

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Before the

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

Release No. 103229 / June 11, 2025

WHISTLEBLOWER AWARD PROCEEDING

File No. 2025-37

---

In the Matter of the Claims for Awards

in connection with

Redacted

Redacted

Notice of Covered Action Redacted

---

**ORDER DETERMINING WHISTLEBLOWER AWARD CLAIMS**

The Claims Review Staff (“CRS”) issued Preliminary Determinations recommending the denial of the whistleblower award claims submitted by Redacted (“Claimant 4”) and Redacted (“Claimant 6”) (collectively “Claimants”) in connection with the above-referenced covered action (the “Covered Action”). Claimant 4 and Claimant 6 filed timely responses contesting the preliminary denials.<sup>1</sup> For the reasons discussed below, the CRS’s recommendations are adopted and the award claims of Claimant 4 and Claimant 6 are denied.

**I. Background**

**A. The Covered Action**

The Commission brought enforcement actions Redacted, including the above-referenced Covered Action. The Commission found that the respondent had violated Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

securities laws, and to

Redacted

, in violation of the federal

---

<sup>1</sup> The CRS also recommended the denial of the award applications of four other claimants, three of whom did not contest the Preliminary Determination (“Claimants 2, 3 and 5”) and one of whom withdrew his/her award application (“Claimant 1”). As a result, the Preliminary Determinations with respect to Claimants 2, 3 and 5 became the Final Order of the Commission through operation of Exchange Act Rule 21F-10(f), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-10(f).

Redacted Among other relief, the Commission ordered that the respondent pay Redacted Redacted. The Office of the Whistleblower (“OWB”) posted a Notice for the Covered Action on the Commission’s public website inviting claimants to submit whistleblower award applications within 90 days. Claimants filed timely whistleblower award claims.

## B. The Preliminary Determinations

The CRS issued Preliminary Determinations recommending that the Claimants’ award claims be denied because their information did not lead to the success of the Covered Action. The CRS determined that the Commission investigation that led to the bringing of the Covered Action (the “Covered Action Investigation”) was not opened based on information provided by Claimants. Further, Claimants’ information was not received or used by the staff handling the Covered Action,<sup>2</sup> and those staff members otherwise had no contact with the Claimants.

## C. Claimants’ Responses to the Preliminary Determinations

Claimants 4 and 6 submitted timely written responses contesting the Preliminary Determinations.

### 1. Claimant 4

Claimant 4 argues in his/her reconsideration request that Claimant 4’s contributions to an earlier Commission enforcement action against Redacted (the “Other Entity”) for similar Redacted misconduct was a “pivotal catalyst” and foundation for the Commission’s opening of the Covered Action Investigation. Claimant 4 asserts that his/her internal whistleblowing to the Other Entity led the Other Entity to self-report these violations to the Commission which, in turn, led the Commission to open an investigation into the Other Entity (the “Other Entity Investigation”) and, ultimately, with the assistance of Claimant 4’s later detailed tip and other information, including sworn testimony, led to the success of the Commission’s enforcement action against the Other Entity (the “Other Entity Action”).<sup>3</sup> Claimant 4 notes that one of the staff declarations in the record specifically stated the Covered Action Investigation was opened when staff assigned to a \*\*\* investigation Redacted discovered, in response to an investigative subpoena of the Other Entity, the existence Redacted

Redacted. Claimant 4 argues that this discovery, along with, to a lesser extent, information the staff learned from news coverage and conversations with other SEC attorneys, showed that the Other Entity was not the only Redacted that was committing Redacted. Claimant 4 maintains, however, that this declaration failed

---

<sup>2</sup> The Covered Action Investigation consisted of an investigation into Redacted Redacted.

