

Cryptocurrency Litigation and Regulation Tracker

Last updated
January 21, 2025

The information on these pages is for informational purposes only and is derived from sources believed to be reliable as of the date first written. No representation or warranty is made regarding the accuracy of any statement or information in this document, nor as to the completeness of the information herein. All allegations in any complaint or regulatory action are only allegations; and no statements made in any of the linked materials should be interpreted as conclusive fact.

This tracker is not intended as a substitute for legal counsel, and is not intended to create a lawyer-client relationship or constitute legal advice. The impact of the law for any particular situation depends on a variety of factors. If you have questions, seek professional legal counsel.

Morrison Cohen LLP may represent one or more entities mentioned on these pages.

For more information, please contact the Morrison Cohen Digital Assets team:

Jason P. Gottlieb

*Partner & Chair, Digital Assets Department;
Chair, White Collar & Regulatory Enforcement Group*
212.735.8837
jgottlieb@morrisoncohen.com

Daniel C. Isaacs

Partner
212.735.8653
disaacs@morrisoncohen.com

Michael Mix

Partner
212.735.8747
mmix@morrisoncohen.com

William Roth

Counsel
212.735.8751
wroth@morrisoncohen.com

Rachel Fleder

Associate
212.735.8893
rfleder@morrisoncohen.com

Vani Upadhyaya

Associate
212.735.8827
vupadhyaya@morrisoncohen.com

Emma McGrath

Associate
212.735.8894
emcgrath@morrisoncohen.com

Index

Key Statutes and Regulations in Cryptocurrency Litigation.....	4
SEC Litigation and Administrative Proceedings.....	5
CFTC Litigation and Administrative Proceedings.....	76
DOJ and other Criminal Proceedings.....	101
Bankruptcy Proceedings	164
State Summary Suspensions and Settlements	168
Class Action and Other Private Litigation	175
Select U.S. Regulatory Pronouncements	272
Thought Leadership from Our Digital Assets Team	279

Key Statutes and Regulations in Cryptocurrency Litigation

The Securities Act of 1933		
		Summary description
Securities Act § 5	15 U.S.C. § 77e	Prohibitions relating to issuance of unregistered securities
Securities Act § 8A	15 U.S.C. § 77h-1	Cease-and-desist proceedings
Securities Act § 11	15 U.S.C. § 77k	Civil liabilities for false registration statements
Securities Act § 12	15 U.S.C. § 77l	Civil liabilities for prospectuses and communications
Securities Act § 15	15 U.S.C. § 77o	Liability of controlling persons
Securities Act § 17	15 U.S.C. § 77q	Fraudulent interstate transactions
Securities Act § 20	15 U.S.C. § 77t	Injunctions and prosecution of offenses
Securities Act § 24	15 U.S.C. § 77x	Penalties
Securities Act § 27	15 U.S.C. § 77z-1	Private securities litigation
The Exchange Act of 1934		
		Summary description
Exchange Act § 5	15 U.S.C. § 8e	Transactions on unregistered exchanges
Exchange Act § 10	15 U.S.C. § 78j	Manipulative and deceptive devices
Exchange Act § 17	15 U.S.C. § 78q	Records and reports
Exchange Act § 21	15 U.S.C. § 78u	Investigations and actions
The Commodity Exchange Act of 1936		
		Summary description
CEA § 2	7 U.S.C. § 2	Jurisdiction; transactions in interstate commerce
CEA § 4	7 U.S.C. § 6	Regulation of futures trading and foreign transactions
CEA § 5	7 U.S.C. § 7	Designation of boards of trade as contract markets
CEA § 6(c)	7 U.S.C. § 9	Prohibition regarding manipulation and false information
CEA § 22	7 U.S.C. § 25	Private rights of action
17 C.F.R. § 180.1		Prohibition on use of manipulative and deceptive devices
17 C.F.R. § 180.2		Prohibition on price manipulation
The Investment Advisers Act of 1940		
		Summary description
IAA § 206(1)	15 U.S.C. § 80b-6(1)	Manipulative and deceptive devices
IAA § 206(2)	15 U.S.C. § 80b-6(2)	Transaction, practice, or course of business that is fraud
Bank Secrecy Act of 1970		
		Summary description
31 U.S.C. § 5313 (see also 31 C.F.R. 1010.370)		Reports on domestic coins and currency transactions
31 U.S.C. § 5314 (see also 31 C.F.R. 1010.360)		Records and reports on foreign financial agency transactions
31 U.S.C. § 5317 (see also 31 C.F.R. 1010.830)		Search and forfeiture of monetary instruments
31 U.S.C. § 5318 (see also 31 C.F.R. 1010.810)		Compliance, exemptions, and summons authority
31 U.S.C. § 5321 (see also 31 C.F.R. 1010.820)		Civil penalties
31 U.S.C. § 5322 (see also 31 C.F.R. 1010.840)		Criminal penalties
31 U.S.C. § 5324 (see also 31 C.F.R. 1010.314)		Structuring transactions to evade reporting requirements
Criminal Statutes		
		Summary description
18 U.S.C. § 371		Conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States
18 U.S.C. § 1341		Mail fraud
18 U.S.C. § 1342		Fictitious name or address
18 U.S.C. § 1343		Fraud by wire, radio, or television
18 U.S.C. § 1344		Bank fraud
18 U.S.C. § 1348		Securities and commodities fraud
18 U.S.C. § 1349		Attempt and conspiracy
18 U.S.C. § 1621		Perjury
18 U.S.C. § 1956		Money laundering
18 U.S.C. § 1957		Engaging in transactions in money derived from unlawful activity
18 U.S.C. § 1960		Prohibition of illegal money transmitting business
18 U.S.C. § 1962		Prohibited activities under Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO)

SEC Litigation and Administrative Proceedings

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Digital Currency Group, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/17/2025	Administrative Proceeding	3-22427
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a)(3)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC and Digital Currency Group (DCG) agreed to a settlement regarding DCG’s alleged non-scienter fraud concerning statements regarding the financial health of a subsidiary, Genesis Global Capital (GGC), after one of GGC’s largest borrowers defaulted on loans. Without admitting or denying the allegations, DCG agreed to cease and desist from further violations, and pay a monetary penalty of \$38,000,000.</p> <p>On January 17, 2025, Michael Moro, former CEO of GGC, also settled charges brought against him in his personal capacity (File No. 3-22428), for his role. As part of the settlement, Moro agreed to pay a civil monetary penalty of \$500,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Nova Labs		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/17/2025	S.D.N.Y.	25-cv-539
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), 5(b), 17(a)(2), Exchange Act § 10(b), Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that Nova Labs sold tokens that were unregistered securities and misled the public about such securities, in part, via sales of three hotspot devices that mined Helium Network Token (“HNT”), the Helium Mobile Network Token (“MOBILE”), and the Helium IoT Network Token (“IOT”).</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Eric Zhu		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/16/2025	M.D. La.	25-cv-54
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 17(a)(1), 17(a)(3), Exchange Act § 10(b), Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that defendant engaged in a fraudulent scheme to deceive investors in connection with trading activity of the Game Coin (“GME”). Defendant was hired by the developers of GME to perform coding work for the coin, but, unbeknownst to the developers, defendant allegedly implemented coding that allowed him to withdraw GME from a liquidity pool that was publicly advertised as “locked” and sell such GME leading to a sudden 12% decline in the value of the token.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Commonwealth of Kentucky v. SEC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/14/2024	E.D. Ky.	24-cv-69
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Ultra Vires Executive Action; Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A), (C), (D)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>A group of state Attorneys General along with DeFi Education Fund brought an action against the SEC requesting that the court declare the SEC’s crypto policies, which allegedly usurp state authority, to be unlawful executive actions and to enjoin the SEC from bringing future enforcement actions against digital asset platforms. Plaintiffs further requested that the court should declare the SEC’s enforcement policies against digital asset platforms to be an abuse of discretion under the APA.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Cumberland DRW LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/10/2024	N.D. Ill.	24-cv-9842
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 15(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that Cumberland DRW, beginning in March of 2018, acted as an unregistered securities dealer by selling over at least \$2 billion of crypto assets that were alleged to be securities, including POL, SOL, ATOM, ALGO, and FIL, while failing to register as a securities dealer.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. CLS Global FZC LLC and Andrey Zhorzhes		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/9/2024	D. Mass.	24-cv-12590
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a)(1) and (3); Exchange Act § 9(a)(2), 10(b), Rules 10b-5(a),(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that defendants engaged in manipulative trading of clients’ crypto assets designed to create the false impression of market interest in the tokens traded by CLS. This manipulation was advertised by CLS itself, a so-called “market maker,” as a means for prospective clients to create artificial trading volume and benefit from artificial price swings.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Gotbit Consulting LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/9/2024	D. Mass.	24-cv-12589
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a)(1) and (3); Exchange Act § 9(a)(2), 10(b), Rules 10b-5(a),(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that defendants engaged in manipulative trading of clients' crypto assets designed to create the false impression of market interest in the tokens traded by Gotbit. As part of its market manipulation, Gotbit would advertise to clients its extensive wash trading capabilities and ability to pump a token's price so that clients could benefit from artificial trading that mimicked natural market activity.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. ZM Quant Investment LTD., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/9/2024	D. Mass.	24-cv-12587
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 17(a), (3); Exchange Act § 9(a)(2), 10(b), Rules 10b-5(a),(b),(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that defendants engaged in manipulative trading of clients' crypto assets designed to create the false impression of market interest in the tokens traded by ZM Quant. ZM Quant advertises itself as a market maker, but its alleged purpose is to manipulate the market to create false interest in traded tokens to mislead investors regarding the market for such tokens.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Russell Armand, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/9/2024	D. Mass.	24-cv-12586
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), 5(c), 17(a); Exchange Act § 9(a)(2), 10(b), Rules 10b-5(a),(b),(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that Defendants engaged in a scheme to manipulate the market for the Saitama Inu token through both coordinated small purchases to create the appearance of an organize market and the engagement of market manipulation firms such as ZM Quant and Gotbit to artificially inflate both price and trading volume.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Vy Pham, a/k/a "msyv_crypto"		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/9/2024	D. Mass.	24-cv-12588
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), 5(c), 17(a)(1), (3); Exchange Act § 9(a)(2), 10(b), Rules 10b-5(a).(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC alleged that defendant launched crypto assets, Saitama and Robo Inu Finance Token, as unregistered securities that were subsequently manipulated to create the appearance of market interest in both tokens.		

Filing / Order		
In re Mango Labs, LLC, Mango DAO, and Blockworks Foundation		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/27/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-7334
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), 5(c); Exchange Act § 15(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Settled complaint alleging that Mango Labs, LLC, Mango DAO, and Blockworks Foundation sold unregistered securities through Mango Markets, and served as an unregistered broker by facilitating such transactions. Defendants collectively agreed to pay nearly \$700,000 in civil penalties, and injunctive relief including the destruction of their MNGO tokens, requesting the removal of MNGO tokens from trading platforms, and refraining from soliciting any trading platform to allow trading in or offering or selling MNGO.		
The Blockworks Foundation agreed to pay a civil penalty of \$334,842, Mango DAO agreed to pay a civil penalty of \$223,238, and Mango Labs agreed to pay a civil penalty of \$116,614.		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. TrueCoin LLC and TrustToken, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/24/2024	N.D. Cal.	24-cv-6684
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), 5(c), 17(a)(2), 17(a)(3)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Settled complaint alleging that defendants sold unregistered digital asset securities, including one, TUSD, that was fraudulently advertised as being backed 1:1 by U.S. dollars.		
As part of a settlement, defendants agreed to cease further violations of securities laws, and to pay disgorgement of \$340,930, prejudgment interest of \$31,538, and a civil monetary penalty of \$163,766.		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Rari Capital, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/18/2024	C.D. Cal.	24-cv-7967
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), 5(c), 17(a)(3); Exchange Act § 15(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Settled complaint alleging multiple violations of the securities laws stemming from defendants' operation of the Earn and Fuse pools. It further alleged that such pools offered and sold securities without the necessary registrations and that defendants engaged in unregistered broker activities. Additionally, the SEC alleged that defendants made false and misleading statements regarding the Earn product to investors.		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. CoinW6, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/17/2024	C.D. Cal.	24-cv-7924
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), 5(c), 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC alleged that defendants engaged in a romance investment scam through developing relationships with investors over social media platforms and then inducing them to invest in an unregistered online crypto trading platform, which was falsely advertised to such investors. In total, defendants defrauded at least 11 investors out of \$2.2 million.		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Nanobit Limited, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/17/2024	E.D.N.Y.	24-cv-6517
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 17(a), 17a(1), 17(a)(3); Exchange Act § 10(b), Rules 10b-5, 10b-5(a), 10b-5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC alleged that defendants engaged in a relationship investment scam through posing as experienced financial professionals on social media and then inducing investors to invest in an unregistered online crypto trading platform, which was falsely advertised to such investors. In total, defendants defrauded at least 18 investors out of \$967,835.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Flyfish Club, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/16/2024	Administrative Proceeding	3-22114
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that defendant conducted an unregistered offering of crypto securities through the sale of NFTs, which generated gross proceeds of \$14.8 million.</p> <p>As part of a settlement, defendant agreed to destroy all Flyfish NFTs in its possession, remove links to crypto trading platforms from its website, stop accepting royalties from sales of Flyfish NFTs and pay a civil monetary penalty of \$750,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Galois Capital Management LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/3/2024	Administrative Proceeding	3-22043
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Advisers Act § 206(4), 206(4)-2, 206(4)-7, 206(4)-8, 206(4)-2(d)(6), 206(4)-2(d)(6)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that defendant misled investors regarding its redemption practices for the Galois Capital Alpha Fund, purchased crypto assets without ensuring that a qualified custodian maintained the securities, and failed to adopt and implement written compliance policies during the time period It was registered an investment advisor.</p> <p>As part of a settlement, defendant was ordered to cease further violations of the Advisers Act and pay a civil monetary policy of \$225,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Tanner S. Adam, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/26/2024	N.D. Ga.	24-cv-3774
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b), 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that defendants operated a crypto investing Ponzi scheme which led to \$53.9 million of the \$61.5 million raised by defendants to be misappropriated or used to pay interest, pay finders fees, and return principal to existing investors.</p> <p>On September 12, 2024, the court issued an asset freeze on defendants.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Plutus Lending, LLC d/b/a Abra		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/26/2024	D.D.C.	24-cv-2457
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), 5(c); Investment Company Act § 7(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Settled complaint alleging that Abra violated securities laws through selling and underwriting securities to retail investors through a program called Abra Earn without registering the offerings or registering as an investment company.		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. NovaTech LTD, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/12/2024	S.D. Fla.	24-cv-23058
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), 5(c), 17(a)(1), (a)(2); Exchange Act §§ 10(b), 10b-5, 15(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC alleged that NovaTech operated a fraudulent crypto trading investment and pyramid scheme that raised over \$650 million in crypto assets from over 200,000 investors.		

Filing / Order		
Jonathan Mann and Brian Frye v. SEC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/29/2024	E.D. La.	24-cv-1881
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
28 U.S.C. § 2201		
Plaintiffs, two artists who sell their art in the form of NFTs, seek a declaratory judgment that selling art as NFTs, including attaching royalties to such NFTs or marketing them to the public does not constitute an unregistered offer and sale of securities in violation of Section 5 of the Securities Act.		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Silvergate Capital Corporation, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/1/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-4987
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 17(a), 17(a)(2), (3); Exchange Act §§ 10(b), Rule 10b-5, 13(a), Rules 12b-20, 13a, 13a-1, 13a-11, 13a-13, 13(b)(5), 13(b)(2)(A), (13(b)(2)(B), 13b2-1		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC alleged that defendants made false or misleading statements regard the effectiveness of its Bank Secrecy Act and AML compliance programs, along with its financial wellbeing. Specifically, defendants allegedly misrepresented the operational and legal risks posted by crypto assets to its customers and that it had conducted extensive due diligence on such crypto assets.		

Filing / Order		
Consensys Software Inc. v. Gensler		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/25/2024	N.D. Tex.	24-cv-369
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Agency Action in Excess of Statutory Authority; Agency Action in Violation of the Due Process Clause; Agency Action in Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 701-706		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Litigation against the SEC regarding its attempt to regulate ETH as a security through ad hoc enforcement actions. Plaintiff seeks declaratory judgements finding, among others, that (1) ETH is not a security, (2) an enforcement action against Consensys on the basis of ETH being a security would violate due process, (3) offering services through MetaMask does not make Consensys a Broker under the Securities Act, and (4) permanent injunctive relief prohibiting the SEC from pursuing enforcement actions premised on ETH transactions being security transactions is proper. Case dismissed on 9/19/24 for mootness on the “ETH as a security” point (after the conclusion of the SEC’s “ETH 2.0” investigation), and for lack of subject matter jurisdiction for lack of a final agency action.		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Geosyn Mining, LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/24/2024	N.D. Tex.	24-cv-365
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act §§ 5(a), 5(c), 10(b), 20(b), 20(d), and 22(a); Securities Act §§ 17(a), 21(d), 21(e), and 27(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC charged Caleb Ward and Jeremy McNutt with selling unregistered and fraudulent securities through their crypto mining company, Geosyn, which allegedly failed to set up the mining rigs it purchased, obtain the favorable electricity rates it promised to investors, and offer the individualized mining opportunities described in offering documents.		

Filing / Order		
Crypto Freedom Alliance of Texas, et al. v. Securities and Exchange Commission, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/23/2024	N.D. Tex.	24-cv-361
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
5 U.S.C. § § 553, 706		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Litigation against the SEC regarding the Dealer Rule, which expands the SEC’s interpretation of Dealer to anyone engaged in trading activity that has the effect of providing liquidity. Plaintiffs seek declaratory judgements finding, among others, that (1) the Dealer Rule is arbitrary and capricious, (2) the Dealer Rule should be vacated, (3) the SEC should be enjoined from enforcing the Dealer Rule and (4) the effectiveness of the Dealer Rule is delayed pending the conclusion of the case.		

Filing / Order		
Beba LLC, et al. v. SEC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/25/2024	W.D. Tex.	24-cv-153
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Declaratory Judgment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Beba LLC, a small clothing company that launched BEBA tokens which can be redeemed for apparel, seeks declaratory judgements finding that (1) Beba’s first airdrop and planned second airdrop of BEBA tokens is not an unlawful sale of securities, (2) BEBA tokens are not investment contracts, and (3) the SEC violated the APA when it adopted a policy that nearly all digital assets are securities.		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Ismael Zarco Sanchez, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/14/2024	S.D. Texas	24-cv-939
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b), 15(a); Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5(a), (c), 17(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC alleged that CryptoFX conducted a Ponzi scheme that targeted over 40,000 predominantly Latino investors and raised more than \$300 million by falsely claiming to trade investor funds in the crypto-asset and foreign exchange markets. Out of the 17 individuals charged, two of the defendants, Serrano and Taffinder, without admitting or denying the allegations, consented to final judgements that permanently restrained and enjoined them from violating the federal securities law and agreed to pay more than \$68,000 in civil penalties, disgorgement, and interest.		

Filing / Order		
Coinbase, Inc. v. SEC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/11/2024	Third Circuit Court of Appeals	23-3202
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 701		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Coinbase alleged that the SEC’s failure to engage in rulemaking regarding digital assets violated the APA, and that the SEC’s failure to provide a reasoned explanation for its denial of Coinbase’s rulemaking petition is arbitrary and capricious.</p> <p>On January 13, 2025, the Third Circuit ruled that the SEC’s explanation for its denial of Coinbase’s rulemaking petition was conclusory and insufficiently reasoned, and therefore “arbitrary and capricious” under the APA. The court remanded to the SEC for a more complete explanation of the denial, but declined to order the agency to institute rulemaking proceedings.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of ShapeShift AG		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/5/2024	Admin Proc.	3-21891
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 15(a), (b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged ShapeShift AG, a Swiss company which previously operated out of Colorado, with allegedly acting as an unregistered dealer in the operation of its online crypto asset trading platform. Without admitting or denying the SEC’s findings, ShapeShift agreed to a cease-and-desist order and to pay a fine of \$275,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
LEJILEX, et al. v. Securities Exchange Commission, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/21/2024	N.D. Tex.	24-cv-168
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
28 U.S.C. §2201		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Claim requesting declaratory judgments finding: (1) that Legit.Exchange is not an unregistered securities exchange under 15 U.S.C. §78e, (2) that operating the Legit.Exchange will not make LEJILEX an unregistered broker under 15 U.S.C. §78o(a), (3) that operating the Legit.Exchange will not make LEJILEX an unregistered clearing agency under 15 U.S.C. §78q-1(b)(1), and (4) enjoining the SEC from bringing an enforcement action against LEJILEX or similarly situated CFAT members premised on any purported failure to register as securities exchanges, brokers, or clearing agencies.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Barnbridge DAO		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/22/2023	Admin Proc.	3-21817
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Investment Company Act 7(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that BarnBridge DAO failed to register BarnBridge’s offer and sale of structured crypto asset securities, known as SMART Yield Bonds, and allegedly operated BarnBridge’s SMART Yield pools as unregistered investment companies. To settle the SEC’s charges, Barnbridge DAO agreed to turn over nearly \$1.5 million of proceeds from the sales, cease the operation of its SMART Yield products, cease the development and maintenance of its protocols and website, and to publish the notice of this agreement on its website and channels.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Tyler Ward and Troy Murray		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/22/2023	Admin Proc.	3-21815
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Investment Company Act 7(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Tyler Ward and Troy Murray, the two founders of Barnbridge DAO, for the failure to register BarnBridge’s offer and sale of structured crypto asset securities (known as SMART Yield Bonds) and with allegedly operating BarnBridge’s SMART Yield pools as unregistered investment companies. Without admitting or denying the charges, Ward and Murray agreed to cease-and-desist orders and to each pay a \$125,000 civil penalty fine.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Payward, Inc. and Payward Ventures, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/20/23	N.D. Cal.	23-cv-6003
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act §§ 5, 15(a), 17A(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>After agreeing to discontinue its staking-as-a-service program and paying \$30 million in penalties in February 2023, Kraken is charged with operating its trading platform as an unregistered securities exchange, broker, dealer, and clearing agency.</p> <p>On February 29, 2024, the Montana Attorney General filed an amicus brief in support of neither party opposing the SEC regulation of crypto assets absent an investment contract because such authority has not been granted to the SEC by Congress.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Stoner Cats 2, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/13/2023	Admin Proc.	3-21655
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Stoner Cats 2, LLC with the alleged unregistered offering and sale of securities, in the form of the NFTs they offered and sold to the public. The SEC claimed the creators of Stoner Cats 2, LLC conducted an unregistered offering of crypto asset securities in the form of NFTs that raised \$8 million to finance a web series called Stoner Cats. Without admitting or denying the SEC’s findings, Stoner Cats 2 agreed to a cease-and-desist order and to pay a civil penalty of \$1 million. The order also required Stoner Cats 2 to destroy all Stoner Cats NFTs in its possession</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Linus Financial, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/7/2023	Admin Proc.	3-21627
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC settled with Linus Financial, Inc. for failing to register the offers and sales of Linus Interest Accounts, a retail crypto lending product offered to U.S. investors. The SEC declined to impose civil penalties because Linus Financial voluntarily ceased offering the product to new investors and asked existing investors to withdraw their funds after the SEC announced charges against a similar crypto product.</p>		

Filing / Order		
National Association (“NA”) of Private Fund Managers v. SEC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/1/2023	5th Cir.	23-60471
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
5 U.S.C. §§ 702–704, 706, 15 U.S.C. § 80b–13(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff requested a review of the final order of the SEC in <i>Private Fund Advisers; Documentation of Registered Investment Adviser Compliance Reviews</i>, Release No. IA6383 arguing that such rules exceed the SEC’s statutory authority, were adopted without proper notice-and-comment requirements, and are arbitrary and capricious in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act.</p> <p>On June 5, 2024, the court vacated the entirety of the questioned Rule on the grounds that the SEC lacked the necessary authority to enact it.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In The Matter of Impact Theory, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/28/2023	Admin Proc.	3-21585
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC settled with Impact Theory, a media and entertainment company, for allegedly offering and selling NFTs as investment contracts. The settlement requires that Impact Theory destroy all “KeyNFTs” in its possession or control within 10 days, and revise the smart contract(s) or any other programming code(s) or computer protocol(s) underlying the KeyNFTs to eliminate any royalty that Impact Theory might otherwise receive from any future secondary market transactions in KeyNFTs.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Titan Global Capital Management USA LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/21/2023	Admin Proc.	3-21569
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Investment Advisers Act Rule 206(4)-1		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC settled with Titan, a fintech investment adviser that offered investment strategies including the “Titan Crypto strategy,” for allegedly violating the Marketing Rule (Advisers Act Rule 206(4)-1, as adopted by the Commission in December 2020) by, among other things, improperly advertising hypothetical performance, failing to provide certain information underlying the hypothetical performance, and making misleading statements in advertisements.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Richard J. Schueler, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/31/23	E.D.N.Y.	23-cv-5749
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b), Rules 10b-5(a) and (c); § 17(a)(1) and 17(a)(3); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Richard Schueler for allegedly engaging in the unregistered offer and sale of the cryptocurrency assets Hex, PulseChain, and PulseX, and for defrauding investors. Between 2019 and 2022, Schueler raised more than \$1 billion, claiming that the investments were for the purpose of supporting free speech, but instead allegedly used the money for personal luxury purchases. The complaint seeks injunctive relief, disgorgement of ill-gotten gains plus prejudgment interest, penalties, and other equitable relief.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission v. Elbanna et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/21/2023	M.D. Fla.	8:23-cv-1638
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b), Rule 10b-5(a); Securities Act § 5, 17(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Elbanna with conducting fraudulent offers and sales of two unregistered crypto asset securities: Digital World Exchange (DWE) and Boostedpro Coin (BPC). To secure investors, Elbanna and his businesses made materially false and misleading statements to investors concerning Elbanna’s experience, wealth, potential investment risks, and the operation of a crypto asset trading platforms, which lost investors over \$1 million. Without admitting or denying the allegations, the defendants consented to a bifurcated settlement, that included permanent injunctions and monetary relief in an amount to be determined by the court.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Quantstamp, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/21/2023	Admin. Proc.	3-21535
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Quantstamp settled action with SEC for an unregistered initial coin offering of cryptocurrency asset QSP. The settlement requires disgorgement of \$1,979,201, prejudgment interest of \$494,314, and a civil money penalty of \$1,000,000 (for a total payment of \$3,473,515); and requires Quantstamp to transfer all QSP in its possession or control to a Fund Administrator, to enable the Fund Administrator to destroy or permanently disable such QSP.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Digital Licensing Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/26/2023	N.D. Utah	23-cv-482-RJS
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a)(1), 17(a)(2), 17(a)(3); Exchange Act § 10(b), Rule 10b-5(a), Rule 10b-5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that Digital Licensing and others conducted a fraudulent and unregistered securities offering of so-called “node software licenses” which purported to allow customers to mine different types of crypto assets. SEC obtained an ex parte TRO and asset freeze, and appointed a receiver.</p> <p>On November 30, 2023, the court dissolved the Temporary Restraining Order and receivership as improperly issued because of misrepresentations the SEC made to obtain the TRO. On March 18, 2024, the court found the SEC in contempt of court, and sanctioned the SEC for those misrepresentations.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Celsius Network Limited, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/13/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cv-6005
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a)(1); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 9(a)(2)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Celsius, and its founder and CEO, with raising billions of dollars from investors through the unregistered offers and sales of securities through its “Earn Interest Program”, a crypto lending product. The SEC also claims that Celsius and Mashinsky defrauded investors by making false statements and artificially manipulating the price of the CEL token by engaging in buybacks. The SEC complaint seeks injunctions against future securities law violations and to prohibit Mashinsky from participating in crypto asset securities transactions.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Coinbase, Inc. and Coinbase Global, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/6/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cv-4738
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act §§ 5, 15(a), 17A(b), 20(a); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Coinbase for operating a trading platform through which U.S. customers can buy, sell, and trade cryptocurrency, despite not registering with the SEC as a broker, national securities exchange, or clearing agency. Additionally, SEC alleges that Coinbase operated as an unregistered broker through two other services it offers, Coinbase Prime and Coinbase Wallet, and also offered a staking program without registering with the SEC.</p> <p>On March 27, 2024, the court issued an opinion and order finding that the SEC sufficiently pled that Coinbase operates as a securities exchange, and, that through its Staking Program, Coinbase engaged in the unregistered offer and sale of securities; and that the SEC sufficiently pled control person liability for Coinbase Global Inc. under the Exchange Act. However, the court granted Coinbase’s motion to dismiss the SEC’s claims that Coinbase acts as a broker by making its Wallet feature available to customers.</p> <p>On January 7, 2025, the court granted Coinbase’s motion for an interlocutory appeal to resolve the central question of whether “transactions involving crypto-assets of the kind Coinbase intermediates are ‘investment contracts,’ and thus securities, for purposes of the Securities Act” before proceeding with trial.</p>		

Filing / Order		
<i>SEC v. Binance Holdings Limited, et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/5/2023	D.D.C.	23-cv-1599
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act §§ 5, 15(a), 17A(b), 20(a); Securities Act §§ 5(a) and 5(c) 17(a)(2), 17(a)(3)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Binance with unlawfully soliciting U.S. investors to buy, sell, and trade cryptocurrency through various Binance platforms, and knowingly engaging in multiple unregistered offers and sales of cryptocurrency. The SEC also alleged that Binance secretly allowed high-value U.S. customers to trade on the Binance.com platform, while claiming US customers were restricted from the site and that Zhao, the CEO, secretly controlled the Binance.US platform behind the scenes.</p>		

