

SUPPLEMENTAL EVIDENCE

Supplement to Appeal of Termination

AAO1890000630 / RCW1031910148 / RCID1031910148

Vermont Agency of Commerce and Community
Development Regional Center

ROBERT C. DIVINE, SHAREHOLDER
Direct Dial: 423.752.4416
Direct Fax: 423.752.9533
E-Mail Address: rdivine@bakerdonelson.com

September 18, 2018

USCIS Administrative Appeals Office
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

Re: **SUPPLEMENTAL EVIDENCE**
Supplement to Appeal of Termination
AAO1890000630 / RCW1031910148 / RCID1031910148
Vermont Agency of Commerce and Community Development Regional Center

Dear Officers:

Please accept the following supplement to the appeal of the above-referenced termination of Vermont Agency of Commerce and Community Development Regional Center (“VRC”) by letter dated July 3, 2018. The complaint (Exhibit 1) filed by the SEC against Joel N. Burstein, a Raymond James broker who managed the Jay Peak accounts, provides further evidence that although VRC continually met its oversight requirements, the Jay Peak developers, with the help of Mr. Burstein, actively concealed the fraud, making it difficult to detect from the outside. According to the complaint, Mr. Burstein helped mask the misappropriation of investor funds by obtaining margin loans and purchasing U.S. Treasury Bills on margin to hide shortfalls in accounts, by transferring funds in roundabout ways through several accounts, and by using other similar tactics.


As detailed in the SEC press release and final judgment (Exhibits 2 and 3, respectively), Mr. Burstein settled the claims without admitting or denying the allegations. He is permanently enjoined from future violations of the antifraud provisions of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933, Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Rule 10b-5. In addition, he is required to pay the SEC a civil penalty of \$80,000 and is barred from associating with any broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer, transfer agent, or nationally recognized statistical rating organization, and from participating in an offering of penny stock, with the right to apply for reentry after 10 years.

The complaint, press release, and final judgment included in this supplement were not available at the time the brief and supporting evidence were filed on September 4, 2018 and

provide compelling evidence supporting this appeal. Thus, we respectfully ask that they be added to the record.

We reiterate our request that USCIS reverse the termination and allow VRC to continue in existence until all pending projects are concluded.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robert C. Divine". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'R' and a distinct 'D'.

Robert C. Divine

Exhibit 1

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

CASE NO.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOEL N. BURSTEIN,

Defendant.

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND OTHER RELIEF

Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission alleges:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. From approximately June 2008 through March 2014, Defendant Joel N. Burstein aided and abetted violations of the antifraud provisions of the federal securities laws by substantially assisting a massive fraudulent scheme in which the Miami owner and the chief executive of a Vermont ski resort systematically looted more than \$50 million of the more than \$350 million raised from hundreds of foreign investors through the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service's EB-5 Immigrant Investor Program.

2. The fraudulent scheme spanned seven limited partnership securities offerings all connected to Jay Peak, Inc. ("Jay Peak"), a Vermont ski resort formerly owned by Miami-based Q Resorts, Inc. ("Q Resorts"), which in turn was owned by Miami businessman Ariel Quiros, who was primarily responsible for the fraudulent scheme.

3. Investor funds raised from the Jay Peak offerings were held in, and transferred into, about 15 brokerage accounts at Raymond James & Associates, Inc. ("Raymond James"),

and Quiros and the entities he controlled used those accounts to perpetrate the fraud. In fact, most of the investor money that Quiros misappropriated and misused flowed through the Raymond James brokerage accounts. Burstein, who was Raymond James's branch manager and the registered representative who managed the firm's Jay Peak accounts, was Quiros's son-in-law for part of the relevant time period.

4. Burstein substantially assisted in the fraud from its inception. For example, Burstein played a role in facilitating Quiros' misappropriation of more than \$21 million of investor money to acquire his ownership interest in the Jay Peak resort. After the acquisition, Burstein continued to play a role in the fraud by assisting Quiros in masking his misappropriation of the investor funds. In addition, Burstein facilitated Quiros' fraudulent use of more than \$18 million of investor funds to pay off Jay Peak's margin debt.

5. Through his conduct, Burstein aided and abetted violations of 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act") [15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)] and Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act"), 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Exchange Act Rule 10b-5, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5. Unless restrained and enjoined, Burstein is reasonably likely to engage in future violations of the federal securities laws.