<sup>3</sup> The Commission issued a final order awarding Claimant 4 a Redacted whistleblower award for his/her substantial assistance in the Other Entity Action. Redacted

to disclose the key impact Claimant 4's contributions to the Other Entity Investigation had on the decision to open the Covered Action Investigation, noting that while the declarant proposed the opening of the Covered Action Investigation, the declarant was not the person who actually authorized the opening of the investigation. Claimant 4 asserts that the record needs to include a sworn declaration from the person(s) who did authorize the opening of the Covered Action Investigation and that this declaration would show the staff's awareness of the critical importance of the Other Entity's self-report and the information Claimant 4 subsequently provided to the Other Entity Investigation in the decision to open the Covered Action Investigation. Claimant 4 also argues that the reason the Other Entity was able to <sup>Redacted</sup> <sup>Redacted</sup> in response to the Commission's subpoena was because the Other Entity <sup>Redacted</sup> as a direct result of Claimant 4 having reported his/her allegations to the Other Entity.

Claimant 4 further argues that, even if the Covered Action Investigation staff did not receive his/her information, Claimant 4's information should, nevertheless, be credited as having satisfied the "led to" requirements of Rule 21F-4(c)(3),<sup>4</sup> which credit a whistleblower who reports original information through an entity's internal compliance procedures with the information the entity then provides the Commission based on the whistleblower's information and/or the results of the entity's investigation initiated in response to the whistleblower's information.<sup>5</sup> Claimant 4 asserts that the information the Commission received from the Other Entity's self-report should be credited to Claimant 4 under the provisions of this rule and, given the purported importance of the self-report to the decision to open the Covered Action Investigation, Claimant 4 should be deemed to have provided information that led to the success of the Covered Action.

Claimant 4 additionally contends that he/she is entitled to an award for the Covered Action since the Other Entity Action, for which Claimant 4 received a whistleblower award (the "Other Entity Action Award"), shares "the same nucleus of operative facts" with the Covered Action and thus, pursuant to Exchange Act Rule 21F-4(d)(1), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-4(d)(1), is deemed to be the same action for purposes of determining whistleblower award eligibility for the Covered Action. Claimant 4 disputes the CRS's determination that the Other Entity Action did not arise from the same nucleus of operative facts as the Covered Action because the Other Entity Action involved different time periods and different actors than those involved in the Covered Action. Claimant 4 argues that, in fact, the Other Entity Action and the Covered Action "constitute one and the same action" and that Claimant 4, therefore, is eligible to receive a whistleblower award for the Covered Action based on his/her contributions to the Other Entity Action.

---

<sup>4</sup> Exchange Act Rule 21F-4(c)(3), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-4(c)(3).

<sup>5</sup> Claimant 4 disputes the CRS's determination that he/she did not qualify under this provision because Claimant 4 provided the information to the Commission more than 120 days after providing it to the Other Entity. Claimant 4 asserts that he/she did provide the Commission with information within 120 days after providing it to the Other Entity. Claimant 4 requests that, if he/she were deemed to have not provided information to the Commission within 120 days of providing it to the Other Entity, the Commission waive the 120-day requirement because of extraordinary circumstances, namely that he/she was retaliated against by the Other Entity and the failure of Claimant 4's then-attorney to alert Claimant 4 to the 120-day requirement for filing a TCR.

Claimant 4 also contends that the <sup>Redacted</sup> was based on Claimant 4's whistleblowing, that Claimant 4's information established the full dimension and context of the misconduct, and that the Commission used the Other Entity Action as the template for, and his/her information contributed to the process, findings <sup>Redacted</sup> in, the investigations and enforcement actions that followed the Other Entity Action.

Claimant 4 next asserts that the Commission's press release announcing the Other Entity Action specifically notes that <sup>Redacted</sup>

<sup>Redacted</sup> and since Claimant 4 provided important information that helped the Commission to bring the Other Entity Action (for which the Commission awarded him/her the Other Entity Action Award), Claimant 4 should also receive credit for the investigation that resulted in the bringing of the Covered Action.

Claimant 4 also points to the fact that one of the supervisors of an investigation that resulted in the bringing of the Other Entity Action, and who attended Claimant 4's sworn testimony in that investigation, is also listed as a supervisor in the press release that announced the Commission enforcement actions brought <sup>Redacted</sup>

<sup>Redacted</sup> Claimant 4 contends that this supervisor must have transmitted to the staff that opened the Covered Action Investigation the issues Claimant 4 raised in his/her testimony and helped approve, shape, and assist with the decision to open the investigation.