Filing / Order		
<i>In the Matter of Up, Global SEZC, Coinme Inc., and Neil Bergquist</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/28/2023	Administrative Proceeding	3-21398
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), 5(c), 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b), Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC accepted settlement offers in response to public cease-and-desist proceedings against respondents in connection with the sale of a cryptocurrency, UpToken, that was allegedly sold as an unregistered security. Without admitting or denying fault for violations of the Securities Act and Securities Exchange Act, respondents agreed to pay individual penalties of \$3,520,000, \$250,000, and \$150,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
<i>In re Coinbase, Inc.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/24/2023	Third Circuit Court of Appeals	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Coinbase brings a mandamus action to seek a writ requiring the SEC to act on Coinbase’s pending rulemaking petition to provide clarity for the crypto industry.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Bittrex, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/17/2023	W.D. Wash.	23-cv-580
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act §§ 5, 15(a), 17A(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>After Bittrex announced it would shutter its U.S. operations effective April 30, 2023, the SEC charged Bittrex and its co-founder and former CEO for operating an unregistered national securities exchange, broker, and clearing agency. On August 10, 2023, Bittrex, Inc. and its co-founder and former CEO settled charges with the SEC for disgorgement of \$14.4 million, prejudgment interest of \$4 million, and a civil penalty of \$5.6 million, for a total monetary payment of \$24 million.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Beaxy Digital, Ltd.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/29/2023	N.D. Ill.	23-cv-1962
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a); Exchange Act §§ 5, 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, 15(a), 17(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Beaxy Digital and its founder for operating the Beaxy Platform without registering as a national securities exchange, broker, and clearing agency. The founder was also charged with raising \$8 million in an unregistered offering of the Beaxy token, and allegedly misappropriating the funds for personal use. On February 13, 2024, the court found Beaxy Digital liable for disgorgement of nearly \$6 million, together with prejudgment interest of nearly \$1.4 million. The founder was liable for disgorgement of \$480,000. Beaxy Digital and its founder were liable for civil penalties in the amounts of about \$111,614 and \$960,000 respectively.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Justin Sun, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/22/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cv-2433
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a)(1), 17(a)(3), 17(b); Exchange Act §§ 9(a)(1), 9(a)(2), 10(b) and Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Justin Sun and three of his companies, Tron Foundation Limited, BitTorrent Foundation Ltd., and Rainberry Inc. (formerly BitTorrent) for the unregistered offer and sale of Tronix (TRX) and BitTorrent (BTT), and for allegedly manipulating the secondary market for TRX through wash trading. The SEC also charged eight celebrities for touting TRX and/or BTT without disclosing that they were compensated to do so.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Green United, LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/3/2023	D. Utah	23-cv-159
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a)(1), 17(a)(2), 17(a)(3); Exchange Act §§ 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, 15(a)(1); Equitable disgorgement		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC filed an action against Green United, LLC, its founder Wright W. Thurston, and one of its promoters, Kristoffer A. Krohn, for defrauding investors through an unregistered offering of crypto asset securities. According to the SEC’s complaint, the defendants allegedly raised \$18 million by fraudulently selling securities in the form of “Green Boxes” and “Green Nodes.” Defendants also allegedly falsely claimed that these products mined a digital token called “Green” on a supposed “Green Blockchain,” while in reality, they mined Bitcoin, as the “Green” token did not yet exist. On Sept. 23, 2024, the court denied defendants’ motion to dismiss.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Nishad Singh		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/28/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cv-1691
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 17(a)(1), 17(a)(3); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged the former co-lead engineer of FTX, a platform started by him, Bankman-Fried, and Gary Wang, for his alleged role in a scheme to defraud equity investors. According to the SEC, Singh had created software code that diverted customer funds from FTX to Alameda Research, a crypto hedge fund owned by Bankman-Fried and Wang. The SEC also alleged that Singh had withdrawn approximately \$6 million from FTX for personal use. Singh pled guilty to charges of wire fraud, commodities fraud, securities fraud, money laundering, and campaign finance violations.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. BKCoin Management, LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/23/2023	S.D. Fla.	23-cv-20719
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 17(a)(1), 17(a)(2), 17(a)(3); Exchange Act §§ 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Advisers Act §§ 206(1), 206(2); Unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC filed an action against investment adviser BKCoin Management LLC and Kevin Kang in connection with an alleged crypto asset fraud scheme. According to the SEC, BKCoin raised approximately \$100 million from at least 55 investors and used more than \$3.6 million to make Ponzi-like payments to fund investors. The complaint alleges that BKCoin materially misrepresented to investors that they had received an audit opinion from a “top four auditor” and attempted to conceal the unauthorized use of investor money.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Paul Anthony Pierce		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/17/2023	Admin. Proc.	3-21305
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 17(a)(2), 17(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Former NBA player Paul Pierce settled charges for allegedly promoting EMAX tokens (crypto asset securities offered and sold by EthereumMax) on social media without disclosing the payment he received for the promotion and for making false and misleading promotional statements about the same crypto asset. Without admitting or denying the SEC's findings, Pierce agreed to pay approximately \$1.4 million in penalties, disgorgement, and interest, and to refrain from promoting any crypto asset securities for three years.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Terraform Labs PTE Ltd. And Do Hyeong Kwon		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/16/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cv-1346
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 5(e), 17(a); Exchange Act §§ 6(1), 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, 20(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC filed an action against Terraform and Do Kwon, alleging they offered and sold securities in unregistered transactions, and perpetrated a fraudulent scheme that led to the loss of over \$40 billion. On July 31, 2023, Judge Rakoff denied defendants' motion to dismiss, in certain parts declining to follow the reasoning in <i>SEC v. Ripple Labs Inc.</i>, 2023 WL 4507900 (S.D.N.Y. July 13, 2023) that programmatic sales of cryptocurrency assets on trading platforms did not involve investment contracts.</p> <p>On December 28, 2023, Judge Rakoff granted summary judgment for the SEC on the claim that defendants offered and sold unregistered securities, granted summary judgment for defendants on the claims involving offering and effecting transactions in security-based swaps, and denied the cross-motions for summary judgment on the fraud claims.</p> <p>On April 5, 2024, a jury found Terraform Labs and Do Kwon liable for fraud in violation of Section 17 of the Securities Act and Rule 10b-5 of the Exchange Act. Kwon was also found liable for control person liability regarding Terraform's violation of Rule 10b-5.</p> <p>On July 12, 2024, the court issued its final judgment barring the defendants from various future violations of both the Securities Act and the Exchange Act. The court also found that Terraform was liable for a combined \$4,473,828,306 in monetary penalties, and that Do Kwon was liable for a combined \$204,320,196 in monetary penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Payward Ventures, Inc. (d/b/a Kraken) and Payward Trading, Ltd. (d/b/a Kraken)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/9/2023	N.D. Cal.	23-cv-588
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC filed settled charges against Payward Ventures, Inc. and Payward Trading, Ltd., also known as Kraken, with allegedly failing to register the offer and sale of their crypto asset staking-as-a-service program. Within this program, investors transferred crypto assets to Kraken for staking in exchange for promoted annual investment returns. The SEC also alleged that Kraken engaged in risky business practices, such as commingling customers' money and crypto assets with its own. The two Kraken entities agreed to cease offering or selling securities through crypto asset staking services or programs and to pay \$30 million in disgorgement, prejudgment interest, and civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Avraham Eisenberg		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/20/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cv-503
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act §§ 9(a)(2), 10(b) and Rules 10b-5(a), (c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Eisenberg with allegedly orchestrating an attack on the cryptocurrency trading platform Mango Markets by manipulating the MNGO governance token, which the SEC claims was offered and sold as a security. The complaint further alleges that Eisenberg artificially drove up the price of the token to increase the value of his MNGO perpetual futures positions and then withdrew \$116 million worth of crypto assets from the Mango Markets platform.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Nexo Capital Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/19/2023	Admin. Proc.	3-21281
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 8(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Nexo Capital Inc. with failing to register the offer and sale of its retail cryptocurrency lending product, Earn Interest Product. The SEC claimed that Nexo's products were investment contracts and therefore subject to registration and other federal securities laws. Without admitting or denying the allegations, Nexo settled and paid a \$22.5 million penalty and ceased the unregistered offer and sale of the Earn Interest Product to U.S. investors.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Genesis Global Capital, LLC and Gemini Trust Company, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/12/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cv-287
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that Genesis and Gemini engaged in the alleged unregistered offer and sale of securities to U.S. retail investors through the Gemini Earn cryptocurrency asset lending program. On March 18, 2024, Genesis settled with the SEC and agreed to pay a civil penalty of \$21 million.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Francisley Valdevino Da Silva, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/14/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-10534
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged four individuals for allegedly creating and promoting Forcount Trader Systems, Inc. - an alleged pyramid scheme that purportedly raised over \$8.4 million from hundreds of retail investors, primarily from Spanish-speaking communities throughout the U.S. and other countries. According to the SEC's complaint, the defendants allegedly defrauded investors through false promises of guaranteed returns stemming from investments in "memberships" in Forcount Trader Systems. The complaint alleged that, despite Forcount having no crypto asset trading and mining operations, the defendants marketed these "memberships" as deriving interest in profits from such non-existent operations.</p> <p>On October 15, Juan Tacuri was sentenced to 240 months in prison and ordered to forfeit \$3,610,718.67 and pay restitution of at least \$3,610,718.67.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Samuel Bankman-Fried		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/13/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-10501
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Samuel Bankman-Fried, the CEO and co-founder of the cryptocurrency trading platform FTX, for purportedly orchestrating a scheme to defraud FTX investors. The SEC claimed that Bankman-Fried had concealed the diversion of investment funds from FTX to his privately held hedge fund, Alameda Research, and had used some of these funds for personal purchases and donations. He allegedly raised approximately \$1.8 billion from investors while purportedly concealing these risks.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Hodl Law, PLLC v. SEC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/21/2022	S.D. Cal.	22-cv-1832
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Declaratory relief		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Law firm Hodl Law PLLC alleged the SEC has failed to clarify its jurisdictional authority over digital assets, and failed to define whether it views digital assets as securities. Hodl seeks declaratory judgment that the Ethereum Network and the Ether digital asset are not securities, and that engaging in transactions on the Ethereum Network does not implicate the Securities Act of 1933.</p> <p>On July 28, 2023, the court granted the SEC’s motion to dismiss the claims on the grounds that Hodl Law lacked standing to bring the claims and that such claims are not ripe for adjudication.</p> <p>On August 22, 2024, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the dismissal.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Jeremy K. Rounsville		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/3/2022	N.D. Tex.	22-cv-2458
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a)(1), 17(a)(3)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Rounsville for allegedly violating certain registration and antifraud provisions of the federal securities laws. They claimed he used a pseudonym to pose as the CEO of Arbitraging.co, a fictitious trading program he created that falsely promised to generate income via automated arbitrage trades of digital assets. Without admitting or denying the allegations, Rounsville settled with the SEC and agreed to pay approximately \$207,000 in civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Jonathan Tetreault		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/3/2022	W.D. Wash.	22-cv-1567
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 15(a); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Tetreault for allegedly promoting and soliciting investors for the “Trade Coin Club,” a crypto Ponzi scheme. The “Trade Coin Club” falsely claimed that investor money was allocated to a crypto asset trading bot that purportedly executed microtransactions to generate returns for investors. Instead, investor funds were allegedly used for personal purchases, and returns purportedly came from new deposits. The Trade Coin Club purportedly raised 82,000 Bitcoin (around \$295 million at the time) from over 100,000 investors. Tetreault allegedly personally received 158 Bitcoin (around \$625,000 at the time) from the scheme. Without admitting or denying the allegations, Tetreault agreed to settle the SEC’s charges, subject to court approval.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Douver Torres Braga, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/3/2022	W.D. Wash.	22-cv-1563
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act §§ 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, 15(a); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged the defendants for their alleged roles in the “Trade Coin Club”, a crypto Ponzi scheme. This scheme reportedly raised 82,000 Bitcoin, valued at \$295 million, from more than 100,000 investors. Trade Coin Club allegedly falsely claimed that investor funds were used for a crypto asset trading bot executing microtransactions to generate returns. Instead, the funds were allegedly used for personal purchases and to pay company promoters, with returns coming from new investor deposits.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Kimberly Kardashian		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/3/2022	Admin. Proc.	3-21197
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Kim Kardashian for touting EMAX tokens on social media without disclosing the \$250,000 payment she received for the promotion. Kardashian agreed to settle the charges, pay \$1.26 million in penalties, disgorgement, and interest, and cooperate with the SEC’s investigation.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Arbitrade Ltd., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/30/2022	S.D. Fla.	22-cv-23171
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a); Exchange Act §§ 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, 20(a); aiding and abetting; unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Arbitrade Ltd. (a Bermudan company), Cryptobontix Inc. (a Canadian company), and their principals for allegedly perpetrating a pump-and-dump scheme involving DIG tokens, a crypto asset. The SEC alleged that both companies falsely claimed to have \$10 billion in gold bullion backing each DIG token with \$1 of gold. This fabricated gold acquisition allegedly enticed U.S. investors into purchasing DIG tokens at inflated prices, allowing the defendants to sell over \$36.8 million worth of tokens.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. The Hydrogen Technology Corporation, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/28/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-8284
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a); Exchange Act §§ 9(a)(2), 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, 15(a), 20(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged The Hydrogen Technology Corporation, its former CEO, and the CEO of a “market making” firm for unregistered offers and sales of Hydro tokens, and for manipulating the trading volume and price of those alleged securities. The complaint alleges that Hydro tokens were distributed through an airdrop, bounty programs, employee compensation, and direct sales. On May 26, 2023, Defendants entered final consent judgments with the SEC, agreeing to pay disgorgement of ~\$1.5 million, and a civil penalty of ~\$1 million.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Mauricio Chavez, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/19/2022	S.D. Tex.	22-cv-3359
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a); Advisers Act §§ 206(1), 206(2); equitable claim		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC filed an emergency action to stop the defendants from allegedly operating an unregistered and fraudulent cryptocurrency asset offering through CryptoFX, LLC. The SEC claimed that Chavez offered paid classes on crypto investments to the Latino community to lure individuals into investing in his fraudulent company. He allegedly raised over \$12 million from more than 5,000 investors, which he then used for personal purchases.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Sparkster, Ltd. and Sajjad Daya		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/19/2022	Admin. Proc.	3-21103
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC issued a cease-and-desist order against Sparkster, Ltd. and Sajjad Daya (Sparkster’s CEO) for the alleged unregistered offer and sale of SPRK tokens. Through these sales, Sparkster allegedly raised around \$30 million from 4,000 investors. Without admitting or denying the allegations, Sparkster and Daya agreed to pay more than \$35 million in disgorgement, prejudgment interest, and civil money penalties. Additionally, a fair fund was created to distribute funds to harmed investors.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Ian Balina		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/19/2022	W.D. Tex.	22-cv-950
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that crypto investor Ian Balina failed to disclose compensation he received from the issuer of SPRK tokens while he publicly promoted the tokens and organized an investing pool. SEC alleges that the transactions took place in the U.S. because ETH contributions were validated by a network of nodes on the Ethereum blockchain, which are clustered more densely in the U.S. than any other country.</p> <p>On May 22, 2024, the court granted in part the SEC’s motion for summary judgment and denied Balina’s motion for summary judgment. The court found that even though Balina was located abroad, because many of his investors were in the U.S., the offers and transactions at issue were sufficiently domestic for U.S. securities laws to apply. It further found that SPRK tokens are securities under the <i>Howey</i> Test and Balina, acting as an underwriter, violated Section 5 of the securities act by selling SPRK from his pool to investors. The Court denied summary judgment on the SEC’s Section 17 claim.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Gabriel Edelman, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/15/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-7892
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that Gabriel Edelman, through his entities Creative Advancement LLC and Edelman Blockchain Advisors LLC, fraudulently offered and sold securities by making false statements to four investors, claiming he would invest their funds in digital assets. Instead, he allegedly used their funds for personal expenses, raising around \$4.3 million through this scheme. In a settlement, Edelman admitted to the findings of the Commission and is now barred from associating with any broker, dealer, investment adviser, or similar entities, and from participating in any offering of a penny stock.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Chicago Crypto Capital LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/14/2022	N.D. Ill.	22-cv-2975
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(c); Exchange Act §§ 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, 15(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that Chicago Crypto Capital LLC, its owner, and former salesmen defrauded investors during their unregistered offering of crypto assets. Different salesmen from the company each conducted unregistered offerings of BXY tokens, raising around \$1.5 million from approximately 100 investors. Many investors allegedly never received their tokens. One of the former salesmen settled with the SEC and is now barred from associating with any broker, dealer, investment adviser, or similar entities, and from participating in any offering of a penny stock.</p> <p>A default judgment enjoined Chicago Crypto Capital and the remaining defendants from violating securities laws and ordered the owner, Amoah, and the company to jointly pay disgorgement of around \$936,000 plus interest. The former salesman was ordered to pay disgorgement of around \$22,000 plus interest. In terms of civil penalties, Chicago Crypto Capital owes around \$1.3 million, while the owner owes \$245,000, and the salesman owes around \$134,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Dragonchain, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/16/2022	W.D. Wash.	22-cv-1145
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that Dragonchain conducted an unregistered offering of a crypto asset called "DRGN" and raised over \$16 million from approximately 5,000 investors.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Bloom Protocol, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/9/2022	Admin. Proc.	3-20952
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Bloom Protocol, LLC, a company building an online identity attestation platform, for conducting an unregistered ICO. Bloom agreed to pay a springing penalty of up to \$309.9 million if it does not register the coins and compensate harmed investors.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Vladimir Okhotnikov, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/1/2022	N.D. Ill.	22-cv-3978
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a)(1), 17(a)(3); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rules 10b-5(a), 10b-5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged 11 individuals for creating and promoting Forsage, a fraudulent crypto pyramid and Ponzi scheme that raised more than \$300 million from millions of retail investors worldwide. Through the website Forsage.io, investors could enter transactions via smart contracts that operated on the Ethereum, Tron, and Binance blockchains. However, Forsage’s investors allegedly earned profits by recruiting others to the scheme, in a typical Ponzi/pyramid structure. Without admitting or denying the allegations, two of the defendants, Ellis and Theissen, agreed to settle the charges and be permanently enjoined from future violations of the charged provisions, as well as pay disgorgement and civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Coinbase’s Petition for Rulemaking – Digital Asset Securities Regulation		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/21/2022		
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
17 C.F.R. 201.192(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>On the same day the SEC filed a complaint alleging that certain tokens were securities in <i>SEC v. Wahi</i>, Coinbase files a petition requesting that the SEC propose and adopt rules to govern the regulation of digitally native securities, including rules to identify which digital assets are securities.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Ishan Wahi, Nikhil Wahi, and Sameer Ramani		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/21/2022	W.D. Wash.	22-cv-1009
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>SEC brings insider trading charges against a former Coinbase product manager, and his brother and friend, for perpetuating a scheme to trade ahead of announcements regarding crypto assets that would be made available for trading on Coinbase (also see DOJ case below). The SEC explicitly alleged that nine of the 25 tokens traded were securities.</p> <p>On May 30, 2024, Ishan Wahi and Nikil Wahi settled with the SEC and were permanently enjoined from violating Rule 10b-5 of the Exchange Act.</p> <p>On March 1, 2024, a default judgment was entered against Sameer Ramani enjoining him from violating Rule 10b-5 of the Exchange Act, and ordering him to pay disgorgement of \$817,602 and a civil penalty of \$1,635,204.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Empires Consulting Corp. (DBA "EmpiresX"), et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/30/2022	S.D. Fla.	22-cv-21995
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged EmpiresX and its founders, along with the head trader, for raising \$40 million from investors through misleading statements and allegedly misappropriated the funds for personal use. The SEC claims that EmpiresX stated that its investments would yield daily profits of one percent, earned by a trading "bot" that, in reality, did not exist. The defendants also allegedly deceived investors by falsely stating that EmpiresX had filed with the SEC to register as a hedge fund. On May 19, 2023, the defendants settled with the SEC for \$34.6 million.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Grayscale Investments, LLC v. SEC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/29/2022	D.C. Cir.	22-1142
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Petition for review of SEC Order		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Grayscale Investments seeks review of the SEC's order rejecting Grayscale's application to convert its Grayscale Bitcoin Trust product to an exchange-traded fund (ETF). On August 29, 2023, the Court found that the SEC's denial of Grayscale's proposal was arbitrary and capricious, and granted Grayscale's petition and vacated the SEC's order.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Nvidia Corporation		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/6/2022	Admin. Proc.	3-20844
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 13(a) and Rules 13a-13, 13a-15(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC settled charges against NVIDIA Corporation for allegedly failing to adequately disclose that crypto mining was a significant element of its revenue growth. NVIDIA's gaming GPUs were increasingly used by customers for crypto mining, impacting sales, which NVIDIA was allegedly aware of but did not disclose in Form 10-Q. NVIDIA also purportedly made statements implying that its gaming business was unaffected by crypto mining. Without admitting or denying the allegations, NVIDIA agreed to a cease-and-desist order and a \$5.5 million penalty.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Chiang		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/28/2022	S.D. Cal.	22-cv-600 (TWE) (WVG)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Chiang and his associates for their roles in raising over \$10 million through selling two tokens, SNP and NSG, which were allegedly unregistered securities via the websites Sharenode and NASGO, respectively. The defendants purportedly misrepresented the volume of NSG tokens sold and the number of platform users. The SEC also alleged that the defendants misappropriated \$4 million in investor funds and used 133 Bitcoin to artificially inflate their cryptocurrency's prices through a team of traders. Two defendants, Tippetts and Chelliah, agreed to bifurcated settlements, and are enjoined from violating federal securities laws; Chelliah agreed to pay a \$75,000 penalty. Without admitting or denying the allegations, Chiang settled with the SEC on January 31, 2024. He was enjoined from offering securities for ten years and is liable for disgorgement of around \$2.5 million plus a civil penalty of approximately \$223,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Block Bits Capital, LLC, et al.; SEC v. David B. Mata		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/27/2022	N.D. Cal.	22-cv-2563 22-cv-2565
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a); Advisers Act §§ 206(1), 206(2), 206(4), 206(4)-8		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that Block Bits and their co-founders and co-managing directors engaged in the fraudulent and unregistered offer and sale of securities. The U.S. Attorney's Office commenced parallel criminal actions against the co-founders, charging each with wire fraud. On August 17, 2022, co-founder and co-managing director Mata entered into a judgment with the SEC that prohibits Mata from violating federal securities laws or participating in the purchase or offer of any securities, and renders him liable for disgorgement of \$75,000 plus prejudgment interest.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. MCC International Corp. (dba "Mining Capital Coin Corp."), et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/7/2022	S.D. Fla.	22-cv-14129
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a); control person liability		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged MCC International Corp., its founders, and two related entities with fraud in connection with alleged unregistered offerings and sales of investment plans called mining packages. The defendants purportedly raised approximately \$8.1 million from the sale of these mining packages and \$3.2 million in initiation fees from about 65,000 investors worldwide. The SEC claims that they falsely promised investors extreme returns while using investor funds for personal expenditures.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Barksdale		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/8/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-1933
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that siblings John and JonAtina Barksdale violated securities laws through two unregistered offerings of securities involving the digital token "Ormeus Coin." The SEC claimed that the Barksdales defrauded retail investors out of more than \$124 million by falsely claiming that Ormeus Coin was supported by a large crypto mining operation, despite the company having abandoned crypto mining years ago. The SEC also alleged that the Barksdales artificially manipulated the price of Ormeus Coin and misused investor funds for personal expenses. On March 15, 2023, the defendants were found liable for approximately \$46 million in disgorgement, with \$10 million in prejudgment interest. Additionally, each defendant must pay \$23 million in civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In re BlockFi Lending LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/14/2022	Admin. Proc.	3-20758
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 8(a); Investment Company Act § 9(f)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>BlockFi Lending agreed to pay a \$100 million penalty to the SEC and 32 states (split evenly between the SEC and states) to settle charges that it failed to register the offers and sales of its retail crypto lending product. BlockFi offered customers the ability to lend the company digital assets and earn interest on those loans; regulators asserted that was an investment contract. BlockFi further agreed to a cease-and-desist order from future violations of the Securities Act and the Investment Company Act.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Paul A. Garcia		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/18/2022	D. Col.	22-cv-118
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 17(a)(1), 17(a)(3); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Garcia for stealing investor funds raised for Gold Hawgs Development Corp., a failed cryptocurrency venture that had raised \$400,000 from 16 investors. Gold Hawgs purportedly promised significant returns to investors after launching a new cryptocurrency and completing its ICO, but the funds were allegedly used for Garcia's personal and business expenses instead. On May 10, 2024, it was ordered that Garcia pay approximately \$133,000 in disgorgement and prejudgment interest. The court also imposed a \$123,000 civil penalty.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Crowd Machine, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/6/2022	N.D. Cal.	22-cv-76
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a), 5(c), 17(a); Exchange Act Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that Crowd Machine and its founder, Craig Derel Sproule, put proceeds of an ICO (CMCTs) into South African gold mining rather than the advertised purpose of developing a decentralized peer-to-peer network, the Crowd Computer. Defendants purportedly sent more than \$5.8 million to the Southern African gold mines.</p> <p>On January 17, 2024, the court issued an amended final judgment ordering defendants Crowd Machine, Inc. and Metavine, Inc. to disgorge \$19,676,401.27, plus \$3,358,147 in prejudgment interest. Relief defendant and affiliate Metavine Pty. Ltd. was also found liable, jointly, and severally with the defendants, for disgorgement of \$5 million. Each defendant was also ordered to pay civil penalties of \$600,000, each.</p> <p>On the basis of prior consent agreements, defendants were also permanently enjoined from violating the antifraud provisions of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, Rule 10b-5 of the Exchange Act, and the registration provisions of Sections 5(a) and (c) of the Securities Act. Further, defendants were enjoined from taking part in future securities offerings.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Empower Oversight Whistleblowers & Research v. SEC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/8/2021	E.D. Va.	21-cv-1370
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Empower Oversight, a government watchdog group, is suing the SEC to compel with FOIA document requests relating to potential conflicts of interest associated with former SEC officials (Jay Clayton, William Hinson, & Marc Berger) and their oversight of cryptocurrencies.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Auzins		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/2/2021	E.D.N.Y.	21-cv-6693
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act 10(b); Securities Act 17(a); Sections 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Ivar Auzins, also known as Ron Ramsey or Daniel Gaines, with defrauding investors in the unregistered sale of securities through two separate schemes that raised around \$7 million. The first scheme involved the ICO of Denaro, which claimed to be a "multi-currency debit card platform" for storing digital assets, but allegedly was fictitious. The second scheme involved the offering of unregistered securities of Innovamine, which purportedly offered a cloud mining program. Auzins allegedly misappropriated nearly all the funds raised in both offerings.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Ginster		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/18/2021	C.D. Cal.	21-cv-1957
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act 10(b); Securities Act 17(a); Sections 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>SEC alleges that Ginster raised approximately \$3.6 million in Bitcoin through two online platforms that promised high rates of returns by falsely claiming cryptocurrency trading and advertising arbitrage. SEC further alleges that Ginster deceived investors in both offerings about how the funds were used because Ginster misappropriated funds for personal use.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of American CryptoFed DAO LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/10/2021	Admin. Proc.	3-20650
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC halted two token registrations of American CryptoFed DAO LLC, a Wyoming blockchain-based LLC. American CryptoFed submitted Form 10s for two tokens as equity securities, which the SEC claimed were misleading because the forms did not include required information and contained materially misleading information and omissions.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Terraform Labs Pte Ltd. and Do Kwon v. SEC; SEC v. Terraform Labs Pte Ltd		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/22/2021; 11/12/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-8701-JPO, 21-mc-810 (JPO)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
21-cv-8701: 17 C.F.R. §203.8 and 201.150 (Commission’s Rules Relating to Investigations), 5 U.S.C. §§ 702 and 706(2)(A) & (C), U.S. Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment		
21-mc-810: Petition to enforce administrative subpoena		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The two interrelated cases relate to a subpoena served on Do Kwon, the CEO of Terraform Labs. Terraform Labs and Kwon brought a complaint against the SEC alleging that service was arbitrary and capricious, violating the SEC’s own rules of service, as well as the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. See 21-cv-8701. The SEC countered with bringing a petition to enforce the subpoena. See 21-mc-810. The District Court heard the petition first, and granted the SEC’s motion, and denied Terra’s arguments. In June 2022, the Second Circuit affirmed the District Court’s order requiring compliance with the investigative subpoenas served on Terraform and Kwon.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of GTV Media Group Inc. et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/13/2021	Admin. Proc.	3-20537
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that GTV Media Group Inc., Saraca Media Group Inc., and Voice of Guo Media Inc. conducted an unregistered offering of GTV common stock and an unregistered offering of the digital asset securities G-Coins or G-Dollars. The respondents raised around \$487 million from over 5,000 investors. The defendants have agreed to pay more than \$539 million to settle the action. As of October 2021, the Fair Fund consisted of approximately \$454 million paid by the respondents.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Rivetz Corp.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/8/2021	D. Mass.	21-cv-30092
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), (c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged defendants Rivetz Corp., Rivetz International SEZC, and Steven K. Sprague with selling and marketing unregistered securities through an ICO of RvT tokens, purportedly to capitalize on Rivetz’s business. The ICO raised \$18 million in digital assets. The SEC seeks injunctive relief, restitution, and a civil penalty.</p> <p>On September 30, 2024, the court granted the SEC’s motion for summary judgment finding that the RvT tokens sold and marketed by defendant constituted securities under the <i>Howey</i> test.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. BitConnect		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/1/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-7349 (JGK)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act §§ 17(a), 17(a)(1), 17(a)(3), §§ 5(a), (c), §15(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that BitConnect and its founders and promoters defrauded investors through the unregistered offering and sale of securities, <i>i.e.</i> the “Lending Program.” Defendants purportedly induced investors to deposit funds into the Lending Program, through which BitConnect would use a proprietary “volatility software trading bot” to generate returns. The SEC alleges, however, that defendants siphoned invested funds to digital wallets controlled by Bitconnect, its founder Satish Kumbhani, and Glenn Arcaro in essentially a Ponzi scheme. Arcaro has separately pleaded guilty to criminal charged brought by the Department of Justice, <i>see infra</i> DOJ and Other Criminal Proceedings.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Poloniex, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/9/2021	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 5; Exchange Act Rule 3b-16(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Settlement for acting as a digital asset securities exchange (allowing trading in certain unnamed digital assets that the SEC believed were securities), without registering as an exchange or an ATS. Settlement included disgorgement of \$8,484,313.99, prejudgment interest of \$403,995.12, and a civil money penalty of \$1,500,000, for a total of \$10,388,309.10.</p> <p>Accompanied by public statement by Commissioner Peirce, addressing questions potentially left open by the Poloniex settlement, and criticizing the “Commission’s enforcement-centric approach to crypto.”</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Blockchain Credit Partners d/b/a DeFi Money Market, Gregory Keough, and Derek Acree		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/6/2021	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a) & 5(c); Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Action against purportedly decentralized platform, which was really a centralized company that conducted an unregistered token offering, and allegedly misrepresented the nature of the assets on the platform (pooled auto loans).</p> <p>SEC applies a Reves analysis (from <i>Reves v. Ernst & Young</i>, 494 U.S. 56, 64-66 (1990)) to conclude that the tokens in question were notes that were securities (because they were sold to raise funds for the general use of the business, sold to the general public, purchased to earn interest, and with no “alternative regulatory scheme or other risk reducing factors.”</p> <p>Potentially a warning shot to other “decentralized” platforms offering interest-bearing tokens, however, the facts and circumstances may be radically different on other platforms.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Uulala, Inc et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/4/2021	C.D. Cal	21-cv-1307
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 20(b), 20(d), and 22(a); Exchange Act §§ 21(d), 21(e), and 27		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Uulala Inc. and two of its founders, Oscar Garcia and Matthew Loughran, for defrauding over a thousand investors in an unregistered offering of digital asset securities called UULA tokens, which raised more than \$9 million. Uulala and Garcia were also alleged to have made materially false statements about Uulala’s financial performance and to have claimed that they had patent-pending technology that did not exist. Without admitting or denying the allegations, all defendants consented to permanently disabling the UULA and EUULA tokens and removing them from digital asset platforms. Uulala Inc. was required to pay around \$300,000 in civil penalties, while Garcia and Loughran were required to pay approximately \$192,000 and \$50,000, respectively.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Aron Govil		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/19/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-6150
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act §§ 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, 16(a) and Rule 16a-3		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged the defendant with purportedly defrauding investors in two companies, Cemtrex Inc. and Telidyne Inc. Regarding Cemtrex, Govil allegedly misappropriated around \$7 million in investor funds between 2016 and 2018 for personal expenses and engaged in scalping and insider trading. Concerning Telidyne, Govil allegedly made material misrepresentations to investors about developing certain apps that did not exist, such as an app that allowed users to transact in cryptocurrencies from their mobile phones. Without admitting or denying the allegations, Govil consented to a final judgment that enjoined him from violating the relevant provisions, imposed disgorgement of around \$626,000 with prejudgment interest of around \$76,000, and imposed a civil penalty of \$620,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Blotics f/d/b/a Coinschedule Ltd.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/14/2021	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Action against promoters of various ICOs and IEOs, some of which were allegedly securities offerings. Settlement was accompanied by a statement from Commissioners Peirce and Roisman, stating they were “disappointed that the Commission’s settlement with Coinschedule did not explain which digital assets touted by Coinschedule were securities, an omission which is symptomatic of our reluctance to provide additional guidance about how to determine whether a token is being sold as part of a securities offering or which tokens are securities.”</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Watson et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/9/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-5923
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged three individuals in an insider trading case related to the name change of Long Island Iced Tea Co. to Long Blockchain Company. The SEC alleged that these investors had advanced knowledge that the company was going to shift from a beverage business to focusing on blockchain technology. This shift led to the company’s stock price soaring, and the investors allegedly made more than \$160,000 in illicit profits.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Profit Connect Wealth Services Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/8/2021	D. Nev.	21-cv-1298
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC obtained a temporary restraining order and asset freeze against defendants who allegedly falsely promised investors that their money would be invested in securities trading and cryptocurrencies based on recommendations from an artificial intelligence supercomputer, which would secure returns of 20-30 percent per year, with interest. Instead, the company was allegedly a Ponzi-like scheme that used payments from other investors and investor money for personal purchases.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Ali Asif Hamid, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/15/2021	D.N.J.	21-cv-12542
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a)(1), 17(a)(3); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; aiding and abetting		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged three additional individuals in connection with the fraudulent \$30 million initial coin offering led by Boaz Manor and Edith Pardo. The defendants allegedly knew Manor was a convicted criminal and chose to conceal his history from investors by using a false name for him. Of the three defendants, one, Cristine Page, agreed to a settlement that included permanent injunctions, disgorgement of the digital assets she received, and a civil penalty of around \$192,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Loci Inc. and John Wise		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/22/2021	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a) & 5(c); Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The SEC settled charges against Loci Inc. and its CEO, John Wise, for making fraudulent statements about the company and conducting an unregistered offer and sale of digital asset securities. Between 2017 and 2018, Loci raised \$7.6 million from investors through the sale of digital tokens named LOCI coin. Loci and Wise allegedly made false statements to potential investors about various aspects of the company, and Wise used around \$38,000 of investor proceeds for personal expenses. Without admitting or denying the SEC's findings, Loci and Wise agreed to a cease-and-desist order, to destroy their remaining tokens and remove them from trading platforms, and to publish the SEC's order on Loci's social media channels. The SEC also imposed a \$7.6 million civil penalty against Loci.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Edgar M. Radjabli, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/11/2021	D.S.C.	21-cv-1761
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a) & 5(c); Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act §§ 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, 14(e) and Rule 14e-8; Advisers Act 206(4) and Rule 206(4)-8		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The SEC charged a defendant and two entities he controlled with conducting a fraudulent offering of Apis Tokens, a digital asset representing interests in Apis Capital’s investment fund. Radjabli allegedly falsely claimed that the token offering had raised \$1.7 million when it raised no money. He also allegedly manipulated the securities market for Veritone Inc., an artificial intelligence company, to gain \$162,800 in illicit profits. Additionally, Radjabli allegedly raised around \$20 million from over 450 investors in another unregistered fraudulent securities offering through My Loan Doctor LLC and loaned much of these proceeds to Apis Capital. The defendants agreed to settle the charges without admitting or denying the SEC’s claims. Radjabli was ordered to pay \$600,000 in monetary relief and was enjoined from violating the relevant provisions of federal securities law.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Trevon Brown et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/28/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-4791 (JGK)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a) & 5(c); Exchange Act § 15(a); aiding and abetting; unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC filed action against five defendants for allegedly promoting an unregistered digital asset offering through BitConnect, raising over \$2 billion from investors. Most of the defendants settled with the SEC and were permanently enjoined from violating Section 5 of the Securities Act. Laura Mascola was found liable for disgorgement of \$576,358, including pretrial interest. Ryan Maasen must pay \$525,958 to the SEC, covering disgorgement, pretrial interest, and civil penalties. Trevon Brown's case is still pending.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. LBRY, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/29/2021	D.N.H.	21-cv-260
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a) & 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>First Circuit denied LBRY’s Foundations motion to intervene in the action against LBRY, Inc. The District Court granted the SEC’s motion for judgment on the pleadings re LBRY, Inc’s selective enforcement affirmative defense, and on November 7, 2022 granted summary judgment for the SEC. Court ordered LBRY, Inc. to pay a civil penalty of \$111,614.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Shawn C. Cutting, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/5/2021	D. Idaho	21-cv-103
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC obtained a temporary restraining order and asset freeze against Shawn C. Cutting for allegedly raising millions of dollars from investors by falsely claiming to be a financial adviser and representing that he would pool investor money into a fund that invested in various digital assets. Cutting allegedly raised at least \$6.9 million from more than 450 investors and used these funds for personal expenditures. He also allegedly prolonged the scheme through Ponzi-like payments to investors.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Long Blockchain Corp.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/19/2021	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 13(a); Exchange Act Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Settlement pursuant to Exchange Act § 12(j) revoking each class of registered securities		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Coinseed		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/17/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-1381
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a) & 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Coinseed, Inc. in connection with the offer and sale of digital asset securities called “CSD tokens” to hundreds of investors. Coinseed raised more than \$141,410 in the offering. This filing coincided with an action against Coinseed by the New York Attorney General’s Office. On July 12, 2023, Coinseed was ordered to pay \$424,000 in penalties and disgorgement after it failed to appear in the action.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Krstic, DeMarr, and Enos		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/1/2021	E.D.N.Y.	21-cv-529
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a); Exchange Act §§ 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, 15(a); aiding and abetting		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged the defendants with engaging in a fraudulent scheme to induce the public into buying unregistered securities in two offerings, “Start Options” and “Bitcoin2Gen.” They allegedly raised at least \$11.4 million from over 460 investors. Many of the tokens were allegedly not genuine assets traded on the Ethereum blockchain but were instead false.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Wireline, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/15/2021	SEC Administrative Release	Release No. 10920
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a)(2)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC settled cease-and-desist proceedings against Wireline Inc. The SEC alleged that Wireline raised over \$16.3 million through the sale of securities in an investment contract that promised future tokens (SAFTs). Wireline never distributed the tokens to investors and allegedly made false statements about the feasibility of their platform and the timing of token issuance. Wireline admitted the findings and paid \$650,000 in civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Malley and MG Capital Management LP		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/12/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-237
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
<p>Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b); Exchange Act Rule 10b-5; aiding and abetting violations of the same; control person liability for violations of Exchange Act § 10(b) and Exchange Act Rule 10b-5; unjust enrichment. The parties entered a consent judgment in March 2022.</p>		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged MG Capital Management L.P. and its owner, Eric C. Malley, with defrauding investors in two real estate funds. The SEC claimed that Malley and MG Capital falsely claimed they had previous experience managing successful real estate funds valued at \$1.18 billion, though these prior funds never existed. Malley and MG Capital allegedly misappropriated around \$7 million in investor assets and falsified financial reports to conceal these losses. In 2022, Malley and MG Capital agreed to pay more than \$12 million to resolve the charges.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Tierion, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/23/2020	SEC Administrative Release	Release No. 33-10914
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC settled charges against Tierion Inc. for the unregistered offering of securities. The SEC maintained that in 2017 Tierion raised approximately \$25 million through the sale of digital tokens called Tierion Network Tokens (TNT), claiming the funds would be used to develop a network offering a "blockchain receipt" service. Without admitting or denying the findings, Tierion agreed to pay a \$250,000 civil penalty, return funds to harmed investors, and disable trading of TNT tokens.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Qin		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/22/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-10849 (LGS)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b); Exchange Act Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Stefan H. Qin, founder and operator of Virgil Sigma Fund LP, an investment fund engaged in digital asset arbitrage trading, for defrauding investors through misrepresentations about the fund. Qin consented to a final judgment ordering him to pay approximately \$36 million in disgorgement and around \$3.5 million in prejudgment interest.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Ripple Labs et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/22/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-10832(AT)(SN)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a) & 5(c); aiding and abetting		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>On July 13, 2023, Judge Torres partially granted Ripple's motion for summary judgment, ruling that the institutional sales of XRP constituted an unregistered sale of securities, but the sale of XRP on exchanges through algorithms (and certain grants and provisions to employees) did not constitute investment contracts. The SEC moved for leave to file an interlocutory appeal to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, which was denied on October 3, 2023.</p> <p>On August 7, 2024, the court issued its judgment on damages, in which it permanently enjoined Ripple from future violations of Section 5, imposed a civil penalty of \$125,035,150, and declined to impose any disgorgement amounts.</p> <p>On October 2, 2024, the SEC filed a notice of appeal.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Amir Bruno Elmaani (aka Bruno Block)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/9/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-10376
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b), Rule 10b-5		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The SEC charged the defendant, who goes by the online alias Bruno Block, with conducting an illegal securities offering of digital tokens called Pearl tokens through his venture, Oyster Protocol. The unregistered offering raised \$1.3 million. Additionally, Block is accused of secretly minting millions of unauthorized tokens for himself at no cost and selling them in secondary markets. This allegedly caused the value of Pearl tokens to decline, resulting in investor losses, while Block reportedly made \$570,000 in illicit gains.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. John David McAfee and Jimmy Gale Watson, Jr.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/5/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-8281 (JGK)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a) and 17 (b); Exchange Act § 10(b), Rule 10b-5.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The SEC charged John McAfee with allegedly promoting investments in initial coin offerings on Twitter without disclosing that he was paid for this promotion. Jimmy Watson Jr., McAfee's bodyguard, is also alleged to have assisted in promoting the ICO investments on Twitter and was charged for his role in the scheme. They are accused of planning to profit by buying a large amount of a cryptocurrency, promoting it on Twitter, and then selling it as its value increased. On July 14, 2022, Jimmy Gale Watson Jr. settled, agreeing to disgorge \$316,000 plus \$59,533.38 in prejudgment interest. The SEC dismissed its claims against McAfee due to his death in 2021.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Salt Blockchain Inc. f/k/a Salt Lending Holdings, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/30/2020	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a) , 5(c)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The SEC instituted cease-and-desist proceedings against Salt Blockchain Inc. for conducting an unregistered coin offering of digital tokens called "Salt Tokens," which raised around \$47 million. Without admitting or denying the findings, Salt agreed to cease and desist from any further violations, refund investors who purchased tokens, and pay \$250,000 in civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In <i>The Matter of Solutech, Inc. and Nathan Pitruzzello</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/25/2020	SEC Administrative Release	3-20071
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a), § 17; Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rules 10b-5		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The SEC settled fraud charges against SoluTech, Inc. and its former CEO in connection with an alleged unregistered offering of securities in the form of digital assets called SCRL. SoluTech raised approximately \$2.4 million from over 100 investors for a blockchain-based platform called the Scroll Network. The company is alleged to have made false and misleading statements about their business and numerous misrepresentations to raise additional funds through a Series A stock offering. SoluTech agreed to destroy all SCRL tokens in its possession and remove them from trading platforms. The former CEO, Pitruzzello, is barred from participating in any digital asset securities offerings and must pay approx. \$25,000 in civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. <i>Flik, et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/10/2020	N.D. Ga.	20-cv-3739
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b); Exchange Act Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 9(a)(1); Securities Act §§ 5(a) & 5(c); Securities Act § 17(b); Unjust Enrichment.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>Settlement requiring cease-and-desist and \$75,000 payment.</p> <p>The SEC filed a lawsuit against Flik, Coinspark, and Ryan Felton for offering fraudulent initial coin offerings. Felton claimed he would build a digital streaming platform for Flik tokens and a digital asset trading program for Coinspark. Instead, he is accused of transferring Flik tokens to himself and selling them to fund personal expenses, as well as artificially inflating the price of Spark tokens. A final judgment permanently enjoined Flik, Coinspark, and Felton for violating securities laws and ordered them to disgorge \$2.8 million plus prejudgment interest.</p> <p>Separately, a purchaser, Kenneth Fedance, brought a lawsuit against Ryan Felton and Clifford "T.I." Joseph Harris Jr., one of the purported co-owners of the company that issued the tokens. That suit was dismissed as untimely, in a decision affirmed by the 11th Circuit on June 21, 2021.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Millan, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/18/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-6575
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 15(a).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC filed a lawsuit against Cecilia Millan and Margarita Cabrera de Velasco for participating in a Ponzi-like scheme called AirBit Club. AirBit Club was a purportedly fraudulent investment program that promised returns on cryptocurrency investments but instead used new investors' money to pay off earlier ones.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Kelvin Boon, LLC and Rajesh Pavithran		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/13/2020	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c), 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC charged the defendants with fraud and registration violations related to an unregistered initial coin offering of a digital asset called "Boon Coins." The ICO raised approximately \$5 million to fund a software platform called Boon.Tech, which was still in its early stages. In promoting the ICO, Pavithran and Kelvin Boon, LLC, are alleged to have made misleading statements about the value of Boon Coins. The SEC issued a cease-and-desist order, and Boon.Tech and Pavithran settled, with Boon.Tech agreeing to pay \$5,000,000 plus \$600,334.50 in prejudgment interest, and Pavithran agreeing to pay \$150,000 in civil penalties.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Plutus Financial, Inc. d/b/a Abra, et ano.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/13/2020	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(e); Exchange Act § 6(l).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Settlement requiring cease-and-desist and \$150,000 civil penalty (also see CFTC settlement below).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC charged the defendants with violating securities laws through their unregistered offering and sale of security-based swaps, which were allegedly facilitated on Abra's mobile app. The defendants consented to a settlement requiring them to pay \$150,000 in civil penalties (see also CFTC settlement below).		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. NAC Foundation, LLC and Rowland Marcus Andrade		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/25/2020	N.D.Ca.	20-cv-4188
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that defendants engaged in a fraudulent and unregistered securities offering of ABTC tokens, which could allegedly later be traded for so-called anti-money laundering BitCoins. The SEC further alleges that the tokens offered by defendants never had any of the promised anti-money laundering or know-your-customer features promised to investors, and that defendants were never prepared to launch a coin with such features.</p> <p>On January 8, 2021, the court issued an order denying defendants' motion to dismiss primarily on the grounds that the SEC had sufficiently pled that the tokens sold by defendants were investment contracts under the Howey test.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Jack Abramoff		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/17/2020	N.D. Cal.	20-cv-4190
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The SEC filed a complaint against the defendant for promoting unregistered offers and sales of digital asset securities called "AML BitCoin" by NAC Foundation, LLC. The offering is said to have raised at least \$5.6 million from approximately 2,400 retail investors in the U.S. NAC Foundation LLC purportedly claimed that AML BitCoin was superior to Bitcoin due to anti-money laundering and other security technologies. However, the SEC further claimed that these technologies had never existed or been in development. Abramoff is accused of being aware of these false and misleading statements and continuing to promote the offering through articles and investor solicitations. Abramoff settled with the SEC, agreeing to pay \$55,000 in disgorgement and interest, and is permanently barred from future securities offerings.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Hvizdzak Capital Management, LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/16/2020	W.D. Pa.	20-cv-154
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The SEC obtained a temporary restraining order and asset freeze against the Hvizdzak brothers, who are said to have offered securities in a private fund called High Street Capital Fund USA, LP, falsely claiming it invested in digital assets. The defendants are accused of misappropriating tens of millions of dollars from retail investors into their personal bank accounts. The court froze \$7 million of investor funds, and the SEC alleged that \$24 million in funds is missing. The defendants were directed to disgorge all alleged ill-gotten gains, including prejudgment interest, and to pay civil money penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of BitClave PTE Ltd.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/28/2020	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC instituted and settled cease-and-desist proceedings against BitClave PTE Ltd., an early-stage blockchain services firm, over the alleged unregistered offer and sale of digital asset securities called “Consumer Activity Tokens” (CAT). The company is alleged to have raised approximately \$25.5 million from 9,500 investors. Without admitting or denying the allegations, BitClave agreed to pay around \$30 million in disgorgement, prejudgment interest, and civil penalties. The SEC established a Fair Fund to distribute these funds.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Putnam, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/7/2020	D. Utah	20-cv-301 (DBB)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5(a) and (c).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC obtained an asset freeze and other emergency relief against Daniel Putnam, Jean Paul Ramirez Rico, and Angel Rodriguez, who are alleged to have defrauded investors of over \$12 million through two Ponzi-like cryptocurrency schemes. Putnam is alleged to have used multiple multilevel marketing businesses to recruit investors. The defendants are accused of selling interests in a purported cryptocurrency mining operation and allegedly fake mining machines to about 200 investors. The SEC claims that they made false or misleading statements to investors and misappropriated funds for personal use. Without admitting or denying the allegations, Rodriguez settled with the SEC, agreeing to pay \$45,000 in disgorgement and an additional \$6,200 in prejudgment interest.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Dropil Inc. et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/23/2020	C.D. Ca.	20-cv-793
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17(a); Securities Act § 5(a) and (c).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Dropil, Inc. and its three founders with defrauding investors through a fraudulent and unregistered ICO of the DROP token. The ICO is alleged to have raised over \$1.8 million from thousands of investors. Dropil is accused of claiming that a trading bot would generate returns by trading investors' digital asset funds, but instead diverting the funds to the founders' personal digital asset and bank accounts. Additionally, Dropil allegedly fabricated profitability reports for their trading bot and misrepresented details about the volume and dollar amount of DROPs sold before and after the ICO. Defendants settled, and were ordered to pay disgorgement, prejudgment interest, and civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Meta 1 Coin Trust		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/16/2020	W.D. Tex.	20-cv-273
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The SEC obtained an asset freeze against Meta 1 Coin Trust regarding the unregistered offering and sale of a digital asset called "Meta 1 Coin." It is claimed that the defendants made false and misleading statements to investors, including claims that art collections and gold reserves backed their coin. The complaint estimates that the defendants raised over \$4.3 million from 150 investors in and outside the U.S.</p> <p>David A. Schmidt, who marketed Meta 1 Coin, was found liable for approximately \$26,000 in disgorgement and prejudgment interest, along with around \$24,000 in civil penalties. Meta 1 and Dunlap, another individual who organized the sale, were found liable for about \$12 million in disgorgement plus prejudgment interest, and around \$10 million in civil penalties. Bowdler was held liable for \$1,674,044.51 in disgorgement, including prejudgment interest, and approximately \$1.5 million in civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Steven Seagal		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/27/2020	Admin. Proc.	3-19712
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC settled with actor Steven Seagal related to charges of failing to disclose payments he received for promoting an initial coin offering conducted by Bitcoin2Gen (B2G). The SEC's order found that Seagal was promised \$250,000 in cash and \$750,000 worth of B2G tokens in exchange for posts on various social media accounts recommending the product. Without admitting or denying the SEC's findings, Seagal agreed to pay \$157,000 in disgorgement, including prejudgment interest, and \$157,000 in civil penalties. He also agreed not to promote any securities for three years.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Enigma MPC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/19/2020	Admin. Proc.	3-19702
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC announced a settlement with blockchain technology startup Enigma MPC for conducting an unregistered initial coin offering for ENG tokens, which raised \$45 million and sold \$75 million in digital tokens. Enigma MPC agreed to pay a \$500,000 fine and to file for registration.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Ackerman		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/11/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-1181
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Ackerman with operating a digital asset scheme called the "Q3 Trading Club," which allegedly defrauded around 100 investors. The Q3 Trading Club is said to have raised at least \$33 million by claiming it had developed a proprietary algorithm to generate large profits through cryptocurrency trading. Instead, Ackerman is alleged to have doctored images of Q3's trading account and used investor funds for personal expenses. The defendant was found liable for approximately \$30 million in disgorgement and prejudgment interest.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Grybniak, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/21/2020	E.D.N.Y.	20-cv-327
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17(a); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); aiding and abetting; unjust enrichment.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Grybniak and his company, Opperty International, Inc., in connection with an initial coin offering of a digital token named “OPP Tokens.” The offering is claimed to have raised approximately \$600,000 from nearly 200 investors. Grybniak and Opperty are accused of exaggerating the number of users on the platform and falsely claiming that the platform was registered and compliant with the SEC.</p> <p>On September 26, 2024, the court granted partial summary judgment to the SEC, and denied defendants’ summary judgment motion.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Boaz Manor, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/17/2020	D.N.J.	20-cv-597
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); aiding and abetting.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Boaz Manor, his associate, and two businesses, CG Blockchain Inc. and BCT Inc., in connection with a fraudulent and unregistered initial coin offering. This offering is said to have raised more than \$30 million from hundreds of investors. The defendants are accused of using false identities and falsely claiming that 20 hedge funds were testing technology to record transactions on a blockchain.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Blockchain of Things, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/18/2019	SEC Administrative Release	Release No. 33-10736
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and (c).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The Securities and Exchange Commission and Blockchain of Things Inc. (BCOT) agreed to a settlement regarding BCOT’s alleged unregistered offering and sale of digital tokens. The offering is said to have raised approximately \$13 million from 1,380 individuals. Without admitting or denying the allegations, BCOT agreed to cease and desist from further violations, register its tokens, and pay a monetary penalty of \$250,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Eyal and UnitedData, Inc. d/b/a "Shopin"		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/11/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-11325
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>Defendant pleads guilty to fraud in related criminal case in Kings County, New York, ordered to pay \$125k in restitution to Springleap investors, \$475k in fines, and give up remaining digital assets paid by investors, valued at \$450k.</p> <p>The SEC charged Eran Eyal, founder of UnitedData, Inc. d/b/a Shopin, with conducting a fraudulent ICO. The SEC purports that the ICO raised \$42.5 million in digital currency from the unregistered sale of the "Shopin token." Without admitting or denying the allegations, Eyal consented to a final judgment that bars him from acting as an officer or director of a public company, enjoins him from engaging in any offering of digital asset securities, and orders him to pay \$422,100 in disgorgement and about \$35,000 in prejudgment interest.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of XBT Corp Sarl d/b/a First Global Credit		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/31/2019	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Exchange Act § 6(1) and 15(a).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged XBT Corp with offering and selling unregistered security-based swaps to U.S. investors using bitcoins and for failing to make its swaps on a registered national exchange. After consenting to a cease-and-desist order, XBT Corp agreed to pay \$31,687 in disgorgement and a penalty of \$100,000. XBT Corp also agreed to repay trading losses incurred by U.S. investors.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Telegram Group, Inc. and Ton Issuer, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/11/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-9439 (PKC)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Preliminary injunction granted by district court, March 24, 2020.		
Follow up decision on PI, April 1, 2020, explains that order applies universally; not limited by extraterritoriality concerns.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
SEC alleges an unregistered securities offering, and filed a TRO to halt the then-upcoming \$1.7 billion token distribution. In granting a preliminary injunction, the court held that the SAFT offering and distribution of Grams comprised one unregistered securities offering. Settled for \$1.224 billion in disgorgement and \$18.5 million civil penalty.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Nebulous		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/30/2019	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC settled charges against Nebulous, Inc., relating to an unregistered offer and sale of securities that raised \$120,000. Nebulous is said to have announced plans to offer and sell “Siastock” and use the proceeds to develop a decentralized cloud storage network called Sia. Holders of Siastock were purportedly entitled to a percentage of revenue generated from transactions on the Sia network. Without admitting or denying the claims, Nebulous consented to a cease-and-desist order and agreed to pay \$120,000 in disgorgement, \$24,601 in prejudgment interest, and \$80,000 in civil penalties.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Block.one		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/30/2019	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC announced settled charges against Block.one for conducting an unregistered ICO that raised several billion dollars over one year. Block.one’s ICO is claimed to have raised billions in digital assets globally, including from many U.S. investors. Without admitting or denying the allegations, Block.one agreed to pay a \$24 million civil monetary penalty.		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Lucas		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/20/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-8771
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17(a); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Jonathan C. Lucas, former founder and CEO of Fantasy Market, an adult entertainment marketplace, with conducting a fraudulent ICO. The unregistered sale of digital securities on Fantasy Market is claimed to have raised \$63,000 from 100 investors. Lucas is also alleged to have made numerous false statements in a white paper and online to persuade investors to participate in the ICO. Without admitting or denying the allegations, Lucas consented to a final judgment that ordered him to pay a \$15,000 civil penalty and imposed a five-year bar from acting as an officer or director.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. ICOBox and Evdokimov		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/18/2019	C.D. Cal	19-cv-8066 (DSF)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Exchange Act § 15.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Default judgment awarded against Defendants.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC sued ICOBox and its founder, Evdokimov, for allegedly conducting an unregistered offering of ICOBox's digital token, "ICOS." The SEC's complaint states that ICOBox sold around \$14.6 million in "ICOS" tokens to over 2,000 investors. The SEC also alleged that ICOBox provided unregistered broker services by facilitating initial coin offerings for clients that raised more than \$650 million. The defendants defaulted, and the court issued a default judgment in favor of the SEC. The judgment found ICOBox and Evdokimov jointly and severally liable for approximately \$16,059,000 in disgorgement and prejudgment interest. Evdokimov was also ordered to pay a civil penalty of \$192,768.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Bitqyck, Inc. Bruce E. Bise, and Samuel J. Mendez		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/29/2019	N.D. Tex. – Dallas Division	19-cv-2059
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17(a); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Exchange Registration Provisions of the Exchange Act § 5; aiding and abetting.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The SEC filed charges against Bitqyck, Inc., and its founders, Bruce E. Bise and Samuel J. Mendez, for conducting unregistered securities offerings and exchanges. The SEC claimed that Bitqyck and its founders raised more than \$13 million through the offering of digital assets Bitqy and BitqyM. The defendants are also accused of falsely telling investors that Bitqy tokens represented fractional shares of Bitqyck stock and that the Bitqy token provided interest in a cryptocurrency mining facility, which, according to the SEC, did not exist. Without admitting or denying the allegations, all defendants consented to final judgments agreeing to the injunctive relief. Bitqyck agreed to pay \$8,375,617 in disgorgement, prejudgment interest, and civil penalties. Bise and Mendez consented to orders of \$890,254 and \$850,022, respectively, in disgorgement, prejudgment interest, and civil penalties.</p> <p>On March 10, 2022, the owners of Bitqyck were sentenced to a combined 8 years in federal prison for tax evasion.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of ICO Rating		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/20/2019	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(b).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC settled cease-and-desist proceedings with ICO Rating, a Russian website that provides reviews and rating services for cryptocurrency. The SEC alleged that ICO Rating failed to disclose compensation received from issuers. Despite being a Russian site, the SEC claimed that ICO Rating attracted a significant portion of its web traffic from the United States and did not implement measures to block U.S. users from accessing the site. The Commission estimated that ICO Rating was paid approximately \$100,572 by certain cryptocurrency issuers. Without admitting or denying the allegations, ICO Rating agreed to pay \$100,673 in disgorgement, \$6,426 in prejudgment interest, and a civil penalty of \$162,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of SimplyVital Health, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/12/2019	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC announced settled charges against SimplyVital Health, Inc. a New England-based blockchain company, for allegedly conducting an unregistered securities offering that raised around \$6.3 million. The SEC claimed that in late 2017, SimplyVital Health, Inc. publicly announced plans to conduct an ICO for a new token called Health Cash (HLTH). The SEC alleged that SimplyVital Health claimed this token would serve as a currency in the Health Nexus, a “healthcare-related blockchain ecosystem,” and that the funds raised from the ICO would purportedly help develop this ecosystem. Although SimplyVital Health conducted a pre-sale in 2018, it did not proceed with the scheduled ICO. SimplyVital Health voluntarily returned the funds raised during the pre-sale to investors and consented to a cease-and-desist order without admitting or denying the SEC’s findings.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Middleton, Veritaseum, Inc., and Veritaseum, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/12/2019	E.D.N.Y.	19-cv-4625
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17(a); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Exchange Act § 9(a)(2).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>Proposed Settlement and Final Judgment. The SEC charged Veritaseum, Inc., Veritaseum LLC, and their owner, Reginald Middleton, with engaging in fraudulent activities related to the unregistered sale of securities through an ICO. The SEC claimed that the defendants raised millions of dollars through the ICO of their digital token, VERI. They further claimed that the defendants made false and misleading statements to investors about Veritaseum’s profitability, the use of ICO funds, and the amount raised. Middleton was accused of purportedly manipulating VERI’s price and volume on secondary digital-asset trading platforms during the ICO. A final judgment ordered the defendants to pay \$7,891,600 in disgorgement and \$582,535 in prejudgment interest. Middleton was found liable for a \$1,000,000 civil penalty.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Longfin Corp., and Meenavalli		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/5/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-5296
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 13(a) and Rules 12b-20, 13a-1, 13a-11, and 13a-13; Exchange Act § 13(b)(2)(A) and (B); Exchange Act § 13(b)(5) and Rule 13b2-1; Exchange Act Rule 13a-14; Exchange Act Rule 13b2-2.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>Default judgment against Longfin ordering \$3,532,235 in disgorgement and a \$3,243,613 civil monetary penalty. The SEC filed a complaint against Longfin Corp. and its CEO, Venkata S. Meenavalli, for engaging in fraudulent conduct related to obtaining a Nasdaq listing. The defendants were also accused of committing accounting fraud by reporting fictitious revenue from commodity transactions and creating materially false financial reports. In a default judgment, Longfin was ordered to pay \$6,755,848 in penalties and disgorgement. Meenavalli settled without admitting or denying the allegations and agreed to pay \$400,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Kik Interactive Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/4/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-5244
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and (c).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>Wells submission made public by the company on 12/10/2018.</p> <p>SEC's motion for summary judgment granted.</p> <p>SEC obtains final judgment.</p>		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>This case marks the first district court litigation by the SEC alleging only violations of the registration provisions of Section 5 of the Securities Act, without fraud allegations. The SEC filed a lawsuit against Kik Interactive Inc. for allegedly conducting an unregistered offer and sale of securities. Kik was alleged to have raised \$100 million through an offering of its "Kin" tokens. The SEC won on summary judgment, with the court finding that the sale of the tokens constituted sales of securities. The final judgment required Kik to notify the SEC before engaging in future issuances, offers, sales, and transfers of digital assets for the next three years. The company was also ordered to pay a \$5 million penalty.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Savraj Gata-Aura and Core Agents, Ltd.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/23/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-4780
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged defendants with aiding and abetting an alleged investment scheme that defrauded investors of more than \$30 million. The defendants, a group of sales agents, were accused of selling fraudulent investments in Bar Works, Inc. and Bar Works 7th Avenue, Inc. The SEC alleged that the offering materials used false and misleading information about Bar Works, including a fake name as the purported CEO and omitting mention of the actual CEO, Renwick Haddow. Gata-Aura and Core Agents were alleged to have raised over \$10 million from 100 investors through fraudulent investments and received at least \$2.9 million in commissions from Haddow and the Bar Works companies. Gata-Aura and Core Agents Ltd. were each found liable for \$2.9 million in disgorgement, \$300,000 in prejudgment interest, and \$160,000 in civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Pacheco		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/22/2019	C.D.Cal	19-cv-958
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17(a)(1) and (3); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); unjust enrichment.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC filed a civil injunctive action against Daniel Pacheco, who is alleged to have perpetrated a multimillion-dollar pyramid scheme. The complaint alleged that Pacheco conducted a fraudulent, unregistered offering of securities through his two companies: IPro Solutions LLC and IPro Network LLC. Between 2017 and 2018, IPro reportedly raised over \$26 million from investors by selling instructional packages about e-commerce. Investors were given “points” that were convertible to the companies’ own PRO token. The SEC alleged that Pacheco misappropriated investor funds to purchase luxury items. The court found Pacheco liable for \$26 million in disgorgement and \$1.8 million in prejudgment interest, and ordered him to pay \$100,000 in civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of NextBlock Global Ltd. and Alex Tapscott		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/14/2019	Ontario Securities Commission / SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a)(2).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Joint SEC Administrative Release with the Ontario Securities Commission.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC, in conjunction with the Ontario Securities Commission, settled charges against NextBlock Global, a Canadian corporation formed to invest in blockchain companies and related digital assets, and its co-founder and former CEO, Alex Tapscott. The SEC alleged that NextBlock raised around \$20 million CAD and \$16 million USD from over 100 investors, including those in the U.S. The company was also accused of falsely claiming that prominent individuals in the blockchain industry were advisors to the company. Without admitting or denying the allegations, NextBlock agreed to a cease-and-desist order, paid a \$700,000 CAD administrative penalty, and contributed \$100,000 toward the Ontario Securities Commission's investigation. Alex Tapscott agreed to pay a \$300,000 CAD administrative penalty to the Ontario Securities Commission and a \$25,000 civil penalty to the SEC.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Natural Diamonds Investment Co., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/13/2019	S.D.FI.	19-cv-80633 (RLR)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17(a); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
TRO obtained; receiver appointed 5/20/2019.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC filed a case against Natural Diamonds Investments Co. and others associated with the company, alleging that they operated a Ponzi scheme that targeted over 300 investors in the U.S. and Canada, raising around \$30 million. The SEC claimed the defendants promised unreasonably large returns through investment contracts supposedly backed by diamonds. Instead, investor funds were allegedly misused to pay earlier investors and for personal expenses. The court granted a temporary restraining order (TRO) and appointed a receiver over Argyle Coin. The court ordered disgorgement of all ill-gotten gains and imposed civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Bitcoin Generation, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/29/2019	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 12(k)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC suspended trading in the securities of Bitcoin Generation Inc. (BTGN) from April 29, 2019, to May 10, 2019, due to concerns about the accuracy and adequacy of publicly available information on the marketplace.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Mutual Coin Fund LLC and Usman Majeed		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/1/2019	SEC Administrative Release	3-19127
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), 17(a)(2)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC issued a cease-and-desist order against Mutual Coin Fund LLC and its founder, Usman Majeed, with the alleged unregistered sale of limited partnership interests in Mutual Coin Fund LP, which invested in cryptocurrencies like Bitcoin, Ethereum, and Litecoin. MCF purportedly raised \$567,000 from 15 individual investors between August 2017 and May 2018; the SEC alleged that MCF intentionally misrepresented the amount of money raised.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Gladius Network LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/20/2019	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC charged Gladius Network LLC for allegedly conducting an unregistered ICO and violating securities laws. The SEC claimed that Gladius, which offered and sold digital asset securities, did not register its ICO with the SEC nor qualify for an exemption from registration. The company allegedly raised approximately \$12.7 million from investors in the U.S. and around the world. Gladius was notable for being the first ICO issuer to self-report its violation of registration requirements. Due to their self-reporting of the violation, Gladius was not assessed a civil penalty as part of the settlement. The company agreed to return \$12.7 million to investors and comply with various undertakings to ensure future compliance with securities laws.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of CoinAlpha Advisors LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/7/2018	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged CoinAlpha Advisors LLC, a Delaware limited liability company based in Sunnyvale, California, for failure to register. Between October 2017 and May 2018, CoinAlpha allegedly raised approximately \$600,000 from 22 investors in the U.S., promising profits from the fund’s digital asset investments. The SEC claimed CoinAlpha violated securities laws by raising funds from investors without being registered. As a result, the SEC issued a cease-and-desist order against CoinAlpha Advisors LLC and imposed a \$50,000 penalty.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Floyd Mayweather, Jr.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/29/2018	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged professional boxer Floyd Mayweather Jr. for allegedly promoting investments in ICOs without disclosing promotional payments. The SEC claimed that Mayweather received payments from three ICO issuers, including \$100,000 from Centra Tech Inc., in exchange for social media promotions. Without admitting or denying the findings, Mayweather agreed to pay \$300,000 in disgorgement, a \$300,000 penalty, and \$14,775 in prejudgment interest. Mayweather also agreed not to promote any securities, digital or otherwise, for three years.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Khaled Khaled		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/29/2018	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged music producer Khaled Khaled, known as DJ Khaled, for allegedly failing to disclose promotional payments he received for promoting investments in ICOs. The SEC claimed that Khaled received a \$50,000 payment from Centra Tech Inc., which he later promoted on his Twitter account. Without admitting or denying the findings, Khaled agreed to pay \$50,000 in disgorgement, a \$100,000 penalty, and \$2,725 in prejudgment interest. He also agreed to a two-year ban from promoting any securities, digital or otherwise.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Paragon Coin, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/16/2018	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that Paragon Coin conducted an unregistered initial coin offering in which it purportedly raised approximately \$12 million from investors. Paragon Coin agreed to pay a \$250,000 penalty, register its tokens as securities, and file periodic reports with the SEC to ensure ongoing compliance. The SEC explicitly encouraged other companies in the digital asset space to self-report violations and adopt similar measures. However, Paragon Coin was never able to register its token.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of CarrierEQ, Inc., d/b/a AirFox		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/16/2018	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that AirFox conducted an unregistered initial coin offering in which it purportedly raised \$15 million from investors. AirFox agreed to pay a \$250,000 penalty, register its tokens as securities, and file periodic reports with the SEC. The SEC explicitly encouraged other companies to self-report violations and adopt similar measures. However, AirFox was never able to register its token.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Zachary Coburn		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/8/2018	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 5		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Disgorgement \$300k, prejudgment interest \$13k, civil monetary penalties of \$75k.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Zachary Coburn, founder of EtherDelta, for allegedly operating an unregistered securities exchange. The SEC claimed that Coburn wrote the code for EtherDelta, which provided a marketplace for bringing together the orders of multiple buyers and sellers of digital asset securities, specifically Ether and ERC-20 tokens, through the combined use of an order book (a website that displayed orders) and a smart contract run on the Ethereum blockchain. Without admitting or denying the findings, Coburn agreed to pay \$300,000 in disgorgement, a \$75,000 penalty, and \$13,000 in prejudgment interest.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Saint James Holding and Investment Company Trust and Jeffrey James		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/5/2018	C.D.Cal.	18-mc-135
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. § 77s(c), 15 U.S.C. § 78u(b) (application for order compelling compliance with investigative subpoenas)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC issued subpoenas to St. James Trust and its sole trustee, Jeffrey James, over their alleged involvement in a pump-and-dump scheme involving Cherubim Interests. Cherubim allegedly issued false public statements claiming a \$100,000,000 financing commitment for St. James Trust, which purportedly caused their stock price to rise. Despite multiple attempts, James and St. James Trust allegedly failed to respond or produce the relevant documents.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Crypto Asset Management, LP and Timothy Enneking		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/11/2018	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Investment Advisers Act §§ 203(c), 203(f), and 203(k); Investment Company Act § 9(f)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC issued a cease-and-desist order against Crypto Asset Management, LP (CAM), a California-based hedge fund manager, and its founder and sole principal, Timothy Enneking. The SEC claimed that CAM falsely represented to investors that it was the “first regulated crypto asset fund in the United States” despite not having filed a registration statement with the SEC. The defendants allegedly raised over \$3.6 million from 44 investors. Without admitting or denying the allegations, the defendants consented to the cease-and-desist order and agreed to pay a \$200,000 civil money penalty.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of TokenLot, LLC, Lenny Kugel, and Eli L. Lewitt		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/11/2018	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 15(a); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The SEC charged TokenLot for allegedly operating as an unregistered broker-dealer from July 2017 to 2018, advertising and selling digital tokens to retail investors through its website. The SEC claimed that TokenLot received orders from over 6,100 retail investors and handled more than 200 different digital tokens. Without admitting or denying the SEC's findings, the defendants agreed to pay \$471,000 in disgorgement, plus \$7,929 in interest, and \$45,000 in penalties each. The defendants also agreed to industry and penny stock bars, along with an investment company prohibition, with the right to reapply after three years.		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Blockvest et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/3/2018	S.D.Cal.	18-cv-2287
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17(a); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Exchange Act § 5		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Denial of preliminary injunction; SEC did not show tokens were securities because of issue of fact as to whether they were sold to real investors.		
Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Reconsideration.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC filed a complaint against Blockvest LLC and its founder, Reginald "Buddy" Ringgold III. The SEC alleged that Blockvest and Ringgold made fraudulent offers of securities in the form of digital assets called BLVs. The defendants were accused of falsely claiming that their crypto fund was licensed and regulated, and of using the SEC seal without permission in their ICO advertising. The defendants were able to halt a preliminary injunction by demonstrating that their product had not been purchased by any real investors. In a final judgment, the court found the defendants liable for \$332,370 in disgorgement, plus \$31,455 in prejudgment interest. The court also granted the SEC's request for a \$332,370.99 civil penalty.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. 1Pool Ltd. a.k.a. 1Broker and Patrick Brunner		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/27/2018	D.D.C.	18-cv-2244
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(c); and Exchange Act §§ 6(l) and 15(a)(1)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Final Judgment.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC alleged that 1Pool sold security-based swaps through bitcoin transactions without filing a registration statement with the SEC. Without admitting or denying the allegations, the defendants consented to a final judgment that found them liable for disgorgement of \$26,167, plus approximately \$1,000 in prejudgment interest. The CEO, Brunner, was found individually liable for a civil penalty of \$26,167.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Barry C. Honig et al. (Riot Blockchain)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/7/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-8175
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act §§ 17(a) and 17(b); Exchange Act § 9(a); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Exchange Act §§ 13(d) and Rule 13d-1(a); aiding and abetting		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The SEC charged Barry C. Honig and several associated entities and individuals for their alleged involvement in fraudulent schemes that the SEC claimed generated over \$27 million from unlawful stock sales. The SEC's complaint alleged that Honig led a group of South Florida-based microcap fraudsters who manipulated the share prices of three companies through classic pump-and-dump schemes.</p> <p>The court issued various final judgments against the 19 defendants in the case. Barry C. Honig was found liable for disgorgement of approximately \$16.6 million, plus interest, and a civil penalty of \$6 million. Other defendants were also held liable, with many facing substantial disgorgement amounts and civil penalties based on their specific roles in the fraudulent activities.</p> <p>On July 19, 2024, the CEO of MGT Capital, Robert Ladd, was also ordered to pay a \$1.1 million civil penalty for his role in making misstatements regarding the pump-and-dump scheme.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Moore, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/27/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-7803
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC filed a complaint against James Bernard Moore and Universal Voicetech Inc., a company controlled by Moore and his wife. The SEC alleged that the defendants recruited a network of sales agents to promote and sell investments using false and misleading offering materials. Specifically, the SEC claimed that these materials contained deceptive statements and omissions that misled investors about the nature and risks of the investments. The SEC alleged that Moore and Universal Voicetech played a significant role in aiding and abetting violations of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by facilitating these fraudulent activities.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Tomahawk Exploration and David Thompson Laurence		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/14/2018	SEC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC instituted settled cease-and-desist proceedings against Tomahawk Exploration and its principal, David Thompson Laurence, alleging securities violations. The SEC further claimed that the company, under Laurence’s leadership, made false and misleading statements about its business prospects and financial condition.</p> <p>Although Tomahawk distributed its tokens at no cost, the SEC alleged that this distribution still constituted an “investment of money” under the Howey test. The SEC argued that Tomahawk received value from these distributions, including online marketing and the creation of a public trading market for its securities. As part of the settlement, Laurence agreed to pay \$30,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Jesky et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/2/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-5980
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged T.J. Jesky and Mark DeStefano for allegedly profiting from illegal sales of stock in UBI Blockchain, a company claiming to have a blockchain-related business. In October 2017, Jesky and DeStefano received 72,000 restricted shares of UBI Blockchain stock, which they were permitted to sell at a fixed price of \$3.70 under the registration statement. The SEC alleged that they instead sold the shares at market prices ranging from \$21.12 to \$48.40 during an unusual price spike in UBI Blockchain’s stock. Between December 26, 2017, and January 5, 2018, the defendants allegedly made approximately \$1.5 million from these sales. Without admitting or denying the allegations, Jesky and DeStefano agreed to return approximately \$1.4 million of the alleged ill-gotten gains, pay \$188,682 in civil penalties, and become subject to permanent injunctions.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Titanium Blockchain Infrastructure Services et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/22/2018	C.D.Ca.	18-cv-4315
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17; Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Exchange Act § 5		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Preliminary Injunction Order. Stipulation for Modification of Asset Freeze.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC announced a preliminary injunction and issued orders to freeze assets and provide other relief concerning an ICO of a token called "BAR" by Titanium Blockchain Services, which raised \$21 million from investors in the U.S. and abroad. The SEC's complaint alleged that Michael Alan Stollery, the president of Titanium, made false statements about business relationships with well-known firms, such as PayPal, and fabricated testimonials from corporate customers on Titanium's website. Stollery is also alleged to have used some of the ICO investors' funds for personal expenses. The court ordered Stollery to pay disgorgement of ill-gotten gains, prejudgment interest, and a civil penalty.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Longfin Corp., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/4/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-2977
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Final Judgment as to Defendant Andy Altahawi. Final Judgment as to Defendant Dorababu Penumarthy. Final Judgment as to Defendant Suresh Tammineedi.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Longfin Corp, its CEO Venkata S. Meenavalli, and individuals Andy Altahawi, Dorababu Penumarthy, and Suresh Tammineedi for allegedly violating federal securities laws by conducting unregistered sales of over \$27 million in Longfin's securities. The court entered final judgments against all the defendants, ordering them to pay a total of \$22,862,377.23 in disgorgement and \$3,582,941.97 in civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Sharma and Farkas		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/2/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-2909
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5(a)-(c); Securities Act § 17(a)(1)-(3); Securities Act § 5(a) and (c); aiding and abetting		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Sohrab Sharma, Raymond Trapani, and Robert Farkas, co-founders of Centra Tech, Inc., with orchestrating a fraudulent ICO that raised over \$32 million in 2017. The SEC alleged that Sharma and Farkas falsely claimed the funds would be used to develop financial products, such as a debit card backed by Visa/MasterCard for converting cryptocurrencies into US dollars. In a final judgment, the court barred all three defendants from participating directly or indirectly in any future securities offerings. Sharma was found liable for approximately \$38,000,000 in disgorgement, including prejudgment interest. Farkas was ordered to pay about \$395,000 in disgorgement and prejudgment interest, while Trapani was ordered to pay around \$2,610,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Montroll and BitFunder		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/21/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-1582
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17; Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Exchange Act § 5; control person liability		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged BitFunder, a former bitcoin-denominated platform, and its founder, Jon E. Montroll, for allegedly operating an unregistered online securities exchange. The SEC also claimed that BitFunder defrauded users by misappropriating bitcoins and failing to disclose a cyberattack that resulted in the loss of over 6,000 bitcoins. Montroll was found liable for disgorgement of \$155,572.53 as a result of the alleged conduct.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Cherubim Interests, Inc. suspension of trading		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/15/2018	SEC administrative release	