II. DEFENDANT AND RELATED ENTITIES AND INDIVIDUAL

A. Defendant

6. **Burstein, 38**, previously resided in Miami, Florida and now resides in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. From April 2001 until he was terminated in December 2016 because of conduct relating to the Jay Peak fraud, Burstein was a registered representative associated with Raymond James, a registered broker-dealer and investment adviser. In

March 2013, Burstein became a branch manager at Raymond James before leaving the firm. Burstein holds, among others, Series, 6, 7, and 63 securities licenses.

B. Related Entities and Other Person Involved

7. **Jay Peak, Inc.** is a Vermont corporation with its principal place of business in Jay, Vermont. Jay Peak operates the Jay Peak Resort in Jay, Vermont. Jay Peak was the umbrella entity that controlled and was behind all of the Jay Peak issuers and their general partner companies. Jay Peak and the entities identified in paragraphs 8 through 11 below are now under the control of a Court-appointed Receiver.

8. **Jay Peak Hotel Suites, L.P.** (“Hotel Phase I”) is a Vermont limited partnership with its principal place of business in Jay, Vermont. Between December 2006 and May 2008, Hotel Phase I raised \$17.5 million through an EB-5 offering of limited partnership interests for the sole purpose of constructing a new hotel.

9. **Jay Peak Hotel Suites Phase II L.P.** (“Hotel Phase II”) is a Vermont limited partnership with its principal place of business in Jay, Vermont. Between March 2008 and January 2011, Hotel Phase II raised \$73 million through an EB-5 offering of limited partnership interests for the sole purpose of constructing a hotel, ice rink, indoor water park, and golf club.

10. **Jay Peak Biomedical Research Park L.P.** (“Biomedical”) is a Vermont limited partnership with its principal place of business in Newport, Vermont. Between November 2012 and April 2016, Biomedical raised approximately \$82 million through an EB-5 offering of limited partnership interests for the sole purpose of constructing a biomedical research facility.

11. **Q Resorts, Inc.** (“Q Resorts”) is a Delaware corporation with offices in Miami, Florida. Q Resorts wholly owned Jay Peak. Q Resorts acquired Jay Peak from a Canadian company in 2008, and essentially served as a project manager for the construction of many of the limited partnerships.

12. **Ariel Quiros**, age 61, resides in Key Biscayne, Florida. Quiros was the sole owner and officer of Q Resorts. He was also the chairman of the board of Jay Peak.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

13. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 20(b), 20(d), and 22(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(b), 77t(d), and 77v(a), and Sections 21(d), 21(e), and 27(a) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d), 78u(e), and 78aa.

14. The Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendant, and venue is proper in the Southern District of Florida because many of the Defendant’s acts and transactions constituting violations of the federal securities laws occurred in the district. In addition, during the relevant time period, the Defendant resided in the district.

15. In connection with the conduct alleged in this Complaint, the Defendant, directly and indirectly, singly or in concert with others, made use of the means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, the means or instruments of transportation and communication in interstate commerce, or the mails.

IV. FACTS

A. The Jay Peak Fraudulent Offerings

16. Between December 2006 and April 2016, Jay Peak offered and sold securities in the form of limited partnership interests in seven private placement offerings to investors, raising a total of approximately \$364 million from 728 investors from at least 74 countries.

The securities were offered and sold pursuant to the EB-5 Immigrant Investor Program. The limited partnerships involved in these offerings were: Hotel Phase I; Hotel Phase II; Jay Peak Penthouse Suites L.P.; Jay Peak Golf and Mountain Suites L.P.; Jay Peak Lodge and Townhouses L.P.; Jay Peak Hotel Suites Stateside L.P.; and Biomedical.

17. The first six limited partnerships centered on ski facilities, and involved the construction of hotels, lodges, condominium units, aquatic and recreation centers, cafes, golf, tennis and other facilities. The last offering, Biomedical, focused on the construction of a biotech manufacturing plant. The first six offerings were fully subscribed, and construction was completed for the first five limited partnerships.

18. Quiros and William Stenger, the other principal officer of both Jay Peak and the limited partnership entities, ran the operations. During the offerings, investors wired their investment amount to the respective limited partnership bank account at People's United Bank ("People's Bank"). Quiros also maintained brokerage accounts for the limited partnerships, and Jay Peak and the other affiliated companies he controlled, at a South Florida branch of Raymond James.