Next, Claimant 4 argues that he/she should receive an award because Claimant 4's information caused the news coverage of <sup>Redacted</sup> which contributed to the staff's decision to open the Covered Action Investigation.

Finally, Claimant 4 argues that the materials he/she received in response to Claimant 4's request for the record materials are insufficient and should be supplemented with additional materials.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Among the materials that Claimant 4 requests be made a part of the record are: (1) the identity of all SEC personnel who viewed or received copies of Claimant 4's tip; (2) all internal and external communications from SEC personnel who implemented and approved the Covered Action Investigation, including the SEC's Chairman, the Director of the Division of Enforcement and other senior Commission officials; (3) the identity of the Commission personnel who <sup>Redacted</sup> with the Other Entity and the <sup>Redacted</sup> charged in the Covered Action; (4) whether these settlements were based on the Other Entity Action, and whether these personnel were familiar with Claimant 4's information; (5) SEC records of quarterly case review meetings, other staff meetings or communications, investigative plans and Hub System reports that reference Claimant 4's information; and (6) whether any SEC commissioner reviewed the Covered Action preliminary determination in advance of it being issued.

2. Claimant 6

Claimant 6 states that he/she was Redacted of the Covered Action respondent and that the Redacted shared Redacted. Believing that the Redacted actions were illegal, Claimant 6 decided to submit “an anonymous letter” to the Commission, providing a copy of the Redacted. Claimant 6 claims that his/her Redacted whistleblowing to the Commission led to his/her being ostracized by Redacted.

Claimant 6 further argues in his/her reconsideration submission that the CRS’s reliance on “highly redacted” staff declarations in its commended denial of his/her award claim threatens the whistleblower program’s “credibility” and “legitimacy,” and will have a “chilling effect” on future whistleblower’s participation in the program. Finally, Claimant 6 asserts that because the Commission investigated the Covered Action respondent after Claimant 6 submitted his/her tip, a “permissible inference” should be made to conclude that Claimant 6’s tip was the reason for either the opening of the Covered Action Investigation of the respondent, or that the tip significantly contributed to the success of the Covered Action itself.

**II. Analysis**

To qualify for an award under Section 21F of the Exchange Act, a whistleblower must voluntarily provide the Commission with original information that leads to the successful enforcement of a covered action.<sup>7</sup> Original information will be deemed to lead to a successful enforcement action if either: (i) the original information caused the staff to “commence an examination, open an investigation . . . or to inquire concerning different conduct as part of a current examination or investigation” and the Commission brought a successful action based in whole or in part on conduct that was the subject of the original information;<sup>8</sup> or (ii) the conduct was already under examination or investigation, and the original information “significantly contributed to the success of the action.”<sup>9</sup> In determining whether a whistleblower’s information “significantly contributed” to the success of the action, the Commission will consider whether the information was “meaningful” in that it “made a substantial and important contribution” to the success of the covered action.<sup>10</sup> For example, the Commission will consider a claimant’s information to have significantly contributed to the success of an enforcement action if it allowed the Commission to bring the action in significantly less time or with significantly fewer

---

<sup>7</sup> Exchange Act Section 21F(b)(1), 15 U.S.C. § 78u-6(b)(1).

<sup>8</sup> Exchange Act Rule 21F-4(c)(1), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-4(c)(1).

<sup>9</sup> See Exchange Act Rule 21-F-4(c)(2), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-4(c)(2).

<sup>10</sup> Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claims, Exchange Act Rel. No. 90922 (Jan. 14, 2021) at 4; *see also* Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claims, Exchange Act Rel. No. 85412 (Mar. 26, 2019) at 9 (same).

resources, or to bring additional successful claims or successful claims against additional individuals or entities.<sup>11</sup>

As an initial matter, we note that the record includes several sworn declarations from the Enforcement staff, which we credit,<sup>12</sup> including: (1) a declaration prepared by the staff attorney who proposed the opening of, and worked on, the Covered Action Investigation; (2) a declaration from a second attorney who worked on the Covered Action Investigation and the bringing of the Covered Action; (3) a declaration from a senior Enforcement attorney who reviewed the first declarant's proposal and was consulted on the decision to open the Covered Action Investigation; and (4) a declaration from a senior Enforcement attorney who supervised the Other Entity Investigation, as well as enforcement actions, other than the Covered Action, resulting from the Covered Action Investigation. Based on our review of the record, including the multiple declarations, we find that neither Claimant 4 nor Claimant 6 provided information that led to the success of the Covered Action.