Filing / Order		
PDX Partners, Inc. suspension of trading		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/15/2018	SEC administrative release	

Filing / Order		
Victura Construction Group, Inc. suspension of trading		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/15/2018	SEC administrative release	

Filing / Order		
SEC v. AriseBank et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/25/2018	N.D.Tx.	18-cv-186
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Securities Act § 17; Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; aiding and abetting		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Preliminary injunction granted against Defendant Stanley Ford. Order Governing the Sale of Personal Property. Final Judgment as to Defendants Jared Rice Sr. and Stanley Ford.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>In the SEC's first action against a self-proclaimed cryptocurrency bank, the agency charged AriseBank and its co-founders, Jared Rice Sr. and Stanley Ford, with allegedly conducting an unregistered offering of securities and using materially false statements to induce investment. The SEC claimed that AriseBank raised \$600 million in an ICO, which was halted by the SEC. In a final judgment, the bank was placed into receivership, and each defendant was permanently restrained and enjoined from violating Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933. The defendants were found jointly liable for disgorgement of approximately \$2.7 million, along with around \$185,000 in civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
UBI Blockchain suspension of trading		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/5/2018	SEC administrative release	

Filing / Order		
In the matter of Munchee Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/11/2017	SEC administrative proceeding	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC instituted cease-and-desist proceedings against Munchee Inc. regarding the ICO of a token called MUN, which aimed to raise about \$15 million for its existing restaurant review app. Munchee Inc. agreed to halt the ICO without admitting or denying the SEC's findings.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Plexcorps et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/1/2017	E.D.N.Y.	17-cv-7007
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 17; Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); aiding and abetting		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Denial of motion to dismiss based on personal jurisdiction.		
Final Judgment as to Defendants.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC filed a complaint against PlexCorps, Dominic LaCroix, and Sabrina Paradis-Royer, and obtained a temporary restraining order to halt the dissemination of allegedly materially false and misleading statements about the illegal offering of unregistered securities, known as PlexCoins, through an ICO. The defendants moved to dismiss based on personal jurisdiction, but the court denied this motion. The parties then settled. In a final judgment, the defendants were permanently restrained and enjoined from violating, Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5; and agreed to pay disgorgement of \$4,563,468.62 in disgorgement (the amount traceable to, or assumed to be from, purchases by U.S. persons), and total civil penalties of \$2 million.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. ReCoin Group Foundation, LLC and DRC World Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/29/2017	E.D.N.Y.	17-cv-5725
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17(a); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); aiding and abetting.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order granting Motion to Intervene and Motion to Stay.		
Order granting Motion to Approve Consent Judgement.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Maksim Zaslavskiy, along with ReCoin Group Foundation, LLC and DRC World Inc. (two companies owned by him), for allegedly conducting illegal, unregistered securities offerings and making fraudulent and misleading statements about their ICOs. The SEC claimed that Defendants made various false and misleading statements for which Zaslavskiy was solely responsible – these statements ranging from the purchase of digital tokens to having a team that was investing ReCoin’s ICO proceeds into real estate and diamonds with 10-15% returns to investors. The court ruled in favor of the SEC, thereby ordering all defendants to permanently restrain and enjoin from any direct or indirect violations of the Exchange and/or Securities Act going forward, to pay disgorgement of ill-gotten gains, prejudgment interest thereon, and civil penalties. Zaslavskiy later pled guilty to conspiracy to commit securities fraud in connection with two ICOs. See U.S. v. Zaslavskiy, below.</p>		

Filing / Order		
First Bitcoin Capital Corp. suspension of trading		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/23/2017	SEC administrative release	

Filing / Order		
CIAO Group, Inc. suspension of trading		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/9/2017	SEC administrative release	

Filing / Order		
Strategic Global Investments, Inc. suspension of trading		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/3/2017	SEC administrative release	

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Haddow et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/30/2017	S.D.N.Y.	17-cv-4950
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; aiding and abetting; control person liability; unjust enrichment.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Preliminary injunction granted against Defendants and Relief Defendant.		
Judgment permanently restraining Defendant from violating Exchange Act § 10(b).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC filed charges against Renwick Haddow, the founder of Bitcoin Store, Inc., and two shared workplace startups, Bar Works, Inc., and Bar Works 7th Avenue, Inc. The SEC claimed that Haddow had created a broker-dealer and violated federal securities laws by not registering it with the SEC. Haddow was also accused of running a Ponzi scheme and misappropriating funds among the three companies. A default judgment ordered Bar Works, Inc., to pay about \$42,000,000, Bar Works 7th Avenue, Inc., to pay about \$40,000,000, and Bitcoin Store, Inc., to pay approximately \$1,623,000 to the SEC. Haddow was permanently restrained and enjoined from violating Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Sunshine Capital, Inc. suspension of trading		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/11/2017	SEC administrative release	Release No. 80435
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Exchange Act § 12k		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC announced the trading suspension of Sunshine Capital in connection with concerns concerning the liquidity and value of their assets, specifically holdings of the DIBCOINS cryptocurrency.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the matter of Bitcoin Investment Trust and Secondmarket Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/11/2016	SEC administrative proceeding	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Regulation M		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Bitcoin Investment Trust and SecondMarket Inc., agreed to settle charges with the SEC over allegations that the companies violated Rules 101 and 102 of Regulation M related to their purchase of BIT shares during a continuous distribution. Without admitting or denying the findings, SecondMarket and BIT agreed to a cease-and-desist order against future violations of Rules 101 and 102 of Regulation M. SecondMarket agreed to pay a total of \$53,755.79 in disgorgement including prejudgment interest.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Garza		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/1/2015	D. Conn.	15-cv-1760
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 17(a); §§ 5(a) and 5(c)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement and Entry of Final Judgment.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Garza with allegedly conducting a fraudulent offering of unregistered securities and operating a Ponzi scheme through the companies GAW Miners and ZenMiner. A final judgement against Garza enjoined him from further securities related violations and found him liable of a disgorgement of \$9,182,000, along with prejudgment interest of \$724,774.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the matter of BTC Trading, Corp. and Ethan Burnside		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/8/2014	SEC administrative proceeding	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act §§ 15(b) and 21C; Investment Company Act § 9(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Burnside for allegedly operating two online venues that traded securities using bitcoin and Litecoin without being registered. Burnside cooperated with the SEC and settled the case, agreeing to disgorge \$58,000, along with \$10,000 in civil penalties. He was barred from the securities industry, with the right to reapply in two years.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the matter of Erik Voorhees (FeedZeBirds and SatoshiDICE)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/3/2014	SEC administrative proceeding	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The SEC charged Erik Voorhees, alleging that he had offered unregistered securities in two of his companies, FeedZeBirds and SatoshiDice. The shares were offered and sold in bitcoin. Voorhees settled with the SEC by agreeing to a cease-and-desist order, paying a disgorgement of around \$15,000 and civil penalties of \$35,000. Voorhees was barred from making bitcoin security offerings for five years.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SEC v. Shavers and Bitcoin Savings and Trust		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/23/2013	E.D.Tx.	13-cv-416
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Amended Final Judgment.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The first litigation by the SEC related to Bitcoin. The SEC accused Shavers of fraudulent offers and sales of BTCST in which all solicited investments were paid in bitcoin. Shavers was accused of operating a Ponzi scheme and using new bitcoin from investors to pay returns and diverted funds for personal use. The final judgment enjoined Shavers and Bitcoin Savings and Trust and ordered disgorgement of over \$40 million. Both defendants were also fined \$150,000.</p>		

CFTC Litigation and Administrative Proceedings

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Universal Navigation Inc. d/b/a Uniswap Labs		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/4/2024	CFTC Administrative Release	24-25
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
7 U.S.C. § 6(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The CFTC settled with Uniswap Labs regarding allegations that it contributed to a digital assets protocol that allowed users to trade leveraged tokens in violation of the CEA. As part of the settlement with the CFTC, Uniswap agreed to cease any future violations 7 U.S.C. § 6(a) pertaining to sales of leveraged tokens to U.S. investors and pay a civil monetary penalty of \$175,000.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of cryptominerstrade.com		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/3/2024	CFTC Administrative Release	24-21
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act §4d(a)(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The CTFC initiated an administrative proceeding ordering cryptominerstrade.com, which purported to be regulated by the CFTC, to cease and desist from acting as an unregistered futures commission merchant.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Expert Stocks Zone		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/3/2024	CFTC Administrative Release	24-22
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act §4d(a)(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The CTFC initiated an administrative proceeding ordering Expert Stocks Zone, which purported to be regulated by the CFTC, to cease and desist from acting as an unregistered futures commission merchant.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of FalconForexBot		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/3/2024	CFTC Administrative Release	24-23
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act §4d(a)(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The CFTC initiated an administrative proceeding ordering FalconForexBot, which purported to be regulated by the CFTC, to cease and desist from acting as an unregistered futures commission merchant.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of swiftminingexpert.com		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/3/2024	CFTC Administrative Release	24-24
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act §4d(a)(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The CFTC initiated an administrative proceeding ordering swiftminingexpert.com, which purported to be regulated by the CFTC, to cease and desist from acting as an unregistered futures commission merchant.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Falcon Labs Ltd.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/13/2024	CFTC Administrative Release	24-06
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
7 U.S.C. §§ 6d(a)(1), 1a(28)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The CFTC settled with Falcon Labs, a Seychelles entity, for providing U.S. persons access to digital asset derivatives trading platforms. Falcon Labs purportedly collected net fees of approximately \$1,179,008 from customers entering digital asset derivative transactions intermediated by Falcon Labs. The order requires \$1,179,008 in disgorgement and a \$589,504 civil monetary penalty. The order recognizes that Falcon Labs also voluntarily improved its controls for identifying the location of customers, after the CFTC filed its complaint against Binance.		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Debiex (defendant), Zhāng Chéng Yáng (relief defendant)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/17/2024	D. Ariz.	24-cv-117-DLR
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
7 U.S.C. § 9(1); 17 C.F.R. § 180.1(a)(1), (3)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC alleged that Debiex used romance scam tactics to induce customers to open and fund digital asset trading accounts resulting in the misappropriation of roughly \$2.3 million from five customers. The CFTC alleged that Debiex used social media platforms, to initiate contact with many of the customers.</p> <p>Zhāng Chéng Yáng was named as a relief defendant because Debiex used his digital asset wallet to misappropriate at least one customer’s funds.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Stephen Ehrlich		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/12/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cv-8962
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 6(c)(1), 4o(1)(A)–(B), 4k(2), 4m(1); 17 C.F.R. §§ 4.21, 180.1(a)(1)–(3)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC alleged that Stephen Ehrlich, CEO of Voyager Digital, fraudulently solicited participation in a digital asset trading and custody platform that was operated as unregistered commodity pool with an unregistered commodity pool operator leading to customer losses of over \$1.7 billion.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Deridex, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/7/2023	CFTC Administrative Release	23-42
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 4(a), 4d(a)(1), 5h(a)(1); Regulations 37.3(a)(1), 42.2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC settled with Deridex for developing, deploying, and maintaining the Deridex Protocol, which offered leveraged trading of alleged digital asset derivatives to retail and institutional users in the U.S., without registering with the CFTC as a swap execution facility or a designated contract market. Additionally, Deridex operated as an unregistered futures commission merchant and failed to conduct know-your-customer diligence as part of a customer identification program, as required of futures commission merchants. The settlement required a \$100,000 civil monetary penalty.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of ZeroEx, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/7/2023	CFTC Administrative Release	23-41
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 4a		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC settled with ZeroEx for developing and deploying the 0x Protocol that allegedly allowed retail and institutional users in the U.S. the ability to trade leveraged tokens created by third parties on a peer-to-peer basis, including through its front-end user interface Matcha. The settlement required a \$200,000 civil monetary penalty.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Oryn, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/7/2023	CFTC Administrative Release	23-40
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 4(a), 4d(a)(1), 5h(a)(1); Regulations 37.3(a)(1), 42.2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC settled with Oryn for developing and deploying the Oryn protocol, which allegedly offered trading of digital asset derivatives to traders in the U.S. without registering with the CFTC as a swap execution facility or a designated contract market. The CFTC alleged that the Oryn protocol was accessible to users in the United States through Oryn’s website; by accessing the Oryn Protocol through a particular (unnamed) decentralized exchange; and by accessing the Oryn protocol directly through an (unnamed) blockchain explorer. As a result, Oryn also allegedly operated as an unregistered futures commission merchant and failed to conduct know-your-customer diligence as part of a customer identification program, as required of futures commission merchants. The settlement required a \$250,000 civil monetary penalty.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Traders Global Group Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/28/2023	D.N.J.	23cv11808
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
17 C.F.R. §§ 5.2(b)(1), 5.3(a)(6)(I), 5.3(a)(6)(ii); 7 U.S.C. §§ 6b(a)(2)(A), (C), 2(c)(2)(C)(iii)(I)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC alleged that defendants violated various provisions of the CEA and CFTC regulations through engaging in a large-scale fraud scheme purporting to offer U.S. customers the opportunity to trade in leveraged contracts and commodities including precious metals, digital asset commodities, broad-based stock indices, and oil.</p> <p>On November 14, 2023, the court granted an injunction prohibiting future violations of the CEA, freezing a portion of defendants’ corporate assets and appointing a receiver.</p> <p>On March 7, 2024, plaintiff filed a request for sanctions against the CFTC for making misrepresentations to the court while seeking an ex parte temporary restraining order to freeze defendants’ assets.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Michael Griffis, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/24/2023	M.D. Tenn.	23-cv-741
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 4b(a)(2)(A)-(C), 4m(1), 4o(1)(A), 4o(1)(B), 6b(a)(2)(A)-(C), 6m(1), 6o(1)(A), 6o(1)(B), Reg 4.20(a)(1), Reg 4.20(a)(b), Reg 4.20(a)(c), Reg 4.21, Reg 4.22		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC charged defendants Michael and Amanda Griffis with defrauding over 100 people and failing to register with the CFTC in connection with operating a commodity pool scheme to trade digital asset commodity futures contracts. The defendants owned a real estate business, and purportedly contacted colleagues and customers of their business, and offered digital asset commodity futures contracts, without having any relevant experience. Defendants raised \$6 million dollars which they allegedly misappropriated for their own personal purchases.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. William Koo Ichioka		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/22/2023	N.D. Cal	23-cv-3095
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 6(c)(1), 4b(a)(2)(A) and (C), 4o(1)(A) and (B), s 2(c)(2)(C)(iii)(l)(cc) and 4m(1); Reg. 180.1(a)(1)-(3), 5.2(b), 5.3(a)(2)(i), 4.20(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC alleged that defendant operated a fraudulent scheme whereby he solicited and subsequently misappropriated tens of millions of dollars from over 100 participants for the alleged purpose of trading in commodity interests, digital assets, and retail foreign currency transactions.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Cunwen Zhu, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/22/2023	C.D. Cal	23-cv-4937
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 4b(a)(2)(A)-(C), 6b(a)(2)(A)-(C), Reg. 5.2(b)(1)-(3)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>In the CFTC's first action involving "pig butchering," a scam involving cultivating a romantic relationship with a potential customer and "fattening" them up with falsehoods before soliciting them to participate in a fraudulent financial opportunity. The CFTC charged Zhu and his company Justby International Auctions for allegedly misappropriating over \$1.3 million in customer funds intended for digital asset trading. On December 7, a default judgment was ordered which required the defendants to pay a \$4,000,000 civil monetary penalty and \$1,352,843 in restitution.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Randy Craig Levine		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/6/2023	CFTC Administrative Release	23-31
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 6(c)(1), Reg. 180.1(a)(1)-(3)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC settled with Levine for making false representations by pretending to be a seller of bitcoin, to induce investors to send \$5 million to an attorney (Phillip Reichenthal) for the purported purchase of Bitcoin (<i>see also CFTC v. Philip Reichenthal</i> below). Levine also allegedly failed to return investor funds or deliver the bitcoin as promised. The court ordered Levine to cease and desist from CEA violations, and pay \$5,375,000 in restitution.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Philip Reichenthal		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/6/2023	CFTC Administrative Release	23-30
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 6(c)(1), Reg. 180.1(a)(1)-(3)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC resolved claims against Reichenthal for using his position as an attorney to falsely represent that he would act as an escrow agent to induce investors to send him \$5 million for the purported purchase of Bitcoin. After receiving the funds, Reichenthal allegedly failed to return the investors' funds or bitcoin. Without admitting or denying the allegation, Reichenthal agreed to an order which ordered him to cease and desist from CEA violations and pay approximately \$5,375,000 in restitution.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Rashawn Russell		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/11/2023	E.D.N.Y.	23-cv-2691
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(1) and Reg. 180.1		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC charged a New York resident with fraudulently soliciting retail investors to invest in a digital asset trading fund and misappropriating over \$1 million. The CFTC seeks restitution, disgorgement, civil penalties, permanent trading and registration bans, and a permanent injunction. The defendant has already pled guilty to defrauding clients in a related criminal case in the Eastern District of New York.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Changpeng Zhao, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/27/2023	N.D. Ill.	23-cv-1887
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 4(a) or alternatively 4(b) and Regulation 48.3, 4c(b) and Regulation 32.2, 4d, 5h(a)(1) and Regulation 37.3(a)(1), Regulation 166.3, Regulation 42.2, Regulation 1.6		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC charged Binance with numerous violations of the CEA and CFTC regulations for operating the digital asset exchange through an opaque web of corporate entities and increasing its U.S. presence.</p> <p>On December 14, 2023, the CFTC settled with Zhao and Binance. Zhao agreed to personally pay a \$150 million civil monetary penalty and Binance agreed to disgorgement of \$1.35 billion and to pay a civil monetary penalty of a further \$1.35 billion. Samuel Lim, Binance’s former Chief Compliance Officer, also agreed to pay a \$1.5 million penalty.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Nishad Singh		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/28/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cv-1684
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(1) and Regulation 180.1(a)(1)-(3)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC charged Nishad Singh, an FTX senior executive, with fraud by misappropriation and with aiding and abetting fraud committed by FTX related to digital asset commodities. These charges are related to those previously filed by the CFTC against FTX and its other executives. Singh agreed to the entry of a proposed consent order of judgment as to his liability on the charges in the complaint. The court permanently prohibited the defendant from engaging in trading or activities involving commodity interests or digital asset commodities, soliciting funds for such purposes, controlling, or directing trading, holding any position that requires registration with the CFTC, or gaining registration with the CFTC. The court will determine the amount of restitution, disgorgement, and civil monetary penalty at a future time.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Avraham Eisenberg		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/9/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cv-173
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 6(c)(1), 6(c)(3), 9(a)(2); Reg. 180.1(a), and Reg. 180.2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC alleged that Eisenberg unlawfully obtained over \$110 million in digital assets from Mango Markets, a decentralized digital asset exchange, through a scheme involving creating anonymous accounts, inflating the price of MNGO on multiple exchanges, and using the inflated value to withdraw the assets. The case has been stayed pending the conclusion of a parallel criminal case.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Samuel Bankman-Fried, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/13/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-10503
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 6(c)(1) and Reg. 180.1(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC filed a case on December 13, 2022, against Samuel Bankman-Fried, FTX Trading Ltd. (FTX.com), and Alameda Research LLC. The CFTC claimed that the defendants committed fraud and made material misrepresentations related to the sale of digital commodities, purportedly resulting in the loss of over \$8 billion in FTX customer deposits. The CFTC further alleged that from May 2019 to November 11, 2022, FTX customer assets were commingled with Alameda’s funds. The defendants are also alleged to have misappropriated these funds for personal use, including luxury real estate, political contributions, and high-risk investments. In its ongoing litigation, the CFTC seeks restitution, disgorgement, civil monetary penalties, permanent trading and registration bans, and an injunction against further violations of the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) and CFTC regulations. The civil proceedings are stayed until the conclusion of a parallel criminal case.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Jeremy Rounsville		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/3/2022	CFTC Administrative Action	8621-22
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(1) and Reg. 180.1(a)(1)-(3)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC filed and settled charges against Rounsville for misrepresenting that he was the CEO of, and soliciting customers to, a website platform engaged in alleged managed virtual currency trading. Rounsville is subject to a \$177,000 civil monetary penalty, and is permanently banned from soliciting or trading in commodity interests and virtual currencies, or registering with the CFTC in any capacity.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Haun’s Petition for Rulemaking – DAO-Participant Liability		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/31/2022		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The venture capital firm Haun Ventures petitioned the CFTC to clarify the obligations and rights of individuals participating in DAOs following the CFTC’s action against Ooki DAO. Haun Ventures argued the precedent set in Ooki DAO created uncertainty among builders and participants and discouraged innovation.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Adam Todd, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/30/2022	S.D. Fla.	22-cv-23174
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 4(a) (or alternatively, 4(b) and Regulation 48.3), 4d, 6(c)(1) and Regulation 180.1(a), 6(c)(3), 9(a)(2) and Regulation 180.2, Regulation 42.2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The CFTC charged Digitex LLC and its founder and CEO Adam Todd for failing to register the crypto futures exchange, and for manipulating the price of the DGTX token. On July 5, 2023, the Court issued a default judgment and granted a permanent injunction against Todd and the companies he controlled, requiring them to pay over \$15 million.		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Ooki DAO (formerly d/b/a bZx DAO)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/22/2022	N.D. Cal.	22-cv-5416
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 4(a), 4d and Reg. 42.2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The CFTC charged Ooki DAO, the successor to bZeroX that allegedly operated the same software protocol, with purportedly offering leveraged and margined retail commodity transactions in digital assets, engaging in activities only futures commission merchants can perform, and failing to adopt a customer identification program. On October 3, 2022, the court granted the CFTC's motion for alternative service via Ooki's "help chat box," with contemporaneous notice by posting in the Ooki DAO's online forum. On June 9, 2023, a default judgment required Ooki DAO to pay a civil monetary penalty of \$643,542, imposed permanent bans on trading and registration, and ordered the shutdown of Ooki DAO's website.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of bZeroX, LLC; Tom Bean; and Kyle Kistner		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/22/2022	CFTC administrative action	22-31
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 4(a), 4d(a)(1) and Reg. 42.2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The CFTC filed settled charges against bZeroX, LLC and its founders for designing and deploying the bZx Protocol which accepted orders and facilitated margined and leveraged retail commodity transactions without registering as a futures commission merchant and without performing KYC diligence as part of a customer identification program. The settlement ordered a \$250,000 civil penalty and required respondents to cease and desist from further violations of the CEA and CFTC regulations.		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Rathnakishore Giri, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/11/2022	S.D. Ohio	22-cv-3091
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(1) and Reg. 180.1(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC filed a civil enforcement action against Rathnakishore Giri and his companies, NBD Eidetic Capital, LLC, and SR Private Equity, LLC. The CFTC alleged that these entities and individuals engaged in a fraudulent scheme involving digital asset trading, purportedly soliciting over \$12 million and at least 10 bitcoins from more than 150 customers. Giri's parents, Giri Subramani and Loka Pavani Giri, were named as relief defendants. The CFTC alleged that the defendants misappropriated customer funds for personal expenses, including luxury items and vacations. This case is currently stayed pending the resolution of a parallel criminal proceeding , U.S. v. Rathnakishore Giri.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Mirror Trading Int'l Proprietary Ltd. and Cornelius Johannes Steynberg		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/30/2022	W.D. Tex.	22-cv-635
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
<p>CEA § 4b(a)(2)(A)-(C), 17 C.F.R. § 5.2(b)(1)-(3) (fraud in connection with Forex); CEA § 4o(1)(A)-(B) (fraud by a CPO; fraud by an AP of a CPO); 17 C.F.R. § 4.20(a)(1), (b), (c) (failure to operate commodity pool as a separate legal entity; failure to receive funds in the pool's name; commingling of pool funds); CEA §§ 2(c)(2)(C)(iii)(I)(cc), 4m(1), and 4k(2), 17 C.F.R. §§ 5.3(a)(2)(i), (ii) (2021) (failure to register as a CPO; failure to register as an AP of a CPO)</p>		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC alleged that Steynberg and Mirror Trading International ("MTI") engaged in a fraudulent multilevel marketing scheme to solicit bitcoin for participation in a commodity pool that MTI operated. On April 24, 2023, the Court entered an order of default judgment and permanent injunction against Steynberg, requiring him to pay \$1.7 billion, then the largest judgment involving cryptocurrency charged in any CFTC case.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Emerson Pires, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/30/2022	S.D. Fla.	22-cv-21997
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 4m(1), 4k(2), 4o(1), 4.20(c), 6(c)(1) and Reg. 180.1(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC filed a civil enforcement action against Emerson Pires, Flavio Goncalves, Joshua Nicholas, and Empires Consulting Corp. The CFTC alleged that defendants had engaged in a fraudulent scheme through EmpiresX, a commodity pool, purportedly soliciting over \$41.6 million from more than 12,500 individuals. They were accused of misappropriating at least \$5 million for personal use and failing to honor withdrawal requests from participants. In a consent order, on March 15, 2024, the defendants were permanently restrained, enjoined, and prohibited from CEA violations, and were required to pay approximately \$32 million in restitution, along with a \$32 million civil monetary penalty (see also SEC action above and DOJ action below).</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Gemini Trust Company, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/2/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-4563 (AKH)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(2)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC claimed that Gemini made false or misleading statements to the CFTC during an evaluation regarding the potential self-certification of a bitcoin futures product by a designated contract market. The CFTC further claimed that the misleading statements, obscured whether Gemini’s Bitcoin Futures Contract would be susceptible to manipulation. On January 6, 2025, Gemini agreed to a Consent Order permanently enjoining it from making false or misleading statements to the CFTC and ordering it to pay a civil monetary penalty of \$5 million.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Sam Ikkurty, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/10/2022	N.D. Ill. 7th Circuit	22-cv-2465 24-2684
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 4m(1), 4o(l)(A)-(B), 6(c)(1), Regulation 180.1		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC alleged that defendants fraudulently solicited and subsequently misappropriated over \$44 million from at least 170 investors to participate in funds that purchased, held, and traded digital assets, commodities, derivatives, swaps, and commodity futures.</p> <p>On July 1, 2024, the court granted the CFTC’s motion for summary judgment finding, in pertinent part, that defendants transacted in commodities, such as Bitcoin and Ethereum, that are covered by the CEA, that they made material misrepresentations of fact regarding such commodities to investors, and that they failed to register as commodity pool operators. In a final order issued on July 22, the court permanently enjoined defendants from future violations of the CEA along with ordering disgorgement, civil monetary penalties and restitution of over \$200 million.</p> <p>On September 19, 2024, several defendants filed a notice of appeal to the 7th Circuit, challenging the CFTC’s definition of “commodities” under CEA § 1(a)(9).</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Blockratize, Inc. d/b/a Polymarket.com		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/3/2022	CFTC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c) & § 6(d)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Cease & desist; \$1.4 million civil monetary penalty		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Polymarket settled with the CFTC for allegations that it offered off-exchange event-based binary options contracts and failed to obtain designation as a designated contract market or register as a swap execution facility. Polymarket agreed to pay a \$1.4 million civil monetary penalty and wind down the exchanges. There was no disgorgement because Polymarket purportedly did not profit from the transactions.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Tether Holdings Limited		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/15/2021	CFTC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(1), 7 U.S.C. § 9(1); and Regulation 180.1(a)(2), 17 C.F.R. § 180.1(a)(2)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Cease & desist; \$41 million civil monetary penalty		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The CFTC charged Tether with making untrue or misleading statements and omissions of material fact in connection with the tether (USDT) stablecoin. Specifically, the CFTC alleged that Tether misrepresented to customers and the market that Tether maintained sufficient US dollar reserves to back every USDT in circulation with the “equivalent amount of corresponding fiat currency” which was not always the case. Tether was ordered to pay \$41 million civil monetary penalty and to cease-and-desist from future violations of the CEA and CFTC regulations.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of iFinex Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/15/2021	CFTC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(1), 7 U.S.C. § 9(1); Reg. 180.1		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The CFTC settled with iFinex Inc. (d/b/a Bitfinex) related to an illegal, off-exchange retail commodity transactions. The CFTC claimed that Bitfinex offered and executed leveraged margined, or financed digital asset transactions with US customers. Bitfinex was ordered to cease-and-desist from violating Sections 4(a) and 4, pay \$1.5 million in civil penalties, and implement and maintain systems and procedures to prevent U.S persons from engaging in transactions or receiving margin funding on the trading platform.		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Uduakobong Udo Inyangudo a/k/a Alexander Uti Bassey		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/30/2021	D. Mass	21-cv-11615
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(2)(A)-(C); 7 U.S.C. § 9(1) Reg. 180.1		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC filed a civil enforcement action against the operators of PrimeFx. The complaint stated that from 2016 to 2019, the defendants used Primefx.org, which purportedly represented itself as a regulated investment firm, to solicit and misappropriate over \$1.2 million from U.S and international customers, as part of a coordinated scheme for purported trading in foreign currency and Bitcoin.</p> <p>On June 12, 2024, a default judgment was issued against three of the defendants Okundaye, Liggins, and Victor Edeh. Okundaye was required to pay \$8,179.61 in restitution, Liggins was ordered to pay a restitution of \$2,400, while Edeh was ordered to pay a restitution of \$15,223. They were found liable for \$429,028 in civil penalties each.</p> <p>In July 2024, a default judgment against T. Edeh ordered restitution of approximately \$211,890 and a civil monetary penalty of \$429,028.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matters of TradingForexPay, Cryptofxtrader, Bitfxprofit, Globalnationfx, BinancaFX Trade, MaxForexOption, ProCryptoMinners, ProFx-Capitals, Smarter Signals, Prime Expert Trade, Star Fx Pro, Excotradeoptions, Climax Capital Fx, Digitalexchange24.com (note these are 14 separate actions)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/29/2021	CFTC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 4d(1).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Seeking cease and desist orders		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC filed related charges against 14 entities for either failing to register as FCMs or making false and misleading claims of having CFTC and NFA membership. The entities offered opportunities to purchase binary options based of currencies, including forex and cryptocurrencies. Each complaint seeks orders directing the entities to cease and desist from committing violations of the CEA and CFTC regulations as charges.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Payward Ventures, Inc. (d/b/a Kraken)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/29/2021	CFTC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 4(a); CEA § 4d(1).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC filed settled charges against respondents Payward Ventures, Inc. d/b/a Kraken for illegally offering margined retail commodity transactions in digital assets, including Bitcoin, and failing to register as a futures commission merchant (FCM). Kraken allegedly offered commodity transactions to U.S customers who were not eligible contract participants, and served as the sole margin provider and maintained physical and/or constructive custody of all assets purchased using margin for the duration of a customer’s open margined position. The order required Kraken to pay a \$1.25 million civil monetary penalty and to cease and desist from further violations of the CEA.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. John David McAfee and Jimmy Gale Watson, Jr.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/5/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-1919
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 6(c)(1) , 6(c)(3), 9(a)(2), Reg. 180.1, Reg. 180.2.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The CFTC filed a complaint against businessman and computer programmer John McAfee and his former employee Jimmy Gale Watson. The charges relate to their alleged involvement in a manipulative and deceptive digital asset “pump-and-dump” scheme, involving the digital assets verge (XVG), dogecoin (DOGE), and reddcoin (RDD).</p> <p>On July 14, 2022, Jimmy Gale Watson Jr. entered a settlement requiring disgorgement of \$144,736, and a civil monetary penalty of \$144,736 (see also SEC settlement above). The CFTC dismissed its claims against McAfee due to his death in 2021.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. HDR Global Trading Limited		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/1/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-8132
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 4(a) or, alternatively, §4 (b); CEA § 4c(b) and Reg. 32.2; CEA § 4d; CEA § 5h(a)(1) and Reg. 37.3(a)(1); Reg. 166.3; Reg. 42.2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Consent order filed 8/10/2021, proposing a settlement of \$100 million total to resolve the CFTC and FinCEN matters (\$50 million to each agency).</p> <p>The CFTC filed a complaint against Defendants HDR Global Trading Limited, ABS Global Trading Limited, 100x Holdings Limited, ABS Global Trading Limited, Shine Effort Inc Limited, and HDR Global Services Limited, all doing business as "BitMEX," as well as BitMEX's co-founders. The CFTC alleged that BitMEX offered leveraged trading of cryptocurrency derivatives to retail and institutional customers in the U.S and was aware that U.S. customers could access the BitMEX platform, violating the CEA by operating a facility to trade and process swaps without being approved as a Designated Contract Market or Swap Execution Facility. The CFTC also alleged that, by accepting bitcoin to margin digital asset derivative transactions and acting as a counterparty to leveraged retail commodity transactions, BitMEX operated as a Futures Commission Merchant without registration. BitMEX has purportedly conducted trillions of dollars in digital asset derivatives transactions and earned fees worth more than \$1 billion. On August 10, 2021 a consent order was filed requiring BitMEX entities to pay a \$100 million civil monetary penalty and prohibited BitMEX from further violations of the CEA and CFTC's regulations as charged.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Garcia		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/11/2020	S.D. Tex.	20-cv-3185
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(1); Reg.180.1		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>CFTC complaint alleged that from 2016 through 2017, Garcia, and the other defendants operated under the name "Global Trading Club", fraudulently solicited at least 27 customers to deposit at least \$989,000 in order to speculate in price movements of Bitcoin, a digital asset. The defendants purportedly misrepresented to actual and potential customers the experience of traders and the expected earnings guaranteed.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Plutus Financial, Inc. d/b/a Abra, et ano.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/13/2020	CFTC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 2(e); § 4d(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
CFTC filed settled charges against respondents Plutus Financial, Inc. d/b/a Abra of California and Plutus Technologies Philippines Corp. d/b/a Abra International for entering illegal off-exchange swaps in digital assets and foreign currency with U.S. and overseas customers and acting as an unregistered FCM. The order requires the respondents to pay a \$150,000 civil monetary penalty and to cease and desist from further violations of the CEA.		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Daniel Fingerhut, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/5/2020	S.D. Fla.	20-cv-21887
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 4c(b) and Reg. 32.4 (“Options Fraud”), § 4o(1), § 6c(1) and Reg. 180.1(a)(1)-(3), § 6(c)(2)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order Granting Motion for Preliminary Injunction Against Defendants. Consent Order for Permanent Injunction, Civil Monetary Penalty, and Other Equitable Relief.		
<p>The CFTC charged three individuals and three companies with fraudulently soliciting tens of millions of customers and prospective customers to open and fund off-exchange binary options and digital asset trading accounts. The defendants allegedly created fraudulent marketing materials that promised astronomical profits with no risk of loss and distributed them through spam emails. The CFTC claims that over 59,000 customers opened and funded trading accounts as a result of these campaigns, and that the defendants collected over \$20 million.</p> <p>The court granted permanent injunctions against all the defendants and required them to pay a combined \$7 million in disgorgement and civil monetary penalties for violations of the CEA and CFTC regulations. The orders also impose permanent trading and registration bans on all the defendants.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Fintech Investment Group, Compcoin LLC, and Alan Friedland		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/16/2020	M.D. Fla.	20-cv-652
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 4b(a)(2)(A)-(C) and Reg. 5.2(b)(1)-(3); § 4o(1)(a) and (B); § 6(c)(1) and Reg. 180.1, Reg. 4.41(a) and (b)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The CFTC claimed that the defendants, Fintech Investment Group, Inc. and Alan Friedland, fraudulently solicited customers to purchase a digital asset called Compcoin. They allegedly promised that Compcoin would allow access to a proprietary forex trading algorithm known as ART, which was never approved for use. The defendants purportedly collected funds by misrepresenting the capabilities and approval status of their trading algorithm. The defendants argued that for the false advertising claim, the CFTC’s typical disclaimer language does not apply to cryptocurrency companies because they are software publishing businesses.</p> <p>On April 7, 2022, a default judgment was entered against Friedland and his companies, requiring them to pay \$1.2 million in restitution and a \$600,000 civil monetary penalty. The order also permanently enjoined the defendants from engaging in conduct that violates the CEA and CFTC regulations, as well as banning them from registering with the CFTC and trading in any CFTC-regulated markets</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Venture Capital Investments Ltd, and Breonna S. Clark		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/14/2020	D. Colo.	20-cv-382
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 4o(1), § 6(c)(1) and Reg. 180.1, § 4m(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC filed against Breonna Clark and Venture Capital Investments Ltd., a Colorado limited liability company, charging them with fraud and failing to register with the CFTC. The CFTC alleged that the defendants solicited U.S. residents to trade foreign currency contracts, as well as Bitcoin and other digital assets, through a commodity pool. The defendants purportedly collected \$534,829 from approximately seventy-two individuals and then misappropriated the funds. On November 4, 2020, a default judgment was entered against the defendants, requiring them to pay \$450,302 in restitution to defrauded clients and a civil monetary penalty of \$450,302. The order also permanently enjoined the defendants from engaging in conduct that violates the CEA and CFTC regulations and banned them from registering with the CFTC or trading in any CFTC-regulated markets.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Ackerman, Q3 Holdings, LLC and Q3 I, LP		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/11/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-1183
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(1); Reg. 180.1(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC claimed that the defendants engaged in a fraudulent scheme which involved soliciting over \$33 million from at least 150 individuals, by falsely promising high returns on cryptocurrency investments. Ackerman and his entities allegedly misappropriated a significant portion of the funds for personal use and provided false account statements to investors to conceal their activities. On June 28, 2023, a default judgment was issued which granted a permanent injunction against Michael Ackerman, banning him from trading in any CFTC-regulated markets and registering with the CFTC. Furthermore, the order required him to pay \$27 million in restitution and a \$27 million civil monetary penalty.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of XBT Corp Sarl d/b/a First Global Credit		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/31/2019	CFTC Administrative Release	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 4d(a)(I)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC filed and settled charges against Switzerland-based XBT Corp Sarl for its failure to register with the Commission as a futures commission merchant (FCM). The CFTC alleged that FGC acted as a FCM by soliciting or accepting orders for futures from U.S customers and by accepting bitcoin to margin their trades. The order required FGC to pay a \$100,000 civil monetary penalty and disgorge gains received in connection with its violations, and to cease and desist from future violations of the CEA.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. David Gilbert Saffron a/k/a David Gilbert and Circle Society, Corp.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/30/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-1697
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 4c(b) and Reg. 32.4; CEA § 4o(1)(A) -(B); Reg. 4.20(a)(1), (b) and (c), CEA § 4m(1) and 4k(2).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC brought an enforcement action against the defendants for engaging in fraudulent solicitation, misappropriation, and registration violations. The CFTC claimed that Saffron and Circle Society solicited members of the general public to participate in a commodity pool operated by Circle Society by making false claims about Saffron’s trading expertise. After accepting \$15,815,967 worth of Bitcoin and U.S. dollars from at least 17 individuals, the defendants allegedly misappropriated the funds and used Ponzi-like payments to pay back participants.</p> <p>On March 19, 2021, the court ordered a final judgment requiring defendants Saffron and Circle Society, jointly and severally, to pay restitution of \$14,841,280 to defrauded pool participants, alongside disgorgement of \$15,815,967, and a civil monetary penalty of \$1,484,128. The defendants were also permanently enjoined from engaging in conduct that violates the CEA and CFTC regulations, registering with the CFTC, trading in any CFTC-regulated markets, or trading in any commodity interest for themselves or others.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Jon Barry Thompson		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/30/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-9052
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(1); Regulation 180.1(a).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC filed a complaint against Jon Barry Thompson, alleging that he engaged in a fraudulent scheme involving the misappropriation of bitcoin. According to the CFTC, Thompson made false representations to two customers about the safety and security of their bitcoin investments, leading them to transfer funds to him, for safeguarding. It is alleged that Thompson then misappropriated these funds.</p> <p>The court, on October 1, 2020, issued a consent order entered against the defendant requiring him to pay restitution of \$7,431,325 to the defrauded customers, along with a civil monetary penalty. The court also permanently enjoined Thompson from engaging in conduct that violates the CEA and CFTC regulations, registering with the CFTC, and trading in any CFTC-regulated markets.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Control-Finance Limited and Benjamin Reynolds		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/17/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-5631
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(1); Reg. 180.1(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC brought an enforcement action against Benjamin Reynolds, conducting business as Control-Finance Limited, charging him with fraud and misappropriation. The complaint alleged that Reynolds used a website to solicit customers to purchase and transfer bitcoins to him, representing himself as a currency trader who guaranteed profits. The CFTC further alleged that Reynolds concealed the fraud through falsified reports and an elaborate pyramid scheme. According to the CFTC, Reynolds was able to solicit at least 22,190.542 bitcoins, valued at \$143 million at the time, from at least 169 individuals in the U.S.</p> <p>The court entered a default judgment against Reynolds on March 26, 2021, requiring him to pay nearly \$143 million in restitution to defrauded customers and a civil monetary penalty of \$429 million. The order also permanently enjoined Reynolds from engaging in conduct that violates the CEA and CFTC regulations, registering with the CFTC, and trading in any CFTC-regulated markets.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. John Doe 1 aka Morgan Hunt dba Diamonds Trading Investment House and John Doe 2 aka Kim Hecroft dba First Options Trading		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/28/2018	N.D. Tex.	18-cv-807-O
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 4b(a)(2)(A)-(C), Reg. 5.2; CEA § 4o(1); CEA § 6(c)(1), Reg. 180.1(a).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order and Default Judgment for civil penalties and restitution against Defendants.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC filed a complaint against John Doe 1, also known as Morgan Hunt, doing business as Diamonds Trading Investment House ("Hunt"), and John Doe 2, also known as Kim Hecroft, doing business as First Options Trading ("Hecroft"). The defendants, whose identities remain somewhat anonymous, were alleged to have messaged multiple investors online with false statements about a cryptocurrency investment strategy. This purportedly led to the investors' bitcoin funds being transferred and then misappropriated by Hunt/Hecroft, with no returns ever given. The court issued a default judgment, permanently enjoining Hunt and Hecroft and ordering them to pay restitution and civil penalties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. IPool Ltd. And Patrick Brunner		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/27/2018	D.D.C.	18-cv-2243
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 4(a); CEA § 4d(a)(1); Reg. 166.3.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Consent Order For Permanent Injunction Against Defendants.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC accused the defendants of illegally offering retail commodity transactions margined in Bitcoin without registering as a futures commission merchant (FCM) and failing to implement required anti-money laundering procedures. To resolve these charges, the defendants entered a Consent Order that included a permanent injunction preventing further violations, a total civil monetary penalty of \$990,000, and a commitment to implement the necessary anti-money laundering compliance measures.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Blake Harrison Kantor aka Bill Gordon et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/16/2018	E.D.N.Y.	18-cv-2247
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 2(c); CEA § 4c(b) and Reg. 32.2; CEA § 4d(a)(1); CEA § 4c(b) and Reg. 32.4; CEA § 6(c)(1) and Reg. 180.1.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order of stay of proceedings.		
Default Judgment against defendants.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC filed a complaint against Blake Harrison Kantor, also known as Bill Gordon, and Nathan Mullins, both from New York, along with the entities Blue Bit Banc (UK), Blue Bit Analytics, Ltd. (Nevis, Turks, and Caicos), Mercury Cove, Inc., and G. Thomas Client Services (both New York), with operating a fraudulent scheme involving binary options and the virtual currency ATM Coin. In a default judgment, the defendants were found liable to pay a total of \$4.25 million. This amount included \$846,405 in restitution and a \$2.5 million civil penalty for Kantor and the corporate entities, while Mullins was fined \$300,000. Kantor and Mullins were also required to disgorge ill-gotten gains of \$515,759 and \$89,574, respectively. The court also found that the defendants had illegally acted as Futures Commission Merchants without CFTC registration. The defendants were permanently enjoined from violating the Commodity Exchange Act. Additionally, Blue Wolf Sales Consultants, a New York company owned by Kantor, was ordered to disgorge \$463,097.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. McDonnell and CabbageTech		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/18/2018	E.D.N.Y.	18-cv-361
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(1) and Reg. 180.1(a)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Memorandum and Order (on CFTC jurisdiction). Memorandum, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Directions for Final Judgment and Injunction. Final Judgment and Order of Permanent Injunction, Restitution, and Civil Monetary Penalties.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC filed charges against Patrick K. McDonnell and his company, CabbageTech Corp., also known as Coin Drop Markets, for engaging in a fraudulent scheme involving Bitcoin and Litecoin. The CFTC claimed that the defendants misappropriated funds from customers who believed they were purchasing cryptocurrency trading advice and services. The court held that the CFTC had standing to sue the defendants for violations of the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) through the trading and purchasing of cryptocurrencies. The court explained that virtual currencies fall within the catch-all portion of the CEA’s definition of “commodity,” which includes “all other goods and articles . . . and all services, rights and interests in which contracts for future delivery are presently or in the future dealt in” (7 U.S.C. § 1(a)(9)). As a result, McDonnell and CabbageTech were ordered to pay a total of \$1.1 million, comprising \$290,429 in restitution and a \$871,287 civil monetary penalty. The court also imposed permanent trading and registration bans on both McDonnell and CabbageTech Corp.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Dean and The Entrepreneurs Limited		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/18/2018	E.D.N.Y.	18-cv-345
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 4c(b) and Reg. 32.4; CEA § 4o(1)(A)-(B); § 4m(1) and 4k(2) and Reg. 3.12(a).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Certificate of Default. Default Judgment Order.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC initially filed a civil enforcement action against Dillon Michael Dean and his company, The Entrepreneurs Headquarters Limited, a UK-registered company. The complaint alleged that the defendants engaged in a fraudulent scheme to solicit Bitcoin from the public, pool these funds, invest in products, and make Ponzi-style payments to participants using other participants' funds. The CFTC claimed that the defendants should have registered with the CFTC as a Commodity Pool Operator and Associated Person of a CPO.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. My Big Coin Pay, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/16/2018	D.Mass.	18-cv-10077
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(1) and Reg. 180.1(a)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Memorandum of Decision (on CFTC jurisdiction).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The court rejected Defendant’s motion to dismiss argument that CFTC cannot regulate virtual currencies on which no futures are traded, concluding that because futures trading exists in one virtual currency (Bitcoin), it was sufficient to allege another virtual currency (My Big Coin) is a commodity under the CEA.</p>		