19. In April 2016, the Commission filed an emergency civil action against Jay Peak, the first seven Jay Peak limited partnerships, including Hotel Phase I, Hotel Phase II, and Biomedical, Quiros, Stenger, and others. The court granted the Commission's emergency relief, including a temporary restraining order, asset freeze, and the appointment of a Receiver. *SEC v. Ariel Quiros, et al.*, Case No. 1:16-cv-21301-DPG (S.D. Fla.). Since then, all the defendants charged in that action have settled with the Commission.

20. The complaint alleged, in part, that Quiros and his companies made false statements and omitted key information while raising more than \$350 million from investors

to construct ski resort facilities and a biomedical research facility in Vermont. Investors were told they were investing in one of several projects connected to Jay Peak, a ski resort operated by Quiros and others, and their money would only be used to finance that specific project. Instead, in Ponzi-like fashion, money from investors in later projects was misappropriated to fund deficits in earlier projects. More than \$200 million was allegedly used for other-than-stated purposes, including \$50 million spent on Quiros's personal expenses and in other ways never disclosed to investors.

21. Most of the investor money Quiros misappropriated or misused flowed through the Jay Peak-related brokerage accounts at Raymond James. Burstein was the registered representative who serviced those accounts, all of which Quiros controlled. Burstein was Quiros' son-in-law for part of the relevant time period.

B. Burstein's Role in the Jay Peak Fraud

1. Misuse of Investor Funds to Acquire Jay Peak

22. Burstein aided and abetted Quiros' fraudulent acquisition of Jay Peak. In June 2008, Quiros fraudulently used investor funds raised from the first two limited partnership offerings, Hotel Phase I and Hotel Phase II, to purchase his ownership interest in Jay Peak from the resort's previous owner, a Canadian company called Mont Saint-Sauveur International, Inc. ("MSSI").

23. Specifically, from January through June 2008, Quiros negotiated and finalized a stock transfer agreement between MSSI and Q Resorts, in which MSSI agreed to transfer the real estate and other assets of Jay Peak to Q Resorts.

24. Up until this time, MSSI had overseen the Hotel Phase I securities offering and part of the Hotel Phase II offering, which had already raised \$17.5 million and \$7.5 million

from investors, respectively. Jay Peak was the company that controlled and was behind both these limited partnerships and their general partner companies. Thus, by purchasing Jay Peak, Quiros, through Q Resorts, was able to take control of the business operations of these projects. The stock transfer agreement was signed on June 13, 2008, and the parties agreed to close on the deal 10 days later, June 23, 2008, for a purchase price of \$25.7 million.

25. Between June 16 and June 20, in preparation for the closing, MSSSI transferred Hotel Phase I and Hotel Phase II investor funds from accounts held at People's Bank to new brokerage accounts in the names of the limited partnerships that Quiros had requested MSSSI open at Raymond James. In conjunction with those transfers, MSSSI representatives provided instructions to Burstein, who was the registered representative and financial advisor on Quiros' and all the Jay Peak-related accounts at Raymond James, that the investor funds held in the MSSSI Raymond James accounts could not be used to pay for Q Resorts' purchase of Jay Peak.

26. Most particularly, in a June 18 letter emailed to Burstein (on which Quiros was copied) confirming their telephone conversation, counsel for MSSSI advised Burstein that the funds in the MSSSI Raymond James accounts were investor funds that were to be used in accordance with the terms of limited partnership agreements. The Hotel Phase I and Hotel Phase II limited partnership agreements prohibited borrowing and commingling of investor funds and from making the type of purchase Quiros made with respect to Jay Peak without investor consent.

27. The letter confirmed Burstein's assurances to MSSSI during their telephone call that the money in the accounts would not be used in any manner to finance the Jay Peak purchase, including as collateral or a guarantee. It further confirmed the claim he made to

MSSI that Raymond James would be lending Q Resorts the funds needed to finalize the transaction. After some additional e-mail communications between them, Burstein sent MSSI an email later the same day again assuring the company that Raymond James would be financing the deal and that no investor money would be used as collateral.

28. Notably, the previous day, Burstein had provided his direct supervisor with a draft of a “funding letter” he intended to send MSSI’s counsel that detailed some of the final steps needed to close the transaction. In this letter, Burstein falsely stated that Raymond James would be “provid[ing] financing” for Q Resorts’ purchase of Jay Peak. Burstein’s supervisor immediately revised the letter by specifically deleting the statement that Raymond James was financing the transaction and writing in instead that the firm was merely “wir[ing] funds” in connection with the closing. Nevertheless, Burstein ignored his supervisor’s revision, instead, reiterating to MSSI the false claim that Raymond James would be financing the deal.

