

- A. While acting as CTAs, or principals thereof, employing any device, scheme, or artifice to defraud any client or prospective client; or engaging in any transaction, practice, or course of business which operates as a fraud or deceit upon any client or prospective client, by use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce, in violation of Section 4o(1) of the Act, 7 U.S.C. § 6o(1) (2002);
- B. While acting as CTAs, or principals thereof, advertising in a manner which employs any device, scheme or artifice to defraud any client or prospective client; or advertising in a manner which involves any transaction, practice or course of business which operates as a fraud or deceit upon any client or prospective client, in violation of Regulation 4.41(a), 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(a) (2006);
- C. Presenting 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 the following statement, prominently disclosed, as required by 17 C.F.R. § 4.41(t):

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.

In doing so, Defendants shall clearly identify those hypothetical or simulated performance results that were based, in whole or in part, on hypothetical trading results.

- D. Directly or indirectly soliciting or accepting any funds from any person in connection with the purchase or sale of any commodity futures or options contract, except as provided for in Commission Regulation 4.14(a)(9), 17 C.F.R. 4.14(a)(9) (2006);
- E. Engaging in, controlling, or directing the trading of any commodity futures or options accounts, on Gemancer I, Gemancer II, or Trade Pro's own behalf or for or on behalf of any other person or entity, whether by power of attorney or otherwise;
- F. 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 with the Commission, except as provided for in Commission Regulation 4.14(a)(9), 17 C.F.R. 4.14(a)(9) (2006), or acting as a principal, agent or officer or employee of any person registered, required to be registered or exempted from registration with the Commission unless such exemption is pursuant to Commission Regulation 4.14(a)(9),17 C.F.R. 4.14(a)(9) (2006); and
- G. Otherwise engaging in any business activities related to commodity futures or options trading.

IV. DISGORGEMENT AND CIVIL MONETARY PENALTY

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED THAT:

A. Disgorgement From Corporate Defendants

Corporate Defendants Gemancer I, Gemancer II, and Trade Pro are jointly and severally liable to pay within 30 days of the date of this Order disgorgement in the amount of \$3 million (\$3,000,000) plus pre- and post- judgment interest. Prejudgment interest is calculated beginning from January 16, 2004 at the underpayment rate established by the Internal Revenue Service pursuant to 26 U.S.C. § 662(a)(2). The Corporate Defendants' shall pay post-judgment interest from the date of this Order until their disgorgement obligation is paid in full at the Treasury Bill rate prevailing on the date of this Order, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §

25

26

27

28

1961(a). The Corporate Defendants shall pay this penalty by making electronic funds transfer, 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 the address below:

Commodity Futures Trading Commission Division of Enforcement ATTN: Marie Batement - AMZ-300 DOT/FAA/MMAC 6500 S. Macarthur Blvd. Oklahoma City, OK 73169

If payment by electronic transfer is chosen, contact Marie Bateman at 405-954-6569 for instructions. The Corporate Defendants shall accompany payment of the penalty with a cover letter that identifies the defendants, and the name and docket number of this proceeding. The Corporate Defendants shall simultaneously transmit a copy of the cover letter and the form of payment to:

Office of Cooperative Enforcement Division of Enforcement Commodity Futures Trading Commission Three Lafayette Centre 1155 21st Street, NW Washington, DC 20581.

B. Disgorgement From Relief Defendants

Relief Defendant Moni Inc. shall be liable and shall pay disgorgement of 427, 407 \$139,038 plus pre- and post- judgment interest within 30-days of the date of this Order.

Relief Defendant Ria Riviera Inc. shall be liable and shall pay disgorgement 81,620 of \$101,320 plus pre- and post- judgment interest within 30-days of the clate of this Order.

Relief Defendant Body Blasters, Inc. shall be liable and shall pay 51,938 disgorgement of \$115,938 plus pre- and post- judgment interest within 30-days of the date of this Order.

Relief Defendant Success Direct Inc. shall be liable and shall pay disgorgement of \$70,165 plus pre- and post- judgment interest within 30-days of the date of this Order.