Filing / Order		
CFTC v. Gelfman Blueprint Inc. and Nicholas Gelfman		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/21/2017	S.D.N.Y.	17-cv-7181
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(1); Reg. 180.1(a)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>Consent order against Gelfman (permanent injunction, restitution of \$492,064.53; civil penalty of \$177,501). Also, the Manhattan District Attorney’s office seized a flame thrower.</p> <p>Final Judgment against GBI (permanent injunction; restitution of \$554,734.48; civil monetary penalty of \$1,854,000).</p>		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>This case marked the first time the CFTC stated in litigation, as opposed to an administrative proceeding, that bitcoin and other virtual currencies fall under the definition of a commodity under the CEA. Thus, the CFTC had standing to sue for violations of the CEA through the trading and purchasing of cryptocurrencies. The CFTC filed a case against Gelfman Blueprint Inc. (GBI) and its CEO, Nicholas Gelfman, for operating a Ponzi scheme, misleading investors to believe an algorithmic computer program was trading Bitcoin to produce returns. The CFTC also alleged that the defendants falsified reports to customers and staged a fake computer hack to conceal the scheme. The defendants allegedly solicited over \$600,000 from approximately 80 individuals. In a final judgment against GBI, the court ordered a permanent injunction, restitution of \$556,734.48, and a civil monetary penalty of \$1,854,000. Gelfman was ordered to pay \$492,064.53 in restitution to customers and a civil penalty of \$177,501.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the matter of BFNXA Inc., d/b/a Bitfinex		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/2/2016	CFTC administrative proceeding	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 4(a) and 4d.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC took regulatory actions against BFNXA Inc., also known as Bitfinex, for violations of the Commodity Exchange Act. The violations included offering illegal off-exchange financed retail commodity transactions in bitcoin and other cryptocurrencies and failing to register as a Futures Commission Merchant. The order claimed that from April 2013 to February 2016, Bitfinex allowed users to borrow funds from other users on the platform to trade bitcoins on a leveraged, margined, or financed basis. The CFTC alleged that these coins were never actually delivered to traders who purchased them. Without admitting or denying any of the findings, Bitfinex consented to the entry of the order and agreed to pay a \$75,000 civil monetary penalty, along with a cease-and-desist order from future violations of the CEA.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In re TeraExchange		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/24/2015	CFTC administrative proceeding	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 7b-3(f)(2) and Reg. 37.203, 17 C.F.R. § 37.203.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Cease and desist order.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The second enforcement action taken by the CFTC with respect to Bitcoin transactions. The CFTC issued an order holding that TeraExchange LLC, a provisionally registered SEF, had violated its obligation under the CEA and the CFTC regulations to enforce rules that prohibit wash trading and prearranged trading on its SEF platform (bitcoin swap). Without admitting or denying the findings, Tera agreed to cease-and-desist from the previously mentioned violations.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the matter of Coinflip, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/17/2015	CFTC administrative proceeding	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 4c(b) and 5h(a)(1) and Reg. 32.2 and 37.3(a)(1), 17 C.F.R. § 32.2 and 37.3(a)(1).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The CFTC issued an order for the first time holding that Bitcoin and other virtual currencies are commodities subject to the Commodity Exchange Act. The order claimed that from March through August 2014, Coinflip Inc. operated Derivabit as an online trading facility without registering it as a designated contract market or swap execution facility. The Commission accepted an offer of settlement from the respondents, who, without admitting or denying the findings, agreed to cease and desist from violating the above-stated sections of the CEA and CFTC regulations, and to cooperate fully with the Commission in the future.</p>		