29. On June 23, 2008, MSSI closed on the sale of Jay Peak to Q Resorts for a purchase price of \$25.7 million. That day, MSSI transferred the Hotel Phase I and Hotel Phase II investor funds that had been held in the MSSI Raymond James accounts to two other accounts in the names of the two partnerships at Raymond James that Quiros controlled. Quiros had opened those accounts on June 18, a few days before the closing. However, despite instructions from MSSI that the Hotel Phase I and Hotel Phase II investor money could not be used to pay for Q Resorts’ acquisition of Jay Peak, Burstein assisted Quiros in immediately redistributing the same investor funds back to MSSI to purchase Jay Peak.

30. Specifically, on the day of the closing, on behalf of Quiros, Burstein wired approximately \$13.5 million of investor funds to MSSI through an account in the name of Q

Resorts as partial payment for the Jay Peak purchase. Over the course of several months, he wired additional investor funds totaling \$8.1 million to MSSSI out of the Q Resorts account. All of this money was investor funds that had been transferred from the Hotel Phase I and Hotel Phase II brokerage accounts at Raymond James. In total, with Burstein's assistance, Quiros misappropriated more than \$21 million of Phase I and Phase II investor funds to purchase Jay Peak.

2. Attempts To Mask The Fraudulent Acquisition of Jay Peak

31. Even after the Jay Peak acquisition, Burstein continued to facilitate the fraud by assisting Quiros in masking his misappropriation of investor funds.

32. Quiros' fraudulent use of investor funds to purchase Jay Peak resulted in significant shortfalls in the Hotel Phase I and Hotel Phase II Raymond James brokerage accounts, including money needed for project construction. To make up for these shortfalls, in June 2008, Burstein helped Quiros secure margin loans from Raymond James in these accounts, with the assets of the limited partnerships impermissibly pledged as collateral. Quiros then began drawing against the accounts and used the borrowed money to pay for construction costs and other project expenses.

33. To give the appearance that the investor funds remained in the accounts, with Burstein's assistance, Quiros also purchased U.S. Treasury Bills on margin. Burstein was aware that Quiros purchased the Treasury Bills in those accounts solely for this reason.

34. Quiros and Burstein later tried to hide the margin debt and low cash balances reflected in the Hotel Phase I and Hotel Phase II accounts from Jay Peak's auditors. By February 2009, the two accounts had a combined margin loan balance of approximately \$23.8

million and positive ending balances totaling only about \$4 million. This was far short of the \$25 million in cash that should have been sitting in the accounts.

35. That month, in an apparent attempt to conceal those low cash balances from Jay Peak's auditors (who would be asking for confirmation of the value of the holdings in those accounts), at Quiros request, Burstein arranged for the margin debts to be moved to a new margin account opened under the name of Hotel Phase I at Raymond James. The debt was moved simply by paying off the margin balances in the Hotel Phase I and Hotel Phase II accounts using the cash from the new margin loan account.

36. As a result, those two accounts now reflected combined positive cash balances of more than \$27 million, consisting of unencumbered U.S. Treasury bills. However, this was just a ruse, as there was still a significant margin debt of \$23.8 million in the new consolidated account.

37. Emails Burstein sent contemporaneously show that he was aware that the new margin account was being opened to hide the Hotel Phase I and Hotel Phase II margin debt. For example, in a February 6, 2009 email to Quiros, Burstein wrote, "per our conversation yesterday, attached are the new documents to open up an account just to hold your margin debit." Later, Burstein sent an email to Raymond James' Customer Accounts department, asking that the margin debits from the two accounts be moved to the new margin account, and stating that he did not want the debits to appear on the statements.

38. Burstein continued to help Quiros hide his fraud by preparing and signing, at Quiros' behest, a letter addressed to Quiros, dated December 9, 2009. In the letter, which was on Raymond James letterhead, Burstein wrote that Raymond James received approximately \$13.5 million into the Hotel Phase I account in June 2008 from MSSSI's bank account.

39. The letter further represented that through November 30, 2009, Raymond James wired a total of \$13.45 million of that money from the Hotel Phase I account through Q Resorts for the construction of Hotel Phase I. This letter is misleading because Burstein knew that Quiros had used the money from MSSSI to acquire Jay Peak and that the funds that were actually wired for Hotel Phase I construction was money borrowed from Raymond James through a margin loan.