Both Claimants suggest that because their information concerned the same sort of misconduct that was found to have occurred in the Covered Action, their information must have been used by the responsible Enforcement staff that investigated and worked on the Covered Action. However, the standard for award eligibility is not what the staff would have or could have done in hypothetical circumstances, but, rather, what impact a claimant's information actually has on the investigation.<sup>13</sup> That the Claimants' information bears a factual nexus to the findings in the Covered Action, and that Claimant 4's information was important to the success of the Other Entity Action, does not mean that their information "led to" the success of the Covered Action. Rather, the record, including multiple sworn staff declarations, supports the conclusion that neither Claimant provided information to the Commission that caused the opening of the Covered Action Investigation or significantly contributed to the Covered Action Investigation or the success of the Covered Action.

#### **A. Contentions Specifically Raised by Claimant 4**

Contrary to Claimant 4's supposition, the Other Entity Action resulted from \*\*\* separate Commission investigations, including the Other Entity Investigation to which he/she had submitted his/her information and provided testimony. The several declarations establish that it was the staff from a different investigation, and not from the Other Entity Investigation, that recommended the opening of the Covered Action Investigation. While one of the

---

<sup>11</sup> Exchange Act Rel. No. 85412 at 8-9.

<sup>12</sup> The whistleblower rules contemplate that the record upon which an award determination is made shall consist of, as relevant here, sworn declaration(s) provided by the relevant Commission staff, in addition to the publicly available materials related to the Covered Action, the claimant's tip, the claimant's award application, and any other materials timely submitted by the claimant in response to the Preliminary Determination. *See* Exchange Act Rule 21F-12(a), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-12(a).

<sup>13</sup> Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claims, Rel. No. 99670 (March 5, 2024); Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claim, Release No. 34-98655 (Sept. 29, 2023); Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claim, Rel. No. 34-97408 (May 1, 2023); Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claim, Rel. No. 34-96657 (Jan. 13, 2023).

supervisors of the Other Entity Investigation also supervised portions of the Covered Action Investigation (but not the bringing of the Covered Action), and did review Claimant 4's information and attended Claimant 4's sworn testimony in connection with the Other Entity Investigation, this supervisor provided a sworn declaration which we credit attesting that to the best of the supervisor's recollection, Claimant 4 did not provide information to the Other Entity Investigation staff

Redacted

Redacted

Nor, as noted, did the staff that opened the Covered Action Investigation receive Claimant 4's information from any other source. Finally, as noted, a sworn declaration from the staff that worked on and brought the Covered Action also attested that it did not receive Claimant 4's information.

Claimant 4 asserts that the staff declarations were deficient because they did not include a declaration from the supervisor(s) who approved the opening of the Covered Action Investigation, which, Claimant 4 argues, would have shown that the decision to open the Covered Action Investigation was "shaped by [the staff declarant's] supervisors' knowledge of [Claimant 4's] information" and "inevitably influenced by awareness of [Claimant 4's] information." However, OWB obtained a supplemental sworn declaration from the declarant's supervisor and, as noted, from a supervisor of the Other Entity Investigation (who also supervised portions of the Covered Action Investigation but not the part related to the Covered Action itself) to address Claimant 4's assertions. The declarant's supervisor confirmed the statements in the supervisor's first declaration that the decision to open the Covered Action Investigation was not based on any information that the staff received from Claimant 4 nor from information learned from the Other Entity self-report.<sup>14</sup> And, as noted above, the Other Entity Investigation supervisor attested that Claimant 4 did not provide information to the Other Entity Investigation staff showing that

Redacted

Redacted

Claimant 4 asserts that he/she should receive credit for the information and assistance he/she provided that contributed to the Other Entity Action since that action led to the Commission investigating including the subject of the Covered Action. However, the Other Entity