DOJ and other Criminal Proceedings

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Roman Vitalyevich Ostapenko, Alexander Evgenievich Oleynik, and Anton Vyachlavovich Tarasov		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/7/2025	D.D.C.	25-cr-1
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1956(a)(1)(B)(i), 1960(2)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
A grand jury indicted defendants for conspiracy to commit money laundering and operating an unlicensed money transmitting business in connection with their operation of an unregistered virtual currency mixing service, which was allegedly used to render untraceable certain cryptocurrency transactions with connections to criminal activities.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Francier Pinillo		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/7/2024	E.D. Wa.	24-cr-6032
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 981(a)(1)(C), 1343, 1960, 981(a)(1)(C), 982; 28 U.S.C. § 2461		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
A grand jury indicted defendant, a pastor, for wire fraud and operating an unlicensed money transmitting business in connection with investments he solicited for his company, Solana Fi, which was falsely advertised as a cryptocurrency investment company. Instead of investing the funds he received, he allegedly defrauded his investors and transferred such funds to himself and co-schemers.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Eric Council Jr.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/10/2024	D.D.C.	24-cr-457
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 371; 18 U.S.C. § 1028A(a)(1); 18 U.S.C. § 1029(a)(1) (access device fraud); 18 U.S.C. § 981; 21 U.S.C. § 853(p); 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
A grand jury indicted defendant for conspiracy to commit aggravated identify theft and access device fraud in connection with hacking the SEC's X account and creating a fake post concerning the approval of Bitcoin ETFs.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Liu Zhou		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/7/2024	D. Mass.	24-cr-10312
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 981(a)(1)(C); 28 U.S.C. § 2461		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The DOJ charged defendant, the founder of various “market maker” tools with conspiracy to commit market manipulation and wire fraud in connection with his alleged wash and bot trading designed to manipulate the market for various cryptocurrencies.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Aleksei Andriunin		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/24/2024	D. Mass.	24-mj-6849
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 1343, 1956(h)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The DOJ charged defendant, the CEO of Gotbit (a company separately under investigation by the SEC for market manipulation) with conspiracy to commit market manipulation, wire fraud and money laundering, in connection with his participation in Gotbit’s alleged scheme to manipulate the market for various cryptocurrencies.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. CLS Global FZC LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/19/2024	D. Mass.	24-cr-10293
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 1343, 981(a)(1)(C); 28 U.S.C. § 2461		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The DOJ charged defendants with manipulating the market for various cryptocurrencies through, among others, offering illegal market manipulation services to clients, engaging in manipulative trades, using multiple wallets to hide the source of trades, and selling cryptocurrencies at inflated prices. In connection with these actions, defendants were formally charged with conspiracy to commit market manipulation, and conspiracy to commit wire fraud, along with a separate charge for wire fraud.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Manpreet Kohli, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/19/2024	D. Mass.	24-cr-10189
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 371; 15 U.S.C. §§ 78i(a)(2) and 78ff(a)); 18 U.S.C. § 1343; 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C); 28 U.S.C. § 2461; 18 U.S.C. § 982(a)(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged defendants with manipulating the market for the Saitama Token through, among others, manipulative trading, making false statements, operating an unlicensed money transmitting business, and lying about Saitama trading profits. In connection with these actions, defendants were formally charged with conspiracy to commit market manipulation, conspiracy to conduct an unlicensed exchange and conspiracy to commit wire fraud, along with separate charges for market manipulation and wire fraud.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Adam Iza		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/23/2024	C.D. Ca.	24-mj-5809
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
26 U.S.C § 7201; 18 U.S.C § 241		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged defendant, who ran a cryptocurrency trading platform called Zort, with conspiracy against rights and evasion of tax assessments through engaging in multiple schemes to extort cryptocurrency from victims and failure to pay taxes on his income.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Sergey Ivanov and Timur Shakhmametov		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/12/2024	E.D. Va.	24-cr-205
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1349; 1029(b)(2) (access device fraud); 1956(h)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged defendants with conspiracy to commit bank fraud, access device fraud and money laundering in connection with their operation of payment services platforms designed for cyber criminals, including Joker's Stash which sold stolen credit card data in exchange for payment made in bitcoin to defendants.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Michelle Bond		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/22/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cr-494
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
52 U.S.C. §§ 30116, 30118, 30109		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The DOJ charged Michelle Bond with knowingly accepting campaign contributions in excess of the permitted amount, accepting unlawful corporate contributions, and receiving conduit contributions (contributions made through a straw donor to conceal the identity of the real donor).		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Nader Al-Naji		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/30/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-mag-2721
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1343		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The DOJ charged defendant, who created a token called BitClout, with wire fraud in connection with a scheme to defraud an investment firm that purchased BitClout tokens. After the investment, the DOJ further alleged that defendant used the proceeds for his own benefit and misled investors regarding whether he retained control over the investment.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Taylor		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/23/2024	S.D.Fla.	24-cr-20308
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1343		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
The DOJ charged Austin Michael Taylor with wire fraud in connection with his initial coin offering of CluCoin. The DOJ alleged that sales of CluCoin were based on materially false and fraudulent statements.		
On August 21, 2024, Austin Michael Taylor plead guilty to the charge of wire fraud and admitted to transferring roughly \$1.1 million of investor funds to his personal account. His sentencing hearing is scheduled for October 31, 2024.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Bradley Beatty		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/27/2024	D. Mass.	24-cr-10188
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1343, 981(a)(1)(C); 28 U.S.C. § 2461		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged defendant, the founder of Lillian Finance, which created the Lillian Token, with a scheme to defraud purchasers of such tokens. As part of this scheme, defendant published interviews which included false and misleading statements concerning alleged contracts with the Department of Defense, an intent to donate Lillian Token proceeds to children’s healthcare charities, and the support of former first lady, Laura Bush. Instead of using funds for such purposes, defendant sent proceeds from the Lillian Token to his personal Coinbase account.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Gotbit Consulting LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/27/2024	D. Mass.	24-cr-10190
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 1343, 981(a)(1)(C); 28 U.S.C. § 2461		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged defendants, Gotbit (a company separately under investigation by the SEC for market manipulation) and its employees, with conspiracy to commit market manipulation and wire fraud, along with a separate charge for wire fraud, in connection with Gotbit’s scheme to manipulate the market for various cryptocurrencies.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. \$56,243.55 formerly on deposit in Bank of America account 325160197444 held in the name of “Gudi Trading Inc.,” and all monies, funds and assets traceable thereto, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/13/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-4529
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 981(a)(1)(A), 981(a)(1)(C)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ brought actions for forfeiture against various bank accounts (“defendants-<i>in-rem</i>”) on the basis that such accounts were used by a wire fraud and money laundering syndicate that defrauded victims through fake cryptocurrency investments.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Vy Pham		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/13/2024	D. Mass.	24-cr-10137
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 981(a)(1)(C), 982(a)(1); 28 U.S.C. § 2461		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged defendants with conspiracy to commit market manipulation, conspiracy to conduct an unlicensed money transmitting business, and conspiracy to commit wire fraud in connection with their trading of both the Saitama and Robo Inu tokens. To perpetuate these acts, defendants allegedly traded Saitama and Robo Inu in a manner that artificially inflated the price of the tokens for the benefit of the conspirators and to the detriment of other investors.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Idin Dalpour		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/30/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cr-264
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C); 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>A grand jury indicted Idin Dalpour on DOJ charges alleging wire fraud in connection with a multi-year Ponzi scheme. Dalpour allegedly defrauded investors of at least \$43 million by promising high returns from a purported Las Vegas hospitality business and a cryptocurrency trading operation. The DOJ alleged that Dalpour diverted funds for personal expenses, including \$1.7 million in gambling losses and private school tuition for his children.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Daren Li, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/8/2024	C.D. Ca.	24-cr-311
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1956(h), 1956(a)(1)(B)(i), 1956(a)(2)(B)(i)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Daren Li and Yicheng Zhang with money laundering conspiracy and international money laundering in connection with a money laundering operation that processed over \$73 million in funds stolen through so-called "pig butchering" cryptocurrency schemes. Li and Zhang managed a global syndicate that transferred money from scheme victims through U.S. bank accounts to accounts at Deltec Bank in the Bahamas, then to cryptocurrency wallets. The DOJ alleged extensive coordination between the conspirators, including discussions about commission structures, shell companies, and victim information.</p> <p>On November 12, 2024, Daren Li pleaded guilty to one count of conspiracy to commit money laundering.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Charles O. Parks III		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/24/2024	E.D.N.Y.	24-CR-105
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 981(a)(1)(c), 982(b)(1), 1343, 1956(a)(1)(B)(i)-(ii), 1957(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>A grand jury indicted defendant for a “cryptojacking” scheme through which he allegedly used false identities to gain access to computing processing power through various cloud computing companies to mine cryptocurrencies. Throughout the scheme, defendant failed to pay such companies for their services and would continuously open new accounts under false identities when his previous accounts were closed or suspended for violation of terms. As a result, defendant was indicted for wire fraud, money laundering, and monetary transactions derived from unlawful activity.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Robert Wesley Robb		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/15/2024	E.D. Va.	24-cr-141
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1343		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ alleged that defendant defrauded investors through advertising a fake MEV bot investment service that would generate profits for investor while using investor funds for his own benefit.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Roger Keith Ver		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/15/2024	C.D. Cal.	24-cr-103
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1341; 26 U.S.C. §§ 7201, 7206(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>A grand jury indicted Roger Keith Ver with mail fraud, tax evasion, and filing false tax returns. Ver, a former California resident, was arrested in Spain and faces U.S. extradition. He allegedly underreported his bitcoin holdings and capital gains after renouncing his U.S. citizenship in 2014, resulting in false tax returns and evading an “exit tax.” Ver is accused of causing the IRS a loss of at least \$48 million by not reporting the sale of bitcoins for \$240 million in 2017.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Keonne Rodriguez, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/14/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cr-82
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 1030, 1342, 1956(h), 1960(a)-(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Keonne Rodriguez and William Lonergan Hill, the founders of Samurai Wallet, with money laundering conspiracy and operating an unlicensed money transmitting business. The DOJ alleged that the defendants facilitated over \$2 billion in illegal transactions. Rodriguez pled not guilty and was released on \$1 million bail with home incarceration and travel restrictions. Prosecutors claim Samurai Wallet was used to launder funds for dark web markets, including Hydra and Silk Road, and did not maintain an anti-money laundering program.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Frank Richard Ahlgren III		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/6/2024	W.D. Tex	24-CR-31
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
26 U.S.C. § 7206(1); 31 U.S.C. § 5324(a)(3)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Frank Richard Ahlgren III with filing false tax returns and structuring cash deposits to avoid currency transaction reporting requirements. Ahlgren allegedly underreported or failed to report the sale of \$4 million worth of bitcoin on his tax returns from 2017 to 2019. He purportedly used proceeds from a \$3.7 million bitcoin sale to purchase a residence and filed a false 2017 tax return inflating the original purchase price of the bitcoin. Additionally, Ahlgren allegedly failed to report over \$650,000 from bitcoin sales in 2018 and 2019. On September 12, 2024, Ahlgren pleaded guilty to filing a tax return that falsely underreported his capital gains from selling bitcoin.</p> <p>On December 12, 2024, Ahlgren was sentenced to two years in prison and ordered to pay \$1,095,031 in restitution to the United States.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Rhoden et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/6/2024	M.D. Fla.	24-cv-51
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 371		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Rhoden and his codefendant with conspiracy to commit wire fraud and money laundering in connection with a much-hyped NFT launch, which turned out to be a “rug pull” that left investors with worthless assets. On May 24, 2024 Rhoden pleaded guilty on both counts, and on October 31, 2024, a jury found his codefendant guilty on both counts. Rhoden was sentenced to five years of probation, and his codefendant was scheduled to be sentenced in January 2025.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Sungatov, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/5/2024	D.N.J.	24-cr-80
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 981(a)(1)(C), 982(a)(2)(B), 1349, 3238, 1030(a)(5)(A), 1030(a)(7)(B), 1030(a)(7)(C), 1030(c)(4)(B)(i), 1030(c)(5)(A); 1030(i); 21 U.S.C. § 853(p); 28 U.S.C. § 2461		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The DOJ charged Sungatov and five co-defendants with conspiracy to deploy the alleged ransomware variant "LockBit." The DOJ claimed that LockBit has been used against over 2,500 victims since January 2020, resulting in more than \$500 million in ransom payments which were often requested in bitcoin.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Russell Armand		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/17/2024	D. Mass.	24-cr-10014
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 371; 15 U.S.C. §§ 78i(a)(2) and 78ff(a); 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C § 2461; 18 U.S.C. § 982(a)(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The DOJ charged defendant with conspiracy to conduct an unlicensed money transmitting business and conspiracy to commit wire fraud along with market manipulation in connection with his trading of both the Saitama and VZZN tokens. To perpetuate these acts, defendant allegedly traded Saitama and VZZN in a manner that artificially inflated the price of the tokens for his benefit and to the detriment of other investors.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Michael Thompson		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/21/2023	D. Mass.	23-ccr-10325
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 371; 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The DOJ charged defendant with conspiracy to commit market manipulation in connection with his trading of the VZZN token, which he created. As part of such manipulation, defendant allegedly made false statements about the token and both engaged in and coordinated manipulative trading of the token.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Chirag Tomar		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/20/2023	W.D.N.C.	24-cr-76
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Defendant with operating a website that looked like Coinbase to trick Coinbase users into providing their log-in credentials. After obtaining the log-in credentials, the DOJ further alleged that defendant used such credentials to steal roughly \$20 million from a total of 542 investors.</p> <p>On May 20, 2024, defendant pled guilty to wire fraud conspiracy.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Zhao		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/31/2023	W.D. Wa.	CR23-179 JHC
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
31 U.S.C. §§ 5318(h), 5322(b), 5322(c), 5322(e); 18 U.S.C. § 1960(a), 1960(b)(1)(B); 50 U.S.C. § 1705		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Binance CEO Changpeng Zhao with the failure to implement and maintain an effective anti-money laundering program and violations of the Bank Secrecy Act. Zhao, a Canadian national, pled guilty to the charges. On April 30, 2024, Zhao was sentenced to four months in prison for his failure to implement an effective anti-money laundering program.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Braden Karony, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/31/2023	E.D.N.Y.	23-cr-433
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C § 1348; 18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Braden John Karony, Kyle Nagy, and Thomas Smith with conspiracy to commit securities fraud, conspiracy to commit wire fraud, and money laundering conspiracy for defrauding investors in a decentralized finance digital asset called “SafeMoon” (SFM). The DOJ claimed defendants misled SFM investors about the inaccessibility of “locked” SFM liquidity, while the defendants purportedly diverted and misappropriated millions of dollars of “locked” SFM liquidity for personal use, including luxury purchases. Following the indictments, SafeMoon US LLC filed for Chapter 7 liquidation in Utah Bankruptcy Court.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Roman Storm, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/23/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cr-430
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1956(h); 18 U.S.C. § 1960(b)(1)(B) and (b)(1)(C); 18 U.S.C. § 371; 50 U.S.C. § 1750		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Roman Storm and Roman Semenov, founders of the Tornado Cash cryptocurrency mixer, with conspiracy to commit money laundering and conspiracy to violate the International Economic Emergency Powers Act. Storm and Semenov allegedly operated Tornado Cash to enable untraceable and anonymous cryptocurrency transactions, resulting in the laundering of over \$1 billion in criminal proceeds. The DOJ claimed that the defendants were aware of the illicit use of their service and had received complaints from cybercrime victims, and still did not implement anti-money laundering controls. The DOJ also claimed that Tornado Cash was used by the Lazarus Group, a sanctioned North Korean cybercrime organization, to launder hundreds of millions of dollars in hacking proceeds. Storm has filed a motion to dismiss arguing that Tornado Cash was an autonomous software and he was merely a developer without control over its use by criminals.</p> <p>On September 27, 2024, defendants' motion to compel discovery and motion to dismiss the indictment were denied.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Tyler Ostern		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/14/2023	S.D. Fla.	23-cr-20165
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1349		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The Department of Justice charged Tyler Ostern, the CEO of Moonwalkers Trading Limited, with conspiracy to commit securities price manipulation and wire fraud. Ostern, the former CEO of the market-making firm Moonwalkers Trading Ltd., pled guilty to these charges. The Court sentenced Ostern to two years in prison, followed by three years of supervised release. The charges stemmed from Ostern's involvement in allegedly manipulating the price and trading volume of HYDRO, a crypto token.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Alexander Mashinsky, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/13/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cr-347
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. §§ 78i(a)(2), 78j(b) and 78ff; 18 U.S.C. §§ 2 and 1343; 7 U.S.C. §§ 9(1) and 13(a)(5); 18 U.S.C. §§ 2, 371, and 1343		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Alexander Mashinsky, founder and former CEO of Celsius Network LLC, and Roni Cohen-Pavon, Celsius's Chief Revenue Officer, for defrauding customers of Celsius Network and orchestrating a scheme to inflate the price of the CEL token. They were accused of misleading customers about Celsius's success, profitability, and investment strategies, and using customer funds to manipulate CEL's market price. The DOJ claimed Mashinsky and Cohen-Pavon secretly sold their CEL holdings at inflated prices for substantial profits, and that as a result, Celsius froze approximately \$4.7 billion in customer assets and filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy. Mashinsky was arrested, while Cohen-Pavon remains abroad. Roni Cohen-Pavon, pleaded guilty to the charges in September 2023, and agreed to cooperate with prosecutors.</p> <p>On December 2, 2024, Alexander Mashinsky pleaded guilty to both commodities and securities fraud. Both Cohen-Pavon and Mashinsky will be sentenced in April 2025.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Shakeeb Ahmed		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/10/23	S.D.N.Y.	23-cr-340
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Shakeeb Ahmed, a former senior security engineer, with computer fraud for exploiting vulnerabilities in decentralized cryptocurrency exchanges. On July 2 and 3, 2022, Ahmed allegedly attacked a cryptocurrency exchange ("Crypto Exchange"), generating approximately \$9 million in inflated fees and then withdrew the funds. He later purportedly negotiated a return of \$7.5 million in stolen funds - in exchange for the the hack not being reported. On July 28, 2022, the DOJ claims that Ahmed targeted Nirvana Finance, exploiting a flaw to purchase and resell cryptocurrency, stealing about \$3.6 million and causing Nirvana to shut down. Ahmed then purportedly laundered the cryptocurrency. He pleaded guilty and was sentenced to three years in prison, followed by three years of supervised release, and was ordered to forfeit \$12.3 million, a significant quantity of cryptocurrency, and pay over \$5 million in restitution.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Eugene William Austin, Jr. et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/30/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-mag-5225
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1349, 1956(h), 371		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Eugene Austin and Brandon Austin with conspiracy to commit wire fraud, money laundering, and interstate transportation of stolen property for stealing millions of dollars' worth of cryptocurrency. It is alleged that Austin participated in a scheme with his son to steal money from investors by fraudulently offering to serve as brokers for large quantities of cryptocurrency, provide short-term investments in cryptocurrency for high returns, and provide marketing and advertising services to small businesses. The Austins purportedly defrauded a Japanese cryptocurrency firm out of \$600,000, another victim of \$5 million, and a cryptocurrency start-up of \$100,000. In total, they allegedly defrauded 20 victims out of more than \$10 million.</p> <p>Brandon Austin pleaded guilty to conspiracy to commit money laundering on April 13, 2023, and was ordered to pay over \$3.4 million to victims.</p> <p>On September 25, 2024, a jury found Eugene Austin guilty of conspiracy to commit wire fraud, money laundering, and conspiracy to commit interstate transportation of stolen property.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Soufiane Oulahyane		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/26/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cr-25
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1343, 3238, and 2; 18 U.S.C. §§ 1029(a)(2) (access device fraud), 3238, and 2; 18 U.S.C. §§ 1029(a)(5), 3238, and 2; U.S.C. §§ 1028A(a)(I), 1028A(b), 3238, and 2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Soufiane Oulahyane, a Moroccan citizen, with wire fraud, the use of an unauthorized access device to affect transactions, and aggravated identity theft for operating a website that spoofed the largest NFT marketplace, OpenSea. On September 26, 2021, Oulahyane allegedly created his spoof website and used paid promotions to ensure that anyone who entered "opensea" in a popular search engine would see his website as the first hit. Once users entered the website and provided their login credentials, Oulahyane allegedly used their seed phrases to transfer assets from the victims' wallets to his own. The DOJ claimed that one victim had lost \$450,000 worth of Ethereum and NFTS from their MetaMask wallet.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Michael Kane, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/21/2023	S.D. Fla.	23-cr-20172
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 371; 18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. § 1343; 18 U.S.C. § 2; 18 U.S.C. § 982(a); 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged three individuals, Michael Kane, Shane Hampton, and George Wolvaardt for allegedly conspiring to manipulate the market for HYDRO by creating the false appearance of supply and demand for HYDRO. Michael Kane pleaded guilty.</p> <p>On February 7, 2024, a jury found Shane Hampton, one of the three defendants, guilty of conspiracy to manipulate the price of a security and guilty of conspiracy to commit wire fraud. The jury found Shane Hampton not guilty of wire fraud.</p> <p>On June 25, 2024, the court sentenced Michael Kane to 45 months, with three years of supervised release afterwards. Shane Hampton was sentenced to 35 months.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Christopher James Scanlon		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/20/2023	D.N.J.	23-10168
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 371		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Christopher James Scanlon with illegally operating an unlicensed money transmitting business. Scanlon was the president, CEO, and founder of Aerae Lifestyle and Club Swann. From 2015 through 2019, he allegedly operated various companies that provided fiat and cryptocurrency services to customers, including transferring fiat and cryptocurrency on behalf of and between customers, and liquidating cryptocurrency on behalf of customers, without registering with the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCen).</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Brandon P. Austin		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/13/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cr-199-PKC
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. § 77q(a); 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b) and Rule 10b-5; 15 U.S.C. § 77e(a), 77e(c); 15 U.S.C. § 77e(e); 15 U.S.C. § 78f(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Eugene Austin and Brandon Austin, with conspiracy to commit wire fraud, money laundering, and interstate transportation of stolen property for stealing millions of dollars' worth of cryptocurrency. It is alleged that Austin participated in a scheme with his son to steal money from investors by fraudulently offering to serve as brokers for large quantities of cryptocurrency, provide short-term investments in cryptocurrency for high returns, and provide marketing and advertising services to small businesses. The defendants purportedly defrauded a Japanese cryptocurrency firm out of \$600,000, another victim of \$5 million, and a cryptocurrency start-up of \$100,000. In total, they allegedly defrauded 20 victims out of more than \$10 million. Brandon P. Austin, specifically, is accused of having brokered the exchange of over \$3.6 million in proceeds from various fraudulent schemes, including through falsified applications for COVID relief funds, for Bitcoin. Brandon Austin pleaded guilty to conspiracy to commit money laundering on April 13, 2023, and was ordered to pay over \$3.4 million to victims.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Do Hyeong Kwon a/k/a Do Kwon		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/23/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cr-151
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. § 77q(a); 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b) and Rule 10b-5; 15 U.S.C. § 77e(a), 77e(c); 15 U.S.C. § 77e(e); 15 U.S.C. § 78f(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>A grand jury indicted Do Kwon on fraud charges, for defrauding individuals who purchased Terra LUNA (LUNA) and TerraUSD (UST) by deceiving them about aspects of the Terra blockchain – such as the effectiveness of the algorithmic mechanism (which ensured the stability of UST's price) through false statements and market manipulation. Kwon has already faced civil charges, brought by the SEC.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Minh Quoc Nguyen		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/14/2023	E.D. Pa.	23-mj-528
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1956, 1960, 1028(a)(3) (identity theft)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Minh Quoc Nguyen with money laundering, operating an unlicensed money transmitting business, and identity theft in his role as operator of the ChipMixer service. The DOJ complaint alleged that ChipMixer was a darknet service that mixed depositors' cryptocurrency with other funds to obscure the path of transactions, and therefore launder money used in various crimes. Nguyen purportedly laundered \$3 billion in bitcoin using ChipMixer. A federal warrant for Nguyen's arrest was issued on March 14, 2023, following his indictment. He is currently wanted by the FBI.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Vladimir Okhotnikov, a/k/a "Lado," et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/22/2023	D. Or.	23-cr-57
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1349, 981		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Vladimir Okhotnikov and three other defendants with conspiracy to commit wire fraud in connection with a \$340 million Ponzi and pyramid scheme involving Forsage, a cryptocurrency investment platform. It is alleged that the defendants founded and controlled Forsage, which they promoted as a decentralized and lucrative business system based on network marketing and crypto smart contracts. Forsage allegedly used smart contracts on the Ethereum, Binance Smart Chain, and Tron blockchains to divert funds from new investors to earlier investors, with significant discrepancies in investor returns. The defendants also purportedly used investor money for personal use.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Anatoly Legkodymov		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/14/2023	E.D.N.Y.	23-mj-17
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1960(b)(1)(b), 1960(b)(1)(c), 2 and 3551 et seq.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Legkodymov, a Russian national and senior executive of cryptocurrency exchange Bitzlato Ltd., with conducting a money transmitting business that transmitted illicit funds and failed to comply with anti-money laundering requirements. In December 2023, Legkodymov pleaded guilty to the allegations. Legkodymov agreed to forfeit approximately \$23 million worth of cryptocurrency. On July 18, Legkodymov was sentenced to time served, and was released from prison.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Aliaksandr Klimenka		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/23/2022	N.D. CA.	22-cr-256-SI
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1960, 2; 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Klimenka with knowingly managing a money transmitting business, BTC-e, that failed to comply with the requisite registration requirements and transmitted funds known to be connected to unlawful activities. The DOJ further alleged that Klimenka conspired to commit money laundering through the operation of BTEC-e. Klimenka was arrested in Latvia in 2023, and is currently in custody.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Avraham Eisenberg		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/23/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-mj-10337
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. § 78j(b) and Rules 10b-5(a) and 10b-5(c); 15 U.S.C. § 78i(a)(2)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Avraham Eisenberg with commodities fraud, commodities market manipulation, and wire fraud. The DOJ alleged that he fraudulently obtained approximately \$110 million worth of cryptocurrency from Mango Markets and its customers by artificially manipulating the price of certain perpetual futures contracts. This prosecution is noted as the first involving the manipulation of cryptocurrency through open-market trades. On May 1, 2024, a jury found Eisenberg guilty of commodities fraud, market manipulation, and wire fraud.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Samuel Bankman-Fried		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/13/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cr-673
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. § 1349; 15 U.S.C. § 1343 and 2; 18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. § 1343 and 2; 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Bankman-Fried with defrauding customers of FTX.com, investors in FTX.com, and lenders to Alameda Research. Bankman-Fried was accused of misappropriating \$10 billion in funds from FTX to cover losses at Alameda Research, his hedge-fund.</p> <p>On November 2, 2023, Bankman-Fried was found guilty of two counts of wire fraud conspiracy, two counts of wire fraud, one count of conspiracy to commit money laundering, conspiracy to commit commodities fraud, and conspiracy to commit securities fraud.</p> <p>On March 28, 2024, Bankman-Fried was sentenced to 25 years in prison.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Francisley Da Silva, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/6/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cr-622
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. §§ 1343 and 2; 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h); 18 U.S.C. § 1001		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Francisley da Silva, Juan Tacuri, Antonia Perez Hernandez and Nestor Nunez with conspiracy to commit wire fraud and wire fraud for their involvement with the Forcount scheme from mid-2017 until the end of 2021. Silva and Tacuri were also charged with conspiracy to commit money laundering, while Hernandez was charged with making false statements. Silva, the founder of Forcount, and Tacuri and Hernandez, promoters of the scheme, allegedly concealed their fraud by laundering victim funds through shell companies before making large personal expenditures on real estate and bulk cellphone purchases.</p> <p>Tacuri was arrested on December 14, 2022, and later pleaded guilty to conspiracy to commit wire fraud. He has agreed to forfeit roughly \$4 million and will be sentenced in September 2024. Hernandez also pleaded guilty. Da Silva is awaiting trial.</p> <p>On July 22, 2024, Antonia Perez Hernandez and Nestor Nunez pled guilty to conspiracy to commit wire fraud for their roles in supporting Forcount.</p> <p>On October 15, 2024, Juan Tacuri was sentenced to the statutory maximum of 240 months in prison.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Rikesh Thapa		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/5/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cr-654
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1343 and 2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged the co-founder and former chief technology officer of Blockparty with defrauding the company out of over \$1 million by representing that he would temporarily hold Blockparty's money in his personal bank account and subsequently stealing the funds, and using them for personal expenditures. Thapa pleaded guilty to structuring and was sentenced to 24 months in prison, followed by 3 years of supervised release, along with a \$5000 fine.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. David Carmona, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/13/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cr-551
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1349		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged David Carmona, Marco Ruiz Ochoa, Moses Valdez, Juan Arellano, and David Brend with conspiracy to commit wire fraud and wire fraud in connection with the IcomTech scheme. Carmona, the founder of IcomTech, and Ochoa, Valdez, Arellano, and Brend, promoters of the scheme, allegedly defrauded victims by falsely promising guaranteed returns from cryptocurrency investments while using victim funds to pay other victims and enrich themselves. Rodriguez was also charged for his role in building and maintaining IcomTech’s website and online portal. Ochoa pleaded guilty and was sentenced to a five year prison term, along with two years of supervised release and \$914,000 in forfeiture. Carmona and Arellano also pleaded guilty, while Brend and Rodriguez were found guilty by a jury.</p> <p>On October 3, David Carmona was sentenced to 121 months in prison.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Ishan Wahi, Nikhil Wahi, and Sameer Ramani		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/21/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cr-392
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. §§ 1343 and 2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>In the DOJ’s first ever crypto insider trading scheme charge, the DOJ charged a former Coinbase product manager, and his brother and friend, for allegedly perpetuating a scheme to commit insider trading ahead of announcements regarding crypto assets that would be made available for trading on Coinbase (see also SEC action above). On September 12, 2022, one of the defendants entered into the first ever guilty plea in a crypto insider trading case, and was sentenced to ten months in prison. Ishan Wahi was sentenced to 24 months in prison and ordered to forfeit 10.97 ether and 9,440 Tether. Nikhil Wahi was sentenced to 10 months in prison and ordered to forfeit \$892,500.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Emerson Pires, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/30/2022	S.D. Fla.	22-cr-20296
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. § 371; 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h); 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C); 18 U.S.C. § 982(a)(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged three men for running a crypto-based Ponzi scheme through their company EmpiresX, and allegedly generating \$100 million (see also SEC and CFTC actions above). On September 8, 2022, the purported head trader, Joshua Nicholas, pled guilty to one count of securities fraud. He was sentenced to 51 months in prison followed by three years supervised release and a restitution of \$3,379,527.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Jayton Gill		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/17/2022	W.D.N.C.	22-cr-149
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1960; 26 U.S.C. § 7203		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Gill pleaded guilty to operating an unlicensed crypto exchange that facilitated over \$3.6 million in unregulated transactions for six years. Gill was also accused of failing to file taxes, despite earning a significant income from his money transmitting business. The defendant was sentenced to 21 months in prison, followed by a year of supervised release.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Dominic Pineda, Shon Morgan		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/14/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cr-337
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1951		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged the defendants for purportedly planning to rob a suburban home and steal information for accounts that defendants believed held millions in bitcoin.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Nathaniel Chastain		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/31/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cr-305 (JMF)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1343; 18 U.S.C. § 1956(a)(1)(B)(i)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Chastain, a former product manager at OpenSea, was charged with wire fraud and money laundering in connection with a scheme to trade on confidential information regarding which NFTs were to be featured on OpenSea's homepage. Chastain was allegedly responsible for selecting the NFTs to be featured on the homepage, after which their prices allegedly would tend to rise. On May 3, Chastain was convicted by a jury, and was subsequently sentenced to three months in prison, three years of supervised release, a \$50,000 fine, and forfeiture of the Ethereum he made from the trading.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Michael Alan Stollery		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/13/2022	C.D. Cal.	22-cr-207 (JLS)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b), 78ff and 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Stollery, the founder and CEO of crypto investment platform Titanium Blockchain Infrastructure Services Inc., pled guilty to his involvement in a scheme related to the company’s unregistered ICO that raised around \$21 million from investors. He was sentenced to four years and three months in prison.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Chet Stojanovich		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/10/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cr-339
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1343 and 2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Stojanovich allegedly engaged in a scheme to defraud individuals and companies who sought to purchase cryptocurrency-mining computers and who were seeking miner-hosting services. On November 29, 2022, Stojanovich pled guilty to wire fraud, admitting he stole more than \$2 million through the sale of nonexistent mining equipment and hosting services.</p> <p>On February 27, 2023, Stojanovich was ordered to pay \$2.1 million in restitution, and to serve a three-year prison sentence along with three years of supervised release.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Ethan Nguyen, Andre Llacuna		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/15/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-mag-2478
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1349 and 1956(h)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Nguyen and Llacuna are alleged to have promised investors NFTs of “Frosties,” but after soliciting investments, defendants shut down operations and transferred the money, i.e. a “rug pull.” Defendants also allegedly perpetuated the “Embers” NFT fraud.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Ilya Lichtenstein, Heather Morgan		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/8/2022	D.D.C.	22-mag-00022
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1956(h); 18 U.S.C. § 371		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Ilya Lichtenstein and Heather Morgan, a married couple from New York City, pleaded guilty to money laundering conspiracies related to the 2016 theft of approximately 120,000 bitcoin from Bitfinex. Lichtenstein purportedly hacked into Bitfinex’s network, transferring the bitcoin to his own wallet and deleting evidence of his access. The couple then allegedly laundered the stolen funds using various sophisticated methods, including fake identities, cryptocurrency mixing services, and converting some funds into gold coins. The government recovered approximately \$4.075 billion of the stolen funds.</p> <p>On November 14, 2024, Ilya Lichtenstein was sentenced to five years in prison. On November 18, 2024, Heather Morgan was sentenced to 18 months in prison.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Keith Ingersoll and James Adamczyk		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/10/2021	M.D. Fla.	21-cr-138 (ACC) (EJK)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. § 1343; 18 U.S.C. § 1957; 18 U.S.C. § 1028A		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Keith Ingersoll and James Adamczyk have been indicted for bilking an investor in Organic Fresh Coin of millions of dollars. Ingersoll and Adamczyk used the investor’s money on luxury car rentals, travel, and adult entertainment. They also prevented the investor from withdrawing funds. Ingersoll posed as employees of a fake company to the investor to assuage doubts. Organic Fresh Coin, which had an ICO in 2018, claims to provide transparency in food supply chains. Ingersoll pleaded guilty to the charges and was sentenced to 109 months, with 3 years of a supervised release. He was also ordered to pay \$12,748,000 in restitution. The indictment against Adamczyk was dismissed after his death.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Arcaro		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/1/2021	S.D. Cal.	21-cr-2542 (TWR)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1349 (wire fraud), 982(a)(2)(A); 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c) (criminal forfeiture)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Arcaro pleaded guilty to criminal charges that he defrauded BitConnect investors, <i>see supra</i> SEC Litigation. Arcaro allegedly sat atop a large network of BitConnect promotors, forming a pyramid scheme known as the BitConnect Referral Program. Arcaro earned as much as 15% from investments, including a secret “slush” fund. Arcaro was sentenced to 38 months, with three years of supervised release to follow.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Hein Ngo Vo		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/26/2021	S.D. Tex.	21-cr-281
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1960		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Hien Ngoc Vo with operating an unlicensed money transmitting business. Vo pled guilty to the charges. Vo used Paxful and LocalBitcoins to buy and sell Bitcoin, purportedly profiting by collecting 5-30% of transaction amounts. Vo did not request identification or transaction purposes from clients. Banks shut down Vo's accounts after inquiring about the funds' origins. Over three months, his unlicensed business allegedly received and transmitted approximately \$515,147.19 in Bitcoin.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Yusko		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/23/2021	E.D. La.	21-cr-77
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1960(a); 18 U.S.C. § 1960(b)(1)(B)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Michael Yusko, III, with operating an unlicensed money transmitting business. Yusko was accused of selling bitcoin to customers but failing to provide the agreed-upon cryptocurrency after receiving payments. He allegedly directed customers to deposit funds into various business accounts, which were not registered as money transmitting businesses with FinCEN. Additionally, Yusko purportedly advised clients to mislead bank employees about the purpose of their wire transfers. The DOJ claimed that Yusko was responsible for \$201,399 in losses. Yusko pleaded guilty to the charges, and was sentenced to one year and one day in prison, three years of supervised release, and ordered to pay \$411,009 in restitution to victims.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Sterlingov		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/26/2021	D.D.C	21-cr-399
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1960(a); 18 U.S.C. § 1956(a)(3); D.C. Code 26-1023(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Roman Sterlingov with money laundering conspiracy, sting money laundering, and operating an unlicensed money transmitting business. Sterlingov allegedly operated Bitcoin Fog, a cryptocurrency "mixer," from 2011 to 2021, which laundered over \$400 million in bitcoin. The DOJ alleged that Bitcoin Fog enabled criminals to hide illicit proceeds from darknet marketplaces involved in illegal narcotics, computer crimes, identity theft, and child sexual abuse material.</p> <p>On March 12, 2024, a jury found Sterlingov guilty of all charges.</p> <p>On November 8, 2024, Sterlingov was sentenced to 12 years and 6 months in prison.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Krstic et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/5/2021	N.D. Tex.	20-cr-120
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Kristijan Krstic and co-defendants with conspiracy to commit wire fraud and conspiracy to commit money laundering. The indictment claims that they helped create and market over 20 fraudulent investment platforms, including Options Giants and Crypto Trading World. They reportedly targeted global investors, including those in north Texas, with promises of high returns on binary options and cryptocurrency mining. The defendants allegedly fabricated company profiles and used fake names during video calls to convince investors of their legitimacy. After receiving wired funds, they provided access to a bogus investment portal showing false positive returns. The scheme allegedly defrauded investors of more than \$70 million. Miao, David, and Stojilkovic pled guilty and are awaiting sentencing, while the remaining defendants are awaiting trial.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. John DeMarr		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/29/2021	E.D.N.Y.	21-mj-128
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged John DeMarr with conspiracy to commit securities fraud related to the promotion of “Start Options” and “B2G”, stating that DeMarr and others misled investors by falsely claiming that funds would be invested in digital asset mining and trading for substantial profits. Instead, the funds were allegedly diverted for personal use, including to purchase luxury items. DeMarr used unauthorized celebrity endorsements to promote Start Options and fabricated promotional materials. When investors attempted to withdraw funds, they were pressured into an unregistered ICO for B2G, never receiving any tokens. DeMarr pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 60 months in prison and ordered to pay \$3,513,305.41 in forfeiture.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of the Search of Multiple Email Accounts Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2703 For Investigation of Violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1956 et al		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/2021	D.D.C.	20-sc-3310
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The government submitted an application for a warrant to search e-mail accounts in connection with its investigation into a hack of a cryptocurrency exchange. The court granted the application in February 2022, finding that the government complied with the Fourth Amendment and established probable cause.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Amir Elmaani		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/7/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cr-661
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
26 U.S.C. § 7201; 26 U.S.C. § 7201		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Amir Bruno Elmaani, also known as "Bruno Block," with tax offenses related to his cryptocurrency, Oyster Pearl. Elmaani is alleged to have secretly minted and sold Pearl tokens for personal gain, which caused the token's value to plummet and to have evaded income taxes on certain profits. In October 2018, Elmaani allegedly increased the volume of Pearl tokens through unauthorized minting, converting them to other cryptocurrencies, leading to a significant drop in their value. He reportedly used friends and family to receive and transfer funds. Elmaani pled guilty to one count of subscribing to a false tax return for 2017 and one count of failure to file a tax return for 2018. He agreed to pay restitution of at least \$5,523,794.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Approximately 69,370 Bitcoin (BTC), Bitcoin Gold (BTG), Bitcoin SV (BSV), and Bitcoin Cash (BCH) seized from 1HQ3Go3ggs8pFnXuHVHRytPCq5fGG8Hbh		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/5/2020	N.D. Cal.	20-cv-7811
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 981(a)(1)(A), 981(a)(1)(C), 981(b), and 21 U.S.C. § 881(a)(6).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ asked a California court to approve the seizure of over \$1 billion in bitcoin, allegedly stolen from the defunct online drug bazaar Silk Road. Prosecutors alleged that an individual, referred to as Individual X, hacked into Silk Road in 2013 and siphoned off digital funds. This individual turned over the cryptocurrency to authorities. Individual X allegedly stole the cryptocurrency, moved it to wallets they controlled, and kept it without spending it. Silk Road, which operated from 2011 to 2013, only accepted bitcoin. It generated over 9.5 million bitcoin in sales, with transactions laundered through a tumbler to hinder tracking attempts.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Hayes, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/1/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-CR-500
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
31 U.S.C. §§ 5318(h)(1) and (1); 31 U.S.C. §§ 5318 and 5322		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>On October 1, 2020, the DOJ indicted Arthur Hayes, Benjamin Delo, Samuel Reed, and Greg Dwyer. Hayes and Delo pleaded guilty on February 24, 2022 to violating the BSA and each agreed to pay a \$10 million fine, representing pecuniary gains. Hayes was sentenced to six months of home detention and two years' probation and agreed to pay a \$10 million fine. Delo was sentenced to 30 months' probation and agreed to pay a \$10 million fine. Reed pleaded guilty on March 9, 2022 to violating the BSA and also agreed to pay a \$10 million fine. Dwyer pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 12 months' probation, and to pay \$150,000 in fines. Separately, the CFTC and FinCEN matters settled for \$100 million.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Ryan Felton		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/9/20	N.D. Ga.	20-cr-347
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1343; 18 U.S.C. § 1957; 15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b) & 78ff		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Ryan Felton with wire fraud, securities fraud, and money laundering in connection with two fraudulent cryptocurrency schemes. Felton is accused of misleading investors about the FLiK streaming platform by falsely claiming endorsements and military contracts. He reportedly raised funds through an initial coin offering but allegedly diverted approximately \$2.4 million to his personal account, using it to finance a lavish lifestyle instead of developing FLiK. In the case of CoinSpark, a cryptocurrency trading exchange, Felton is said to have promised investors dividends and financial audits that were never provided. He purportedly raised over \$200,000 but failed to deliver on these promises, diverting additional funds to his personal account and ignoring refund requests. In July 2022, Felton pled guilty to the charges and was sentenced to 70 months in prison and 3 years of supervised release. The court ordered a civil penalty of \$2,400 with restitution to be determined later.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Gutemberg Dos Santos et al		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/6/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cr-398
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Pablo Renato Rodriguez, Gutemberg Dos Santos, Scott Hughes, Cecilia Millan, Jackie Aguilar, and Karina Chairez with conspiracy to commit wire fraud, bank fraud, and money laundering related to the AirBit Club Scheme. The defendants allegedly misled investors by promoting AirBit Club as a profitable cryptocurrency venture while using funds for luxury items and personal expenses. Scott Hughes received an 18-month prison sentence for laundering about \$18 million. Cecilia Millan was sentenced to five years, and Karina Chairez to one year and one day. Rodriguez, co-founder with Dos Santos, was sentenced to 12 years in prison. All defendants must forfeit assets worth approximately \$100 million.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Lacroix, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/23/2020	N.D. Ohio	20-cr-396
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1343, 1348, 1349, 1956(h) and 2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Dominic Lacroix, Yan Ouellet, and Sabrina Paradis-Royer with conspiracy to commit securities fraud and wire fraud, wire fraud, and conspiracy to commit money laundering in connection with PlexCoin.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.Se. v. Kim		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/9/2020	N.D. Cal	20-70923 MAG
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §1343		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Douglas Jae Woo Kim with wire fraud in connection with a multi-million dollar scheme to raise money for bogus cryptocurrency investments. Kim allegedly misrepresented himself as a cryptocurrency trader and solicited loans from friends and acquaintances for business purposes or cryptocurrency trading. He purportedly used cryptocurrencies like Bitcoin and Ether to finance transactions as part of the scheme. However, Kim allegedly transferred some or all of the assets he received from his victims to online gambling sites outside the United States. He is accused of convincing victims to provide over \$4.5 million, which he then used for gambling.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Joshua Thomas Argires		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/9/2020	S.D. Tex.	21-cr-275
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1014; 18 U.S.C. § 1343; 18 U.S.C. § 1344; 18 U.S.C. § 1957		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Joshua Thomas Argires with making false statements to a financial institution, wire fraud, bank fraud, and engaging in unlawful monetary transactions. Argires allegedly filed two fraudulent PPP loan applications seeking over \$1.1 million in loans guaranteed by the SBA under the CARES Act. He purportedly claimed that his companies, Texas Barbecue and Houston Landscaping, had numerous employees and significant payroll expenses. The loans were funded, but the funds were allegedly not used for payroll or other authorized expenses. Instead, the DOJ claims the funds for Texas Barbecue were invested in a cryptocurrency account. Additionally, the funds for Houston Landscaping were purportedly not used for their intended purpose. Argires is accused of using these fraudulent claims to obtain over \$1.1 million in PPP loans.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Gratkowski		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/30/2020 (5th Cir. Order date)	5th Cir. (on appeal from W.D. Tx.)	19-50492
Ruling / Orders of Note		
No expectation of privacy in Bitcoin transactions.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Richard Nikolai Gratkowski with one count of receiving child pornography and one count of accessing websites with intent to view child pornography. The evidence for the case was obtained through a search warrant based on an analysis of Bitcoin transactions and customer data from Coinbase. Gratkowski accepted a plea agreement but reserved the right to appeal the Fourth Amendment issue. Sentenced to seventy months in prison, Gratkowski appealed to the Fifth Circuit. The court analyzed whether Bitcoin transaction records are protected by the Fourth Amendment and likened them to bank records, which are not protected under the third-party doctrine. The court ruled that Gratkowski had no reasonable expectation of privacy as he voluntarily disclosed information to third parties, including all users of the Bitcoin network and Coinbase. Affirming the district court's denial of Gratkowski's motion to suppress, the court concluded that Bitcoin transaction records are not protected by the Fourth Amendment.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Abramoff		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/25/2020	N.D. Cal.	20-cr-260
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 371; 2 U.S.C. § 1606(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Jack Abramoff with conspiracy to commit wire fraud and violating the Lobbying Disclosure Act. Abramoff allegedly conspired to make false and misleading statements to potential purchasers of AML Bitcoin. He purportedly engaged in a fake "rejection campaign" for a Super Bowl ad, claiming that the network and NFL rejected it for being too politically controversial, while knowing it was never submitted or intended to air. Abramoff and his co-defendants raised over \$5 million by misrepresenting the cryptocurrency's development and viability. He also allegedly made false claims about partnerships with government agencies to boost investor confidence. Abramoff is accused of retaining writers to spread these false statements and failing to register as a lobbyist. Abramoff pleaded guilty to the charges.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. John David McAfee		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/15/2020	W.D. Tenn.	20-cr-10029
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
26 U.S.C. § 7201; 26 U.S.C. § 7203.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged John David McAfee with conspiracy to commit commodities and securities fraud, wire fraud conspiracy, and money laundering conspiracy. McAfee allegedly engaged in a "pump and dump" scheme, buying large quantities of altcoins and then artificially inflating their market prices through misleading endorsement tweets before selling them for significant profits. He also purportedly promoted ICOs without disclosing that he was compensated by the ICO issuers, earning over \$11 million in undisclosed payments and laundering the proceeds into U.S. currency. This case was dismissed due to McAfee's death.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Stojilkovic		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/4/2020	N.D. Tex.	20-cr-120
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Antonije Stojilkovic and over a dozen others with conspiracy to commit wire fraud and money laundering. (See Superseding Indictment.) Stojilkovic, arrested in Serbia on July 24, 2020, was extradited to the Northern District of Texas on Feb. 4, 2021. The indictment purports that the defendants created and marketed over 20 fraudulent investing platforms, including Options Rider and Trinity Mining. They purportedly targeted global investors with false claims of high returns on binary options and cryptocurrency mining investments. The defendants allegedly used fake profiles and names to convince investors of the platforms' legitimacy and instructed them to wire money internationally. The purported scheme defrauded investors of more than \$70 million, with no actual trading occurring and the funds used for personal expenses and to further the fraud.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Chen		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/18/2020	C.D. Cal.	20-CR-89 (JFW)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 371; 26 U.S.C. § 7201		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Steve Chen with conspiracy to commit wire fraud and tax evasion in connection with an alleged scheme to fraudulently obtain \$147 million from tens of thousands of investors. Chen pleaded guilty in June 2020 and was the CEO of U.S. Fine Investment Arts, Inc. (USFIA). He allegedly promoted a multi-level marketing scheme with non-existent gemstone mines and used a Pyramid/Ponzi scheme, where compensation came from recruiting new investors rather than selling products. Investors bought packages of amber, gemstones, and USFIA points, which were later replaced by “Gem Coins.” Chen was sentenced to 120 months in federal prison and ordered to pay \$1,885,094 in restitution to the IRS.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Caruso and Salter		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/29/2020	D. Ariz.	20-cr-165 (JJT)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 371; 18 U.S.C. § 1343; 18 U.S.C. § 1957		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged John Michael Caruso and Zachary Salter with conspiracy to commit wire fraud and money laundering. Both were charged with 17 counts related to their operation of Zima Digital Assets, which allegedly attracted over \$11.5 million from investors through false claims about its operations and regulatory compliance. The DOJ claimed that Caruso and Salter made misleading statements in marketing materials for Zima Digital Assets, claiming regulation by FINRA and having analysts based overseas. Additionally, the defendants allegedly did not use all of the invested funds as promised and the prosecution noted one transaction where Caruso withdrew \$262,000 from a bank account, knowing over \$10,000 of it derived from the alleged fraud.</p> <p>On April 8, 2024, Caruso agreed to plead guilty to one count of transactional money laundering over \$10,000. In exchange, prosecutors agreed to drop the remaining 16 charges. Caruso also agreed to make full restitution up to \$11.5 million. The defendant was sentenced to 78 months in prison, along with a \$250,100, criminal monetary penalty, and a restitution amount to be determined.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Boaz Manor and Edith Pardo		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/16/2020	D.N.J.	20-cr-51 (SRC)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. § 1343; 15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Boaz Manor and Edith Pardo with conspiracy to commit wire fraud, three counts of wire fraud, and one count of securities fraud in connection with a blockchain technology company. Pardo pleaded guilty to allegedly fraudulently inducing victims to invest over \$25 million in cash and cryptocurrency. Through CG Blockchain Inc. and BCT Inc., Pardo and her co-defendant, Boaz Manor, promoted a product called ComplianceGuard, which purportedly provided hedge funds with a blockchain-based auditing tool. Pardo and Manor allegedly concealed Manor's true identity and criminal past from investors, falsely claiming that Pardo was the sole owner and independently wealthy, and that ComplianceGuard was widely used. In reality, the entities allegedly had no real executives, collected no fees, and ComplianceGuard was barely used. In 2017, the DOJ claims that Pardo and Manor raised over \$25 million through an ICO for Blockchain Terminal, based on alleged false claims. After Manor's identity was discovered, he admitted to hiding his past. Manor is currently a fugitive.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Ackerman		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/15/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cr-93 (LTS)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1343; 1956(a)(1)(B)(i)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>In September 2021, Ackerman pleaded guilty to wire fraud in connection with a cryptocurrency investment scheme that raised \$35 million from over 100 investors. As part of the plea agreement, Ackerman will pay restitution of at least \$30.6 million and forfeit approximately \$36.3 million. The District Court sentenced Ackerman to five years of probation (with one year of home incarceration).</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Truglia		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/19/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cr-921
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 371		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The DOJ alleged that Truglia stole \$20 million worth of cryptocurrency through a SIM swap attack, which involved routing the victim's calls and messages to a SIM card controlled by Truglia, and obtaining unauthorized access to the victim's accounts. On December 1, 2022, Truglia was sentenced to 18 months in prison, and was ordered to pay over \$20 million in restitution to the victim.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Harmon		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/3/2019	D.D.C.	19-cr-395
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 1956(a)(1)(A)(i), 1956(a)(1)(B)(i); 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), 846		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
July 24, 2020 Memorandum Opinion (regarding the Helix tumbler, confirms Bitcoin is money for money laundering purposes); in August 2021, Harmon pleaded guilty to one count of conspiracy to launder monetary instruments and agreed to forfeit more than 4,400 bitcoin.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The DOJ charged Larry Dean Harmon with conspiracy to commit money laundering arising from his operation of Helix, alleged Darknet-based cryptocurrency laundering service. Harmon pleaded guilty, and agreed to forfeit more than 4,400 bitcoin. Helix functioned as a bitcoin “mixer” or “tumbler,” allowing customers, for a fee, to send bitcoin to designated recipients in a manner designed to conceal the source or owner of the bitcoin. Helix was linked to and associated with “Grams,” a Darknet search engine also run by Harmon. Harmon advertised Helix to customers on the Darknet to conceal transactions from law enforcement.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Goettsche, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/5/2019	D. N. J.	19-cr-877
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 1349		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The DOJ charged Goettsche, Abel, Balaci, and Weeks with conspiracy to engage in wire fraud related to their roles in BitClub Network. From April 2014 through December 2019, BitClub Network was alleged to be a fraudulent scheme that solicited investments in shares of purported cryptocurrency mining pools and rewarded recruits for bringing in new investors. The defendants, along with others, purportedly used false and misleading figures to misrepresent “bitcoin mining earnings” from BitClub Network’s mining pool. They are accused of obtaining at least \$722 million from investors. Abel and Weeks pleaded guilty to the charges.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Griffith		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/21/2019	S.D.N.Y.	20-cr-15 (PKC)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
50 U.S.C. § 1705		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Virgil Griffith with conspiracy to violate the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA). Griffith was accused of providing services to the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK), including advice on using cryptocurrency and blockchain technology to evade U.S. sanctions. He allegedly traveled to North Korea in April 2019 to speak at a cryptocurrency conference, despite being denied travel permission, and provided guidance on using blockchain. Griffith pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 63 months in prison and three years of supervised release.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Meiggs and Harrington		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/13/2019	D. Mass.	19-cr-10438
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 1349, 1030(a)(2), (c)(2)(B)(ii), 1028A, 981(a)(1)(C), 982(a)(2)(B), 1030(i); 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Eric Meiggs and Declan Harrington with conspiracy to commit computer fraud and abuse and wire fraud; aiding and abetting; computer fraud and abuse; aggravated identity theft. The defendants allegedly took over victims’ social media accounts and stole their cryptocurrency using techniques such as “SIM swapping” and computer hacking. The defendants purportedly targeted executives of cryptocurrency companies and individuals with high-value social media account names. They allegedly used SIM swapping to convince cell phone carriers to reassign victims’ phone numbers to SIM cards controlled by the cybercriminals, allowing them to reset account passwords and access victims’ accounts. Meiggs and Harrington purportedly targeted at least 10 victims and allegedly stole approximately \$330,000 in cryptocurrency. Meiggs was sentenced to two years and one day in prison, while Harrington was sentenced to two years and seven days in prison.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Asa Saint Clair		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/6/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cr-790
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1343		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Asa Saint Clair, a/k/a “Asa Williams,” a/k/a “Asa Sinclair,” with wire fraud. Saint Clair allegedly devised a fraudulent investment scheme, persuading 60 individuals into providing loans to his organization, the World Sports Alliance, tied to a purported digital coin offering called IGObit. He allegedly falsely represented that the World Sports Alliance was a close affiliate of the United Nations and promised guaranteed returns on investments. Instead, he purportedly diverted the investors’ funds for personal expenses. Saint Clair was found guilty of wire fraud in March 2022 following a two-week jury trial. He was sentenced to 42 months in prison, three years of supervised release, and ordered to pay forfeiture of \$618,417 and restitution of \$613,417.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Potekhin		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/29/2019	N.D. Cal.	19-cr-572 (CRB)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1028A(a)(1), 1030(b), 1030(a)(4)-(c)(3)(A), 1349, 1956(h), 982(a)(2)(B), 981(a)(1)(C), 1030(i)-(j); 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Russian nationals Danil Potekhin and Dmitrii Karasavidi with conspiracy to commit computer fraud and abuse; unauthorized access to a protected computer to obtain value, conspiracy to commit wire fraud, aggravated identity theft, conspiracy to commit money laundering. Potekhin allegedly created fake domains mimicking legitimate exchanges to steal login credentials and access customer accounts, on Poloniex, Binance, and Gemini. Starting in July 2017, the defendants allegedly used stolen credentials to withdraw digital currency and manipulate cryptocurrency markets. They purportedly executed a market manipulation scheme in October 2017, that caused victims \$5 million in losses. Similar schemes allegedly occurred from October 2017 to March 2018, resulting in over \$11 million in thefts. The DOJ claimed that the defendants laundered proceeds through multiple accounts, with significant amounts ending up in Karasavidi's account.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Fowler		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/11/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cr-254
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 982 (a)(2)(A), 1344, 1349		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
See Superseding Indictment .		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Trofimovics, Nikitenko, Zaharevics, Ruseckis, Gorenko		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/25/2019	W.D. Pa.	19-cr-304
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1956		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Because three defendants are fugitives, the District Court halted proceedings until further ordered. Arthurs Zaharevics, after pleading guilty, was sentenced to time served and three years of supervised release, and was removed to Latvia. Aleksejs Trofimovics, after pleading guilty, was sentenced to time served and three years of supervised release.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Steven Nerayoff, Michael Hlady		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/17/2019	E.D.N.Y.	20-cr-8 (MKB)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1951(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Steven Nerayoff and Michael Hlady with extortion, alleging they threatened to destroy a startup cryptocurrency company if not paid millions in Ether (ETH). Hlady pleaded guilty to conspiracy to extort and faces up to 20 years in prison. Nerayoff pled not guilty, and charges against him were dismissed in May 2024 after prosecutors admitted they could not prove the case against him. Nerayoff is seeking \$9.6 billion in damages from the U.S. government, alleging he was framed by the FBI and federal prosecutors to coerce him into providing evidence against high-profile individuals in the cryptocurrency industry.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Paul E. Vernon		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/15/2019	S.D. Fla.	19-cr-20509 (RNS)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1343, 1956(A)(1)(B)(I), 1030(A)(5)(A), 1512, 1519, 981(A)(1)(C), 982(A)(1), 982(A)(2)(B), 1030(i); 26 U.S.C. §§ 7201, 7302		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Paul E. Vernon with alleged tax evasion, wire fraud, money laundering, computer fraud, tampering with records, documents, and other objects, and destruction of records in a federal investigation. Vernon purportedly stole over one million dollars from cryptocurrency wallets on his exchange, Cryptsy, between May 2013 and May 2015, depositing the funds into personal accounts. Additionally, Vernon is alleged to have informed employees of a hack that purportedly resulted in the theft of over five million dollars' worth of cryptocurrency, while continuing to solicit new customers without disclosing the security breach. In November 2015, Vernon moved to China and later allegedly reported the hack to customers. In April 2016, Vernon was accused of remotely hacking Cryptsy servers to steal and destroy customer databases to conceal his activities. Vernon is currently a fugitive.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Gunton and Nashatka		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/13/2019	N.D. Cal.	19-cr-372
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 982(a)(2)(B), 1029(a)(1) (access device fraud), 1030(b), 1030(a)(5)(A), 1030 (c)(4)(B)(i), 1030(c)(4)(A)(i)(VI), 1030(i)-(j), 1349; 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The DOJ charged Anthony Tyler Nashatka and Elliott Gunton with alleged conspiracy to commit computer fraud and abuse, transmission of a program, information, code, and command to cause damage to a protected computer, unauthorized access to a protected computer to obtain value, conspiracy to commit wire fraud, and aggravated identity theft. Nashatka purportedly targeted a cryptocurrency exchange platform in December 2017 to steal private keys and information from its users. Nashatka and Gunton allegedly diverted users to a fake website, fraudulently obtained their credentials and cryptocurrency, and transferred approximately \$600,000 to an address they controlled. Additionally, Nashatka and his co-conspirators are alleged to have stolen an additional \$800,000 from a single victim. Nashatka has appeared in court and was released on bond pending further proceedings.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. BTC-E, Alexander Vinnick		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/25/2019	N.D. Cal.	19-cv-4281
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
31 U.S.C. §§ 5311-5314, 5316-5332		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Civil complaint.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Jon Barry Thompson		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/18/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cr-698 (ER)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
7 U.S.C. §§ 9(1), 13(a)(5); 18 U.S.C. § 1343		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The DOJ charged Jon Barry Thompson, the principal of a cryptocurrency escrow company, with commodities fraud. Thompson allegedly claimed that his companies, Volantis Escrow Platform LLC and Volantis Market Making LLC, minimized settlement default risk in cryptocurrency transaction by acting as a custodian for both sides of the transaction. In June and July 2018, Thompson purportedly assured a company (referred to as "Company-1") that he would act as an escrow for over \$3 million intended for Bitcoin purchases. Instead, Thompson allegedly wired the money to a third-party entity without first receiving any Bitcoin. He then allegedly lied about the transaction status and the location of the funds, which were never recovered. Thompson plead guilty to these charges, and was sentenced to three years of supervised release and ordered him to pay back \$3.25 million in restitution.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Yosef and Fowler		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/30/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cr-254
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 982(a)(2)(A), 1344, 1349, 1960		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The DOJ charged Reginald Fowler and Ravid Yosef with alleged bank fraud, bank fraud conspiracy, operating an unlicensed money transmitting business, conspiracy to operate an unlicensed money transmitting business, and wire fraud. Fowler purportedly committed these offenses in connection with his work for Crypto Capital, a payment processor that allegedly processed approximately \$750 million in transactions for various cryptocurrency exchanges through bank accounts opened under false pretenses. Additionally, Fowler is alleged to have defrauded the Alliance of American Football (AAF) by misrepresenting funds as his own assets, which he purportedly used to acquire a significant stake in the AAF, contributing to the league's eventual collapse. Fowler has pleaded guilty to these charges. Ravid Yosef has remained at large. Fowler was sentenced to 75 months in prison and was ordered to pay forfeiture of \$740,249,140.52 and restitution in the amount of \$53,189,261.80 to the AAF.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Onwueerie Gift, Kelvin Usifoh		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/24/2019	D. Or.	19-cr-141
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1343, 1349, 1956(h)		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Patrick McDonnell		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/25/2019	E.D.N.Y.	19-cr-148 (NGG)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1343, 981 (a)(1)(C); 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The DOJ charged Patrick McDonnell with alleged wire fraud related to a scheme to defraud investors in virtual currency. McDonnell, who operated under the alias "Jason Flack," purportedly deceived investors by promising trading advice and virtual currency investments through his company, CabbageTech, Corp., also known as Coin Drop Markets. McDonnell allegedly falsely represented his company's capabilities and used fabricated financial statements to cover up his fraudulent activities, ultimately defrauding at least 10 victims of approximately \$224,350.32. He was sentenced to 33 months in prison and ordered to pay \$224,352 in restitution after pleading guilty in June 2019.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Ruja Ignatova		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/12/2024	S.D.N.Y.	17-cr-630
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 981(a)(1)(C), 1343, 1349, 956(a)(2)(A); 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c); 15 U.S.C. 78j(b), 78ff; 17 U.S.C. § 240.10b-5		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>In October, of 2017 the DOJ charged Ruja Ignatova , a German national, with alleged conspiracies to commit wire fraud, wire fraud, and conspiracy to commit money laundering. Ignatova, co-founder of OneCoin Ltd, allegedly defrauded global investors out of more than \$4 billion by promoting OneCoin as a digital currency investment through false statements and representations. Ignatova fled to evade arrest and has been a fugitive since. She was added to the FBI’s Ten Most Wanted Fugitives List in 2022. Germany has also criminally charged Ignatova for her role in the transnational fraud scheme. The U.S. Department of State has authorized a reward of up to \$5 million for information leading to her arrest.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Antonenko		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/26/2019	D.Mass	20-cr-10102 (WGY)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1956(h)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The DOJ charged Vitalii Antonenko with conspiracies to engage in computer hacking, trafficking in stolen payment card numbers, and money laundering. Antonenko was indicted on one count of conspiracy to gain unauthorized access to computer networks and traffic in unauthorized access devices, and one count of money laundering conspiracy. Antonenko allegedly used SQL injection attacks to access networks, steal payment card data, and sell it on online criminal marketplaces. The proceeds were purportedly laundered using Bitcoin and traditional bank transactions. The court ordered Antonenko to undergo psychiatric treatment in a suitable facility, before the proceedings could continue.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Randall Crater		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/26/2019	D.Mass	19-cr-10063 (DJCO)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1343; 18 U.S.C. § 1957; 18 U.S.C. §§ 981(a)(1)(C), 982(a)(1) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The U.S. Attorney’s Office for the District of Massachusetts charged Randall Crater, the founder of My Big Coin, with alleged securities fraud. On July 21, 2022 Crater was convicted by a federal jury on four counts of wire fraud and three counts of unlawful monetary transactions and sentenced to 100 months in federal prison, ordered to pay \$7,668,317 in forfeiture, and restitution to be determined later. Crater and his agents allegedly misled investors, claiming that My Big Coin was backed by gold and had a partnership with MasterCard. From 2014 to 2017, Crater allegedly obtained over \$7.5 million from investors through these misrepresentations.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Rice		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/20/2018	N.D. Tex – Dallas Division	18-cr-587-K
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b) and 78ff; 17 U.S.C. § 240.10b-5; 18 U.S.C. § 1343; 18 U.S.C. § 981 (a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Guilty plea agreement to one count of securities fraud; pending sentencing; parties agreed to recommendation of 60 months (see factual resume). In August 2020, Rice was sentenced to five years in prison and ordered to pay more than \$4 million in restitution.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The DOJ charged Jared Rice, Sr., the inventor of AriseCoin and CEO of AriseBank, with alleged securities fraud. Rice pleaded guilty to the charges and was sentenced to five years in federal prison and ordered to pay \$4,258,073 in restitution. Rice purportedly lied to investors, claiming AriseBank, billed as the world’s “first decentralized banking platform” based on the proprietary digital currency AriseCoin, could offer FDIC-insured accounts, traditional banking services, and Visa-brand credit cards, none of which were true. Rice allegedly misused investor funds for personal expenditures. Hundreds of investors allegedly bought approximately \$4,250,000 in AriseCoin using digital currencies and fiat currency.		

Filing / Order		
New York Attorney General v. Eyal		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/27/2018	Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Kings	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
N.Y. General Business Law Article 23-A (the “Martin Act”)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
New York Attorney General Letitia James announced the conviction of Eran Eyal for operating fraudulent schemes involving three separate ventures, including a deceptive ICO for Shopin. Eyal pleaded guilty to felony securities fraud related to Shopin and two counts of Scheme to Defraud in the First Degree concerning his earlier companies, Springleap, Inc., and Passo Sync, Inc. Eyal was sentenced to pay \$125,000 in restitution, \$475,000 in judgments to Springleap investors, and surrender approximately \$450,000 in cryptocurrency from Shopin. Additionally, he was barred from raising capital or serving as a business officer in New York for three years.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. James Moore, Savraj Gata-Aura		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/27/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cr-759
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1343		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
James Moore was sentenced to 140 months of imprisonment and three years of supervised release. In addition, Moore ordered to pay a \$50,000 fine and \$57,579.790 in restitution. Gata-Aura sentenced to 48 months of imprisonment and three years of supervised release.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Campos		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/9/2018	S.D. Cal.	18-cr-3554
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1960(a); 31 U.S.C. § 5318(h); 18 U.S.C. §1956(a)(2)(A); 18 U.S.C. § 371; 31 U.S.C. § 5324(c); 18 U.S.C. § 982 (a)(1) and (b)(1); 31 U.S.C. § 5317(c)(1)(A) and (B)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Guilty plea to operating an unlicensed money transmitting business (18 USC § 1960); agreed forfeiture of \$823,357; sentence of two years in prison.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Stoica, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/5/2018	E.D. Ky	18-cr-81
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1962(d); 18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. §1956(h); 18 U.S.C. §1028A		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Coinflux CEO pleads guilty to one count of RICO conspiracy.		

Filing / Order		
New York v. Meza, Guzman, Nunez and Colon		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/12/2018	Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York	04350/2017 & 1932/2018
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Penal Law §155.42 (Grand Larceny); Penal Law §1 65.54 (Criminal Possession of Stolen Property in First Degree); Penal Law §135.20 (Kidnapping in the Second Degree); Penal Law §160.15(4) (Robbery in the First Degree); Penal Law §265.09(1)(b) (Criminal Use of a Firearm in the First Degree); Penal Law §140.25(2) (Burglary in the Second Degree).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Indictment.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Trapani, Sharma		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/18/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cr-340 (LGS)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b), 78ff; 17 C.F.R. §§ 240,10b-5; 18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 1343, 1349, 2		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Trapani pleaded guilty to nine counts. Trapani ordered to forfeit about \$2.9 million.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Sharma pleaded guilty and was sentenced to eight years in prison in connection with his leading role in a scheme to induce victims to invest more than \$25 million worth of digital funds in Centra Tech, Inc. ("Centra Tech"), a Miami-based company he co-founded and that purported to offer cryptocurrency-related financial products. Trapani avoided prison time due to cooperation.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Kantor		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/10/2018	E.D.N.Y.	18-cr-177
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1349 and 3551 et seq.; 18 U.S.C. §§ 1512(c), 2 and 3551 et seq.; 18 U.S.C. §§ 1001(a)(2) and 3551 et seq.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Judgment.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Blake Kantor in connection with Blue Bit Banc and Blue Bit Analytics (“BBB”), a binary options company he operated. Kantor was alleged to have orchestrated a scheme to defraud BBB investors and those who invested in a cryptocurrency known as “ATM Coin” by engaging in fraudulent activities and misleading investors. Kantor’s actions purportedly led to significant financial losses for the victims. He pleaded guilty to conspiracy to commit wire fraud and was sentenced to 86 months in prison, to be followed by three years of supervised release. Additionally, he was ordered to pay \$806,405 in restitution to the victims, forfeiture of \$1.5 million, and forfeiture of approximately \$153,000 of stolen proceeds.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Sharma and Farkas		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/31/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-mag-2695
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b), 78ff; 17 C.F.R. §§ 240,10b-5; 18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 1343, 1349, 2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Sohrab Sharma and Robert Joseph Farkas in connection with Centra Tech, Inc., a Miami-based company they co-founded. Sharma was alleged to have orchestrated a scheme to defraud investors by falsely marketing Centra Tech as offering cryptocurrency-related financial products and forming partnerships with major financial institutions, while in reality, these claims were fabricated. Sharma’s actions purportedly led to over \$25 million in investments. He pleaded guilty to securities fraud, wire fraud, and mail fraud and was sentenced to eight years in prison, a \$20,000 fine, and forfeiture of \$36,088,960. Farkas, also charged with securities fraud and wire fraud, was alleged to have played a significant role in the scheme, misleading investors with false claims about the company’s capabilities. Farkas pleaded guilty to the charges and was sentenced to one year and one day in prison, three years of supervised release, and ordered to forfeit \$347,062.58 and a Rolex watch bought with fraud proceeds.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Montroll		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/20/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-mag-1372 (sealed complaint)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1621; 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The DOJ charged Jon E. Montroll, a/k/a "Ukyo," with securities fraud and obstruction of justice. Montroll pleaded guilty to the charges and was sentenced to 14 months in prison. Additionally, Montroll was ordered to serve three years of supervised release and pay forfeiture of \$167,480. Montroll operated two online bitcoin services, WeExchange Australia, Pty. Ltd. ("WeExchange"), a bitcoin depository and currency exchange service, and BitFunder.com ("BitFunder"), which facilitated the purchase and trading of virtual shares of business entities. Between December 2012 and July 2013, Montroll allegedly converted a portion of WeExchange users' bitcoins to his personal use without their knowledge or consent, exchanging them for U.S. dollars and spending the funds on personal expenses such as travel and groceries.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Kim		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/15/2018	N.D.Ill.	18-cr-107
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1343		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Guilty plea to one count of wire fraud; sentence of 15 months in prison; \$1.14m in restitution.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Greenwood		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/6/2018	S.D.N.Y.	17-cr-630
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. §§ 1343 and 2; 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h); 18 U.S.C. § 371; 15 U.S.C. 78j(b) & 78ff		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Mansy and TV TOYZ, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/4/2017	D. Me.	15-cr-198
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1960		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Denial of motion to dismiss.		
Final Order of Forfeiture.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Defendant received a year-and-a-day prison sentence and a final order of forfeiture for operating unlicensed money transmission business.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Tetley		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/28/2017	C.D.Ca.	17-cr-738
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1960; 18 U.S.C. § 1956		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Judgment and Probation/Commitment Order.		
Final Order of Forfeiture (\$292,264; 25 gold bars; and 40 BTC).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The DOJ charged Theresa Lynn Tetley with operating an unlicensed money transmitting business and money laundering. Tetley pleaded guilty to these charges and was sentenced to 12 months and one day in federal prison, followed by three years of supervised release and a \$20,000 fine. Tetley purportedly operated an unregistered bitcoin-for-cash exchange business and engaged in unlawful monetary transactions involving bitcoin that was represented to be from narcotics activity, including with an undercover agent. Tetley was ordered to forfeit 40 Bitcoin, \$292,264 in cash, and 25 gold bars.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Zaslavskiy		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/27/2017	E.D.N.Y.	17-cr-647
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 371 and 3551 <i>et seq.</i>		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order denying Defendant's motion to dismiss.		
Judgment sentencing Zaslavskiy to 18 months in prison.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Maksim Zaslavskiy with conspiracy to commit securities fraud in connection with two Initial Coin Offerings (ICOs) – REcoin Group Foundation, LLC (REcoin) and DRC World, Inc. (Diamond Reserve Club). Zaslavskiy pleaded guilty to the charges and was sentenced to 18 months in prison. He purportedly marketed REcoin as “The First Ever Cryptocurrency Backed by Real Estate” and Diamond as an “exclusive and tokenized membership pool” backed by diamonds. Zaslavskiy stated that he did not actually invest in real estate or diamonds, and the certificates he issued were not supported by blockchain technology. The court denied his motion to dismiss the indictment, upholding that securities laws applied to cryptocurrency offerings. See <i>SEC v. RECoin Group Foundation, LLC</i>.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Stetkiw		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/25/2017	E.D. Mich	17-mj-30566
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1960		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Mark S. Scott, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/17/2017	S.D.N.Y.	17-cr-630 (ER)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1956(a)(1)(B)(i)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Conviction as to Mark Scott; guilty plea by David Pike		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Mark Scott with allegedly laundering approximately \$400 million from the international fraud scheme known as OneCoin. This case marked the first prosecution of a lawyer for aiding and abetting a cryptocurrency scheme. Scott was sentenced to 10 years in prison and three years of supervised release, following his conviction on all counts at trial on November 21, 2019. OneCoin, a purportedly fraudulent cryptocurrency scheme initiated in 2014, is alleged to have deceived investors by marketing a fake cryptocurrency through a global multi-level marketing network. The scheme is said to have defrauded over \$4 billion from at least 3.5 million victims, falsely claiming that OneCoin had market-driven value when it was reportedly worthless. Scott, who worked for OneCoin co-founder Ruja Ignatova, is alleged to have laundered the proceeds through fake investment funds in the British Virgin Islands and complex transactions to obscure the funds' origins. He was ordered to forfeit a money judgment of \$392,940,000, several bank accounts, a yacht, two Porsche automobiles, and four real estate properties.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Louis Ong		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/21/2017	W.D. Wash.	17-cr-191
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1956(a)(3)(B) and § 1960(b)(1)(A)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Judgment.		
Final Order of Forfeiture.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Canadian Louis Ong with operating an unlicensed money transmission business. Ong pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 20 days in prison and over \$1 million in forfeitures. Ong will likely face difficulty returning to the U.S. from Canada due to the charges. Ong was arrested in July 2017 after allegedly engaging in bitcoin-for-cash transactions with an undercover agent. Ong allegedly repeatedly told the agent that he did not want to know the cash source so that he would have “plausible deniability” after the agent divulged that the funds were from drug trafficking. Despite registering with FinCEN, Ong purportedly failed to comply with reporting regulations for suspicious transactions, including those involving drug-related cash.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Homero J. Garza		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/20/2017	D. Conn.	17-cr-158
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1343		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Judgment (sentence of 21 months; restitution of \$9,182,000).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Homero Joshua Garza with wire fraud for defrauding investors through misleading virtual currency schemes. Garza, sentenced to 21 months in prison followed by three years of supervised release, allegedly made false claims about his companies, including GAW, GAW Miners, ZenMiner, and ZenCloud. He purportedly misled investors about his companies' capabilities and financial backing to attract them, falsely claiming significant partnerships and a reserve to support PayCoin's value. Garza's alleged fraudulent tactics included Ponzi-scheme elements, using funds from new investors to pay older ones and defrauding individuals of approximately \$9,182,000. He pled guilty on July 20, 2017, and was ordered to pay restitution of that amount.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Renwick Haddow		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/29/2017	S.D.N.Y.	19-cr-340
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1343 and 2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Renwick Haddow with wire fraud and wire fraud conspiracy related to his involvement in the Bar Works scheme and a separate Bitcoin-related investment scheme. Bar Works was a fraudulent scheme where Haddow purportedly deceived investors by misrepresenting the profitability and legitimacy of a supposed bar and restaurant investment opportunity. Haddow plead guilty on May 23, 2019, under a cooperation agreement to one count each of wire fraud and wire fraud conspiracy for both the Bar Works scheme and the Bitcoin scheme. His sentencing is scheduled for November 1, 2024.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Thomas M. Costanzo a/k/a Morpheus Titania		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/21/2017	D. Ariz.	17-cr-585
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1) and 924(a)(2)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The DOJ charged Thomas Mario Costanzo, a.k.a. Morpheus Titania, with five counts of money laundering. Costanzo was found guilty of all counts by a federal jury on March 28, 2018. He was sentenced by U.S. District Judge G. Murray Snow to 41 months' imprisonment, with credit for time served since his April 2017 arrest.</p> <p>The Department of Justice alleged that evidence presented at trial showed Costanzo advertised on a peer-to-peer bitcoin exchange, offering cash transactions up to \$50,000. Undercover federal agents, posing as drug dealers, claimed that Costanzo provided bitcoin to conceal drug proceeds and advised it as a method to avoid law enforcement. Over two years, he purportedly took \$164,700 in cash, including \$107,000 in April 2017, and exchanged it for bitcoin. The trial also claimed that Costanzo used bitcoin to buy drugs and facilitate drug purchases over the internet. At sentencing, the court ordered the forfeiture of 80.94512167 BTC. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. BTC-E and Vinnick		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/17/2017	N.D. Cal.	16-cr-227
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1960, 1956(h), 1956(a)(1), 1957, 982(a)(1)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>FinCen civil money penalty (\$110 million as to BTC-e; \$12 million as to Vinnick).</p> <p>The DOJ charged Alexander Vinnick with conspiracy to commit money laundering related to his role in operating the cryptocurrency exchange BTC-e from 2011 to 2017. Vinnick, a Russian national, pleaded guilty in May 2024. BTC-e processed over \$9 billion in transactions and served over one million users, including many in the U.S., and was accused of laundering criminal proceeds from cybercrimes and other illegal activities, resulting in an alleged loss of at least \$121 million. Despite significant U.S. business, BTC-e purportedly failed to register with FinCEN and lacked AML and KYC policies. Vinnick reportedly used shell companies and global financial accounts to facilitate operations. In 2017, FinCEN announced civil monetary penalties of \$110 million against BTC-e and \$12 million against Vinnick for purported AML violations.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Richard Petix		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/4/2015	W.D.N.Y.	15-cr-227
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1960		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Denial of motion to dismiss. Judgment. Final order of forfeiture.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Richard Petix with making materially false statements and operating an unlicensed money transmitting business. Despite being on supervised release, he allegedly failed to notify his probation officer about his computer and Internet use. On December 3, 2015, Petix purportedly transferred approximately \$13,000 in bitcoins to an undercover federal agent using a laptop and smartphone, which he falsely claimed were not his when confronted. Between August 2014 and December 2015, he allegedly conducted over 100 Bitcoin transactions, transferring over \$200,000 without federal registration compliance. Petix pleaded guilty to the charges, and was sentenced to three years of supervised relief.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Michael Lord and Randall Lord		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/18/2015	W.D. La.	15-cr-240
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 371; 18 U.S.C. §§ 1960(a), (b)(1)-(2); 18 U.S.C. §§ 1956(a); 18 U.S.C. §§ 5313, 5322; 18 U.S.C. § 2; 18 U.S.C. §§ 1343		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The DOJ charged Michael and Randall Lord with operating an unlicensed money-services business by selling Bitcoin in exchange for various payments. Despite being notified by Coinbase in 2014 to register with FinCEN, they falsely claimed compliance and did not register until November. The Lords were indicted in 2015 under 18 U.S.C. § 1960 for not holding a Louisiana money-services license and for failing to register with FinCEN. Although they initially pleaded guilty, they later sought to withdraw their pleas, arguing issues related to state licensing laws. The court denied their motion, emphasizing their continued failure to meet federal registration requirements. Randall Lord was sentenced to 46 months in prison, while Michael Lord received a 106-month sentence.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Murgio, Lebedev, and Gross		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/21/2015	S.D.N.Y.	15-cr-769 (AJN)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 371; 18 U.S.C. § 1960 and 2; 18 U.S.C. § 215(a); 18 U.S.C. § 1349; 18 U.S.C. § 1343; 18 U.S.C. § 1956(a)(2)(A)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Denial of motion to dismiss.		
Defendants plead guilty; sentenced to prison.		
Second Circuit affirms district court verdicts and sentences.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Convictions of all defendants for illegal bitcoin transactions and money laundering, and five-year prison sentence for Defendant Gross.		