3. Misuse of Investor Funds To Pay-Off A Margin Loan

40. Burstein also aided and abetted Quiros' fraudulent use of more than \$18 million in investor funds from the Biomedical offering to pay off another margin account under the name of Jay Peak. Quiros opened the margin account in February 2012 and began drawing against it to pay for construction costs associated with some of the other Jay Peak projects. Moreover, Quiros also used approximately \$7 million from this margin loan to finance his purchase of another ski resort in Vermont called Burke Mountain Resort.

41. In March 2014, Quiros used about \$18 million of Biomedical investor funds to pay off the Jay Peak margin loan. As a result, Biomedical investors effectively funded some of the construction costs of other Jay Peak projects, and even more blatantly, paid for Burke Mountain.

42. As the registered representative on Quiros' accounts at Raymond James, Burstein played a significant role in facilitating this fraudulent transaction, while being aware that the \$18 million consisted of Biomedical investor funds. Burstein handled the transfer of the investor funds, which followed a circuitous route involving several accounts, seemingly to hide the misuse. Specifically, on March 4, 2014, Burstein facilitated Quiros' transfer of \$18.2

million from the Biomedical account at Raymond James to the Biomedical bank account at People's Bank.

43. That same day, he facilitated the transfer of the money back to Raymond James, where it was then deposited into an account in the name of another entity controlled by Quiros, Jay Construction Management, Inc. ("JCM"), which had been established purportedly to pay bills from outside vendors related to construction on the Jay Peak projects. The following day, the money was transferred from that account to the Jay Peak account where it was used to pay off the margin debt.

44. The roundabout transfer of investor money from Raymond James to People's Bank and then back to Raymond James on the same day served no legitimate purpose. Apparently, this movement of money was designed to muddy and confuse the actual use of Biomedical investor funds and create the false appearance that the money was being used to pay for construction related costs for the project.

45. Burstein allayed questions from Raymond James personnel in its customer accounts and anti-money laundering departments about this unusual flow of funds by falsely claiming that it was for "accounting purposes" without providing any specific details of what that meant.

46. Besides helping transfer the funds, Burstein facilitated this fraudulent transaction by processing the Letters of Authorization, and other paperwork and approvals needed to move the Biomedical funds at the direction of Quiros. He also worked with Raymond James' customer accounts department to come up with the "pay off plan" for the Jay Peak margin loan.

V. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT 1

Aiding and Abetting Violations of Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 of the Exchange Act

47. The Commission repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 46 of its Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

48. Between approximately June 2008 and March 2014, Burstein, directly or indirectly, knowingly or recklessly provided substantial assistance to persons who, directly or indirectly, singly or in concert with others, in connection with the purchase or sale of a security, with scienter, used the means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange: (a) to employ devices, schemes or artifices to defraud; (b) to make untrue statements of material facts or omit to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; or (c) to engage in acts, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon any person in connection with the purchase or sale of any security.

49. By reason of the foregoing, Burstein aided and abetted and, unless enjoined, is reasonably likely to continue to aid and abet violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5.

COUNT 2

Aiding and Abetting Violations of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act

50. The Commission repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 46 of its Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

51. Between approximately February 2012 and March 2014, Burstein, directly or indirectly, knowingly or recklessly provided substantial assistance to persons who, directly or indirectly, singly or in concert with others, in the offer or sale of a security, used the means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or of the mails, or of a facility of a national securities exchange: (a) to knowingly or recklessly employ devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud; (b) to negligently obtain money or property by means of untrue statements of material fact or omissions to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; or (c) to negligently engage in transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon purchasers of the securities.

52. By reason of the foregoing, Burstein aided and abetted and, unless enjoined, is reasonably likely to continue to aid and abet violations of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77q(a).

VI. RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court find Burstein aided and abetted violations of the federal securities laws alleged herein and

A.

Permanent Injunction

Issue a permanent injunction restraining and enjoining Burstein, and his officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, representatives, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, and each of them, from violating the federal securities laws alleged in this complaint.

B.

Civil Penalty

Issue an Order directing Burstein to pay a civil money penalty pursuant to Section 20(d) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77t(d), and Section 21(d) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78(d).

C.

Further Relief

Grant such other and further relief as may be necessary and appropriate.


D.

Retention of Jurisdiction

Further, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court retain jurisdiction over this action in order to implement and carry out the terms of all orders and decrees that may be entered, or to entertain any suitable application or motion by the Commission for additional relief within the jurisdiction of this Court.