Relief Defendant Tri Lynx Inc. shall be liable and shall pay disgo-gement of \$169,868 plus pre- and post- judgment interest within 30-days of the date of this Order.

Prejudgment interest is calculated at the underpayment rate established by the Internal Revenue Service pursuant to 26 U.S.C. § 662(a)(2). The Relief Defendants shall pay post-judgment interest from the date of this Order until its disgorgement obligation is paid in full at the Treasury Bill rate prevailing on the date of this Order, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961(a). The Relief Defendants shall pay this penalty by making electronic funds transfer, 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 the address below:

> Commodity Futures Trading Commission Division of Enforcement ATTN: Marie Batement - AMZ-300 DOT/FAA/MMAC 6500 S. Macarthur Blvd. Oklahoma City, OK 73169

If payment by electronic transfer is chosen, contact Marie Bateman at 405-954-6569 for instructions. The Relief Defendants shall accompany payment of the penalty with a cover letter that identifies the defendants, and the name and docket number of this proceeding. The Relief Defendants shall simultaneously transmit a copy of the cover letter and the form of payment to:

24 25

21

22

23

26

27

28

Office of Cooperative Enforcement Division of Enforcement Commodity Futures Trading Commission Three Lafayette Centre 1155 21st Street, NW Washington, DC 20581.

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

26

27

28

C. Civil Monetary Penalty

Corporate Defendants Gemancer I, Gemancer II, and Trade Pro shall pay, jointly and severally, Civil Monetary Penalty of \$9,000,000 (\$9 million) within 30 days of the date of this Order. This is based on the Commission maximum penalty of triple the monetary gain to the Corporate Defendants. The Corporate Defendants shall pay this penalty by making electronic funds transfer, 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 the address below:

Commodity Futures Trading Commission Division of Enforcement ATTN: Marie Batement - AMZ-300 DOT/FAA/MMAC 6500 S. Macarthur Blvd. Oklahoma City, OK 73169

If payment by electronic transfer is chosen, contact Marie Bateman at 405-954-6569 for instructions. The Corporate Defendants shall accompany payment of the penalty with a cover letter that identifies the defendants, and the name and docket number of this proceeding. The Corporate Defendants shall simultaneously transmit a copy of the cover letter and the form of payment to:

Office of Cooperative Enforcement Division of Enforcement Commodity Futures Trading Commission Three Lafayette Centre 1155 21st Street, NW Washington, DC 20581.

D. Miscellaneous

Prohibition on Transfer of Funds: The Corporate Defendants and Relief Defendants, or their officers, agents or employees, shall not transfer or cause others to transfer funds or other property to the custody, possession or control of any

other person for the purpose of concealing such funds or property from the Court, the Commission, or any officer that may be appointed by the Court.

Notices: All notices required to be given by any provision in this Consent Order shall be sent certified mail, return receipt requested, as follows:

Notice to Commission:

Associate Director Division of Enforcement - Central Region Commodity Futures Trading Commission 525 West Monroe Street, Suite 1100 Chicago, Illinois 60661

This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this action to assure compliance with this Consent Order and for all purposes related to this action, including the implementation and enforcement of this final judgment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: Quember 1/, 2006

CHRISTINA A. SNYDER

The Honorable Christina A. Snyder United States District Court Judge

PROOF OF SERVICE

′

The undersigned, an attorney with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, certify that I served true copies of the [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT BY COURT AGAINST DEFENDANTS GEMANCER, INC., GEMANCER II, INC. AND TRADE PRO, INC. AND RELIEF DEFENDANTS MONI, INC., RIA RIVIERA, INC., BODY BLASTERS, INC., SUCCESS DIRECT, INC., AND TRI LYNX, INC. via Federal Express on October 26,2006, to the following Service List:

Jonathan Schwartz Law Offices of Jonathan Schwartz 4640 Admiralty Way #500 Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Attorney for Plaintiff Monica Schiera Main and Brian Main

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on October 26, 2006, at Chicago, Illinois.