Filing / Order		
Florida v. Espinoza		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/6/2014 (approx.)	11th Judicial Circuit, Miami-Dade County, Florida	F14-2923
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
§ 560.125(5)(a), Fla. Stat.; § 896.101(5)(a) and (5)(b) (revised to add virtual currency)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The State of Florida charged Michell Espinoza with money laundering and unlawfully engaging in an unlicensed money-services business. Miami Beach police detective Ricardo Arias, working with a Secret Service task force, allegedly successfully posed as a bitcoin buyer and initiated transactions with Espinoza, leading to the charges. Initially, the court dismissed the charges, ruling that selling bitcoin did not constitute a money-services business under Florida law. However, this decision was later reversed on appeal, reinstating the charges against Espinoza. The appellate court found that selling bitcoin could indeed fall under the money-services business statute, in part on the basis of the definition of bitcoin as a “medium of exchange.”</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Ross William Ulbricht a/k/a "Dread Pirate Roberts," "DPR," "Silk Road"		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/4/2014	S.D.N.Y.	14-cr-68
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
21 U.S.C. § 846; 21 U.S.C. § 848(a); 18 U.S.C. § 1030(b); 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Ross William Ulbricht with operating the Silk Road, an online black market for illegal drug sales, and using Bitcoin to facilitate and conceal these transactions. He was accused of multiple crimes, including conspiracy to commit money laundering, computer hacking, and narcotics trafficking. In 2015, Ulbricht was convicted and sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Faiella (aka BTCKing) and Shrem		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/24/2014	S.D.N.Y.	14-cr-243 (JSR/0)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§ 1960, 1956; 31 U.S.C. §§ 5318(g) & 5322(a)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>The DOJ charged Robert Faiella and Charlie Shrem with operating an unlicensed money transmitting business and money laundering. They were accused of facilitating the sale of over \$1 million in bitcoins to users of the Silk Road, an online black market. Both defendants pled guilty to the charges. Shrem was sentenced to two years in prison and ordered to forfeit \$950,000. Faiella was sentenced to four years in prison and also ordered to forfeit \$950,000.</p>		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Budovsky and Liberty Reserve		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/21/2013	S.D.N.Y.	13-cr-368
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C § 1956(h); 18 U.S.C. § 371; 18 U.S.C. § 1960		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>Denial of motion to dismiss, to strike surplusage, and to compel. Final order of forfeiture. Second Final Order of Forfeiture.</p>		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>The DOJ charged Liberty Reserve and its founder, Arthur Budovsky, with operating an unlicensed money transmission business and facilitating large-scale money laundering. The platform was allegedly used by cybercriminals to conduct anonymous and untraceable transactions. The U.S. government seized and shut down Liberty Reserve's operations. Budovsky was arrested in Spain in 2013 and extradited to the US in 2014.</p> <p>In 2016, the defendant accepted a plea deal and was sentenced to 20 years in prison for laundering money through cryptocurrency. Additionally, he was ordered to forfeit \$122 million in criminal proceeds.</p>		

Other Regulatory Litigation and Proceedings

Filing / Order		
<i>The People of the State of New York v. Michael Lauchlan</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/31/2024	New York Criminal Court	019842/2024
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Grand larceny; scheme to defraud		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The Manhattan DA's Office alleged that Lauchlan stole from his clients through posing as a cryptocurrency "recovery analyst" and providing to clients false blockchain tracing reports in return for fees.		

Filing / Order		
<i>The People of the State of New York by Letitia James v. Nova Tech LTD, et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/6/2024	Supreme Court of New York, County of New York	451633/2024
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Martin Act Securities and Commodities Fraud - General Business Law §§ 352, 352-c, 353, 359-e, 359-fff; Executive Law § 63(12); Education Law § 224		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The NYAG alleged that defendants defrauded thousands of investors out of over a billion dollars by promoting two fraudulent investment schemes. The first concerned AWS Mining, a crypto mining pyramid scheme, which allegedly fraudulently guaranteed 200% returns to investors, but ultimately collapsed when returns were insufficient to cover both monthly profits promised to customers and commissions promised to investor recruiters. The second concerned Nova Tech, an alleged cryptocurrency trading pyramid scheme, which similarly collapsed when profits generated from purported forex trading were insufficient to cover bonuses promised to investor recruiters and promised weekly ROIs.		

Filing / Order		
<i>The People of the State of New York by Letitia James v. Gemini Trust Co., et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/19/2023	Supreme Court of New York, County of New York	452784/2023
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
NY General Business Law § 352; Executive Law § 63(12); NY Penal Law §§ 190.65, 105.05		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The NYAG alleged that Gemini and Genesis conducted schemes to solicit money from investors with false assurances that Earn was a highly liquid investment. Genesis settled as part of its bankruptcy proceedings.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Coin Café, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/18/2023		23-027
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
NY General Business Law § 352; Executive Law § 63(12)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Coin Café agreed to settle with the New York Attorney General for \$4.3 million based on findings that Coin Café allegedly failed to register as a commodity broker dealer, and allegedly misled customers about the fees it charged to store their Bitcoin in their Coin Café account or associated wallet service.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Poloniex, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/1/2023		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Cryptocurrency exchange Poloniex, LLC settles with OFAC for \$7.59 million due to allegations that it allowed users in sanctioned regions to engage in transactions on its platform.		

Filing / Order		
The People of the State of New York by Letitia James v. MEK Global Limited and PhoenixFin PTE Ltd d/b/a KuCoin		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/9/2023	New York Supreme	450703/2023
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
NY General Business Law § 352; Executive Law § 63(12)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
New York Attorney General seeks a permanent injunction against KuCoin for failing to register as a securities and commodities broker-dealer, and for allegedly misrepresenting itself as an exchange. In particular, NYAG alleges that ETH is a security, and that KuCoin was required to register before selling ETH.		

Filing / Order		
The People of the State of New York by Letitia James v. VINO Global Limited d/b/a CoinEx		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/22/2023	New York Supreme	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
NY General Business Law § 352		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
New York Attorney General sues cryptocurrency platform CoinEx for failing to register as a securities and commodities broker-dealer, and misrepresenting itself as a crypto exchange. NYAG alleged that certain tokens, including AMP, LUNA, LBC, and RLY, are securities and commodities.		

Filing / Order		
The People of the State of New York by Letitia James v. Alex Mashinsky		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/5/2023	New York Supreme	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
NY General Business Law §§ 352, 352-c (1), 353, 359-e; Executive Law § 63(12)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
New York Attorney General files suit against Mashinsky, co-founder and former CEO of cryptocurrency lending platform Celsius Network LLC, for defrauding investors out of billions of dollars. Mashinsky allegedly misrepresented and concealed Celsius's deteriorating financial condition.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Payward, Inc. d/b/a Kraken		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/28/2022		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Kraken, a virtual currency exchange, settles with OFAC for failing to timely implement geolocation tools including an automated IP address blocking system, which allowed users in Iran to engage in transactions on Kraken's platform. Kraken agreed to pay over \$362,000, and invest an additional \$100,000 in sanctions compliance controls.		

Filing / Order		
Coin Center, et al. v. Janet Yellen, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/12/2022	N.D. Fl.	22-cv-20375
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Statutory authority; contrary to law; arbitrary or capricious; First Amendment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs, who are users of Ethereum, bring an action against the Treasury Department and OFAC, among others, for the Biden administration's criminalization of the use of open-source software tool Tornado Cash.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Bittrex, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/11/2022		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
OFAC and FinCEN settle with virtual currency exchange Bittrex, Inc. for \$24 million and \$29 million respectively over Bittrex's alleged violations of multiple sanctions programs and the Bank Secrecy Act's anti-money laundering and suspicious activity reporting requirements.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Nexo Inc. and Nexo Capital, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/26/2022	Multiple	
Morrison Cohen Notes		
California, New York, Washington, Maryland, South Carolina, Vermont, Kentucky, and Oklahoma file individual actions against crypto lending platform Nexo for offering unregistered securities in the form of accounts that pay interest for crypto deposits.		

Filing / Order		
Van Loon, et al. v. Department of the Treasury, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/8/2022	W.D. Tex.	22-cv-920
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A), (C); First Amendment; Fifth Amendment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiffs bring an action challenging defendants' addition of privacy protocol Tornado Cash to the Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons List. On August 17, 2023, summary judgment for the Treasury Department was granted, and the case was dismissed.</p> <p>On September 20, 2023, Plaintiffs filed an appeal with the Fifth Circuit.</p> <p>On November 26, 2024, the Fifth Circuit reversed the district court's decision and remanded on the basis that immutable smart contracts are neither "property" nor "services" over which Tornado Cash could exercise control and thus were not within the scope of OFAC's oversight.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Idaho Dept. of Finance v. Celsius Network Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/1/2022		2022-07-07
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Offer and sale of unregistered securities (Idaho Code § 30-14-301); Unlicensed money transmitter activities (Idaho Code § 26-2903); Unauthorized trust activity (Idaho Code § 26-3204)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Idaho Department of Finance issued a "notice of intent" to Celsius to cease and desist from violation of Idaho financial regulations, alleging that Celsius has nearly \$60 million in funds from more than 1,300 Idaho residents and businesses.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Robinhood Crypto, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/1/2022		
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Virtual Currency Regulation (23 NYCRR Part 200), Money Transmitter Regulation (3 NYCRR Part 417), Transaction Monitoring Regulation (23 NYCRR Part 504), and Cybersecurity Regulation (23 NYCRR Part 500)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
In the New York Department of Financial Services' first crypto enforcement action, it imposed a \$30 million fine on Robinhood's crypto trading unit for failing to maintain and certify anti-money laundering and cybersecurity programs.		

Filing / Order		
Carmen v. Janet Yellen		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/10/2022	E.D. Ky.	22-cv-149 (KKC)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fourth Amendment Unreasonable Search; First Amendment Association; Fifth Amendment Vagueness; Congress's Enumerated Powers		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Coin Center, a digital currency lobbyist, sued the Treasury Department and the IRS. Coin Center contends that the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act's § 6050I amendment, which would require individuals and businesses that receive \$10,000 or more in digital currencies to collect and report the name, date of birth, and social security number of the sender to the government, is unconstitutional. Coin Center seeks a declaration that the amended § 6050I's reporting mandate is facially unconstitutional and an injunction against its enforcement.		

Filing / Order		
Custodia Bank Inc. v. Federal Reserve Board of Governors et al		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/7/2022	D. Wyo.	22-cv-125 (SWS)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Violation of APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(1); Relief under the Mandamus Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1361; Violation of Constitution Article I and Amendment 5 (due process); Constitution Article II; Declaratory Judgment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Custodia Bank, a digit asset bank, is suing the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City on the grounds that the Federal Reserve has "unlawfully" delayed acting on Custodia's application for a master account with Federal Reserve. Custodian alleges that review of master accounts ordinarily only take 5-7 days, and that the Federal Reserve is operating "standardless" and in "secrecy." Custodia is seeking to open the first bitcoin master account. On March 29, 2024, the court granted the Federal Reserve's motion for judgment as a matter of law , dismissing Custodia's claim for declaratory judgment under the Declaratory Judgment Act, and dismissing without prejudice, for lack of jurisdiction, Custodia's petition for review under the APA.		

Filing / Order		
In re iFinex Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/30/2021	New York Supreme	158119/2021
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CPLR 78, FOIL		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Tether and Bitfinex moved to block CoinDesk's and other organization's FOIL request for the composition of Tether's reserves. Tether and Bitfinex argue that the release of the information would be competitively damaging.		

Filing / Order		
GBM Global Holding Co. Ltd. v. The Unidentified Individuals Listed on Schedule A		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/23/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-6284 (AJN)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Pre-arbitration injunctive relief		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Petitioner, a cryptocurrency exchange, moved for and was granted a preliminary injunction against hackers from making fraudulent transfers of cryptocurrency. The Bitcoin Association had discovered a “block-reorganization attack,” in which the hackers created an alternative blockchain and double-spent coins, on the Bitcoin SV network. On July 13, 2022, a \$5.2 million arbitration award was confirmed against the 91 alleged hackers who failed to appear at the proceedings.</p>		

Filing / Order		
SingularDTV GmbH v. Doe		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/13/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-6000 (VEC)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1030 (Computer Fraud and Abuse Act); 18 U.S.C. § 1962(a) (Civil RICO); conversion; fraud in the inducement; unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff alleges that defendant, identity unknown, stole 76,800,000 tokens from it. Defendant transferred the tokens to Binance. Plaintiff has served a Rule 45 subpoena on Google to determine the identity of defendant.</p>		

Filing / Order		
The People of the State of New York, by Letitia James, Attorney General of the State of New York v. Coinseed Inc., Delgerdalai Davaasambu, and Sukhbat Lkhagvadorj		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/17/2021	New York Supreme	450366/2021
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
<p>Violations of New York’s Martin Act General Business Law §§ 352 et seq.; (securities fraud); Executive Law §63(12) (repeated and persistent illegality); General Business Law § 359-e; and regulations thereunder, 13 NYCRR § 10 (violation of registration provisions).</p>		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>First action alleging unregistered cryptocurrency business operation brought by the NYAG’s office. Brought on same day as action against Coinseed filed by the SEC.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Dapper Labs Inc., v. John Does Nos. 1 to 25		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/12/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-1289 (PAE)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
(1) False designation of origin (15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(1)(a)); (2) violation of anticybersquatting consumer protection act (15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)); (3) common law trademark infringement; (4) common law unfair competition		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Case brought against pseudonymous developer(s); plaintiff made attempts to discover the identity of the developers through discovery of the outside counsel for the developer(s). Case settled and dismissed, 4/15/2021.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Larry Dean Harmon		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/19/2020	FinCEN	Number 2020-2
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Violations of Bank Secrecy Act for willfully (a) failing to register as a money services business; (b) failing to implement and maintain an effective anti-money laundering (AML) program; and (c) failing to report certain suspicious activity.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. 280 Virtual Currency Accounts		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/27/2020	D.D.C.	20-cv-2396
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Action <i>in rem</i> to forfeit 280 virtual currency accounts allegedly used to launder millions of dollars' worth of digital currencies stolen by North Korea-backed hackers in 2019.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. \$44,601 In U.S. Currency		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/9/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-11248
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Action <i>in rem</i> to forfeit and condemn funds arising from an investigation into widespread online drug transactions on the "dark web" using BitCoin pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(A).		

Filing / Order		
Grewal, Attorney General of the State of New Jersey on behalf of Christopher W. Gerold, Chief of the New Jersey Bureau of Securities v. Pocketinns, Inc. and Mada		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/17/2019	Superior Court of New Jersey, Chancery Division, General Equity, Essex County	C-151-19
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
N.J.S.A 49:3-60 (offer and sale of unregistered securities); N.J.S.A 49:3-56 (a)(Acting as an agent without registration); N.J.S.A 49:3-56(h)(employing unregistered agent).		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. \$194,073.14 in U.S. Currency		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/28/2019	W.D. La.	19-cv-837
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Action <i>in rem</i> to forfeit and condemn proceeds involved in Defendant Randall Lord's conspiracy to operate an unlicensed money transmitting or servicing business prohibited by 18 U.S.C. § 1960, and thereby forfeitable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(A) and Defendant Randall Lord's Plea Agreement filed on April 19, 2016.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Judgment granting motion for summary judgment forfeiting and condemning the \$194,073.14 in United States Currency for the use of the U.S. and further ordering that Randall Lord's claim to said currency is dismissed with prejudice.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of the Inquiry by Letitia James, Attorney General of the State of New York v. iFinex, Inc. et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/25/2019	Supreme Court of New York, County of New York	450545/2019
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
N.Y. General Business Law Article 23-A (the "Martin Act"); N.Y. Executive Law § 63(12).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order granting preliminary injunction.		
Decision & Order modifying preliminary injunction.		
Order denying Respondents' motion for lack of personal and subject matter jurisdiction.		
Order from Appellate Division, 1st Dept, affirming denial of Respondents' motion to dismiss.		

Filing / Order		
United States v. 89.9270303 Bitcoins, more or less, seized from Trezor Virtual Currency Wallet Belong to Jaymes Allen Clark		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/25/2018	W.D. Tex.	18-cv-998 (JKP)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Civil forfeiture action of bitcoins held on a Trezor hardware wallet, stemming from a Target gift card fraud incident. Defendant Clark was a Target employee and used his credentials to access the Target gift card database and obtained the information on newly activated cards. He and others used those funds to purchase other gift cards. Clark was paid in Bitcoin, which he transferred to a Trezor hardware wallet. Clark, from a detention facility, tried to have his wife send the wallet and passcode to a friend.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Summary judgment partially granted to the United States on issue of the forfeiture of Bitcoin traceable to the gift card conspiracy.		

Filing / Order		
FINRA Department of Enforcement v. Timothy Tilton Ayre		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/11/2018	FINRA admin. proceeding	2.0160493078e+12
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; negligent misrepresentation; Securities Act § 5; NASD Rule 3040 & FINRA Rule 3280; (private securities transactions).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Defendant made material misstatements in public filings, in part, by creating, offering, and selling unregistered cryptocurrency securities to the public that he touted as “the first minable coin backed by marketable securities.”		

Filing / Order		
FTC v. Dluca (d/b/a Bitcoin Funding Team and My7Network) et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/20/2018	S.D.FI	18-cv-60379
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. § 45(a) (FTC Act § 5(a)).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order granting Preliminary Injunction.		
Order to Liquidate Cryptocurrency.		
Order on Motion to Strike.		
Order Denying Motion to Dismiss.		
Contempt Order.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Linda Healthcare Corporation Co. and Arturo Devesa		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/2/2018	Colorado admin. proceeding	2018-CDS-022
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
C.R.S. § 11-51-201, 301.		

Filing / Order		
In the Matter of Broad Investments, LLC and Guoyong Liu		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/3/2018	Colorado admin. proceeding	2018-CDS-021
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
C.R.S. § 11-51-201, 301.		

Filing / Order		
U.S. v. Coinbase		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/16/2017	N.D. Cal.	17-cv-1431
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Petition to enforce IRS summons.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Petition granted in part , 11/29/17.		

Filing / Order		
FTC v. Equiliv Investments and Ryan Ramminger		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/24/2015	D.N.J.	14-cv-815
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. § 45(a) (FTC Act § 5(a)); N.J.S.A. 56:8-1 et seq.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Stipulated Order for Permanent Injunction and Monetary Judgment.		

Filing / Order		
In re Ripple Labs		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/5/2015	FinCEN / USAO-N.D. Cal.	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
12 U.S.C. §§ 1829b, 1951-1959 and 31 U.S.C. §§ 5311-5314, 5316-5332 (Bank Secrecy Act).		

Filing / Order		
FTC v. BF Labs, Inc., d/b/a Butterfly Labs		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/15/2014	W.D. Mo.	14-cv-815
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. § 45(a) (FTC Act § 5(a)).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Stipulated Final Order for Permanent Injunction and Monetary Judgment.		

Bankruptcy Proceedings

Filing / Order		
In re Hector DAO		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/17/2024	U.S. Bankruptcy Ct, D.N.J.	24-16067-MBK
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Chapter 15 of the Bankruptcy Code		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Hector DAO filed for Chapter 15 bankruptcy.		

Filing / Order		
In re Genesis Global Holdco, LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/17/2024	U.S. Bankruptcy Ct, S.D.N.Y.	23-10063 (SHL)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The court approved Genesis' bankruptcy plan to, in pertinent part, return roughly \$3 billion to creditors. Repayments to Gemini Earn customers will be made in-kind (someone who is owed 1 bitcoin will receive roughly 1 bitcoin at today's value).		

Filing / Order		
In re Blockfi Inc, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/24/2023	U.S. Bankruptcy Ct, D. N.J.	22-19361 (MBK)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The court approved Blockfi's third amended bankruptcy plan.		

Filing / Order		
In re Terraform Labs Pte. Ltd.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/21/2024	U.S. Bankruptcy Ct, D. Del.	24-10070
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Terraform Labs filed for bankruptcy and listed both assets and liabilities in the range of \$100mm to \$500mm.</p> <p>On August 9, 2024, 3AC liquidators filed a claim against the bankruptcy for \$1.3 billion alleging that Terraform misled 3AC regarding the stability of TerraUSD and LUNA.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In re FTX Trading LTD., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/11/22	U.S. Bankruptcy Ct, D. Del.	22-11066 22-11068 (consolidated docket)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>On November 11, 2022, Alameda Research LLC filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy and listed both assets and liabilities in the range of \$10-\$50 billion along with more than 100,000 estimated creditors.</p> <p>On November 22, 2022, the court issued an order consolidating all related FTX bankruptcies into a single proceeding.</p> <p>On May 7, 2024, FTX filed its Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization and Disclosure Statement.</p> <p>On June 26, 2024, the Bankruptcy Court entered an order approving the Disclosure Statement.</p> <p>On October 8, 2024, the Bankruptcy Court entered an order confirming the Plan.</p> <p>On January 3, 2024, the Effective Date of the Plan occurred, and the Plan was consummated.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In re Celsius Network LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/13/22	U.S. Bankruptcy Ct., S.D.N.Y.	22-10964
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Crypto lending platform Celsius filed for bankruptcy protection, a month after pausing all withdrawals and transfers. On September 7, 2022, the Vermont Department of Financial Regulation joined in a motion requesting an examiner be appointed with broad powers to investigate the debtors, and stated that at least 40 state securities regulators were engaged in a multistate investigation into Celsius.</p> <p>On November 19, 2022, the examiner, Shoba Pillay, filed an interim report concerning the bankruptcy.</p> <p>On January 31, 2023, Shoba Pillay filed her final report concerning the bankruptcy.</p> <p>On November 9, 2023, the court approved Celsius' bankruptcy plan allowing it to return roughly \$2 billion to customers and re-organize into a company owned by creditors.</p> <p>On August 9, 2024, Celsius sued Tether to recover \$2.3 billion of bitcoin posted to Tether as collateral for a loan it liquidated without giving Celsius the opportunity to top-up its collateral.</p>		

Filing / Order		
In re Voyager Digital Holdings, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/7/22	U.S. Bankruptcy Ct., S.D.N.Y.	22-10943
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Voyager filed for bankruptcy protection after the Three Arrows Capital BVI liquidation and related Chapter 15 proceeding.		

Filing / Order		
In re Three Arrows Capital, Ltd.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/1/22	U.S. Bankruptcy Ct., S.D.N.Y.	22-10920
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Chapter 15 of the Bankruptcy Code		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Three Arrows Capital, a cryptocurrency hedge fund, filed for bankruptcy protection for its U.S. assets after a British Virgin Islands court ruled that Three Arrows should be liquidated.		

Filing / Order		
In re Cred LLC, Libra Credit (US) LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/7/2020	Bank. D. Del.	20-12836
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Chapter 11 Bankruptcy Filing.		

Filing / Order		
In re Cryptopia Limited (In Liquidation)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/24/2019	U.S. Bankruptcy Court, S.D.N.Y.	19-11688
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Requesting relief under Chapter 15 of U.S. Bankruptcy Code		

Filing / Order		
In re Giga Watt Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/19/2018	E.D.Wa	18-br-3197
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Chapter 11 Bankruptcy Filing		

State Summary Suspensions and Settlements

Filing / Order	Filing Date	State Authority	Causes of Action / Relevant Authority
In the Matter of Burns Capital Investments LLC and Thomas Zachary Burns	4/4/2024	Connecticut Department of Banking	Exchange Act § 36b-16, 36b-4(a), 36b-4(b), 36b-6(c)(1), 36b-5(a), 36b-5(f), 36b-23
In the Matter of Gemini Trust Company, LLC	2/28/24	New York State Department of Financial Services	New York Banking Law § 44; f 23 NYCRR § 200.18; 23 NYCRR § 200.10; 3 NYCRR § 200.15(c)(1)
In the Matter of INDXcoin, LLC, et al. (Defendants) and Victorious Grace Church, et al. (Relief Defendants)	1/16/24	Securities Commissioner for the State of Colorado	Colo. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 11-51-501(1)(b), 11-51-501(1)(c)
In the Matter of Genesis Global Trading, Inc.	1/3/24	New York State Department of Financial Services	23 NYCRR §§ 200.14(b); 200.15; 200.16(a), (b), (d); 200.17; 200.19(c), (d), (e); 500.2, 500.3; 500.4; 500.7; 500.9; 500.13; 500.16(b)(6); 500.17(b)
In the Matter of Coinbase Global, Inc. and Coinbase, Inc.	6/6/23	Alabama Securities Commission	
In the Matter of the Commissioner of Financial Protection and Innovation v. Coinbase Global, Inc. and Coinbase, Inc.	6/6/23	California Commissioner of Financial Protection and Innovation	Cal. Corp. Code §§ 25019, 25110
In the Matter of Coinbase Global, Inc. and Coinbase, Inc.	6/6/23	Maryland Securities Commissioner	Maryland Securities Act § 11-501
In the Matter of Coinbase, Inc. and Coinbase Global, Inc.	6/6/23	Illinois Secretary of State	Ill. Securities Law of 1953 § 12
In the Matter of Bitpay, Inc.	3/16/23	New York State Department of Financial Services	23 NYCRR §§ 200.15(c)(1), (c)(2), (i); 500.09(a); 500.04(a), (b)
In the Matter of Coinbase, Inc.	1/4/23	New York State Department of Financial Services	New York Banking Law § 44; 23 NYCRR § 200.15; 3 NYCRR § 417.2; 23 NYCRR § 504.3; 23 NYCRR § 500.17
World Over the Counter Limited d/b/a World OTC	9/27/22	California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation	Cal. Corp. Code. §§ 25110, 25401

Filing / Order	Filing Date	State Authority	Causes of Action / Relevant Authority
Vexam Limited	9/27/22	California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation	Cal. Corp. Code. §§ 25110, 25401
Sytrex Trade	9/27/22	California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation	Cal. Corp. Code. §§ 25110, 25401
Sity Trade	9/27/22	California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation	Cal. Corp. Code. §§ 25110, 25401
Remabit	9/27/22	California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation	Cal. Corp. Code. §§ 25110, 25401
Polinur ME Limited	9/27/22	California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation	Cal. Corp. Code. §§ 25110, 25401
Pegasus	9/27/22	California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation	Cal. Corp. Code. §§ 25110, 25401
Metafiyielders Pty Ltd	9/27/22	California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation	Cal. Corp. Code. §§ 25110, 25401
GreenCorp Investment LLC	9/27/22	California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation	Cal. Corp. Code. § 25110
Elevate Pass LLC	9/27/22	California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation	Cal. Corp. Code. §§ 25110, 25401
Cryptos OTC Trading Platform Limited d/b/a COTP	9/27/22	California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation	Cal. Corp. Code. §§ 25110, 25401
In the Matter of Robinhood Crypto, LLC	8/1/2022	New York State Department of Financial Services	3 NYCRR §§ 200.15, 200.16, 417.2, 500, 500.17(b); 23 NYCRR §§ 504.3, 504.4; § 44(1)(a) New York Banking Law
Voyager Digital	3/29/2022	New Jersey Bureau of Securities	New Jersey, Securities Law, N.J.S.A. 49:3-47 to -89
Informational Letter (counterparty redacted)	10/18/2021	New York Attorney General's Office	General Business Law § 352 (the Martin Act); Executive Law 63(12)
Texas State Securities Board v. Celsius Network, Inc., et al.	9/17/2021	Texas State Securities Board	Cease and desist issued pursuant to Section 7 of the Texas Securities Act; Section 12 of the Texas Securities Act

Filing / Order	Filing Date	State Authority	Causes of Action / Relevant Authority
In the matter of Prestige Assets Mgmt, LLC and Oscar Hill	8/11/2021	Texas State Securities Board	Emergency cease and desist pursuant to Section 23-2 of the Texas Securities Act (alleged impersonation of a registered investment advisor)
In the matter of BlockFi, Inc, BlockFi Lending, LLC, and BlockFi Trading, LLC	7/29/2021	Kentucky (currently unavailable)	Kentucky Revised Statute 291.470; 292.500; Kentucky Administrative Regulation 10:225
In the matter of BlockFi, Inc, BlockFi Lending, LLC, and BlockFi Trading, LLC	7/22/2021	Texas State Securities Board	Section 7 of the Texas Securities Act; Section 12 of the Texas Securities Act
In the matter of BlockFi, Inc, BlockFi Lending, LLC, and BlockFi Trading, LLC	7/22/2021	Vermont	9 V.S.A. § 5301
In the matter of BlockFi, Inc, BlockFi Lending, LLC, and BlockFi Trading, LLC	7/20/2021	Alabama Securities Commission	Code of Alabama 1975, Sections 8-6-4
In the matter of BlockFi, Inc, BlockFi Lending, LLC, and BlockFi Trading, LLC	7/19/2021	New Jersey Bureau of Securities	N.J.S.A. 49:3-60
In the Matter of Liquid Gold Trust, Liquidity Card Solution LLC, Liquidity Global Card Solution (PTY) Ltd, and Lance Angus Jerrard	8/14/2020	Texas State Securities Board	Section 29.D of the Texas Securities Act
In the Matter of Mirror Trading Intl. Pty Ltd., et al.	7/7/2020	Texas State Securities Board	Section 29.D of the Texas Securities Act
In the Matter of Coinvaultpro	6/5/2020	Texas State Securities Board	Section 29.D of the Texas Securities Act
In the Matter of PK Crypto Investment	10/14/2019	Texas State Securities Board	Section 7 of the Texas Securities Act; Section 12 of the Texas Securities Act; Fraud
In the Matter of Crypto Miner Limited and Elizabeth Frazier	10/14/2019	Texas State Securities Board	Section 7 of the Texas Securities Act; Section 12 of the Texas Securities Act; Fraud
In the Matter of Zoptax LLC	8/7/2019	New Jersey Bureau of Securities	N.J.S.A. 49:3
In the Matter of Unocall	8/7/2019	New Jersey Bureau of Securities	N.J.S.A. 49:3
In the Matter of Forex and Bitcoin Trader AKA Forex & Bitcoin Traders AKA FX & Bitcoin Trader AKA FX & Bitcoin	8/6/2019	Texas State Securities Board Administrative Proceeding, Order No. ENF-19-CDO-1785	Section 7 of the Texas Securities Act; Section 12 of the Texas Securities Act; fraud

Filing / Order	Filing Date	State Authority	Causes of Action / Relevant Authority
In the Matter of Mikhail Rania Safiya	6/28/2019	Texas State Securities Board Administrative Proceeding, Order No. ENF-19-CDO-1779	Section 7 of the Texas Securities Act; Section 12 of the Texas Securities Act; fraud
In the Matter of Madeline O'Farrell	6/28/2019	Texas State Securities Board Administrative Proceeding, Order No. ENF-19-CDO-1780	Section 7 of the Texas Securities Act; Section 12 of the Texas Securities Act; fraud
In the Matter of TintXMiningPool and Maxi Samantha Fortune	6/28/2019	Texas State Securities Board Administrative Proceeding, Order No. ENF-19-CDO-1781	Section 7 of the Texas Securities Act; Section 12 of the Texas Securities Act; fraud
In the Matter of FxBitGlobe Ltd.	4/9/2019	Texas State Securities Board Administrative Proceeding, Order No. ENF-19-CDO-1776	Section 7 of the Texas Securities Act; Section 12 of the Texas Securities Act
In the Matter of Mintage Mining, LLC, et al.	2/21/2019	Texas State Securities Board Administrative Proceeding, Order No. ENF-19-CDO-1774	Section 7 of the Texas Securities Act; Section 12 of the Texas Securities Act
In the Matter of My Crypto Mine and Mark Steven Royer	11/27/2018	Texas State Securities Board Administrative Proceeding, Order No. ENF-18-CDO-1773	Section 7 of the Texas Securities Act; Section 12 of the Texas Securities Act; Fraud
In the Matter of Exy Crypto AKA Execrypto et al.	11/6/2018	Texas State Securities Board Administrative Proceeding, Order No. ENF-18-CDO-1772	Section 7 of the Texas Securities Act; Section 12 of the Texas Securities Act; Fraud
In the Matter of AWS Mining Pty LTD	11/6/2018	Texas State Securities Board Administrative Proceeding, Order No. ENF-18-CDO-1771	Section 7 of the Texas Securities Act; Section 12 of the Texas Securities Act; Fraud
Crystal Token	10/2/2018	North Dakota Securities Commissioner	North Dakota Century Code Chapter 10-04
Advertiza Holdings (Pty) Ltd.	10/10/2018	North Dakota Securities Commissioner	North Dakota Century Code Chapter 10-04
Life Cross Coin a/k/a LifecrosscoinGmbH	10/10/2018	North Dakota Securities Commissioner	North Dakota Century Code Chapter 10-04
Bitconnect Ltd. and Bitconnect International plc	9/19/2018	North Dakota Securities Commissioner	North Dakota Century Code Chapter 10-04
Magma Foundation a/k/a Magma Coin a/k/a Magma	9/19/2018	North Dakota Securities Commissioner	North Dakota Century Code Chapter 10-04
In the Matter of CrowdShare Mining	9/28/2018	Colorado Division of Securities	Colorado Revised Statutes §§ 11-51-301 (sale of unregistered securities), 11- 51-501(1) (securities fraud)

Filing / Order	Filing Date	State Authority	Causes of Action / Relevant Authority
In the Matter of Cyber Capital Invest (a/k/a CCI Token)	8/30/2018	Colorado Division of Securities	Colorado Revised Statutes §§ 11-51-301 (sale of unregistered securities), 11- 51-501(1) (securities fraud)
In the Matter of Cred (dba Credits LLC)	8/30/2018	Colorado Division of Securities	Colorado Revised Statutes §§ 11-51-301 (sale of unregistered securities), 11- 51-501(1) (securities fraud)
In the matter of Global Pay Net (aka GLPN Coin and GPN Token)	8/10/2018	Colorado Division of Securities	Colorado Revised Statutes §§ 11-51-301 (sale of unregistered securities), 11- 51-501(1) (securities fraud)
In the matter of Bionic Coin; In the matter of Sybrelabs Ltd. (aka CryptoARB)	8/10/2018	Colorado Division of Securities	Colorado Revised Statutes §§ 11-51-301 (sale of unregistered securities), 11- 51-501(1) (securities fraud)
In the matter of Bitcoin Investments Ltd. (aka DB Capital); In the matter of EstateX; In the matter of Bitconnect Ltd.; In the matter of Magma Foundation (aka Magma Coin)	8/2/2018	Colorado Division of Securities	[press release available]
In the Matter of LevelNet Inc.	5/26/2018	Vermont Department of Regulation, No. 18-030-S	9 V.S.A. §§ 5301, 5401(a), 5402(a); V.S.R § 3-1(c)(16)
In the Matter of Springcryptoinvest	5/21/2018	New Jersey Bureau of Securities	N.J.S.A. 49:3-56 and 49:3-52(b)
In the Matter of Bullcoin Foundation a/k/a Bullcoin Gold	5/21/2018	New Jersey Bureau of Securities	N.J.S.A. 49:3-56 and 49:3-52(b)
In the Matter of Trident a/k/a Trident Crypto Index Fund	5/21/2018	New Jersey Bureau of Securities	N.J.S.A. 49:3-56 and 49:3-52(b)
In the Matter of ShipChain, Inc. (d/b/a ShipChain.io)	5/21/2018 C&D vacated 7/26/2018	South Carolina State Securities Commissioner, No. 20182574	S.C. Code Ann. § 35-1-301, 35-1-401(a), 35-1-401(d)
In the Matter of Browsers Lab, LLC	5/21/2018	Securities Commissioner of Maryland Administrative Proceeding	M.S.A. § 11-501, 11-401, 11-402, 11-301
In the Matter of Wind Wide Coin a/k/a WWC, Inc.	5/15/2018	Texas State Securities Board, Order No. ENF-18-CDO-1764	Texas Securities Act § 23-2; Texas Securities Act §§ 7, 12
In the Matter of Adosia LLC and Kyle Solomon	5/3/2018	North Carolina Secretary of State Securities Division, 18 ADM 007	N.C. Gen. Stat. §§78A-24; 78A-36

Filing / Order	Filing Date	State Authority	Causes of Action / Relevant Authority
In the Matter of Forex EA & Bitcoin Investment LLC a/k/a My Forex EA & Bitcoin Investment LLC a/k/a Forex EA	5/8/2018	Texas State Securities Board, Order No. ENF-18-CDO-1763	Texas Securities Act § 23-2; Texas Securities Act §§ 7, 12
In the Matter of Bitcoin Trading & Cloud Mining Limited a/k/a BTCRUSH	5/8/2018	Texas State Securities Board, Order No. ENF-18-CDO-1762	Texas Securities Act § 23-2; Texas Securities Act §§ 7, 12
In the Matter of Power Mining Pool	4/19/2018	North Carolina Secretary of State Securities Division, 18 ADM 006	N.C. Gen. Stat. §§78A-24; 78A-36
In the Matter of Sparkco, Inc. d/b/a Librium	3/27/2018	Massachusetts Securities Division (consent order)	Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 110A § 301
In the Matter of Pink Ribbon ICO	3/27/2018	Massachusetts Securities Division (consent order)	Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 110A § 301
In the Matter of Mattervest, Inc.	3/27/2018	Massachusetts Securities Division (consent order)	Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 110A § 301
In the Matter of Across Platforms, Inc. d/b/a ClickableTV	3/27/2018	Massachusetts Securities Division (consent order)	Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 110A § 301
In the Matter of 18Moons, Inc.	3/27/2018	Massachusetts Securities Division (consent order)	Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 110A § 301
In the matter of Swiss Gold Global, Inc. and Genesis Mining, Ltd.	3/9/2018	Securities Commissioner of South Carolina administrative proceeding	S.C. Code Ann. § 35-1-101 et seq.
In the Matter of Bitcoin a/k/a Bitcoin B2G	3/7/2018	New Jersey Bureau of Securities	N.J.S.A. 49:3
In the Matter of LeadInvest	2/26/2018	Texas State Securities Board, Order No. ENF-18-CDO-1760	Texas Securities Act § 23-2
In the Matter of Investors of Crypto LLC and Daniel Neves	2/15/2018	Texas State Securities Board, Order No. ENF-18-CDO-1759	Texas Securities Act § 23-2; Texas Securities Act §§ 7, 12
In the Matter of DavorCoin	2/2/2018	Texas State Securities Board, Order No. ENF-18-CDO-1757	Texas Securities Act § 23-2; Texas Securities Act §§ 7, 12
In the Matter of R2B Coin	1/24/2018	Texas State Securities Board, Order No. ENF-18-CDO-1756	Texas Securities Act § 23-2; Texas Securities Act §§ 7, 12
In the Matter of Caviar and Kirill Bensonoff	1/17/2018	Massachusetts administrative proceeding	Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 110A § 201, § 301; Massachusetts Uniform Securities Act; 950 Mass. Code Regs 10.00-14.413
Texas State Securities Board v. Bitconnect	1/4/2018	Texas State Securities Board, Order No. ENF-18-CDO-1754	Texas Securities Act § 23-2; Texas Securities Act §§ 7, 12

Filing / Order	Filing Date	State Authority	Causes of Action / Relevant Authority
Texas State Securities Board v. Balanced Energy LLC and Kirk Johnson	3/10/2014	Texas State Securities Board, Order No. ENF-14-CD0-1731	Texas Securities Act § 23-2

Class Action and Other Private Litigation

Filing / Order		
<i>Michael Lewellen v. Merrick Garland</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/16/2025	N.D. Tex.	25-cv-30
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
28 U.S.C. § 2201, Violation of the First Amendment, Violation of the Fifth Amendment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brought an action against the head of the U.S. Justice Department asking for a declaration that his planned cryptocurrency business does not violate federal money transmitting laws and an injunction to prevent enforcement of federal money transmitting laws against him.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Kendall Carnahan, et al. v. PUMP.FUN, et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/16/2025	S.D.N.Y.	25-cv-490
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), 12(a)(1), 15		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs brought an action against defendants alleging that PUMP.FUN's core purpose is to facilitate pump and dump schemes, and that the platform's own token, PNUT, is an unregistered security. Plaintiffs seek recovery for losses associated with their purchase of PNUT and other cryptocurrencies that were lost as a result of hacks and ransomware attacks.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Alister Watt, et al. v. Okcoin USA Inc., et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/10/2025	N.D. Ca.	25-cv-368
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §1962(c)-(d); conversion; aiding and abetting conversion		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs brought an action against defendants in connection with their operation of one of the largest consumer cryptocurrency purchasing and trading platforms. Plaintiffs allege that defendants failed to register as money transmitting business and adopt effective AML policies in a deliberate attempt to profit from the U.S. market without conforming to U.S. laws. Because of these failures, plaintiffs allege that the OKX platform became a hub for criminal activity, which contributed to a hack of the platform that led to investor losses.		

Filing / Order		
John Kramer v. Mango Labs, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/23/2024	D.P.R.	24-cv-1587
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty; Violation of Article 1802, § 5141 of the Puerto Rico Civil Code; fraud; unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
John Kramer brings suit against Mango Labs, Dafydd Durairaj, and Tyler Shipe for conducting a scheme whereby they deprived Kramer of his right to vote his MNGO tokens.		

Filing / Order		
Abdulhadi Albouni, et al. v. Alex Larson Schultz, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/19/2024	E.D.N.Y.	24-cv-8650
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a), 12(a)(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs brought an action against Defendants in connection with the alleged unregistered offering of the Hawk Tuah cryptocurrency meme coin, \$HAWK, which is alleged to have caused plaintiffs losses after its price dropped following its launch.		

Filing / Order		
BiT Global Digital Limited v. Coinbase Global, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/13/2024	N.D. Ca	24-cv-9019
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C § 2; 15 U.S.C. § 1125; Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200; intentional and negligent interference with prospective economic advantage; trade libel		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
BiT Global pioneered the wrapped Bitcoin product, wBTC, which became available and extremely popular to trade on the Coinbase platform beginning in October 2020. In September 2024, Coinbase launched a competitor token to wBTC, called cbBTC, and proceeded to delist wBTC just two months later in November 2024. BiT Global alleges that Coinbase's actions in connection with the launch of cbBTC constitute monopolization and unfair competition in violation of both state and federal law.		

Filing / Order		
James Adams, et al. v. Guillermo Gharib, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/9/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-9378
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1),(2)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Over 200 Plaintiffs brought an action against defendants in connection with an alleged cryptocurrency Ponzi scheme whereby defendants, who purported to be expert cryptocurrency traders, solicited investments for various digital asset pools. In connection with this scheme, plaintiffs allege that defendants sold unregistered securities in violation of the Securities Act causing plaintiffs to lose at least \$20 million.		

Filing / Order		
Daniel E. Simerman v. MVMT Labs, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/3/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-9187
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brought an action against his former employer, MVMT Labs, for breach of contract concerning MVMT's failure to honor Plaintiff's token issuance worth an estimated \$18 million.		

Filing / Order		
Steward Capital Holdings LP, et al. v. Golden Gate Investment Company, LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/22/2024	E.D. Pa	24-cv-6257
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; enforcement of security interest; appointment of receiver		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Steward Capital brought an action against Golden Gate Investment for breach of contract concerning default on two loans totaling \$5 million and a security interest in digital currency kiosks pledged as collateral.		

Filing / Order		
Prometheum, Inc., et al. v. Matthew Blumberg		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/14/2024	Supreme Court of New York, County of New York	160676/2024
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Defamation		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Prometheum brought an action against Matthew Blumberg, who advertises himself as a “crypto expert,” for defamation stemming from Blumberg’s social media posts claiming, among others, that Prometheum is a “scam” operating as an “unregistered commodity exchange.”		

Filing / Order		
Naeem Azad, et al. v. Caitlyn Jenner, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/13/2024	C.D. Cal.	24-cv-9768
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1)-(2), 15(a); 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5(b); California Corp. Code §§ 25401, 25110; Common Law Fraud; Aiding and Abetting Fraud; Unjust Enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Class action against Caitlyn Jenner and Sophia Hutchins in connection with their launch of the \$JENNER cryptocurrency. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants fraudulently solicited the purchase of \$JENNER as part of a pump-and-dump scheme.		