September 6, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Robert K. Levenson, Esq.
Senior Trial Counsel
Florida Bar No. 0089771
Direct Dial: (305) 982-6341
Email: levensonr@sec.gov

Christopher E. Martin, Esq.
Senior Trial Counsel
SD Fla. Bar No. A5500747
Direct Dial: (305) 982-6386
Email: martinc@sec.gov

Trisha D. Sindler
Senior Counsel
Fla. Bar No 773492
Direct Dial: (305) 982-6352
E-mail: fuchst@sec.gov

Brian Theophilus James
Senior Counsel
Fla. Bar No. 431842
Direct Dial: (305) 982-6335
E-mail: jamesb@sec.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff
U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
801 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1800
Miami, Florida 33131
Telephone: (305) 982-6300
Facsimile: (305) 536-4154

Exhibit 2



U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Company Filings | More Search Options

[ABOUT](#) [DIVISIONS & OFFICES](#) [ENFORCEMENT](#) [REGULATION](#) [EDUCATION](#) [FILINGS](#) [NEWS](#)

ENFORCEMENT

Accounting and Auditing
Enforcement Releases

Administrative
Proceedings

ALJ Initial Decisions

ALJ Orders

Amicus / Friend of the
Court Briefs

Fair Funds

Information for Harmed
Investors

Litigation Releases

Opinions and
Adjudicatory Orders

Receiverships

Stop Orders

Trading Suspensions

SEC Charges Former Raymond James Branch Manager for Facilitating a Massive EB-5 Fraud

Litigation Release No. 24259 / September 6, 2018

*Securities and Exchange Commission v. Joel N. Burstein, Civil
Action No. 18-cv-23636 (S.D. Fla. 2018).*

On September 6, 2018, the Securities and Exchange Commission filed charges against Joel N. Burstein, a former registered representative and branch manager with Raymond James & Associates, Inc. for helping facilitate an EB-5 offering fraud perpetrated by Jay Peak, Inc., a Vermont-based ski resort, its former principal, Ariel Quiros, and other related entities.

[► SEC Complaint](#)
[► LR-23520](#)

The SEC's complaint, filed in federal district court in Miami, Florida alleges Burstein aided and abetted Quiros' misappropriation and misuse of investor money that flowed through various brokerage accounts held at Raymond James. Burstein, who is Quiros' former son-in-law, managed those accounts. According to the SEC's complaint, Burstein facilitated Quiros' misappropriation of more than \$21 million of investor funds to acquire the Jay Peak ski resort. Burstein then assisted Quiros in trying to mask the significant shortfall created in the Raymond James brokerage accounts from the misappropriation. The complaint also alleges that Burstein facilitated Quiros' fraudulent use of more than \$18 million of investor money to pay off Jay Peak's margin debt at Raymond James.

On April 12, 2016, the SEC filed an emergency civil action against Ariel Quiros, Jay Peak, and others, for engaging in an offering fraud in which, among other things, Quiros systematically misappropriated and misused investor funds. Securities and Exchange Commission v. Ariel Quiros, et al., Case No. 16-cv-21301-Gayles (S.D. Fla. 2016).

Without admitting or denying the SEC's allegations, Burstein has consented to the entry of a final judgment permanently enjoining him from future violations of the antifraud provisions of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933, Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Rule 10b-5 and ordering him to pay a civil penalty of \$80,000. Burstein also settled, without admitting or denying the findings, to an SEC order that bars him from association with any broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer, transfer agent, or nationally recognized statistical rating organization, and from participating in an offering of penny stock, with the right to apply for reentry after 10 years.

The SEC's investigation was conducted by Trisha Sindler and Brian Theophilus James in the Miami Regional Office, and supervised by Chedly C. Dumornay.

Modified: September 6, 2018

[Site Map](#) | [Accessibility](#) | [Contracts](#) | [Privacy](#) | [Inspector General](#) | [Agency Financial Report](#) | [Budget & Performance](#) | [Careers](#) | [Contact](#)
[FOIA](#) | [No FEAR Act & EEO Data](#) | [Whistleblower Protection](#) | [Ombudsman](#) | [Votes](#) | [Open Government](#) | [Plain Writing](#) | [Links](#) | [Investor.gov](#) | [USA.gov](#)

Exhibit 3

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO.: 1:18-cv-23636-MORENO/LOUIS

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOEL N. BURSTEIN,

Defendant.