Redacted

Redacted

---

<sup>14</sup> The supervisor confirms that, like the first declarant, he/she was aware that the Other Entity had sent a self-report to the Commission but was not aware of the specific details of the self-report. In addition, the supervisor states that, at the time of the conception and opening of the Covered Action Investigation, the supervisor, like the first declarant, was not aware of Claimant 4's TCR or of the existence of its underlying factual allegations and did not become aware that Claimant 4 had submitted his/her whistleblower complaint to the Commission until well after the opening of the Covered Action Investigation.

Both declarants note that they had limited discussions with staff from the Other Entity Investigation prior to the opening of the Covered Action Investigation. The supervisor notes that these discussions were general in nature and did not delve into the specific information that that staff had received or learned from the Other Entity. Moreover, the supervisor attests that during these discussions, the Other Entity Investigation staff did not tell the supervisor about

Redacted

Redacted

The other declarant states that his/her discussions with the Other Entity Investigation staff prior to the opening of the Covered Action Investigation only helped to inform his/her understanding of the problems at the Other Entity in relation to and that he/she did not learn about the existence of problems at companies other than the Other Entity from the Other Entity Investigation staff.

Investigation supervisor stated that that Claimant 4 did not provide information to the Other Entity Investigation staff showing <sup>Redacted</sup>

Further, the declarations from the staff who participated in the decision to open the Covered Action Investigation and the supervisor of the Other Entity Investigation state that the Other Entity Investigation staff did not share Claimant 4's information with the staff that opened the Covered Action Investigation nor advise the staff that opened the Covered Action Investigation <sup>Redacted</sup>

Indeed, the Other Entity Investigation supervisor stated that he/she did not recall telling the staff who participated in the opening of the Covered Action Investigation about <sup>Redacted</sup>

that the Other Entity Investigation staff received, nor did he/she recall mentioning Claimant 4 to them or the information Claimant 4 provided to the Other Entity Investigation staff.

This is not to denigrate Claimant 4's contribution to the success of the Other Entity Action, a contribution that we recognized with an order directing the payment of a whistleblower award to Claimant 4.<sup>15</sup> However, the issue here in assessing Claimant 4's eligibility to receive a whistleblower award is not the importance of Claimant 4's contribution to the Other Entity Investigation and the Other Entity Action but, rather, whether Claimant 4's submission of information to the Commission caused the staff to open the Covered Action Investigation, inquire concerning different conduct as part of a current examination or investigation or provided information that significantly contributed to the success of the Covered Action. We conclude that Claimant 4's information did not cause the staff to open the Covered Action Investigation, inquire concerning different conduct as part of a current examination or investigation or significantly contribute to the Covered Action Investigation or the success of the Covered Action.

We also reject Claimant 4's argument that he/she is entitled to awards for the Covered Action, since the Covered Action shares "the same nucleus of operative facts" with the Other Entity Action. While the Other Entity Action concerned similar types of misconduct as that determined to have occurred in the Covered Action, the misconduct in the Other Entity Action involved different actors and somewhat different time periods<sup>16</sup> than that involved in the Covered Action.<sup>17</sup> Thus, we find that the Covered Action did not arise from the same nucleus of operative facts as the Other Entity Action.

---

<sup>15</sup> See *supra* note 3.

<sup>16</sup> While the Other Entity Action and the Covered Action concerned misconduct that occurred from <sup>Redacted</sup> <sup>\*\*\*</sup>, the misconduct in the Other Entity Action continued through <sup>Redacted</sup> and the misconduct in the Covered Action continued through <sup>Redacted</sup>.