Filing / Order		
Morrison Cohen v. AI Agents And Other Unsavory Characters Trying To Steal Our Work Product		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/1/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-111111
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Copyright infringement; generally being unfair.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>This is a fake entry, here for one sole purpose: sniffing out information thieves. We saw that others have been stealing our tracker and re-publishing it without permission or attribution. This tracker is free for everyone to use! We hope you’re enjoying it and finding it useful. But come on, please don’t steal it without giving us credit. We worked really hard on it! If you see this entry anywhere outside the original Morrison Cohen Cryptocurrency Litigation Tracker available on our webpage (or an authorized reproduction), you know it was copied from us! Lexis-Nexis hosts a great version of the tracker, with our full permission and cooperation. If you’re seeing this on Lexis, all good. But if you’re seeing this elsewhere, or as part of some AI bot regurgitation of cases, something has gone awry.</p> <p>If you see this entry anywhere but the MoCo tracker, please let us know. And if you see it in the tracker itself, and found it amusing, send us an email that just says “amusing” as the subject line. It will be our inside joke. Cheers to you for making it this far.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Jones Eagle, LLC v. Ward, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/13/2024	E.D. Ark.	24-cv-990
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Violation of equal protection; violation of the right to procedural due process; violation of the commerce clause; violation of the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution Preemption of Acts 636 and 174 by Federal Regimes Governing Foreign Affairs, Foreign Investment, and National Security; taking without just compensation		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff brought an action against Wes Ward in his official capacity as the Secretary of the Arkansas Department of Agriculture and Tim Griffin in his official capacity as the Attorney General of Arkansas for their allegedly discriminatory attempt to shut down his crypto mining business under Arkansas Legislation Act 636, which prohibits foreign-party-controlled-businesses from owning Arkansas land.</p> <p>On December 9, 2024, the court issued an Order denying defendants motion to dismiss and granting Plaintiff a preliminary injunction to prevent defendants from enforcing any provision of Arkansas Legislation Act 636 or Act 174 (which bans foreign parties from ownership of crypto mining facilities) against Plaintiff.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. NYSE.LPQV.LIVE		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/30/2024	Sup. Ct. Ma.	484-cv-2851
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Massachusetts Consumer Protect Act G.L.c. 93A, § 2		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The Attorney General of Massachusetts brought an action NYSE.LPQV.LIVE alleging that it presented victims with fraudulent and misleading cryptocurrency trading opportunities, including through the use of its name, "NYSE," which allegedly led users to believe that they were interacting with the New York Stock Exchange.		

Filing / Order		
FractureLabs OU v. Jump Trading, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/15/2024	N.D. Ill.	24-cv-10249
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud; Conspiracy to Commit Fraud; Breach of Contract; Breach of Fiduciary Duty		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
FractureLabs and Jump Trading entered into a contract whereby FractureLabs agreed to send 10 million DIO tokens – created to augment a FractureLabs video game – to Jump Trading so that it could serve as a market maker for the token. Jump Trading also encouraged FractureLabs to enter into a second contract with a cryptocurrency exchange whereby FractureLabs sent the exchange 6 million DIO as part of an initial exchange offering, and agreed to pay 1.5 million USDT if the value of DIO fell outside certain parameters. FractureLabs alleges that Jump Trading then engaged in a pump-and-dump scheme causing the value of DIO to plummet and resulting in the loss of the majority of FractureLabs' 1.5 million USDT deposit with the exchange.		

Filing / Order		
Alexander Nikolas Gierczyk v. Olympus Peak Trade Claims Opportunities Fund I Non-ECI Master LP		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/10/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-7708
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Declaratory Judgment; Anticipatory Breach of Contract		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff assigned his FTX bankruptcy claim to Olympus Peak at a 42% discount, but he bargained for the contractual right to receive additional recovery if his claim was paid above par. After FTX announced its intention to pay out claims like Plaintiff's at 129% to 146% of estimated value, Plaintiff contacted Olympus Peak to ensure that he would receive such additional recovery. Plaintiff alleges that Olympus Peak preemptively stated its intent not fulfill its contractual obligation to pay Plaintiff excess recovery in breach of their agreement.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Liquid Rarity Exchange, LLC v. Ozone Networks, Inc., d/b/a OpenSea		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/8/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-7651
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Infringement of U.S. Patent 10,825,090		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Liquid Rarity Exchange brought a patent infringement claim against OpenSea alleging that OpenSeas' sales of certain 3D NFTS violates one of its patents which covers "[a] virtual merchandising mart comprising a simulated trading center, wherein a virtual three-dimensional depiction of one or more rarity assets included in a raritymine are configured for visualization by sellers and buyers of raritybits in the raritymine."</p>		

Filing / Order		
Omar Aamer, et al. v. Eden Gallery Group Ltd.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/9/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-7678
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud; unjust enrichment; New York General Business Law § 349		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiffs allege various violations in connection with defendants' sale of Meta Eagle NFTs and plans to create a related metaverse and cryptocurrency token.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Mango Labs LLC v. John Kramer, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/7/2024	D.P.R.	24-cv-1469
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of Fiduciary Duty; Violation of Article 1802, § 5141 of the Puerto Rico Civil Code; Fraud; Unjust Enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Mango Labs brought claim against Defendants, who are former DAO members, for conducting a scheme whereby they purchased 330 million MNGO tokens held by the FTX estate at cost and then marked up the price of such tokens before selling them back to the Mango DAO. Defendants used these newly purchased 330 million MNGO tokens to manipulate the vote concerning the repurchase while concealing their true identities from the rest of the DAO.		

Filing / Order		
Troell, et al. v. Binance Holdings Limited et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/20/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-7136
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 2333(d)(2);		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs brought an action against Binance alleging that it knowingly funded terrorist groups in violation of the Anti-Terrorism Act.		
On November 1, 2024, Binance filed a Motion to Dismiss claiming, in pertinent part, that none of the plaintiffs is able to connect Binance services with the terrorist attacks raised in the Complaint, and that Plaintiffs cannot sufficiently plead that Binance knowingly or intentionally assisted terrorists.		

Filing / Order		
Anthony Shnayderman, et al., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, v. Ozone Networks, Inc. (d/b/a OpenSea)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/19/2024	S.D. Fla.	24-cv-23616
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 349; Breach of Warranty; Florida Securities and Investor Protection Act § 517.07; Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act, § 501.201; unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Class action against OpenSea alleging that OpenSea sold unregistered securities through its sales of NFTs. Among other allegations, plaintiffs further claim that the sale of such unregistered securities constituted deceptive practices under both New York and Florida law and that OpenSea has been unjustly enriched by the fees it has received from NFT sales.		

Filing / Order		
Celacare Technologies, Inc. v. Circle Internet Financial, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/10/2024	D. Mass.	24-cv-12322
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
6 Del. Code §§ 3-309, 8-405; Cal. Commercial Code § 8405; money had and received		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Celacare accidentally sent \$1 million USDC to an incorrect wallet address. After Circle declined to place the wallet on an “access denial” list thereby forbidding it from engaging in transactions with the erroneously transferred USDC, Celacare brought a suit claiming that (1) USDC is a negotiable instrument subject to a right of redemption, (2) USDC is a security and that Circle is required to reissue to the USDC under Delaware law, and (3) Circle has received money which equity demands should be returned to Celacare.</p>		

Filing / Order		
S.M., on behalf of herself and all others, v. Athena Bitcoin, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/9/2024	Cnty. Ct. Ohio	24-cv-103506
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Negligence; Ohio Products Liability Act R.C. 2307.71, et seq. – public nuisance, negligent design/failure to warn; premises liability; Ohio Consumer Sales Practices Act R.C. 1345.01, et seq.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Class action against defendant, a bitcoin ATM company, alleging that it failed to take reasonable steps to prevent financial exploitation of the elderly, that bitcoin ATMs are public nuisances, and that the bitcoin ATMs operated by defendant were negligently designed and manufactured. The class action further alleges that the stores in which the ATMs are located are independently liable under theories of premises liability and the violation of the Consumer Sales Practices Act.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Nibi, Inc. v. John Doe, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/30/2024	N.D. Cal.	24-cv-6184
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Conversion; unjust enrichment; replevin; fraud		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff, a software corporation affiliated with the Nibiru Chain, alleged that defendants, who are unidentified attackers, impersonated a bank in email correspondence causing Plaintiff to transfer \$4 million in digital assets to the attackers.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Philip Martin, et al. v. Binance Holdings, LTD, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/16/2024	W.D. Wash.	24-cv-1264
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. §§1962(c)-(d), 1960, 1961(1)(E), 1956, 1957, 2314		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Class action alleged that defendants aided and abetted money laundering, violated the Bank Secrecy Act, and engaged in monetary transactions in property that was either stolen or derived from unlawful activity.		

Filing / Order		
Tiger Mines New York, Inc. v. Tether Holdings Limited, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/2/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-5905
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty; unjust enrichment; conversion		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleged that Tether improperly froze the assets of wallets assigned to plaintiff, with holdings of roughly \$160 million, due to the request of a Chinese police department which alleged that the assets in the wallets were connected to an ongoing criminal proceeding.		

Filing / Order		
Vandelay Industries TM LLC, et al. v. Bitwise Hold 10 Private Index Fund, LLC.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/8/2024	N.Y. Supreme Court	653436/2024
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty; negligent misrepresentation; fraud; conspiracy to commit fraud; Securities Act §10(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs invested \$1.3 million in a fund that they allege was fraudulently represented to be managed by expert crypto currency investors. They further allege that fraudulent misrepresentations were made to induce Plaintiffs to agree to a 25% management fee along with the conversion of the fund from an LLC to a statutory trust, which caused Plaintiff substantial losses.		

Filing / Order		
Logan Paul v. Stephen Findeisen, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/27/2024	W.D. Tex.	24-cv-717
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Libel Per Se		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Logan Paul alleged that defendant defamed him by perpetuating a narrative that he operated a scam in connection with CryptoZoo, an NFT based blockchain video game that Logan Paul had unsuccessfully tried to develop.		

Filing / Order		
PleasrDAO, an exempted foundation company, v. Martin Shkreli		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/10/2024	E.D.N.Y.	24-cv-4126
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Enforcement of order; violations of the Defend Trade Secrets Act; misappropriation of confidential information/trade secrets; tortious interference with prospective economic advantage; unjust enrichment; recovery of chattel/replevin		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
PleasrDAO alleged that Martin Shkreli improperly maintained copies of a Wu-Tang Clan record, that was supposed to constitute the sole copy of that record, that PleasrDAO purchased for almost \$5 million.		

Filing / Order		
Mollijoy Carter, et al. v. Coinbase Global, Inc. et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/4/2024	N.D. Cal.	24-cv-3350
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
California Corporate Securities Law §§ 25210, 25503; California Unfair Competition Law § 17200; Florida Securities and Investor Protection Act §517.07; FLA. STAT. § 517.211, §517.301, §772; Florida's Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act § 501.211(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Class action alleged that Coinbase operated as an unregistered broker-dealer through engaging in the sale of cryptocurrency securities in violation of various California and Florida state laws.		

Filing / Order		
Luke Brown, et al. v. Dolce & Gabbana, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/16/2024	S.D.N.Y	24-cv-3807
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. §§ 77e(a)(1), 12(a)(1), 77l(a)(1), 77o(a)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Class action alleged that defendants created and sold unregistered securities as part of DGFamily, an NFT digital asset project, that did not deliver the benefits it promised and resulted in economic losses to the class.		

Filing / Order		
Gerardo Aceves, et al. v. Coinbase Global Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/3/2024	N.D. Ca.	24-cv-2663-MMC
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Cal. Corp. §§ 25110, 25503, 25210; Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200; Fla. Stat. §517.07, 517.211, 517.301, 772, 501.211(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Class action alleging that because Coinbase admits in its user agreement that it is a securities broker, it is knowingly violating state securities laws by selling securities such as SOL, MATIC, NEAR, MANA, ALGO, UNI, XTZ, and XLM.		

Filing / Order		
Olympus Peak Trade Claims Opportunities Fund I Non-ECI Master LP v. Etheral Tech Pte. Ltd, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/25/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-3160
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract under New York Law; breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing under New York Law; declaratory judgement		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleged that defendants, after agreeing to sell their bankruptcy claims against FTX's estate to plaintiff for 30% of the face value of the claims, have failed to execute their binding agreements to transfer such claims to plaintiff.		

Filing / Order		
Fall v. Battan, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/8/2024	Superior Court M.A. Suffolk County	2484cv00935
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Mass. Gen. Laws Ch. 149 (the "Wage Act")		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Alleging that executives at BSTX, a company building the first blockchain-integrated national securities exchange, failed to timely pay all of plaintiff's wages.		

Filing / Order		
Google LLC v. Yunfeng Sun, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/4/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-2559
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1962(c)–(d); Breach of Contract – Google Play App Signing Terms of Service; Breach of Contract – Google's Developer Program Policies; Breach of Contract – Google Terms of Service; Breach of Contract – YouTube Community Guidelines; Breach of Contract – Google Voice Acceptable Use Policy		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Alleging that defendants engaged in a scheme to defraud consumers through Google Play apps that purported to offer cryptocurrency investments. Consumers ultimately were not able to withdraw their funds from such apps and were charged additional fees when they tried to do so.		

Filing / Order		
Williams v. Binance		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/8/2024	Second Circuit	22-972
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. §§ 78e, 78o(a)(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Decision reversing a lower court dismissal of a putative securities class action brought by purchasers of crypto assets alleging that Binance sold unregistered securities. The reversal was based on three primary grounds: (1) claims involved domestic transactions and were thus subject to U.S. securities laws, (2) plaintiffs' claims were timely and did not accrue until they purchased the relevant crypto assets, and (3) concerns regarding out-of-state class members are questions of predominance were to be decided at a later stage in the proceedings.		

Filing / Order		
Christopher Harborne, et al. v. Dow Jones & Company, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/28/2024	The Superior Court of the State of Delaware	N24C-02-292
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Defamation		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Defamation claim alleging that the Wall Street Journal falsely accused plaintiffs of committing fraud, laundering money, and financing terrorists.		

Filing / Order		
Genesis Block LLC, et al. v. Infrasingularity LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/23/2024	N.Y. App. Div.	650973/2024
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Tortious Interference with Contract Against All Defendants; Misappropriation of Trade Secrets Against All Defendants; Common Law Unfair Competition Against All Defendants; Breach of Contract Against Individual Defendants		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Complaint alleging that a former employee misappropriated Genesis Block IP when he started a new crypto staking company built on Genesis Block trade secrets.		

Filing / Order		
Leonard Licht v. Binance Holdings Limited, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/23/2024	D. Mass.	24-cv-10447
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1960(a); 1956(a)(1)(A)-(B)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Complaint alleging that Binance knowingly failed to register with FinCEN as a money transmitting business and willingly failed to implement an anti-money laundering program, which caused Leonard Licht to lose \$2.7 million of cryptocurrency that he unknowingly sent to a Cambodian crime syndicate.		

Filing / Order		
Edwin Garrison, et al. v. Sullivan & Cromwell, LLP		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/16/2024	S.D. Fla.	24-cv-20630
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Civil conspiracy; common law aiding and abetting fraud; common law aiding and abetting fiduciary breach; RICO, 18. U.S.C. § 1962(d)		
Morrison Cohen Note		
Class action alleging that Sullivan & Cromwell, through its legal representation of FTX, aided FTX's fraudulent schemes and further converted class member's property through charging excessive fees as lead counsel during the FTX bankruptcy proceedings.		

Filing / Order		
Ryan Mayiras, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, v. Hut 8 Corp., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/7/2024	S.D. N.Y.	24-cv-904
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act 10(b), 20(a); Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Class action alleging that Hut 8 carried out a scheme to deceive the public and cause members of the Class to purchase Hut 8's securities at artificially inflated prices.		

Filing / Order		
Dominik Karnas, et al. v. McCarter & English, LLP, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/6/2024	S.D. Fla.	24-cv-20480
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
18 U.S.C. § 1962(d); N. J. S. A. §§ 2A:16-51 et seq.; N.J.S.A. §§ 49:3-60 et seq.; N.J.S.A §§ 56:8-1 et seq.; Fla. Stat. §§ 501.201 et seq.; Fla. Stat. §§ 517.07 et seq.; Gross Negligence		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Class action brought against the law firm, McCarter & English LLP, and the NBA for conspiracy under the RICO Act, gross negligence, and the violation of both Florida and New Jersey securities laws resulting the alleged loss of \$4.2 billion in Voyager customer deposits.		

Filing / Order		
Raanan, et al. v. Binance Holdings Limited, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/31/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-697
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Aiding and Abetting Designated Foreign Terrorist Organizations in Violation of 18 U.S.C § 2333(d)(2); Providing Material Support to Terrorists in Violation of 18 U.S.C § 2333(a), 2339A, 2339B(a)(1); Damages Against State Sponsors of Terrorism for Providing Material Support to an Act of Terrorism		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Individually and through legal representatives, hostages taken by Hamas during the October 7, 2023 terrorist attack on Israel, bring claims against Binance, the Republic of Iran and Syria for facilitating Hamas' financial transactions in violation of anti-terrorism laws.		

Filing / Order		
Exceptional Media Ltd., v. Chainalysis, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/21/2024	N.Y. Supreme Court	650314/2024
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Defamation Per Se; Tortious Interference with Business Relationships		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleged that Chainalysis defamed Exceptional Media's Yieldnodes project by falsely identifying it as a scam in its blockchain tracing software in 2022, and later identifying it as the second largest cryptocurrency scam of 2022 in its 2023 Crypto Crime Report.		

Filing / Order		
Ali Banai, et al. v. Ledger SAS, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/8/2024	S.D.N.Y.	24-cv-132
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
New York General Business Law § 349; Unjust enrichment/restitution		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs bring a class action against Ledger for allegedly falsely advertising its hardware wallets as being impervious to private key extraction.		

Filing / Order		
Stephen Maschi v. Coinbase, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/28/2023	Sup. Ct., N.Y. Cty.	656511/2023
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty; unfair or deceptive business practices; negligence; fraud in the inducement; fraud; recklessness; prima facie tort.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings an action against Coinbase for being unable to log into his Coinbase account.		

Filing / Order		
Andrew Samuels v. Lido DAO, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/17/2023	N.D. Cal	23-cv-6492
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs, purchasers of the LDO token, bring a putative class action alleging that Lido DAO is a statutory seller of LDO tokens because it listed LDO on U.S.-based crypto exchanges.		

Filing / Order		
Michael Lynn Gabriel v. Block Assets, LLC dba BLOCKAS.COM		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/30/2023	N.D. Cal.	23-cv-6204
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; wrongful acquisition and retention of property/unjust enrichment; conversion; fraud-concealment; 18 U.S.C § 1962		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a proposed class action against crypto lending platform Blockas for allegedly operating a Ponzi scheme in which it withholds clients' funds.		

Filing / Order		
Jeff Parker, et al., derivatively on behalf of Stronghold Digital Mining, Inc. v. Gregory A. Beard, et al. & Stronghold Digital Mining, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/14/2023	S.D.N.Y.	23-cv-10028
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty; unjust enrichment; Securities Act § 11(f); Exchange Act § 21(D); waste of corporate assets; aiding and abetting		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs bring a shareholder derivative suit against Bitcoin mining company Stronghold Digital Mining and its officers and directors for allegedly concealing financial issues and misrepresenting the rate at which their technology could mine Bitcoin.		

Filing / Order		
Griffin Anderson, et al. v. Joseph Lubin, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/19/2023	Sup. Ct., N.Y. Cty.	655151/2023
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; tortious interference with contract; breach of fiduciary duty; aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty; unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Early employees of ConsenSys bring an action against the founder of ConsenSys, among others, for allegedly failing to provide equity in the company they helped build.		

Filing / Order		
Krishna Okhandiar, et al. v. John Duff III, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/10/2023	D. Nev.	23-cv-1409
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Conversion; Trespass to Chattels; Intentional Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage; Breach of Contract; Breach of the Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing; Breach of Fiduciary Duty; Unjust Enrichment; Civil Conspiracy; 18 U.S.C. §§ 1836, 1830; Nev. Rev. Stat. § 600A.010		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Founder of an NFT business brings a claim against former independent contractors who allegedly abused their permissions to take control of certain company revenue streams and directed roughly \$1 million of such revenue to a private wallet.		

Filing / Order		
Genesis Global Capital, LLC v. Digital Currency Group, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/6/2023	Bankr. S.D.N.Y.	23-10063
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
11 U.S.C. § 542(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Genesis Global Capital brings an action against DCG for turnover of money allegedly owed to GGC in connection with certain loans between them that matured in May 2023. On September 13, 2023, DGC stated it reached an agreement in principle with the debtors, the official committee of unsecured creditors, Gemini Trust Company, LLC, and the ad hoc group of Genesis lenders to deliver creditors 70-90% recovery of their claims.		

Filing / Order		
True North United Investments, LLC, et al. v. Eric Schiermeyer, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/31/2023	D. Utah.	23-cv-590
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty; waste of corporate assets; unjust enrichment; judicial removal of Schiermeyer as director of BGP; breach of contract; conversion		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Gala Games alleges that director Schiermeyer, among other things, caused Gala Games to sell off and waste millions of dollars in company assets, and lent millions of Gala Games' funds to himself for personal interests.		

Filing / Order		
Eric Schiermeyer, et al. v. Wright Thurston, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/31/2023	D. Utah.	23-cv-589
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duties; conversion; fraud; unjust enrichment; equitable accounting; removal of Thurston as director		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a derivative action on behalf of Gala Games against one of the directors and his investment vehicle, arguing that they stole GALA tokens from Gala Games.		

Filing / Order		
Blake Ratliff v. Chainalysis Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/14/2023	Sup. Ct., N.Y. Cty.	653902/2023
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Ratliff alleged that Chainalysis wrongfully terminated his employment shortly before his one-year anniversary at the company to deny him access to his stock options.		
On June 7, 2024, the court granted defendant's motion to dismiss on the grounds that Plaintiff's complaint was untimely and failed to state a viable claim.		

Filing / Order		
Gemini Trust Company, LLC v. Digital Currency Group, Inc. et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/7/2023	Sup. Ct., N.Y. Cty.	653260/2023
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud; aiding and abetting fraud		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Gemini alleges that DCG and Barry Silbert engaged in a fraudulent scheme to induce Gemini users to lend cryptocurrency and U.S. dollars to Genesis Global Capital, LLC through the Gemini Earn program.		

Filing / Order		
Alameda Research LLC, et al. v. Daniel Friedberg		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/27/2023	Bank. D. Del.	22-11068 (JTD)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty; aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty; legal malpractice/professional negligence; corporate waste; aiding and abetting waste of corporate assets; fraudulent transfer; disallowance of claims		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Debtors and debtors in possession Alameda and FTX sue Daniel Freidberg for advising Sam Bankman-Fried and others on legal and compliance matters, while ignoring the lack of internal controls and paying off whistleblowers, to profit at the expense of debtors and their creditors.		

Filing / Order		
Taylor Thomas v. Persistence Technologies (BVI) Pte Ltd., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/13/2023	C.D. Cal.	23-cv-4669
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud; Civil Conspiracy to Commit Fraud; Exchange Act § 10(b); Selling Unregistered Securities - Cal. Corp. Code § 25503; Misrepresentation or Omission of Material Fact in the Sale of Securities – Cal. Corp. Code §25501; False Advertising - Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17500 BPC		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Alleged, in pertinent part, that Persistence made false and misleading statements about its cryptocurrency, XPRT, which caused plaintiff to lose at least \$43,565,429 when the value of the cryptocurrency suddenly dropped by more than 90%.		

Filing / Order		
Meany et al v. Atomic Protocol Systems et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/21/2023	D. Col.	23-cv-1582
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Negligence		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Alleged that Atomic acted negligently in failing to maintain the security of the funds in Atomic wallets, which resulted in a hack that led to loss of over \$100 million in customer deposits. On September 10, 2024, the court granted defendant's motion to dismiss on the grounds that plaintiffs had failed to establish personal jurisdiction over defendants.		

Filing / Order		
Wray, Inc. v. Coinbase, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/31/23	E.D.N.Y.	23-cv-4031
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud; replevin; permanent injunction; breach of contract; breach of fiduciary duty; violation of the EFTA and Regulation E; NY GBL § 349; aiding and abetting		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff sued Coinbase and Exodus, alleging that they failed to investigate fraudulent transfers of cryptocurrency from his Coinbase account and Exodus wallet, and the unknown individuals who perpetrated the fraud. Case dismissed as against Exodus.		

Filing / Order		
Mislav Basic, et al. v. BProtocol Foundation, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/11/2023	W.D. Tex.	23-cv-533-RP
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1), 15		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Customers brought a class action against the operator and officers of a cryptocurrency exchange, alleging that the exchange, Bancor, falsely advertised total protection from the risk of loss associated with transferring custody and control of crypto assets to Bancor.</p> <p>On September 6, 2024, the court dismissed the case finding that it lacked personal jurisdiction over defendants and that the securities laws at issue did not have extraterritorial application.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Michael Massel v. Coinbase, Inc. and DOES 1 through 10		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/1/23	N.D. Cal.	23-cv-2123
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
740 ILCS §§ 14/15(a), (b), (c), (d)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff brings a putative class action alleging that Coinbase violated Illinois biometric privacy laws by collecting and storing users' facial scans and fingerprints.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Adam Grabski, derivatively on behalf of Coinbase Global, Inc. v. Marc Andreessen, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/1/23	Del. Chancery Ct.	2023-0464-KSJM
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty; unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff alleges that Coinbase Inc. Chairman and CEO Brian Armstrong, board member Marc Andreessen, and other officers used inside information to sell stock within days of Coinbase's public listing, avoiding more than \$1 billion in losses.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Patagon Management LLC v. Wei “Max” Wu		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/31/23	S.D.N.Y.	23-cv-2742
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1); unjust enrichment; money had and received		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleges that it invested in defendant’s scheme by purchasing SPA tokens, but defendant absconded with plaintiff’s and others’ investments of approximately \$30 million. On May 8, 2023, the Court granted a preliminary injunction barring defendant from moving investors’ digital assets worth an estimated \$35 million, and permitted the order to be served via NFT.		

Filing / Order		
Michael Sizemore v. Changpeng Zhao, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/31/23	S.D. Fla.	23-cv-21261
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Florida Securities and Investor Protection Act; Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act; California Corporation Code; Unfair Competition Law Business & Professions Code § 17200, et seq.; civil conspiracy		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs bring a putative class action on behalf of Binance customers against Binance, its CEO, and various influencers who promoted, assisted in, and/or actively participated in Binance’s alleged offer and sale of unregistered securities.		

Filing / Order		
All In Bits, Inc. v. Grace Yu		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/23/23	E.D.N.Y.	23-cv-2270
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
All In Bits, the company behind blockchain consensus technology Tendermint, brings an action against a former consultant for violating the non-disparagement clause in her consulting agreement.		

Filing / Order		
Edwin Garrison v. Kevin Paffrath, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/15/23	S.D. Fla.	23-cv-21023
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Florida Securities and Investor Protection Act; Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act; Civil conspiracy; Declaratory judgment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs bring a putative class action on behalf of all FTX consumers against various influencers who promoted, assisted in, and/or actively participated in FTX's alleged offer and sale of unregistered securities.		

Filing / Order		
Touzi Capital, LLC v. Bitmit Co. Ltd.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/13/23	Supreme Ct., N.Y. Cty.	651302/2023
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of purchase agreement; breach of hosting agreement; money had and received; unjust enrichment; conversion		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Touzi Capital, an investment firm with a focus on bitcoin mining investment opportunities, alleges that defendant breached its contract by failing to deliver 4,000 bitcoin mining servers.		

Filing / Order		
Justin Dufoe v. DraftKings Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/9/23	D. Mass.	23-cv-10524
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1), 15; Exchange Act §§ 5, 15(a)(1), 20, 29(b); Unregistered broker and dealer; Sale of unregistered securities		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action on behalf of purchasers of DraftKings' NFTs, alleging that the NFTs constitute unregistered securities, and defendants are operating an unregistered securities exchange.		

Filing / Order		
Alameda Research Ltd. v. Grayscale Investments, LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/6/23	Del. Chancery Ct.	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; breach of implied covenant; breach of fiduciary duty; declaratory judgment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Alameda Research sues asset manager Grayscale Investments, among others, for imposing a “redemption ban” that prevents investors from redeeming their shares, and for failing to reduce fees.		

Filing / Order		
Ryan Breslow, et al. v. Mark Phillips and Benjamin Reed		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/24/23	S.D. Fla.	23-cv-20727
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty; fraud; civil conspiracy		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs are investors in Movement DAO who claim that the DAO never launched due to defendants’ conduct. Plaintiffs received a Temporary Restraining Order preventing defendants from transferring any assets from the DAO’s wallets.		

Filing / Order		
Nanolabs, Inc. v. Coinbase Global, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/24/23	N.D. Cal.	23-cv-844
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Federal trademark infringement; False designation of origin; California common law trademark infringement; Unfair business practices; Interference with prospective economic relations		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
NanoLabs files a trademark infringement lawsuit against Coinbase, alleging that Coinbase’s Nano Bitcoin futures contract and Nano Ether futures contract products infringe on NanoLabs’ trademark rights.		

Filing / Order		
Subhojit Dasgupta v. Coinbase, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/24/23	Supreme Ct., N.Y. Cty.	151843/2023
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud; replevin; permanent injunction; breach of contract; breach of fiduciary duty; Electronic Funds Transfer Act and Regulation E; New York General Business Law 349		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleges he invested with a company which made fraudulent transfers from plaintiff's Coinbase account. Plaintiff brings suit against both the fraudsters and Coinbase for ignoring breaches of security on its exchange.		

Filing / Order		
Tai Mo Shan Limited v. John Doe Nos. 1-100		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/24/23	Supreme Ct., N.Y. Cty.	651017/2023
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Declaratory judgment; conversion; replevin; unjust enrichment; money had and received; trespass to chattels; equitable subrogation		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleges that defendants hacked the Wormhole network and stole tokens worth over \$320 million. Plaintiff deposited the same amount of tokens in the Wormhole network to make users whole and prevent the collapse of the network. Now, Plaintiff seeks a declaratory judgment that it is entitled to all stolen assets.		

Filing / Order		
Connor O'Keefe v. Sequoia Capital Operations, LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/22/23	S.D. Fla.	23-cv-20700
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Civil conspiracy; common law aiding and abetting fraud; common law aiding and abetting fiduciary breach; aiding and abetting conversion		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleges that defendants, comprised of banks, venture capital firms, law firms, and accounting firms, knowingly and substantially assisted Sam Bankman-Fried in perpetuating fraud through FTX. This action was transferred to the multi-district litigation <i>In re FTX Cryptocurrency Exchange Collapse Litigation</i> , 23-cv-3076 (S.D. Fla.)		

Filing / Order		
Theodore Rider, et al., v. Uphold HQ Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/22/23	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-1602
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Electronic Fund Transfer Act; deceptive business practices; breach of contract; breach of express and implied warranties; negligence; gross negligence; unjust enrichment; negligence per se; negligent misrepresentation		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Customers brought a putative class action against the operator and CEO of a cryptocurrency exchange, alleging that their accounts were improperly accessed as a result of defendants' failure to implement two-factor authorization. The Court found that cryptocurrencies constituted "funds" within the meaning of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, and allowed plaintiffs to proceed on those claims.		

Filing / Order		
Tobias Moeller-Bertram v. Gemini Trust Company, LLC and Digital Currency Group, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/22/23	Supreme Ct., N.Y. Cty.	151710/2023
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1), 15		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action on behalf of all investors in the Gemini Earn program, alleging that defendants engaged in an unregistered offer and sale of securities to U.S. retail investors.		

Filing / Order		
Mannu Singh v. Illusory Systems, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/17/23	D. Del.	23-cv-183
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
RICO; Conversion; Breach of contract		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action against Illusory Systems, the business entity behind the Nomad Bridge, as well as various exchanges, blockchain firms, and venture capital firms for their roles in funding the creation and upkeep of the Nomad Bridge, which Plaintiffs allege was an illegal money-transmitting business that was subject to a \$186 million hack.		

Filing / Order		
Patrick J. Rabbitte v. Sequoia Capital Operations, LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/14/23	N.D. Cal.	23-cv-655
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
California's Unfair Competition Law; California's False Advertising Law; Cal. Corp. Code § 25504.1; Negligent misrepresentation; Intentional misrepresentation; Fraudulent inducement; Civil conspiracy; Aiding and abetting; Declaratory judgment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs bring a putative class action alleging that venture capital and private equity firms aided in FTX's alleged fraud by investing money into FTX and publicly portraying FTX and Sam Bankman-Fried as trustworthy.		

Filing / Order		
Matson Magleby, et al. v. Silvergate Bank and Silvergate Capital Corp.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/14/23	N.D. Cal.	23-cv-669
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Aiding and abetting fraud; aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty; unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs bring a putative class action on behalf of investors in FTX, claiming that Silvergate Bank aided and abetted FTX's misconduct that caused Plaintiffs' losses.		

Filing / Order		
Parker Pelham v. VBit Tech. Corp., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/13/23	D. Del.	23-cv-162
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1), 15; Exchange Act §§ 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Unjust enrichment/restitution		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs bring a putative class action on behalf of investors who purchased VBit Mining Contracts, which they allege were unregistered securities. Plaintiffs also allege that defendants operated a Ponzi scheme that paid Bitcoin to new investors who bought into the scheme.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Statistica Capital Ltd., et al v. Signature Bank</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/6/23	S.D.N.Y.	23-cv-993
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Aiding and abetting fraud; aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty; unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs allege that Signature Bank was aware of the financial relationship between FTX Trading Ltd. and Alameda Research, and allowed customer funds intended for FTX to be transferred to Alameda.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Don Holland v. CryptoZoo Inc., et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/2/23	W.D. Tex.	23-cv-110
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud; express breach of contract; implied breach of contract; unjust enrichment; violation of Texas's Deceptive Trade Practices Act; negligence; fraudulent misrepresentation; conspiracy to commit fraud		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
An investor in CryptoZoo Inc., Youtube star Logan Paul's failed cryptocurrency based gaming project, alleges that Paul and his team engaged in a rug pull by failing to ship the final project after investors purchased digital assets allegedly required to play the game.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Aaron Murphy v. Argo Blockchain PLC, et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/26/23	E.D.N.Y.	23-cv-572
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act §§ 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, 20(a); Securities Act §§ 11, 15		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action on behalf of those who invested in Argo Blockchain PLC immediately after its initial public offering, alleging that investors were misled about Argo's business prospects by negligently prepared offering documents and misleading statements.		

Filing / Order		
Mango Labs, LLC v. Avraham Eisenberg		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/25/23	S.D.N.Y.	23-cv-665
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Conversion; fraudulent misrepresentation; unjust enrichment; declaratory judgment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Mango Labs brings an action against Eisenberg for manipulating the value of the Mango token and converting approximately \$114 million from Mango Markets depositors into his own accounts.		

Filing / Order		
Sanjay Chablaney v. Gemini Trust Company, LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/5/23	New York Supreme	230105-48
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1), 15; New York General Business Law § 349; fraudulent inducement; fraudulent concealment; fraudulent misrepresentation; negligent misrepresentation; breach of contract; unjust enrichment; civil conspiracy		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action on behalf of persons and entities that invested in Gemini Earn or otherwise purchased Gemini Interest Accounts, seeking damages after Gemini paused customer withdrawals.		

Filing / Order		
Julie Chon Papadakis v. Samuel Bankman-Fried, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/3/23	N.D. Cal.	23-cv-24
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, 17500; fraudulent concealment; negligent misrepresentation; intentional misrepresentation; fraud; breach of fiduciary duty; aiding and abetting fraud; aiding and abetting violations of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200; aiding and abetting breaches of fiduciary duty; civil conspiracy; conversion; unjust enrichment; declaratory judgment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action on behalf of customers who deposited funds into FTX or FTX.US, seeking damages for being unable to withdraw deposited funds.		

Filing / Order		
Joewy Gonzalez v. Silvergate Bank, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/14/22	S.D. Cal.	22-cv-1981
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Aiding and abetting fraud; aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty; unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action against Silvergate Bank, alleging that in maintaining FTX and Alameda accounts, it comingled funds, engaged in improper transfers, and lent out customer money.		

Filing / Order		
Amanda Houghton, et al. v. Compound DAO, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/8/22	N.D. Cal.	22-cv-7781
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs bring a putative class action claiming that they incurred financial losses from buying COMP tokens, which they allege are unregistered securities.		

Filing / Order		
Michael Elliott Jessup v. Samuel Bankman-Fried, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/5/22	N.D. Cal.	22-cv-7666
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud; unjust enrichment; conversion		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action on behalf of FTX customers, alleging that defendants transferred customers' assets to Alameda Research without authorization.		

Filing / Order		
Russell Hawkins v. Samuel Bankman-Fried, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/2/22	N.D. Cal.	22-cv-7620
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 (unfair competition); Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 (false advertising); fraudulent concealment; civil conspiracy; declaratory judgment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action on behalf of persons and entities that have been unable to withdraw funds deposited into yield-bearing accounts on FTX, seeking damages, attorney fees, and a jury trial.		

Filing / Order		
José Tomàs Sepúlveda Zuleta v. Silvergate Capital Corp., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/1/22	S.D. Cal.	22-cv-1901
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud; fraudulent concealment & inducement; civil conspiracy; negligence; Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 (unfair competition); quasi-contract/unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action on behalf of FTX investors, alleging that Silvergate Bank allowed FTX to direct customer deposits to Alameda Research, and is therefore complicit in and responsible for losses stemming from FTX's collapse.		

Filing / Order		
Stephen Pierce v. Sam Bankman-Fried, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/23/22	N.D. Cal.	22-cv-7444
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
RICO enterprise; RICO conspiracy		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brought a putative class action against Sam Bankman-Fried and others alleging RICO violations for the collapse of cryptocurrency exchange FTX.		

Filing / Order		
Pardalis Technology Licensing, L.L.C. v. International Business Machines Corporation		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/22/22	E.D. Tex.	22-cv-452
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Patent infringement		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brought an action against Defendant for patent infringement concerning certain blockchain technologies. On September 27, 2024, a jury found IBM liable for two counts of infringement and ordered it to pay \$19.5 million.		

Filing / Order		
Edwin Garrison v. Sam Bankman-Fried, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/15/22	S.D. Fla.	22-cv-23753
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Florida Statute § 517.07; Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act § 501.201; civil conspiracy; declaratory judgment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brought a putative class action against Sam Bankman-Fried and celebrities who promoted FTX, alleging they did not adequately disclose their partnerships with FTX.		

Filing / Order		
True Return Systems, LLC v. MakerDAO		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/5/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-8478
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Patent infringement		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 10,025,797, titled "METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR SEPARATING STORAGE AND PROCESS OF A COMPUTERIZED LEDGER FOR IMPROVED FUNCTION," which concerns a recent patent covering common blockchain technology. This case was dismissed after the settlement of a separate inter partes review proceeding at the USPTO between DeFi Education Fund ("DEF") and True Return Systems (IPR2023-01388) regarding the validity of the patent. DEF purchased the patent and dedicated it to public use.		

Filing / Order		
True Return Systems, LLC v. Compound Protocol		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/5/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-8483
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Patent infringement		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 10,025,797, titled "METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR SEPARATING STORAGE AND PROCESS OF A COMPUTERIZED LEDGER FOR IMPROVED FUNCTION," which concerns a recent patent covering common blockchain technology.</p> <p>This case was dismissed after the settlement of a separate inter partes review proceeding at the USPTO between DeFi Education Fund ("DEF") and True Return Systems (IPR2023-01388) regarding the validity of the patent. DEF purchased the patent and dedicated it to public use.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Matthew Albright v. Terraform Labs, PTE. LTD., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/25/22	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-7281
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff, on behalf of a proposed nationwide class of all individuals and entities who purchased Terraform stablecoins, allege that Terraform Labs and its top executives violated RICO by artificially inflating the price of the stablecoins and publishing misleading information following its collapse.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Christopher Freeman v. Stake.com, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/17/22	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-7002
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Trade secret misappropriation; fraud; breach of fiduciary duty and duty of loyalty; unfair competition; idea misappropriation; tortious interference with prospective economic advantage; unjust enrichment; conversion; accounting		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff alleges that defendants' crypto-based online casino misappropriated plaintiff's online crypto-based dice game.</p>		

Filing / Order		
George Kattula v. Coinbase Global, Inc., and Coinbase Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/15/22	N.D. Ga.	22-cv-3250
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Declaratory judgment; breach of fiduciary duty; breach of contract and implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; unjust enrichment; deceptive practice; Electronic Funds Transfer Act and Regulation E; negligence		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs bring a class action alleging that Coinbase’s security systems exposed their accounts to hackers, and that Coinbase arbitrarily locked them out of their accounts which prevented them from selling off tokens.		

Filing / Order		
Brent Jay v. Scott Walker, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/1/22	D. Nev.	22-cv-1236
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 12(a)(2), 15, 17; Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, § 20; unfair business acts or practices; unlawful business acts or practices; fraudulent business acts or practices; breach of contract; breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing; unjust enrichment; conversion; promissory estoppel; fraud; negligent misrepresentation; elder abuse.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleges that an advisory firm misled him into investing in various crypto tokens that are actually securities.		

Filing / Order		
David Gonzalez v. Coinbase Global, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/25/22	N.J. Super. Ct., Bergen Cty.	BER-L-004001-22
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1), 15; Exchange Act §§ 5, 15(a)(1), 20, 29(b); N.J. Consumer Fraud Act; breach of contract; common law fraud; conversion.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleges that Coinbase sold unregistered securities and failed to register as either a securities exchange or broker-dealer.		

Filing / Order		
Taylor Goines, et al. v. Celsius Network, LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/13/22	D.N.J.	22-cv-4560
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1), 15; Exchange Act §§ 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, 20(a); unjust enrichment/restitution; declaratory judgment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
On the same day crypto lending company Celsius filed for bankruptcy protection, Plaintiff brings a putative class action alleging Celsius held the equivalent of \$10 billion from selling unregistered securities in a Ponzi-like scheme and induced investors to purchase its financial products at inflated rates.		

Filing / Order		
KeyFi, Inc. v. Celsius Network Limited and Celsius KeyFi LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/7/22	Sup. Ct. N.Y. Cty.	652367/2022
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; negligent misrepresentation; fraud in the inducement; accounting		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleges that defendants, which operate a crypto lending platform, failed to pay plaintiff millions of dollars pursuant to a profit-sharing agreement between the parties. Plaintiff further alleges that defendants were operating a Ponzi scheme, and leveraging customer deposits to manipulate crypto-asset markets.		

Filing / Order		
Polychain Capital LP et al. v. Pantera Venture Fund II LP et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/6/22	Del. Chancery Ct.	2021-0670-PAF
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Disputes re LLC agreement; breach of fiduciary duty		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Confirmed an arbitration award.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Polychain Capital and its investor, Pantera Venture Fund II LP, went to arbitration re allegations that Polychain and others usurped Pantera's financial opportunity by Polychain's creation of a separate, similarly named entity to operate in the crypto investment and advising space. Polychain also allegedly attempted to rewrite its LLC agreement to terminate Pantera. The arbitrator found in favor of Pantera, and the Delaware Chancery Court confirmed the award despite Polychain's motion to vacate. Polychain owes more than \$5.5 million in fees and expenses to Pantera.		
On February 1, 2023, Polychain filed a notice of appeal regarding the confirmation of the \$5.5 million award.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Mark Young v. Solana Labs, Inc., et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/1/22	N.D. Cal.	22-cv-3912
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1), 15; California Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25503		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brought a putative class action on behalf of all investors who purchased Solana tokens, which plaintiff alleges are unregistered securities.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Chryskylodon LLC v. Markus Schneider, et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/28/22	Sup. Ct. N.Y. Cty.	155436/2022
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud; breach of contract; conversion; unjust enrichment; access to books and records and accounting		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleges that defendants fraudulently induced plaintiff to invest \$100,000 into defendants' cryptocurrency mining company by using fake financial documents and statements about the mining company's value and business.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Dfinity Foundation v. New York Times Co., et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/27/22	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-5418
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Defamation; violation of N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 349		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleges that the New York Times and its reporter Andrew Ross Sorkin defamed plaintiff by publishing a story that plaintiff was engaging in illegal and wrongful conduct in connection with the blockchain network, Internet Computer, and the ICP utility token.		

Filing / Order		
Yuga Labs, Inc. v. Ripps et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/24/22	C.D. Cal.	22-cv-4355 (JFW) (JEM)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Lanham Act trademark violations; cybersquatting; common law trademark violation; common law unfair competition; CA UCL; CA false advertising; unjust enrichment; conversion; interference with prospective economic advantage		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff is the creator behind the Bored Ape Yacht Club (“BAYC”) NFTs. Plaintiff alleges that defendants are violating the BAYC trademark by producing copycat NFTs, the RR/BAYC (Ryder Ripps BAYC). Defendant Ripps allegedly claims that his NFTs are satire of the BAYC NFTs.		

Filing / Order		
Patterson v. Terraform Labs PTE. LTD et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/17/22	N.D. Cal.	22-cv-3600 (BLF)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12, 15; Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; California common law aiding and abetting, conspiracy; RICO; unjust enrichment/restitution		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action against Terraform Labs, Definance Capital/ Definance Technologies Oy, GSR/GSR Markets Limited, Jump Crypto, Jump Trading LLC, Do Kwon, Nicholas Platias, Republic Capital, Republic Maximal LLC, Three Arrows Capital, Pte. Ltd., and Tribe Capital, stemming from the May 2022 collapse of UST and Luna. Plaintiff alleges that UST and Luna were unregistered securities, and that defendants made false and misleading statements about the tokens.		
On September 8, 2023, plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed Nicholas Platias, Definance Capital/Definance Technologies OY, Tribe Capital, and Three Arrows Capital Pte. Ltd from the proceedings.		
On September 28, 2023, plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed Terraform Labs from the proceedings.		
On January 4, 2024, the court issued an opinion rejecting Jump Trading’s (the final defendant) motion to compel arbitration, but granting its motion to dismiss for failure to claim with leave for plaintiffs to amend.		

Filing / Order		
Keith Johnson v. Elon Musk, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/16/22	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-5037
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Civil RICO – wire fraud; civil RICO – gambling; common law fraud; negligence; false advertising; deceptive practices; products liability – failure to warn; unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action accusing Elon Musk of running a racketeering scheme to intentionally drive up the price of the cryptocurrency Dogecoin.		

Filing / Order		
Gerro v. Blockfi Lending LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/14/2022	Cal. Ct. App.	B307156, B312647
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Enforcement of forum selection clause		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Gerro bought suit against BlockFi in California, arising out of a loan Gerro had with BlockFi securitized by bitcoin. BlockFi moved to transfer the case to Delaware. The California appellate panel reversed the trial court's order enforcing a Delaware forum selection clause. The appellate panel found that California has a fundamental policy against jury waivers, and the Delaware Court may quash that right.		

Filing / Order		
Lockhart v. BAM Trading Services Inc. et al		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/13/2022	N.D. Cal.	22-cv-3461
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 12, 15(a); Exchange Act §§ 5, 29(b), 15(a)(1), 20; California Securities Act, Cal. Corp. Code		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action against BAM Trading Services d/b/a Binance U.S. and the CEO, Brian Shroder, stemming from the May 2022 collapse of UST and Luna. Plaintiff alleges that UST and Luna were unregistered securities, and Binance failed to comply with securities laws in listing them.		

Filing / Order		
IRA Financial Trust v. Gemini Trust Company, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/6/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-4672
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud; negligence; gross negligence; NY GBL § 349; contribution; defamation; tortious interference		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
IRA Financial Trust, a self-directed retirement and pension account provider, sued Gemini Trust over a February 2022 cyberattack that resulted in at least \$36 million worth of crypto assets being stolen from IRA customers' individual retirement accounts. IRA alleges that Gemini lacked adequate security protections, by designing its API with a single point of failure.		

