

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

CASE NO. 21-2989-MDL-ALTONAGA/Torres

IN RE:

**JANUARY 2021 SHORT SQUEEZE
TRADING LITIGATION**

_____ /

This Document Relates to:

ALL ANTITRUST ACTIONS

CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

[REDACTED VERSION]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
INTRODUCTION	I
JURISDICTION AND VENUE.....	5
PARTIES	6
A. Plaintiff Angel Guzman	6
B. Plaintiff Burke Minahan.....	7
C. Plaintiff Christopher Miller.....	8
D. Plaintiff Terell Sterling.....	8
E. Introducing Brokerage Defendants	9
F. Self-Clearing Brokerage Defendants	II
G. Market Maker Defendants	13
H. Clearing Defendants.....	13
AGENTS AND CO-CONSPIRATORS	14
CLASS ALLEGATIONS	15
FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS.....	18
CLAIMS FOR RELIEF	131
PRAYER FOR JUDGMENT	133
JURY TRIAL DEMANDED.....	134

Plaintiffs Angel Guzman, Burke Minahan, Christopher Miller, and Terell Sterling, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, bring this Class Action Complaint against Defendants for violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1.

INTRODUCTION

1. This case is about individual investors (the “Retail Investors”) who invested their hard-earned money in the stock market and were stripped of their rights to control their own investments. Defendants and other market players hatched an anticompetitive scheme to restrict Retail Investors’ access to the stock market and prevent the market from operating freely and fairly. Defendants did so to protect each other, and to stop the hemorrhaging losses incurred by the Market Maker Defendants as a result of their accumulation of large short positions.

2. Retail Investors are individual investors who make investments on their own behalf. Retail Investors purchase securities such as stocks, bonds, options, mutual funds, and exchange traded funds (ETFs). They execute their personal trades through websites, apps and trading platforms provided by brokerage firms or other investment service providers. Retail Investors tend to invest smaller amounts, as compared to institutional investors, and have little ability to influence market prices or market dynamics on their own.

3. Historically, Retail Investors paid a fee or commission to their brokerages for executing personal trades. Today, most brokerages do not charge their investors a fee per transaction, rather, they earn revenue through rebates, kickbacks and other payments from market makers. These payments are collectively known as payment for order flow.

4. When a Retail Investor places a trade through a brokerage such as Robinhood, the brokerage routes the order to a market maker for processing and execution. When a market maker executes an order, it makes a profit on the spread between the “bid” price, the price at

which a market maker is willing to buy a security, and the “ask” price, the price at which a market maker is willing to sell the security. While the market maker typically earns a modest amount on each share of an order it fulfills, by processing a vast number of orders, market makers can earn a substantial profit.

5. For every order, there must be a buyer and a seller. Market makers, through a process called “internalization,” typically will take the other side of a transaction for orders routed to them. For example, if a buy order is routed to a market maker and there is no sell order available, market makers execute the order, either by selling a security in its inventory or by selling short.

6. Leading up to January 27, 2021, based on their research and observations, the Retail Investors, through stock brokerages, including the Brokerage Defendants, invested in certain stocks—GameStop (GME), AMC Entertainment (AMC), Bed Bath & Beyond (BBBY), BlackBerry (BB), Express (EXPR), Koss (KOSS), Nokia (NOK), Tootsie Roll Industries (TR), and Trivago NV (TRVG) (the “Relevant Securities”)—that they believed would increase and serve as good investment opportunities.

7. As more Retail Investors bought the Relevant Securities and these orders were routed to market makers, such as Citadel Securities LLC (“Citadel Securities”), the market makers acquired substantial short positions in the Relevant Securities, and were thus exposed to massive potential losses as the prices of the Relevant Securities increased.

8. “Short” sellers borrow securities believing that that price of the securities will decrease. If the price of the security in fact drops, a short seller buys the security back at a lower price and returns it to the lender. The difference between the sell price and the buy price is the

profit. Short sellers essentially bet on a security's failure or decline rather than its success or increase.

9. Along with market makers such as Citadel Securities, several large hedge funds and investment firms, including Maplelane Capital, LLC, Melvin Capital Management LP, and others, established massive short positions in the Relevant Securities.

10. In so doing, the hedge funds, market makers, and other unnamed co-conspirators made highly speculative bets. When the Relevant Securities increased in value, due in large part to Retail Investors purchasing the Relevant Securities, hedge funds were exposed to massive potential losses of several billion dollars.

11. As more Retail Investors bought the Relevant Securities, those orders were routed to Citadel Securities through the Brokerage Defendants. Citadel Securities took the other side of the buy orders placed by the Retail Investors, i.e., Citadel Securities sold the Relevant Securities short in order to complete the routed retail investors' orders. Citadel Securities, as it took the other side of more and more buy orders, acquired a substantial short position in the Relevant Securities, and was similarly exposed to massive potential losses.

12. As Retail Investors and others continued to purchase the Relevant Securities, the hedge funds, Clearing Defendants, Citadel Securities and unnamed co-conspirators were caught in a classic "short squeeze." A "short squeeze" occurs when a stock or other asset rises sharply in value, distressing short positions. Short selling investors are faced with a rapid increase in the shorted asset's value, exposing the short seller to increased and theoretically limitless loss. As the price of the asset rises, short sellers face pressure to buy back stock to exit their short positions to mitigate their losses. In the absence of intervention, as short sellers exit their short positions to

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.