<sup>17</sup> See Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claim, Exchange Act Rel. No. 98340 (Sept. 11, 2023) at 4 ("While the Associated Actions involved similar misconduct related to the Covered Action, the time periods of the misconduct in each case were different and they each involve different actors [and] [a]s a result, the Associated Actions do not arise from the same nucleus of operative facts and should not be aggregated together or with the Covered Action for purposes of making an award determination under Rule 21F-4(d)(1)"); Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claim, Exchange Act Rel. No. 96324 (Nov. 16, 2022) at 2 ("The record demonstrates that the Covered Action and the Second Action involved different and unrelated parties and transactions, which Claimant

We further reject Claimant 4’s assertion that he/she is eligible for an award because the Commission allegedly used the resolution of the Other Entity Action as a template for the settlement of the Covered Action. To qualify for an award under Section 21F of the Exchange Act, a whistleblower must have “voluntarily provided original information to the Commission that led to the successful enforcement of the covered . . . action.”<sup>18</sup> Rules 21F-4(c)(1) and (c)(2) specify that this “led to” requirement is satisfied if either “you gave the Commission original information that cause[d] the staff to . . . open an investigation . . . or to inquire concerning different conduct as part of a current examination or investigation” or “[y]ou gave the Commission original information about conduct that was already under examination and investigation by the Commission . . . and your submission significantly contributed to the success of the action.”<sup>19</sup> The focus of the inquiry is on claimant’s information, and Claimant 4’s argument that the Other Entity Action served as a template for the Commission’s settlement of the Covered Action does not address whether the *information* provided by Claimant 4 led to the success of the Covered Action under Rules 21F-4(c)(1) and (c)(2). As discussed, the information Claimant 4 submitted to the Commission was not shared with the staff that opened the Covered Action Investigation and was not helpful to the staff that worked on the Covered Action. Thus, the Commission need not decide whether the Other Entity Action was a template for the settlement of the Covered Action since Claimant 4’s information did not lead to the success of the Covered Action. Further, an interpretation that would grant an award for a template untethered to specific fact allegations would undermine the administrability of the whistleblower program by “introducing speculative and complex causal chains that would be difficult and impracticable in many instances for the Commission to investigate and evaluate.”<sup>20</sup>

Similarly, while Claimant 4 does not specify what is meant by providing a template or “playbook” for the Covered Action, even if Claimant 4 can be broadly construed to be arguing that he/she should receive an award based on speculation that the Other Entity Action pointed to a general area of enforcement interest though untethered to any specific information, that argument fails for the additional reason that such a submission does not qualify as “original information” with respect to the Covered Action. Only “*original information*” that “led to the successful enforcement of the covered . . . action” can qualify a claimant for an award.<sup>21</sup> Original information consists of either “independent knowledge” or “independent analysis.” Independent knowledge means “factual information in [claimant’s] possession that is not derived

---

concedes. The Second Action also was brought more than two years after the Covered Action. That the two enforcement proceedings allege similar violations of law does not mean that they arose from the same nucleus of operative facts.”).

<sup>18</sup> Exchange Act Section 21F(b)(1), 15 U.S.C. § 78u-6(b)(1).

<sup>19</sup> Claimant’s eligibility for an award under Rule 21F-4(c)(3) is addressed separately below.

<sup>20</sup> See Exchange Act Release No. 91253 (Mar. 4, 2021).

<sup>21</sup> Exchange Act Section 21F(b)(1).

from publicly available sources.”<sup>22</sup> Independent analysis means claimant’s “examination and evaluation of information that may be publicly available, but which reveals information that is not generally known or available to the public.”<sup>23</sup> Speculation as to the potential impact of a claimant’s submission regarding another action on general areas of enforcement interest untethered to any specific fact allegations from the award claimant regarding the covered action does not satisfy that threshold. Because such a submission would not qualify Claimant 4 for an award in any case, the Commission need not decide whether Claimant 4’s submission amounts to a template or “playbook” as described in this paragraph or served as a template or playbook for the Covered Action.

Regarding Claimant 4’s argument that he/she is eligible for a whistleblower award under Exchange Rule 21F-4(c)(3)<sup>24</sup> for the information the Other Entity provided the Commission as a result of Claimant 4 having first reported internally to the Other Entity, Claimant 4 does not meet the requirements of this rule. Rule 21F-4(c)(3) provides that if:

- \* a whistleblower reports original information through an entity’s internal whistleblower, legal or compliance procedures before or at the same time he or she reports it to the Commission;

- \* the entity provides the Commission with the whistleblower’s information or with the results of an investigation initiated in response to the whistleblower’s information;

- \* the information provided by the entity to the Commission “led to” successful enforcement under the criteria of Rule 21F-4(c)(1) or (c)(2) discussed above; and

- \* the whistleblower submits the same information to the Commission within 120 days of providing it to the entity,

then the whistleblower will receive full credit for the information provided by the entity as if the whistleblower had provided the information to the Commission.

