	Case 2:21-cv-00632-JCM-DJA Docu	iment 1	Filed 04/16/21	Page 1 of 25
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Case 2:21-cv-00632-JCM-DJA Docu KENNETH W. DONNELLY District of Columbia Bar (No. 462996) (LR IA 11-3 <i>pro hac vice</i> motion pending Email: <u>donnellyk@sec.gov</u> Telephone: (202) 551-4946 SAMANTHA M. WILLIAMS Maryland Bar (No. 0012190024) (LR IA 11-3 <i>pro hac vice</i> motion pending Email: <u>williamssam@sec.gov</u> Telephone: (202) 551-4061 MELISSA ARMSTRONG	g)	Filed 04/16/21	Page 1 of 25
8 9	Texas Bar (No. 24050234) (LP IA 11.3 pro hag vigg motion ponding)			
10	(LR IA 11-3 <i>pro hac vice</i> motion pending) Email: <u>armstrongme@sec.gov</u>			
11	Tel: (202) 551-4724			
12 13	Attorneys for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission 100 F Street N.E.			
14	Washington, D.C. 20549-5949			
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
16	DISTRICT OF NEVADA			
17				
18	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,			
19	Plaintiff,			
20	VS.		2:21-	cv-00632
21	SPOT TECH HOUSE, LTD., formerly known as, SPOT OPTION, LTD.,			
22	MALHAZ PINHAS		COM	PLAINT
23 24	PATARKAZISHVILI, also known as PINI PETER and PINHAS PETER,			
24 25	and			
23 26	RAN AMIRAN,			
27	Defendants,			
28				

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>. Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC") alleges:

1. This case concerns a multi-million dollar fraudulent scheme involving unregistered offers and sales of security-based "binary options" to retail investors in the United States from at least April 2012 through August 2017 (the "Relevant Period"). The scheme was overseen by Malhaz Pinhas Patarkazishvili ("Pini Peter") and Ran Amiran ("Amiran") through a company they owned and controlled called Spot Option, Ltd. ("Spot Option") now known as Spot Option Tech House, Ltd. (collectively, the "Defendants").

2. For the scheme to succeed, Spot Option needed to find investors who could be persuaded to trade the binary options that it issued through its proprietary online trading platform. To do so, Spot Option contracted with third parties, which it referred to as "Partners," "White Labels," and "Brands" (hereinafter, "Partners"), to market its binary options. Unbeknownst to investors, Spot Option structured its business model so that its Partners were the counterparty on every trade. Under this structure, Spot Option and its Partners made their money principally from investor losses.

3. To make the scheme profitable, Spot Option set the payout terms on its options in a way that made it likely that most investors would lose all or a substantial portion of their investment within the first five months of trading. Spot Option trained its Partners, however, to deceptively market the binary options as profitable investments. Spot Option used additional deceptive and manipulative practices to increase investors' losses and boost Spot Options' income stream. These practices included manipulating the trading platform to increase the probability that trading would be unprofitable and offering investors a so-called "bonus" to lock-up investor funds and prevent withdrawals, which, when combined with the payout terms, virtually guaranteed investor losses.

7
4. Through these and other deceptive and fraudulent acts, Spot Option
8
8
8
8
8
8
8
8
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9
9

RM

who traded through its platform. Many of those investors lost most of their moneyincluding, in some cases, hundreds of thousands of dollars meant for retirement. SpotOption and its Partners, on the other hand, raked in millions in profits.

5. As a result of its conduct, Defendant Spot Option violated the registration provisions of Section 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act") [15 U.S.C. §§ 77e(a) and 77e(c)], the antifraud provisions of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)], and the antifraud provisions of Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") [15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b)], and Rule 10b-5 thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b–5].

6. Defendants Pini Peter and Amiran are liable for violations of Section 5 of the Securities Act because they each played a substantial role in Spot Option's offers and sales of binary options. Pini Peter and Amiran are also liable for Spot Option's violations of the Exchange Act because they are controlling persons of Spot Option as defined by the Exchange Act. The SEC seeks disgorgement of Defendants' ill-gotten gains, prejudgment interest, civil monetary penalties, an injunction against further violations of the federal securities laws as to all Defendants, a specific conduct based injunction as to the individual defendants, and other appropriate relief.

