

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, :
: :
Plaintiff, : 20 Civ. 10832 (AT) (SN)
: :
- against - : ECF Case
: :
RIPPLE LABS, INC., BRADLEY GARLINGHOUSE, :
and CHRISTIAN A. LARSEN, :
: :
Defendants. :
: :
-----X

PLAINTIFF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION'S
MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS CHRISTIAN A.
LARSEN'S AND BRADLEY GARLINGHOUSE'S MOTIONS TO DISMISS

Jorge G. Tenreiro
Dugan Bliss
Robert S. Moyer
Benjamin Hanauer
Mark R. Sylvester
Daphna A. Waxman
Jon A. Daniels
Ladan F. Stewart

Counsel for the Plaintiff
Securities and Exchange Commission
New York Regional Office
Brookfield Place
200 Vesey Street, Suite 400
New York, NY 10281
(212) 336-9145 (Tenreiro)

May 14, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....iv

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT 1

BACKGROUND: LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND DIGITAL ASSETS4

STATEMENT OF FACTS5

 I. BACKGROUND: RIPPLE, LARSEN, AND GARLINGHOUSE5

 II. RIPPLE OFFERED AND SOLD SECURITIES WITHOUT A REGISTRATION STATEMENT.5

 III. DEFENDANTS KNEW OR RECKLESSLY DISREGARDED THE UNLAWFUL NATURE OF RIPPLE’S OFFERS AND SALES OF XRP.6

 A. Larsen Received and Ignored Specific Warnings that Offers and Sales of XRP Could Constitute Offers and Sales of Securities.6

 1. Larsen Has Experience with SEC Claims of Section 5 Violations.....6

 2. Larsen Received Two Legal Memos [REDACTED]6

 3. Larsen Knew or Recklessly Disregarded that XRP Was Being Offered and Sold [REDACTED]10

 4. Larsen Received Additional Warnings that XRP Was a Security.11

 B. Garlinghouse Knew or Recklessly Disregarded that Ripple’s Offer and Sales of XRP Had the Characteristics of a Securities Offering.....11

 1. Garlinghouse Knew or Recklessly Disregarded the Facts that Made Ripple’s Offers and Sales of XRP the Offers and Sales of Securities.11

 2. Garlinghouse Knew or Recklessly Disregarded the Legal Risks.12

 IV. DEFENDANTS SUBSTANTIALLY ASSISTED RIPPLE’S VIOLATIONS.15

 A. Defendants Actively Participated in Ripple’s Unregistered Public Distribution of Securities with Their Own Offers and Sales of XRP from the United States.15

 1. Defendants Shared Ripple’s Goal of Selling as Much XRP as Possible into Markets They Created and Actively Participated in that Endeavor.....15

 2. Defendants’ Offers and Sales of XRP Were an Integral Part of Ripple’s Public Distribution of XRP.16

 B. Defendants Provided Additional Substantial Assistance to Ripple’s Violations.17

..

1. Larsen	17
2. Garlinghouse	21
STANDARD OF REVIEW	23
ARGUMENT	24
I. THE COMPLAINT ADEQUATELY ALLEGES THAT DEFENDANTS AIDED AND ABETTED RIPPLE’S VIOLATIONS OF SECURITIES ACT SECTION 5.	24
A. The Complaint Adequately Pleads That Defendants Knew or Recklessly Disregarded Ripple’s Section 5 Violation.	25
1. The Complaint Pleads Sufficient Facts to Infer that Defendants Acted with a High Degree of Scierter.	25
2. Defendants’ Contrary Arguments Misapply the Law.	28
B. The Complaint Adequately Alleges That Larsen Substantially Assisted Ripple’s Violations.	34
II. THE COMPLAINT ADEQUATELY ALLEGES THAT DEFENDANTS ENGAGED IN DOMESTIC OFFERS AND SALES OF SECURITIES.	36
A. The Focus of the Securities Act’s Registration Requirements Determines If a Permissible, Domestic Application of the Statute Is at Issue.	38
B. Securities Act Section 5 Focuses Broadly on Every Aspect of a Public Offering, Not Just Particular Sales.	39
1. The Term “Offer” Goes Beyond its Common Law, Contractual Concept.	41
2. Section 5 and Section 4 Together Make Clear that the Registration Requirement’s Focus Is All Aspects of Public Offerings.	43
C. <i>Morrison</i> Explicitly Recognized that Regulation S Defines What Constitutes a “Domestic” Public Offering under Securities Act Section 5.	44
D. Defendants Engaged in a Public Distribution of Securities That Failed to Comply with Regulation S.	45
E. <i>Morrison</i> and the Securities Act Belie Defendants’ Other Arguments.	48
F. Even if <i>Morrison</i> ’s Transactional Test Applied, the Complaint Pleads Transactions that Satisfy It.	52
1. <i>Morrison</i> ’s Transactional Test Must Apply to All Sales in Defendants’ Public Distribution of XRP.	52
2. The <i>Morrison</i> Transactional Test is Satisfied Even with Respect to Each Individual Sale by the U.S. Defendants on non-U.S. Platforms.	53
III. THE CLAIMS FOR MONETARY RELIEF AGAINST LARSEN ARE TIMELY.	59
CONCLUSION.....	60