**FINAL JUDGMENT AS TO
DEFENDANT JOEL N. BURSTEIN**

The Securities and Exchange Commission having filed a Complaint and Defendant Joel N. Burstein (“Defendant”) having entered a general appearance; consented to the Court’s jurisdiction over Defendant and the subject matter of this action; consented to entry of this Final Judgment without admitting or denying the allegations of the Complaint (except as to jurisdiction and except as otherwise provided herein in paragraph V); waived findings of fact and conclusions of law; and waived any right to appeal from this Final Judgment:

I.

SECTION 17(a) OF THE SECURITIES ACT

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Defendant is permanently restrained and enjoined from violating Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (the “Securities Act”) [15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)] in the offer or sale of any security by the use of any means

or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails, directly or indirectly:

- (a) to employ any device, scheme, or artifice to defraud;
- (b) to obtain money or property by means of any untrue statement of a material fact or any omission of a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading;
or
- (c) to engage in any transaction, practice, or course of business which operates or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser,

by, directly or indirectly: (i) creating a false appearance or otherwise deceiving any person, concerning any investment in or offering of securities, the use of investor funds or investment proceeds, or the misappropriation of investor funds or investment proceeds; or (ii) disseminating false or misleading documents, materials, or information to any investor or prospective investor, or making, either orally or in writing, any false or misleading statement in any communication with any investor or prospective investor, concerning any investment in or offering of securities, the use of investor funds or investment proceeds, or the misappropriation of investor funds or investment proceeds.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that, as provided in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(d)(2), the foregoing paragraph also binds the following who receive actual notice of this Final Judgment by personal service or otherwise: (a) Defendant's officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys; and (b) other persons in active concert or participation with Defendant or with anyone described in (a).

II.

SECTION 10(b) AND RULE 10b-5 OF THE EXCHANGE ACT

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Defendant is permanently restrained and enjoined from violating, directly or indirectly, Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) [15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)] and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5], by using any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce, or of the mails, or of any facility of any national securities exchange, in connection with the purchase or sale of any security:

- (a) to employ any device, scheme, or artifice to defraud;
- (b) to make any untrue statement of a material fact or to omit to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; or
- (c) to engage in any act, practice, or course of business which operates or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon any person.

by, directly or indirectly: (i) creating a false appearance or otherwise deceiving any person, concerning any investment in or offering of securities, the use of investor funds or investment proceeds, or the misappropriation of investor funds or investment proceeds; or (ii) disseminating false or misleading documents, materials, or information to any investor or prospective investor, or making, either orally or in writing, any false or misleading statement in any communication with any investor or prospective investor, concerning any investment in or offering of securities, the use of investor funds or investment proceeds, or the misappropriation of investor funds or investment proceeds.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that, as provided in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(d)(2), the foregoing paragraph also binds the following who receive actual notice of this Final Judgment by personal service or otherwise: (a) Defendant's officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys; and (b) other persons in active concert or participation with Defendant or with anyone described in (a).

III.

CIVIL PENALTY

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Defendant shall pay a civil penalty in the amount of \$80,000 to the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to Section 20(d) of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77t(d)] and Section 21(d) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)]. Defendant shall make this payment within 14 days after entry of this Final Judgment.

Defendant may transmit payment electronically to the Commission, which will provide detailed ACH transfer/Fedwire instructions upon request. Payment may also be made directly from a bank account via Pay.gov through the SEC website at <http://www.sec.gov/about/offices/ofm.htm>. Defendant may also pay by certified check, bank cashier's check, or United States postal money order payable to the Securities and Exchange Commission, which shall be delivered or mailed to

Enterprise Services Center
Accounts Receivable Branch
6500 South MacArthur Boulevard
Oklahoma City, OK 73169

and shall be accompanied by a letter identifying the case title, civil action number, name of this Court, and Joel N. Burstein as a defendant in this action; and specifying that payment is made pursuant to this Final Judgment.

Defendant shall simultaneously transmit photocopies of evidence of payment and case identifying information to the Commission's counsel in this action. By making this payment, Defendant relinquishes all legal and equitable right, title, and interest in such funds and no part of the funds shall be returned to Defendant. The Commission shall send the funds paid pursuant to this Final Judgment to the United States Treasury. Defendant shall pay post-judgment interest on any delinquent amounts pursuant to 28 USC § 1961.

IV.

INCORPORATION OF CONSENT

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the Consent is incorporated herein with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein, and that Defendant shall comply with all of the undertakings and agreements set forth therein.

V.