While Claimant 4 satisfied the first two requirements of Rule 21F-4(c)(3) – he/she reported internally through the Other Entity’s internal whistleblower, legal or compliance procedures before or at the same time he/she reported it to the Commission, and the Other Entity provided the Commission with the results of an investigation initiated in response to Claimant 4’s information – Claimant 4 did not satisfy the third requirement of the rule – that the information the entity provided to the Commission satisfied the “led to” requirements of either paragraph (c)(1) (caused the Commission to commence an examination, open an investigation, reopen an investigation that the Commission had closed, or to inquire concerning different conduct as part of a current examination or investigation), or (c)(2) of the rule (as relevant here,

---

<sup>22</sup> Exchange Act Rule 21F-4(b)(2), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-4(b)(2).

<sup>23</sup> Exchange Act Rule 21F-4(b)(3), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-4(b)(3).

<sup>24</sup> Exchange Act Rule 21F-4(c)(3), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-4(c)(3).

significantly contributed to the success of the action). First, several staff declarations attested that no information from Claimant 4 was used in, or had any impact on, the charges brought by the Commission in the Covered Action. Second, the Other Entity Investigation supervisor also attested that Claimant 4 did not provide information to the Other Entity Investigation staff showing that

Redacted. Finally, both the staff attorney who proposed the opening of the Covered Action Investigation and that staff attorney's supervisor stated in their respective declarations that, while they were aware at the time the Covered Action Investigation was opened that the Other Entity Investigation had been opened Redacted based on a self-report the Other Entity had sent the Commission, they were not aware of the specific details of the self-report. While the supervising attorney had discussions with staff who worked on the Other Entity Investigation, including the Other Entity Investigation supervisor, both supervisors attested that the discussions were "general in nature" and did not extend to Redacted or into the specific information that the Other Entity Investigation staff had received or learned from the Other Entity. Rather, both the staff attorney and that attorney's supervisor attested that the Covered Action Investigation was opened as a result of the Covered Action Investigation staff's receipt, in response to its investigative subpoena to the Other Entity,<sup>25</sup> of information showing that

Redacted  
\*\*\*, as well as their discussions with other SEC attorneys (none of whom provided them with information from Claimant 4 or detailed information about the Other Entity's self-report), and in reading news coverage indicating that similar conduct had taken place Redacted

\*\*\*. Thus, Claimant 4's tip and the Other Entity's self-report did not cause the opening of the Covered Action Investigation, nor, as multiple staff declarations attest, did it contribute to the Covered Action Investigation itself or to the success of the Covered Action.<sup>26</sup>

We also reject Claimant 4's argument that he/she should receive an award because Claimant 4's information caused news coverage of Redacted, which contributed to the decision to open the Covered Action Investigation. Exchange Act Rule 21F-4(c) requires that information must be submitted to the Commission, not the news media, to qualify as information that led to the success of a covered action.

Finally, Claimant 4's argument regarding the alleged incompleteness of the record and his/her need to review additional materials is inapposite, and we deny Claimant 4's request for additional documents. The whistleblower rules permit an award claimant to request and to

---

<sup>25</sup> This subpoena was not issued by the staff on the Other Entity Investigation and was separate and apart from that investigation.