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Absolute Activist Value Master Fund Ltd. v. Ficeto</i> , 677 F.3d 60 (2d Cir. 2012)	53, 55
<i>Armstrong v. McAlpin</i> , 699 F.2d 79 (2d Cir. 1982)	35, 36
<i>Asbcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009)	23
<i>ATSI Commc'ns, Inc. v. Shaar Fund, Ltd.</i> , 493 F.3d 87 (2d Cir. 2007)	24
<i>Banco Safra S.A. Cayman Islands Branch v. Samarco Mineracao S.A.</i> , __ Fed. App'x __, 2021 WL 825743, (2d Cir. Mar. 4, 2021)	54
<i>Barker v. Henderson, Franklin, Starnes & Holt</i> , 797 F.2d 490 (7th Cir. 1986)	26
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	24
<i>Blue Chip Stamps v. Manor Drug Stores</i> , 421 U.S. 723 (1975)	39
<i>Cavello Bay Reinsurance Ltd. v. Shubin Stein</i> , 986 F.3d 161 (2d Cir. 2011)	51
<i>Chris-Craft Indus. v. Bangor Punta Corp.</i> , 426 F.2d 569 (2d Cir. 1970)	41, 42
<i>Diskin v. Lomasney & Co.</i> , 452 F.2d 871 (2d Cir. 1971)	41
<i>ECA and Local 134 IBEW Joint Pension Tr. of Chi. v. J.P. Morgan Chase Co.</i> , 553 F.3d 187 (2d Cir. 2009)	27
<i>Gabelli v. SEC</i> , 568 U.S. 442 (2013)	59 Fn. 20, 60
<i>Geiger v. SEC</i> , 363 F.3d 481 (D.C. Cir. 2004)	44, 53
<i>Gilligan, Will & Co. v. S.E.C.</i> , 267 F.2d 461 (2nd Cir. 1959)	44 Fn. 14

<i>Giunta v. Dingman</i> , 893 F.3d 73 (2d Cir. 2018)	56
<i>Glen-Arden Commodities, Inc. v. Costantino</i> , 493 F.2d 1027 (2d Cir. 1974)	42
<i>Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.</i> , 563 U.S. 754 (2011)	31
<i>Gustafson v. Alloyd Co. Inc.</i> , 513 U.S. 561 (1995)	39
<i>Herod's Stone Design v. Mediterranean Shipping Co. S.A.</i> , 434 F. Supp. 3d 142 (S.D.N.Y. 2020)	24
<i>In re Refco Inc. Secs. Litig.</i> , No. 08 Civ. 3065, 2012 WL 996910 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 17, 2012)	36
<i>In re Tezos Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 17 Civ. 6779, 2018 WL 4293341 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 7, 2018)	58
<i>In re Vivendi Universal, S.A. Sec. Litig.</i> , 765 F. Supp. 2d 512 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)	57
<i>ITT v. Cornfeld</i> , 619 F.2d 909 (2d Cir.1980)	27 Fn. 8
<i>Kalnit v. Eichler</i> , 264 F.3d 131 (2d Cir. 2001)	27
<i>Kokesb v. SEC</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1635 (2017)	59 Fn. 20
<i>Loginovskaya v. Batratchenko</i> , 764 F.3d 266 (2d Cir. 2014)	53, 54
<i>Martin v. Pepsi Bottling Co.</i> , 639 F. Supp. 931 (D. Md. 1986)	27 Fn. 8
<i>Monsen v. Consol. Dressed Beef Co., Inc.</i> , 579 F.2d 793 (3d Cir. 1978)	24
<i>Morrison v. National Australia Bank Ltd.</i> , 561 U.S. 247 (2010)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Myun-Uk Choi v. Tower Rsch. Cap. LLC</i> , 890 F.3d 60 (2d Cir. 2018)	53 Fn. 17, 54, 57
<i>Novak v. Kasaks</i> , 216 F.3d 300 (2d Cir. 2000)	27

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.