BANKRUPTCY NONDISCHARGEABILITY

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that, solely for purposes of exceptions to discharge set forth in Section 523 of the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. §523, the allegations in the complaint are true and admitted by Defendant, and further, any debt for disgorgement, prejudgment interest, civil penalty or other amounts due by Defendant under this Final Judgment or any other judgment, order, consent order, decree or settlement agreement entered in connection with this proceeding, is a debt for the violation by Defendant of the federal securities laws or any regulation or order issued under such laws, as set forth in Section 523(a)(19) of the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. §523(a)(19).

VI.

RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that this Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter for the purposes of enforcing the terms of this Final Judgment.

DONE and ORDERED in Chambers at Miami, Florida, this 14 day of September, 2018.



FEDERICO A. MORENO
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies furnished to:

Counsel of Record

ORIGIN ID: CHAA (423) 756-2010
KATHLEEN HARRISON
BAKER DONELSON BEARMAN CALDWEL
633 CHESTNUT STREET
SUITE 1900
CHATTANOOGA, TN 37450
UNITED STATES US

SHIP DATE: 18SEP18
ACTWGT: 0.50 LB
CAD: 111332957/INET4040

BILL SENDER

TO USCIS
ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE
20 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., N.W.,
MS 2090
WASHINGTON DC 20529


552,11F78C,DC045

(423) 209-4123

REF: 2939047-000001

INV.
PO

DEPT




WED - 19 SEP 10:30A
PRIORITY OVERNIGHT

TRK# 7732 5723 8329
0201

XC RDVA

20529
DC-US IAD



After printing this label:

1. Use the 'Print' button on this page to print your label to your laser or inkjet printer.
2. Fold the printed page along the horizontal line.
3. Place label in shipping pouch and affix it to your shipment so that the barcode portion of the label can be read and scanned.

Warning: Use only the printed original label for shipping. Using a photocopy of this label for shipping purposes is fraudulent and could result in additional billing charges, along with the cancellation of your FedEx account number.

Use of this system constitutes your agreement to the service conditions in the current FedEx Service Guide, available on fedex.com. FedEx will not be responsible for any claim in excess of \$100 per package, whether the result of loss, damage, delay, non-delivery, misdelivery, or misinformation, unless you declare a higher value, pay an additional charge, document your actual loss and file a timely claim. Limitations found in the current FedEx Service Guide apply. Your right to recover from FedEx for any loss, including intrinsic value of the package, loss of sales, income interest, profit, attorney's fees, costs, and other forms of damage whether direct, incidental, consequential, or special is limited to the greater of \$100 or the authorized declared value. Recovery cannot exceed actual documented loss. Maximum for items of extraordinary value is \$1,000, e.g. jewelry, precious metals, negotiable instruments and other items listed in our ServiceGuide. Written claims must be filed within strict time limits, see current FedEx Service Guide.

THIS NOTICE DOES NOT GRANT ANY IMMIGRATION STATUS OR BENEFIT.

NOTICE TYPE Receipt		NOTICE DATE August 10, 2018
CASE TYPE I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion		USCIS ALIEN NUMBER
RECEIPT NUMBER AAO1890000630	RECEIVED DATE August 06, 2018	PAGE 1 of 1
		DATE OF BIRTH

VERMONT AGENCY OF COMMERCE AND
C/O ROBERT C. DIVINE BAKER DONELSON BEARMAN CALD
633 CHESTNUT STREET SUITE 1900
CHATTANOOGA, TN 37450



NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS

PAYMENT INFORMATION:

Application/Petition Fee: \$675.00
Biometrics Fee: \$0.00
Total Amount Received: \$675.00
Total Balance Due: \$0.00

The above case has been received by our office and is in process.

Please verify your personal information listed above and immediately notify the USCIS National Customer Service Center at the phone number listed below if there are any changes.

Please note that if a priority date is printed on this notice, the priority does not reflect earlier retained priority dates.

If you have questions about possible immigration benefits and services, filing information, or USCIS forms, please call the USCIS National Customer Service Center (NCSC) at **1-800-375-5283**. If you are hearing impaired, please call the NCSC TDD at **1-800-767-1833**. Please also refer to the USCIS website: www.uscis.gov.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this notice or the status of your case, please contact our customer service number.

You will be notified separately about any other case you may have filed.

USCIS Office Address:
USCIS/Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
MS2090
20 Massachusetts Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20529-2090

USCIS Customer Service Number:
(800)375-5283
ATTORNEY COPY