<sup>26</sup> Regarding the fourth requirement of Rule 21F-4(c)(3) – that the whistleblower submit the same information to the Commission within 120 days of providing it to the entity – Claimant 4 argues that the Commission should waive or grant an exemption for his/her arguable failure to have submitted the information within 120 days of providing it to the entity. We do not address this contention since the third requirement of Rule 21F-4(c)(3) was not met and, thus, the rule is inapplicable regardless of whether a waiver or exemption were granted.

receive a copy of the materials that formed the basis of the Preliminary Determination<sup>27</sup> but, as we have previously pointed out, “the whistleblower rules do not authorize a claimant to go on a fishing expedition to . . . obtain copies of the SEC’s entire investigative file.”<sup>28</sup> Similarly, the rules do not permit a claimant to investigate, or cause the Commission to investigate, how the staff utilized the information it received from a claimant.<sup>29</sup> The evidence in the record demonstrates that Claimant 4 requested and then was properly sent the record materials that formed the basis for the Preliminary Determinations.<sup>30</sup> Claimant 4 is not entitled to any extra-record materials.

## **B. Contentions Specifically Raised by Claimant 6**

Claimant 6 asserts that because the Commission investigated the Covered Action respondent after Claimant 6 submitted his/her anonymous tip, a “permissible inference” should be made to conclude that Claimant 6’s tip was the reason for either the opening of the investigation into the respondent, or, at least significantly contributed to the success of the Covered Action. Claimant 6 also argues that the CRS’s reliance on “highly redacted” staff declarations threatens the whistleblower program’s “credibility” and “legitimacy” Also Claimant 6 states that he learned from his/her participation in a “social network” that a Redacted Redacted of the Covered Action respondent had Redacted Redacted, and that this led Claimant 6 to report his/her allegations to the Commission via an anonymous tip, which eventually led to Claimant 6 being retaliated against by the social media chatroom. Regardless of Claimant 6’s arguments, the record, which includes three sworn staff declarations specifically addressing his/her arguments about having contributed to the Covered Action Investigation and the bringing of the Covered Action, supports the conclusion that Claimant 6’s tip was not seen or

---

<sup>27</sup> The Rules state that the record upon which an award determination is made shall consist of sworn declarations provided by the relevant Commission staff, in addition to the publicly available materials related to the particular covered action, the claimant’s tip, the claimant’s award application, and any other materials timely submitted by the claimant in response to the Preliminary Determination. *See* Exchange Act Rule 21F-12(a), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F12(a). There is no basis to disregard Rule 21F-12(a) and expand the record to include any of the additional documents requested by Claimant 4. *See* Exchange Act Rule 21F-12(b), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-12(b) (“These rules do not entitle claimants to obtain from the Commission any materials (including any pre-decisional or internal deliberative process materials that are prepared exclusively to assist the Commission in deciding the claim) other than those listed in paragraph (a) of this section [*i.e.*, Rule 21F 12(a)].”)

<sup>28</sup> Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claim, Exchange Act Rel. No. 94647 (Apr. 8, 2022) at 5; Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claim, Exchange Act Rel. No. 88973 (May 29, 2020) at 5. *See also* Exchange Act Rule 21F-12(b), 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-12(b) (noting that the whistleblower rules “do not entitle claimants to obtain from the Commission any materials (including any pre-decisional or internal deliberative process materials that are prepared exclusively to assist the Commission in deciding the claim) other than those listed in paragraph (a) of this section”).

<sup>29</sup> Order Determining Whistleblower Award Claim, Exchange Act Rel. No. 94647 (Apr. 8, 2022) at 5.

<sup>30</sup> The record materials include redacted versions of four staff declarations (which were redacted to protect the confidentiality of the other claimants), Claimant 4’s Form WB-APP, and Claimant 4’s TCR. Because Claimant 4 had previously submitted the Form WB-APP and the TCR to the Commission, those documents were omitted from the record package that OWB sent to Claimant 4; however, the Form WB-APP and the TCR are still part of the record.

reviewed by the Covered Action Investigation staff and, thus, did not lead to the success of the Covered Action.<sup>31</sup>

### **III. Conclusion**

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that the whistleblower award applications of Claimant 4 and Claimant 6 in connection with the Covered Action be, and they hereby are, denied.

By the Commission.

Vanessa A. Countryman  
Secretary

---

<sup>31</sup> Claimant 6 states that he/she was told that the Commission showed Claimant 6's tip to Redacted during its investigation. However, as noted above, several staff declarations state that the Covered Action Investigation staff neither received nor reviewed Claimant 6's tip.