18 ||

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under Section 22 of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77v], Sections 21(d) and 27 of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d) and 78aa], and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

8. Venue is proper in this district under Section 22(a) of the Securities Act
[15 U.S.C. § 77v(a)] and Section 27(a) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78aa(a)]
because certain of the transactions, acts, practices, and courses of conduct
constituting violations of the federal securities laws occurred within this district,
including offers of security-based binary options to at least one investor who in this
district traded through Spot Option's platform via a Spot Option Partner and lost a

substantial amount of her retirement savings. Venue also is proper here under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(3) because all Defendants reside outside of the United States.

DEFENDANTS

9. Spot Option Tech House, Ltd., formerly known as, Spot Option, Ltd., is a private Israeli company headquartered or formerly headquartered in Israel. Currently, it does not appear to be engaged in any business activities.

10. Malhaz Pinhas Patarkazishvili, also known as Pini Peter or Pinhas Peter, age 45, resides in Israel. Pini Peter is the primary founder of Spot Option and, during the Relevant Period, was an Executive Chairman, Director, and/or Chief Executive Officer of Spot Option. During the Relevant Period, Pini Peter was the chief architect of Spot Option's business model and business plans, had ultimate authority over Spot Option's financial accounts, and was in charge of Spot Option's entire management and business affairs. During nearly all of this period, he owned over 90% of Spot Option's shares. On March 13, 2017, Pini Peter transferred his ownership interest in Spot Option, about 94.22% of its then outstanding shares, to his wife, Limor Patarkazishvili.

11. Ran Amiran, age 50, also resides in Israel. During the Relevant Period,
Amiran served first as Head of Business Development and then as Spot Option's
President and Director. Around March 2017, Amiran took over as Spot Option's
Chief Executive Officer. During the Relevant Period, Amiran owned approximately
2.5% of Spot Option's shares and, by the end of February 2015, was Spot Option's
second largest shareholder. Amiran was responsible for Spot Option's sales,
marketing and business development, and he managed the day-to-day relationships
with Spot Option's Partners.

THE SCHEME

A "binary option" is a financial instrument that expires at a
predetermined time where the payout is contingent on the outcome of a yes/no
proposition. These options are "binary" because upon expiration they carry only two

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

RM

1

Case 2:21-cv-00632-JCM-DJA Document 1 Filed 04/16/21 Page 5 of 25

possible outcomes. If the holder's prediction is correct, he will receive a predetermined amount of money. If it is incorrect, he will forfeit all or nearly all of his investment. In one common form, the holder predicts whether a publicly-traded asset will be above or below a specific price at a specific time. The underlying referenced asset in a binary option can be a security, currency, or commodity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

Spot Option offered binary options based on all of these asset classes. 13. Spot Option offered binary options based on the price of common stocks of many companies traded on United States exchanges, such as TEVA, Google, Coca-Cola, and Nike. Spot Options also offered binary options based on various indices of securities, such as the NASDAQ Composite and the Dow Jones Industrial Average. These binary options are referred to hereinafter as "security-based" binary options.

Binary options in which the underlying financial asset is a security or 14. securities within the meaning of Section 2(a)(1) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77b(a)(1)] and Section 3(a)(10) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78c(a)(10)] (including any group or index of securities) are themselves "securities" within the meaning of those provisions. The security-based binary options issued, offered, and sold by Spot Option were therefore securities.

Under the Securities Act, any offer or sale of securities must be 15. registered unless an exemption applies. None of the security-based binary options offered by Spot Option were registered with the SEC, and no exemption applied.

Spot Option determined and structured the key terms of the binary 16. options offered and sold through its platform. Specifically, Spot Option's platform provided investors with a choice of: (a) several forms of binary option; (b) numerous reference assets from multiple asset classes, including securities; (c) various 24 expirations; (d) the investment amount; and (e) whether to predict the price of the reference asset would go up (e.g., buy a "call" option) or go down (e.g., buy a "put" option). Spot Option also set the amounts investors would receive for winning trades

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET A L A R M



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.