Filing / Order		
LCX AG v. 1.274M U.S. Dollar Coin, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/1/2022	N.Y. Supreme Ct., N.Y. Cty.	154644/2022
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Conversion; money had and received		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
LCX AG, a virtual asset service provider in Liechtenstein, alleges that nearly \$8 million worth of various virtual assets based on the Ethereum blockchain that it held were stolen. The court allowed alternative service of process through an airdropped token, and defendants' attorneys were ordered to identify the defendants.		

Filing / Order		
Rackauckas v. SafeMoon US et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/17/2022	D. Utah	22-cv-332
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1), 15; Exchange Act §§ 10(b), 20(a); and Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action against the corporate entities associated with the SafeMoon tokens and the promoters of SafeMoon, such as celebrities Jake Paul and Dave Portnoy, for the unregistered sale of SafeMoon tokens, which plaintiff alleges is an unregistered security. Plaintiff further alleges that SafeMoon was a Ponzi scheme.		

Filing / Order		
Richard Burden Teed v. James "Jimmy" Chen, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/13/22	N.D. Cal.	22-cv-2862
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; fraud; conversion; claim and delivery; breach of fiduciary duty; violation of 17 CFR § 1.20(a); fraudulent solicitation; negligence		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleged that defendants fraudulently induced plaintiff to invest Bitcoin in defendants' opportunity fund, and mismanaged the investment.		

Filing / Order		
Donovan, et al. v. GMO-Z.Com Trust Company, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/12/2022	N.D. Cal.	22-cv-2826
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Negligence; negligence per se; negligent misrepresentation; conversion; New York General Business Law § 349; Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200; Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1), 12(a)(2)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs allege that Coinbase and GMO-Z.com Trust Company, Inc. promoted the stablecoin Gyen as pegged one-to-one in value to the Japanese yen, despite knowing that peg was likely to break when Gyen opened for trading on Coinbase, because Gyen had previously collapsed on other exchanges.		

Filing / Order		
Javon Johnson v. Kenneth Reece		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/10/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-3780
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; breach of fiduciary duty; breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; unjust enrichment; accounting		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleges that defendant fraudulently induced him to invest \$185,000 in a crypto startup, BloxXWop, that never became functional or had any other shareholders.		

Filing / Order		
Trader Joe's Company v. Cheng Chieh Liu		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/4/2022	WIPO	D2022-1620
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Identical or confusingly similar; rights or legitimate interests; registered and used in bad faith		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
The operator of the Trader Joe's grocery stores files a complaint against decentralized finance trading platform Trader Joe for alleged trademark violations. On July 6, 2022, WIPO denied the complaint, finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar, but that there is insufficient evidence to suggest the decentralized platform wanted to obtain a commercial benefit from use of the name, or operated in bad faith.		

Filing / Order		
Sarcuni v. bZx DAO et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/2/2022	S.D. Cal.	22-cv-618 (BEN) (DEB)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Negligence		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiffs bring a putative class action against Defendants arising out of a November 2021 hack whereby the bZx protocol allegedly was hacked and about \$55 million stolen from the protocol. Plaintiffs are purported users of the bZx protocol. Defendants moved to dismiss the complaint for, among other things, failure to state a claim, lack of personal jurisdiction, insufficient service, and lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The court dismissed the claims against Tom Bean, bZeroX LLC, and Leveragebox LLC. On April 24, 2023, Kyle Kistner counterclaimed against Plaintiffs for contribution/indemnification, reimbursement and breach of duty under the California Partnership Act, and declaratory judgment. The docket noted on July 18, 2023 that the case reached a settlement.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Romein Rostami v. Open Props, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/24/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-3326
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraudulent inducement; unjust enrichment; breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; alter ego liability		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff, a purchaser of Open Props' cryptocurrency called "Props Tokens," alleges that Open Props failed to adequately decentralize its network, and raised capital through a Regulation A public offering with the SEC, which ultimately rendered Props Tokens worthless. Defendants' motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim was granted on January 9, 2023.</p> <p>On March 26, 2024, Defendants' motion to dismiss Plaintiff's <i>amended</i> Complaint for failure to state a claim was also granted.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Hu Chun Liang v. Olympus DAO et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/14/2022	D. Conn.	22-cv-541 (JCH)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; conversion; common law fraud; civil conspiracy		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Liang alleges that he provided seed capital to Olympus DAO, but Olympus failed to deliver the as-contracted tokens in exchange for Liang's investment. Liang alleges that he has identified "Apollo," one of the founders of Olympus DAO (the other is "Zeus").</p>		

Filing / Order		
Risley v. Universal Navigation Inc. dba Uniswap Labs, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/4/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-2780
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1); Exchange Act §§ 5, 15(a)(1), 20, 29(b)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiffs brings a putative class action alleging that decentralized exchange Uniswap, and its developers and venture capital backers, offered and sold unregistered securities. Plaintiffs also allege that Uniswap enriched itself and the other defendants by collecting fees on every transaction executed on the exchange, and allowing any user to swap crypto tokens on the exchange without verification or KYC. On August 29, 2023, the Court (Failla, J.) dismissed Plaintiffs' claims in their entirety.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Jonathan Shomroni v. Fei Labs Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/1/22	Superior Court of California, San Francisco County	CGC-22-598995
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1), 15		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff brings a putative class action alleging defendants engaged in the unregistered offer and sale of "FEI" and "TRIBE" digital assets.</p>		

Filing / Order		
De Ford v. Koutoulas et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/1/2022	M.D. Fla.	22-cv-652
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 12, 15(a); Florida Securities Act; Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices; aiding and abetting; unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Alleged securities fraud arising out of "Let's Go Brandon" memecoin fraud.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Thayer v. Furie, Chain/Saw LLC, and PegzDAO		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/12/2022	C.D. Cal.	22-cv-1640 (AB) (MRW)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraudulent inducement; intentional misrepresentation; negligent misrepresentation; violation of Cal. UCL § 17200; violation of Cal. Consumer Legal Remedies Act § 1750; mistake of fact; breach of contract; breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleges that defendants fraudulently misrepresented the value of a Pepe the Frog NFT. Plaintiff paid \$537,084 for a Pepe the Frog NFT created by Furie and sold through PegzDAO. A few weeks after the sale, PegzDAO released 46 identical NFTs for free, which allegedly reduced the value of Plaintiff's NFT.		

Filing / Order		
Barron, et al. v. Helbiz Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/11/2022	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-4703
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; tortious interference; trespass and conversion of chattels; conversion of funds and embezzlement; constructive trust; quiet title; common law fraud; consumer protection/unfair practices; negligent supervision; Exchange Act §§ 9, 10(b) and Rule 10b-5, 20(a); CEA § 9(a)(1), 13(a)(2), 25 and Rule 180.1(a); principal/agent liability; aiding and abetting; RICO; negligent misrepresentation; unjust enrichment; respondeat superior		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs are purchasers of cryptocurrency HelbizCoin, which was ultimately destroyed and delisted from cryptocurrency exchanges after its initial coin offering. Plaintiffs allege that defendants' offer to refund purchasers in Ethereum was a sham, and that there was a conspiracy to fraudulently market HelbizCoin and breach promises to Plaintiffs.		

Filing / Order		
Burt v. Travelers Comm. Ins. Co.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/11/2022	N.D. Cal.	22-cv-3157-JSC
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Declaratory relief; breach of contract; breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs allege that its insurers failed to provide personal property coverage due to theft for crypto stolen from Coinbase account. On August 16, 2022, the court ruled in favor of the insurer, finding that the policy only covered "direct physical loss to property," and the stolen crypto was not a direct physical loss.		

Filing / Order		
Dreamr Labs Ltd. v. Delchain Ltd., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/10/2022	E.D.N.Y.	22-cv-1332
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; fraud in the inducement; conversion; tortious interference; fraud; defamation		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Dreamr Labs alleges that defendants breached their duty to provide advisory and consulting services in connection with Dreamr’s DMR tokens launch, which caused Dreamr to lose more than \$20 million. Dreamr voluntarily dismissed its complaint on July 15, 2022.		

Filing / Order		
Mangano v. BlockFi		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/1/2022	D.N.J.	22-cv-1112
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Unregistered offer and sale of securities under § 5 of the Securities Act and §§ 25110, 25503 of the California Corp. Code., unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action against BlockFi and related entities for the unregistered sale of securities under state and federal law. Plaintiff alleges that BlockFi’s “Crypto Interest Account” / “BlockFI Interest Account” are unregistered securities.		

Filing / Order		
Merewhader v. Safemoon LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/17/2022	C.D. Cal.	22-cv-1108
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Cal. Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Consumers Legal Remedies Act, aiding and abetting, Illinois Consumer Protective and Deceptive Trade Practices, unjust enrichment/restitution		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs bring a putative class action against founders and promoters of SafeMoon tokens for misleading information. The defendants purportedly made false and misleading statements to SafeMoon investors in their social media posts and other promotional activities. The price of SafeMoon was allegedly artificially inflated by these activities and has since fallen. Plaintiffs are represented by the same counsel as that in the EMAX suit, <i>Huegerich v. Gentile infra</i> .		

Filing / Order		
Ephraim Atwal, M.D. v. iFinex Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/2/2022	W.D.N.Y.	22-cv-149
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Conversion; trespass to chattels; breach of contract; unjust enrichment; NY GBL § 349; negligence; permanent injunction		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Atwal alleges that a third-party stole cryptocurrency from him and subsequently transferred it to accounts on Defendants' trading platform, Bitfinex. On March 22, 2023, the action was dismissed for lack of personal jurisdiction.		

Filing / Order		
Huegerich v. Gentile		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/7/2022	C.D. Cal.	22-cv-163 (MWF) (SK)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Cal. Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Consumers Legal Remedies Act, aiding and abetting, unjust enrichment/restitution		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action against promoters of EthereumMax (EMAX) for misleading information. The promoter defendants include Kim Kardashian, Floyd Mayweather, Jr., and Paul Pierce. The defendants purportedly made false and misleading statements to EMAX investors in their social media posts and other promotional activities. The price of EMAX was allegedly artificially inflated by these activities and has since fallen.		

Filing / Order		
Hermès Int'l v. Mason Rothschild		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/14/2022	S.D.N.Y.	22-cv-384 (JSR)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Trademark infringement, dilution, cybersquatting, NY GBL § 360-1, misappropriation & unfair competition		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Hermès sues defendant, who created METABIRKINS NFTs, for trademark infringement on the Birkin bag trademarks. Defendant has been selling METABIRKIN NFTs in the metaverse. On February 8, 2023, a jury held Rothschild liable for trademark infringement.		

Filing / Order		
ConsenSys Inc. v. Kavita Gupta		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/10/2022	Del. Chancery Court	2022-0029
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Declaratory judgment, fraudulent inducement, breach of contract, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, unjust enrichment		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
In response to Gupta’s demand for a stake in the ConsenSys fund (see Gupta v. Lubin, below), ConsenSys seeks a declaratory judgment that Gupta is not entitled to any money and return of the compensation paid to her, claiming that she “turned out to be a fraud.” ConsenSys alleges that Gupta faked her resume credentials and was incapable of doing her job’s duties. ConsenSys further alleges that it asked Gupta to resign.		

Filing / Order		
Kavita Gupta v. Joseph Lubin, ConsenSys Fund I LP et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/31/2021	Sup. Ct. New York Cty	650023/2022
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Gupta, the former head of ConsenSys Ventures and a former partner in the ConsenSys fund, sues for beach of the fund’s partnership agreement and associated documents. Gupta demands her carried stake in the fund. Gupta left ConsenSys in 2019. ConsenSys subsequently sued Gupta in Delaware Chancery Court. <i>See Consensys Inc. v. Gupta.</i>		

Filing / Order		
Diamond Hands Consulting Ltd. v. Kyle R. Bongers a/k/a BTCVIX and DARTHVIX et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/31/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-11223 (AJN)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Lanham Act trademark violations, Lanham Act false advertising, common law trademark infringement, unfair competition, New York state deceptive business practices		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff Diamond Hands operates the SATOSHISTREETBETS online communities and either owns the mark or is pursuing registration of the mark. Plaintiff alleges that defendants are infringing on its mark by also using the SATOSHISTREETBETS mark.		

Filing / Order		
Cassidy v. Voyager Digital Ltd.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/24/2021	S.D. Fla.	21-cv-24441
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Consumer fraud, deceptive trade practices		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings a putative class action against Voyager Digital for alleged non-disclosure of hidden fees when Voyager holds itself out to be commission-free. Plaintiff brings claims on behalf of a putative nationwide class and a Florida Subclass.		

Filing / Order		
OC Global Partners, LLC v. Lirdes S.A. and Luis Felipe Adaime		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/14/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-10686 (LJL)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Contract, fraud, tort, and violations of state unfair trade practices		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
OC Global alleges that it rendered services to list defendants' environmental cryptocurrency, MCO2 token, on Gemini. OC Global further alleges that defendants failed to compensate it for its efforts. MCO2 tokens represent a claim on a carbon credit held in a carbon credit pool.		

Filing / Order		
Matthew Anderson v. Tether Holdings Ltd et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/10/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-10613 (ALC)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Violations of state unfair trade practices (NY, NV), contract, declaratory and injunctive relief		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs allege that defendants (Tether and its related entities) misrepresented the value of Tether (including whether it was back one-to-one with the US dollar and backed by sufficient reserves). Named plaintiffs bring a putative class action on behalf of a nationwide class and a Nevada subclass. On August 4, 2023, the Court dismissed the claims, finding that Plaintiffs failed to plead an injury in fact because Plaintiffs could still sell their USDT and receive the pegged price.		

Filing / Order		
Kent v. PoolTogether Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/29/2021	E.D.N.Y.	21-cv-6025 (FB) (CLP)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
N.Y. Gen. Oblig. Law (GOL) § 5-423		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff alleges that defendant PoolTogether operates a “no-loss lottery” and pursuant to GOL § 5-423 he may sue for and recover the sums paid on behalf of a putative class. In addition to defendant PoolTogether, Plaintiff has also brought the action against Dharma Labs Inc., Ozone Networks, Leighton Cusack, Kain Warwick, Stanislav Kulechov, Dragonfly Digital Management, LLC, Nascent US LLC, Nascent Limited P’ship, Stichting Maven 11 Funds, Maven 11 Capital BV, Galaxy Digital Trading HK Limited, LD, ParaFi Capital LP and Compound Labs Inc. On June 7, 2023, the Court dismissed the case for lack of standing under Article III.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Underwood v. Coinbase Global Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/8/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-8353 (PAE)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1), 15; Exchange Act §§ 5, 29(b), 15(a)(1), 20; California securities laws; Florida securities laws; New Jersey securities laws		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiffs brings a putative securities class action against Coinbase and its CEO Brian Armstrong for alleged violations of securities law, federal and state (California, Florida, and New Jersey). Plaintiffs allege that Coinbase is selling unregistered securities, and Coinbase is not registered (as it purportedly should) as a securities exchange or as a broker-dealer. The purported unregistered securities are various digital assets/tokens. On February 1, 2023, the Court granted defendants’ motion to dismiss.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Bielski v. Coinbase		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/24/2021	N.D. Cal.	21-cv-7478 (WHA)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Electronic Funds Transfer Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1683; 15 U.S.C. § 1693f(f)(6), 12 C.F.R. § 1005.11(a)(7); 15 U.S.C. § 1693c; 12 C.F.R. § 1005.7		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff brings a putative securities class action against Coinbase for failure to assist him after his Coinbase account was drained by scammer. Plaintiff allegedly was unable to speak with a human representative, only bots, after the hack. The District Court found that Coinbase’s arbitration clause lacked mutuality, and, thus, plaintiff was not bound by its terms, and denied Coinbase’s motion to compel arbitration.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Lowry v. Edelman		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/21/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-7861 (JMF)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10b and Rule 10b-5		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleges that defendants, including Gabriel Edelman, Vix Capital Partners, LP, fraudulently induced him to invest in the cryptocurrency WAX, which defendants then used to invest in Celsius (CEL). Plaintiff further alleges that defendant Vix Capital Partners LP is a Ponzi scheme.		

Filing / Order		
Ryan Cox, individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated, v. CoinMarketCap Opco, et al		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/13/2021	D. Ariz.	21-cv-8197 (District Court) 23-15363 (9th Circuit)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
7 U.S.C. § 25		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Cox filed a class-action alleging that Binance restricted HEX's ranking on CoinMarketCap, a platform owned by Binance.		
On February 10, 2023, the district court granted defendants' Motion to Dismiss finding that Cox had failed to link any activity in Arizona to the alleged manipulation of Hex's ranking on CoinMarketCap by Binance that Cox had thus failed to establish personal jurisdiction over defendants. Cox appealed.		
On August 12, 2024, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals reversed in part finding that the U.S. defendants had sufficient contacts with Arizona to justify a finding of personal jurisdiction and that Cox had alleged colorable claims of price manipulation. The case was remanded for further proceedings.		

Filing / Order		
Kang v. Hybrid Trade Ltd		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/13/2021	C.D. Cal.	21-cv-6593-MCS-JPR
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Sale of Registered Securities (Section 5 and 12(a)(1) of the Securities Act); Section 15 of the Securities Act; Securities Fraud (Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, Exchange Act § 10(b), SEC Rule 10b-5); Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiffs, investors in Hybrid Trade's digital token, allege that Hybrid and defendants, including the Olympic speed skater Apolo Ohno, misrepresented the value of Hybrid Tokens. Hybrid suffered a breach in Aug. 2018 that led to about \$4.4 worth of ETH to be stolen, which plaintiffs allege was not timely disclosed by defendants. The District Court dismissed the suit on statute of limitations grounds.		

Filing / Order		
Jeeun Friel v. Dapper Labs, Inc. and Roham Gharegozlou		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/7/2021	S.D.N.Y.	21-cv-5837-VM
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1), control person liability		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff brings a class action against Dapper Labs, which operates NBA Top Shot and sells the NFTs NBA Top Shot Moments. Plaintiff alleges that NBA Top Shot Moments are unregistered securities, and investors were prevented from withdrawing their funds for months. In February 2023, the Court denied defendants' motion to dismiss, stating that the NBA Top Shot Moments NFTs meet the requirements to be considered a security.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Emin Gun Sirev v. Emre Aksoy		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/22/2021	S.D. Fl.	21-cv-22280
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Defamation		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff, and the cryptocurrency company he founded Ava Labs, alleges that Defendant falsely claimed that Sirev was the member of a terrorist organization. In May 2023, the Court awarded Sirev \$3 million in damages.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Anatoly Sorokin v. HDR Global Trading Limited a/k/a BitMEX, ABS Global Trading Ltd, Arthur Hayes, Benjamin Delo, and Samuel Reed		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/12/2021	N.D. Cal.	21-cv-3576 (WHO)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Market manipulation (multiple alleged violations of Chapter 18 of the U.S.C., CEA, and Californian law)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff alleged a plethora of violations of the criminal code (Chapter 18 of the United States Code) as well as violations of the Commodities Exchange Act and the California Penal Code against BitMEX and its founders.</p> <p>Defendants moved to dismiss. Defendants noted that the District Court had already dismissed a related case, <i>BMA v. HDR Global Trading Ltd.</i>, No. 20-cv-3345 on grounds including that plaintiff failed to allege with particularity the existence of any misrepresentations. Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Diamond Fortress Tech. v. Everid, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/6/2021	Del. Ch. Ct.	No. N21C-05-048
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
In order granting damages after a default judgment , Delaware Chancery Court treated cryptocurrency damages like securities damages, by taking cryptocurrency values off Coinmarketcap.com, and using the “New York Rule” (highest intermediate damages within a reasonable time after the wrong).		

Filing / Order		
Richard Burton v. Hayden Adams		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/24/2021	Supreme Court of the State of New York, Kings County	50967/2021
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; quasi-contract/unjust enrichment; quasi-contract/quantum meruit		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleges that he provided financial and other support to Hayden Adams, the CEO and a founder of Uniswap, for the early development of Uniswap.		

Filing / Order		
Michael Ho v. Marathon Patent Group, Inc. et al		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/25/2021	C.D. Ca.	21-cv-339
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff alleged that Marathon breached its contract with him when it failed to honor the compensation agreement between the parties for acting as a consultant to secure an energy agreement for a bitcoin mining operation. On July 18, 2024, a jury found defendant liable for almost \$139 million for circumventing plaintiff and working directly with the energy company that plaintiff had sourced for defendant in his capacity as a consultant.		

Filing / Order		
SolidX Management LLC; Vaneck SolidX Bitcoin Trust v. Vaneck Securities Corporation et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/12/2021	Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York	650223/2021
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; constructive trust		

Filing / Order		
Tetragon Financial Group Limited v. Ripple Labs Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/7/2021	Court of Chancery, Delaware	C.A. No. 2021-0007
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Specific performance; injunctive relief.		

Filing / Order		
Sandoval v. Coinbase, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/30/2020	N.D. Cal.	20-cv-9420
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Class Action – violation of Unfair Competition Law		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed the action before Coinbase was served.		

Filing / Order		
Brad Mills v. Rishi Madhok, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/16/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-9597 (LAK)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5; Exchange Act § 15; breach of contract; unjust enrichment; fraud; aiding and abetting; conversion; breach of fiduciary duty.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Parties stipulated to a voluntarily dismissal.		

Filing / Order		
An v. GTV Media Group Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/18/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-6555 (MKV)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 12(a)(1) and 15(a); Washington Securities Act.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Parties settled the action.		

Filing / Order		
Middleton, et ano. v. T-Mobile US, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/21/2020	E.D.N.Y.	20-cv-3276
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Violation of Federal Communications Act; negligence; violation of the NY Consumer Protection Act; negligent hiring, retention and supervision; negligent infliction of emotional distress; gross negligence.		

Filing / Order		
Harper v. IRS, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/15/2020	D.N.H. / First Circuit Court of Appeals	20-cv-771
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fourth Amendment (unlawful search and seizure of plaintiff's private financial information); violation of Fifth Amendment (violation of plaintiff's due process protections in connection with seizure); 15 U.S.C. § 7609(f) (declaratory action in connection with unlawful John Doe subpoena to obtain plaintiff's private financial records).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiff brought a claim against both Coinbase and the IRS alleging that the defendants violated his Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights after the IRS requested financial records from Coinbase concerning bitcoin holders, and, after receiving a court order, Coinbase complied and turned over to the IRS such records. Plaintiff requested an injunction requiring the IRS to destroy his Coinbase records declaring the issuance of his records to the IRS unconstitutional.</p> <p>On May 30, 2023, the court granted defendants motion to dismiss on the grounds that IRS's actions fell within the broad latitude afforded to it by congress to issue summonses to pursue unpaid taxes and that plaintiff had not shown that his Fourth or Fifth Amendment rights had been violated. On July 10, 2023, plaintiff failed a notice of appeal.</p> <p>On September 24, 2023, the First Circuit dismissed plaintiff's appeal, holding that because plaintiff lacked a reasonable expectation of privacy in his Coinbase account and because the records at issue were not his property, neither his Fourth nor Fifth Amendment rights had been violated. The court further noted that the IRS's summons was reasonable and that plaintiff had been afforded adequate process.</p>		

Filing / Order		
BlockCrushr Inc. v. ConsenSys Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/14/2020	E.D.N.Y.	20-cv-3134 (FB) (MMH)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Misappropriation of trade secrets, breach of contract		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
BlockCrushr alleges that ConsenSys and related entities misappropriated BlockCrushr's trade secrets for a recurring payment system on the Ethereum blockchain, and ConsenSys launched a purportedly identical product before BlockCrushr launched its product. The parties settled after mediation.		

Filing / Order		
Notestein, et al. v. Bittrex		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/16/2020	W.D. Va.	20-cv-342
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Injunctive relief; breach of bailment; conversion; injury to business or trade.		

Filing / Order		
Nowak v. Xapo, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/1/2020	N.D. Cal.	20-cv-3643
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Cal. Penal Code §496; Computer Fraud and Abuse Act (18 U.S.C. §1030(a)(4)); Cal. Penal Code §502.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed action.		

Filing / Order		
Crypto Assets Opportunity Fund LLC and Johnny Hong, individually and on behalf of those similarly situated v. Block One et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/18/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-3829
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1); Securities Act § 12(a)(2); Securities Act § 15; Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20(a).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Settled for \$27.5 million.		

Filing / Order		
BMA LLC v. HDR Global Trading Limited et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/16/2020	N.D. Cal.	20-cv-3345 (WHO)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1962(c) and § 1962(d); CEA §§ 6 & 22 (Market Manipulation); CEA § 2 (Principal Agent Liability).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
After District Court dismissed the action, the case is now on appeal to the Ninth Circuit. <i>Rel. Sorokin v. HDR Global Trading Ltd.</i> , 21-cv-3576 (WHO) (N.D. Cal.). Certain of the plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed.		

Filing / Order		
Messieh and Lee, individually and on behalf of those similarly situated v. HDR Global Trading, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/23/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-3232
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 6, 22 (Market Manipulation); CEA § 2 (Principal Agent Liability); CEA §§ 13, 22 (Aiding & Abetting).		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Decision denying Defendant Belo's Motion to Dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. Case concerns allegation that BitMex, owned by HDR, had an Insider Trading Desk that used its access to customer accounts to not only trade against customers but also block customers' abilities to trade in their own accounts.		

Filing / Order		
Ripple Labs, Inc. and Garlinghouse v. YouTube, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/21/2020	N.D. Cal	20-cv-2747 (LB)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Trademark infringement under the Lanham Act; Violation of CA's statutory and common law right of publicity; Violation of CA's unfair competition law.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Case settled.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Johnson v. Maker Ecosystem Growth Holdings, Inc., et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/14/2020	N.D. Cal.	20-cv-2569 (MMC)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Negligence; intentional misrepresentation; negligent misrepresentation.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order granting defendants' motion to compel arbitration; vacating hearing; closing case pending arbitration. On February 9, 2024, the court approved the parties' settlement agreement of \$1,159,966.09 paid by defendants.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Compound Labs, Inc. v. Alex Mack, Inc.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/8/2020	N.D. Cal.	20-cv-2370 (EMC)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Lanham Act § 43(a); Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act; common law unfair competition; trademark infringement; CA Business and Professions Code.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Case settled.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Clifford, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. Status Research & Development GMBH, et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/3/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-2815
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1); 815 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/13.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Case voluntarily dismissed (April 29, 2021).		

Filing / Order		
<i>Williams, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. Quantstamp, Inc. et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/3/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-2813; 20-cv-2814
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1); Tex. Rev. Civ. Stat. art. 581-33.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Case voluntarily dismissed (April 29, 2021).		

Filing / Order		
Clifford, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. Kaydex Pte. Ltd.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/3/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-2812
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1); 815 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/13.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Case voluntarily dismissed (April 29, 2021).		

Filing / Order		
Zhang, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. Civic Technologies, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/3/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-2811
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1); 815 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/13.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Case voluntarily dismissed (April 29, 2021).		

Filing / Order		
Zhang, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. BProtocol Foundation et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/3/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-2810
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1); N.J. Stat. Ann. § 49:3-71.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Case dismissed on motion to dismiss on standing and personal jurisdiction (February 22, 2021).		

Filing / Order		
Williams and Zhang, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. Block.One, Blumer and Larimer		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/3/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-2809
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1); N.J. Stat. Ann. § 49:3-71; Tex. Rev. Civ. Stat. art. 581-33.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
On August 15, 2022, the District Court denied a proposed \$27.5 million settlement and denied a proposed settlement class with lead plaintiff as class representative. The Judge concluded that the investor class is conflicted because some purchases are subject to U.S. laws and others are not.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Honig v. Riot Blockchain, Inc.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/3/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-2808 (NRB)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Declaratory judgment; breach of contract.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
District Court dismissed on motion to dismiss on grounds that Riot had no duty to indemnify.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Clifford v. Bibox Group Holdings Ltd., et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/3/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-2807
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1); Exchange Act §§ 5, 29(b); Exchange Act §§ 15(a)(1), 29(b); Exchange Act § 20; 815 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/13.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Case dismissed on motion to dismiss on standing and statute of limitations (April 16, 2021). Motion for reconsideration denied.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Williams, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. KuCoin, et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/3/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-2806 (GBD) (RWL)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1); Exchange Act §§ 5, 29(b); Exchange Act §§ 15(a)(1) and 29(b); Exchange Act § 20; Tex. Rev. Civ. Stat. art. 581-33.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Defendants have not appeared; clerk’s certificate of default issued. R&R issued recommending certification of class of TOMO token purchasers on the KuCoin exchange; District Court adopted the decision. Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed because “given the limited trading volume for TOMO on KuCoin and the anticipated costs associated with enforcing a judgment against KuCoin, Plaintiff’s counsel has determined that it would not be economical for the Class to proceed with seeking a default judgment solely as to losses in the TOMO token.”		

Filing / Order		
Williams and Zhang, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. HDR Global Trading Limited, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/3/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-2805
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA §§ 6 and 22; CEA § 2(a)(1)(B); CEA §§ 13 and 22(a)(1); Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1); Exchange Act §§ 5, 6, 29(b); Exchange Act §§ 15(a)(1) and 29(b); Exchange Act § 20; N.J. Stat. Ann. § 49:3-71; Tex. Rev. Civ. Stat. art. 581-33.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Case voluntarily dismissed (April 28, 2021).		

Filing / Order		
Clifford, et al. v. Tron Foundation, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/3/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-2804 (VSB)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1)-(2); 815 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/13; Tex. Rev. Civ. Stat. art. 581-33.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Plaintiffs brought an action against Defendants in connection with its failure to register the TRX token as a security in alleged failure of state and federal laws.		
On October 23, 2024, the defendants' motion to dismiss was denied as to the 12(a)(1) (unregistered sale of securities) and Blue Sky claims, but granted as to the 12(a)(2) claim (sale of securities by means of untrue prospectus).		

Filing / Order		
Lee v. Binance		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/3/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-2803 (ALC)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1); Exchange Act §§ 5, 29(b); Exchange Act §§ 15(a)(1), 29(b); Exchange Act § 20; Tex. Rev. Civ. Stat. art. 581-33.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
The District Court dismissed the action on statute of limitation grounds. Further, the District Court found that the US securities law did not apply because Binance was not a domestic exchange.		

Filing / Order		
Q3 Investments Recovery Vehicle, LLC v. Seijas, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/1/2020	Circuit Court of Thirteenth Judicial Circuit in Hillsborough County, Florida	20-ca-002402
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud; conspiracy to commit fraud; negligent misrepresentation; unjust enrichment; breach of fiduciary duty; negligence; vicarious liability.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order granting plaintiff's motion for remand.		

Filing / Order		
Dos Bowies, LP, et al. v. Ackerman, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/20/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-2479 (LGS)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; fraudulent inducement; breach of fiduciary duty; civil conspiracy to commit fraud; negligence; conversion; unjust enrichment.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Certain defendants defaulted; case dismissed against James Seijas and Quan Tran on motion to dismiss. Tran is in bankruptcy, staying against amendment against him.		

Filing / Order		
Ephraim Atwal v. NortonLifeLock, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/13/20	W.D.N.Y.	20-cv-449
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Declaratory judgment; breach of contract.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
Plaintiff brings suit against his insurer for allegedly failing to issue payment for Stolen Funds Loss and Stolen Identity Loss under his insurance policy after Plaintiff's EOS tokens were stolen.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Simmons v. Ripple Labs, Inc. et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/12/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-2236 (ER)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12, and 15.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Case transferred to N.D. Cal, No. 20-cv-5127, where it was consolidated in <i>Zakinov v. Ripple Labs</i> , No. 18-cv- 6753.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Abdullah v. Canaan, Inc., et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/6/2020	Supreme Court for the State of New York, County of New York	651515/2020
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 11, and 15.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Lemieux v. Canaan Inc. et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/4/2020	D. Or.	20-cv-356
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 11, 12(a)(2), and 15.		

Filing / Order		
<i>GSR Markets, Ltd. and Paul Rogers v. Fr8 Network, Inc., et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/16/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-440
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; breach of contract; unjust enrichment; common law fraud.		

Filing / Order		
Farbus, individually and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated v. iFinex Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/9/2020	S.D.N.Y	20-cv-211
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 2); CEA § 5 (7 U.S.C. § 7); F § 6 (7 U.S.C. § 9); CEA § 22 (7 U.S.C. § 25); CEA § 2 (7 U.S.C. § 2); CEA § 22(a)(1) (7 U.S.C. § 25)(a)(1)); RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1962(c)); unjust enrichment.		

Filing / Order		
Young, Kurtz, and Crystal, individually and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated v. iFinex Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/8/2020	S.D.N.Y.	20-cv-169
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 2); CEA § 5 (7 U.S.C. § 7); CEA § 6 (7 U.S.C. § 9); CEA § 22 (7 U.S.C. § 25); CEA § 2 (7 U.S.C. § 2); CEA § 22(a)(1) (7 U.S.C. § 25)(a)(1)); RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1962(c)); unjust enrichment.		

Filing / Order		
Runyon v. Payward, Inc. d/b/a Kraken, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/26/2019	Superior Court of California, San Francisco County	CGR-19-581099
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Discrimination, failure to engage in the interactive process, failure to accommodate, retaliation, failure to prevent harassment and retaliation, wrongful termination, all in violation of Cal. Gov't Code § 12940 <i>et seq.</i> ; breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing; wrongful termination in violation of Labor Code § 1102.5; wrongful termination in violation of public policy; intentional infliction of emotional distress.		

Filing / Order		
Young and Kurtz v. iFinex Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/22/2019	W.D. Wa	19-cv-1902
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 2); CEA § 5 (7 U.S.C. § 7); CEA § 6 (7 U.S.C. § 9); CEA § 22 (7 U.S.C. § 25); CEA § 2 (7 U.S.C. § 2); CEA § 22(a)(1) (7 U.S.C. § 25)(a)(1)); RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1962(c)); unjust enrichment.		

Filing / Order		
James et al. v. Valo et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/4/2019	E.D. Tex.	19-cv-801
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and (c); Securities Act § 12(a); Computer Fraud and Abuse Act (18 U.S.C. § 1030); conversion; unjust enrichment; product liability.		

Filing / Order		
Bitcoin Manipulation Abatement LLC v. FTX Trading LTD, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/2/2019	N.D. Cal.	19-cv-7245
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Conspiracy to participate and participation in racketeering activity (18 U.S.C. §§ 1962(d) and (c)); use of deceptive or manipulative device (7 U.S.C. §§ 9(1)); price manipulation (7 U.S.C. §§ 9(3) and 13(a)(2)); aiding and abetting price manipulation (7 U.S.C. § 25(a)(1); Cal Corp. Code § 29536, negligence, fraud, civil conspiracy, unfair business practices (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.; unjust enrichment (restitution); constructive trust and accounting.		

Filing / Order		
In re Application of iFinex Inc. for the Issuance of a Subpoena for the Taking of a Deposition and the Production of Documents Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1782		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/21/2019	C.D. Cal	19-mc-00021
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Application to Conduct Discovery pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1782.		

Filing / Order		
Shapiro v. AT&T Mobility, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/17/2019	C.D. Cal.	19-cv-8972
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Violations of Federal Communications Act; Cal. Unfair Competition Law under the unlawful, unfair and fraudulent prongs; Cal. Constitutional right to privacy; negligence; negligent supervision and entrustment; Cal. Consumers Legal Remedies Act; Computer Fraud and Abuse Act.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order granting in part and denying in part Defendant's motion to dismiss.		

Filing / Order		
Finco Services Inc. v. Facebook Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/10/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-9410
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Section 32(1)(a) of the Lanham Act (Infringement); Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act (unfair competition and false designation of origin); common law trademark infringement and unfair competition; breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing.		

Filing / Order		
Crypto Asset Fund, LLC, et al. v. MedCredits, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/27/2019	S.D. Cal	19-cv-1869
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 12(a)(2); Securities Act § 15; Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20(a); Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 25504, 25401, 17200 <i>et seq.</i> ; breach of contract; unjust enrichment; conversion; promissory estoppel; fraud; negligent misrepresentation; interference with contractual relations.		

Filing / Order		
Leibowitz, et al. v. iFinex Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/6/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-9236
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CEA § 6(c)(1), Regulation 180.1(a); CEA § 2(a)(1), CEA § 22(a)(1), Sherman Act § 2; RICO 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c); Fraud; NY GBL § 349; permanent injunctive relief.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Consolidated Class Action Complaint.		

Filing / Order		
Anaykin and Bondarev v. Evdokimov and Cryptonomics Capital		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/20/2019	C.D. Cal	19-cv-8165
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20; Securities Act § 5(a) and 12(a)(1); Securities Act § 15; common law fraud.		

Filing / Order		
Hall, individually and derivatively on behalf of Veritaseum, Inc. v. Middleton et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/30/2019	Supreme Court of New York, County of New York	655003/2019
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty; Violation of N.Y. Bus. Corp. Law § 720; breach of contract; unjust enrichment; fraud; accounting.		

Filing / Order		
Ferrie v. Woodford Research LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/28/2019	W.D. Wash	19-cv-5798
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); breach of contract; fraudulent misrepresentation; negligent misrepresentation; fraudulent concealment; unjust enrichment; alter ego liability; civil conspiracy.		

Filing / Order		
Invictus Hyperion v. Gamedex Limited		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/28/2019	D. Md.	19-cv-2489
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); breach of contract; fraudulent misrepresentation; negligent misrepresentation; fraudulent concealment; unjust enrichment; breach of the implied duty of good faith and fair dealing; alter ego liability; civil conspiracy.		

Filing / Order		
Ethereum Ventures, LLC v. Chet Mining Co LLC and Chet Stojanovich		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/26/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-7949
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of Contract; Fraud; Conversion; N.Y. U.C.C. §§ 2-711, 2-713, 2-715, 2-716.		

Filing / Order		
Blockchain Capital, LLC v. Blockchain Capital Limited and Gavin Brown		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/21/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-7847
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Section 32(1)(a) of the Lanham Act (Infringement); Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act (Unfair Competition); common law trademark infringement; unfair competition; trademark infringement under N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law §360-K; dilution under N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law §360-L.		

Filing / Order		
Oracle Corporation et al v. Crypto Oracle, LLC et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/15/2019	N.D.Ca	19-cv-4900
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Section 32(1)(a) of the Lanham Act (infringement); Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act (unfair competition); Section 43(c) of the Lanham Act (dilution under federal law); 15 U.S.C. § 1125(d) (bad faith registration and use of domain names); Trademark Infringement under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 14200 and 17200 <i>et seq.</i> ; trademark dilution under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247; trademark infringement under CA common law.		

Filing / Order		
Crypto Asset Fund, LLC v. Opskins Group, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/12/2019	C.D.Ca	19-cv-6983
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 12(a)(2); Securities Act § 15; Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20(a); Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 <i>et seq.</i> ; breach of contract; breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing; unjust enrichment; conversion; promissory estoppel; fraud; negligent misrepresentation.		

Filing / Order		
White v. Sharabati		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/9/2019	New York State Supreme Court	157792/2019
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Replevin; CAFA (18 USC § 1030); fraud; conversion; unjust enrichment; declaratory relief.		

Filing / Order		
Merkamerica, Inc. v. Glover, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/16/2019	C.D.Cal.	19-cv-6111
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20; Cal. Corp. Code § 25401; Cal. Corp. Code § 25504 and 25504.1; fraud; conspiracy to defraud; negligent misrepresentation; rescission; quantum meruit; Cal. Business & Professions § 17200; implied contract; equitable restitution.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order denying motion to dismiss.		

Filing / Order		
SG Family Investments LLC et al. v. Argyle Coin LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/12/2019	S.D.FI.	19-cv-22899
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a) and (c); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 17(a)(1), (2) and (3); Florida securities law violations.		

Filing / Order		
Invictus Hyperion v. Menlo, Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/1/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-6146
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5(a) and (c); breach of contract; fraudulent misrepresentation; negligent misrepresentation; fraudulent concealment; breach of duty of good faith and fair dealing; alter ego liability; civil conspiracy.		

Filing / Order		
Anuwave LLC v. Coinbase		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/27/2019	D. Del.	19-cv-1226
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Patent Infringement.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Notice of Voluntary Dismissal with Prejudice.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Grablis, et al. v. OneCoin Ltd., et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/7/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-4074
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 12(a); Securities Act § 15(a); breach of contract; unjust enrichment; fraudulent inducement; fraudulent misrepresentation; negligent misrepresentation; conversion; civil conspiracy.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Lightwire, LLC v. Zerocoin Electric Coin Company, LLC</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/3/2019	D. Colo.	19-cv-1292
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Patent Infringement		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<i>Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice</i>		

Filing / Order		
<i>Alm, et al. v. Spence, et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/3/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-4005
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud; negligent misrepresentation; breach of fiduciary duty; breach of contract; conversion; unjust enrichment; accounting.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Polites v. Alchemy Finance, Inc., et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/30/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-3862
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; fraudulent misrepresentation; negligent misrepresentation; fraudulent concealment; unjust enrichment; breach of implied duty of good faith & fair dealing; RICO Sections 1962(a), (b), (c) and (d); civil conspiracy; civil aiding & abetting.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<i>Notice of Voluntary Dismissal with Prejudice.</i>		

Filing / Order		
Fasulo v. Xtrade Digital Assets Inc., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/26/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-3741
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5 (failure to comply with Regulation D); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20(A) (control person liability); Securities Act §§ 5 and 12(a)(1) (unregistered securities); Securities Act § 15; fraud; restraining order.		

Filing / Order		
Hunichen v. Atonomi LLC et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/25/2019	W.D. Wa	19-cv-615
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Washington Securities Act, RCW 21.20.430.		

Filing / Order		
Silverman v. Payward, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/4/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-2997
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; quantum meruit; unjust enrichment.		

Filing / Order		
GSR Markets Limited v. Diana McDonald, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/1/2019	N.D. Ga	19-cv-1005
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
TRO/injunction; fraud; breach of contract; breach of fiduciary duty; negligence; conspiracy; conversion; aiding and abetting (fraud, fiduciary duty, conversion); unjust enrichment; accounting.		

Filing / Order		
Ball and Toth v. DG Rollins, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/18/2019	D. Ore	19-cv-242
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Declaratory judgment – successor liability; fraudulent transfer (ORS Ch. 95, et seq.); fraudulent transfer, (O.R.S. § 95.230, et seq.); piercing the corporate veil; deceit by misrepresentation & concealment; civil conspiracy.		

Filing / Order		
Garrison and Garrison v. Ringgold et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/4/2019	S.D. Cal	19-cv-244
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; California Corporate Securities Law (Cal. Corp. Code §§ 25000 et seq.); Financial Abuse of an Elder (Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §§15610).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Defendant's Motion to Dismiss with Leave to Amend. Order Granting Plaintiffs/Counterdefendants' Motion to Dismiss Counterclaim as Unopposed and Denying Plaintiffs/Counterdefendants' Request for Attorney's Fees.		

Filing / Order		
Lijun Sun v. Blue Ocean Capital Group, Inc. et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/1/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-1033
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20(a); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c) ; Securities Act § 12(a)(1); Securities Act § 15(a); Fraud.		

Filing / Order		
Mark Owen, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated v. Elastos Foundation et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/31/2019	Supreme Court of New York, County of New York	650628/2019
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and (c); Securities Act § 12(a)(1); Securities Act § 15(a).		

Filing / Order		
ZG Top Technology Co., Lt. v. John Doe		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/22/2019	W.D.Wa	19-cv-92
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Computer Fraud and Abuse Act (18 U.S.C. § 1030 et seq.); Washington Cybercrime Act (RCW 9A.90.050 and RCW 9A.90.100); conversion.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Wu, et al. v. Bitfloor, Inc., et ano.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/9/2019	S.D.N.Y.	19-cv-238
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Section 6(c)(1) of the Commodity Exchange Act (“CEA”) and Regulation 180.1(a); larceny by conversion (NY Penal Law 155); fraudulent misrepresentation; breach of fiduciary duty; loss of opportunity; negligent misrepresentation; unjust enrichment; bailment and/or constructive trust.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order granting in part and denying in part Defendant’s motion to dismiss.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Emerging Markets Intrinsic Cayman, Ltd., et al. v. Kadena LLC, et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/4/2019	Supreme Court of New York, County of Kings	500262/2019
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; duty of good faith and fair dealing; declaratory judgment; fraud; quantum meruit.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Factset Research Systems Inc. v. CG Blockchain, Inc.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/3/2019	Supreme Court of New York, County of New York	650027/2019
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; unjust enrichment.		

Filing / Order		
<i>Fabian, individually and on behalf of other similarly situated, v. Nano f/k/a Railblocks f/k/a Hieusys, LLC et al.</i>		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/3/2019	N.D. Cal.	19-cv-54
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 12(a)(1); Securities Act § 15(a); breach of contract; breach of fiduciary duty; aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty; fraud; negligent misrepresentation; constructive fraud; unjust enrichment; civil conspiracy.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<i>Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Motion to Dismiss.</i>		

Filing / Order		
Zakinov v. Ripple Labs et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/7/2018	N.D. Cal.	18-cv-6753 (PJH)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 5, 12(a)(1), 15; California Corp. Code § 25110, 25503, 25401, 25504; false advertising; unfair competition (UCL § 17200)		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
<p>Plaintiffs alleged securities law violations regarding XRP, an alleged unregistered security.</p> <p>On July 20, 2024, the court issued an order granting in part defendant's motion for summary judgment. The court found that the federal securities claims should be dismissed on the grounds that XRP was offered to the public more than three years before the lawsuit was brought and thus was not within the statute of limitations. It also found that the state securities registration claims should be dismissed on the grounds that class members were not in privity with defendants. However, the court found that the issue of whether a named defendant could be liable for misleading statements hinged on a finding that XRP was a security and that such a claim would need to be litigated at trial.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Adler v. Payward, Inc. d/b/a Kraken		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/5/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-8100 (PAC) (GWG)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of Contract; Breach of Good Faith and Fair Dealing; Statutory Damages for Failure to Pay Sales Commissions; New York Labor Law and New York Wage Theft Prevention Act.		

Filing / Order		
Terpin v. Truglia, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/28/2018	Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles	18STCV09875
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Conversion; money had and received; Penal code § 502 (unauthorized access of computers); Section 1962(c) of the RICO Act; imposition of constructive trust.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Notice of Entry of Judgment against Defendant Truglia.		

Filing / Order		
Oto, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated v. NVIDIA Corp., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/28/2018	N.D.Cal.	18-cv-7783
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20(a).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Consolidated with <i>In re NVIDIA Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 18-cv-7669 (HSG) (N.D. Cal), dismissed on motion to dismiss.		

Filing / Order		
Corram Holdings, LLC v. Edith A. Pardo Mehler a/k/a Edith A. Pardo et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/27/2018	Supreme Court of New York, County of New York	162155/2018
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; fraud; violation of Judiciary Law § 487; injunctive relief; order of attachment; piercing the corporate veil.		

Filing / Order		
Lageman, et al. v. Spence, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/26/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-12218
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraudulent inducement; breach of fiduciary duty; fraudulent misrepresentation; negligent misrepresentation; rescission; unjust enrichment; conversion; civil conspiracy; accounting; imposition of a constructive trust.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment against Spence granted; Spence ordered to pay \$2,989,200.		

Filing / Order		
Blocktree Props., LLC et al. v. Pub. Utility Dist. No. 2 of Grant Cty. Wash		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/19/2018	E.D.Wa	18-cv-390
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Injunctive relief, a declaratory judgment, and damages under the Commerce Clause, the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment as applied to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 & 1988, the Federal Power Act, RCW Title 54, and the Constitution of the State of Washington.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
District Court dismissed the case on motion for summary judgment.		

Filing / Order		
Schafer, et al. v. Graf, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/14/2018	N.D. Ill.	18-cv-8236
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; constructive fraud; conversion; fraud and misrepresentation in the offer and sale of securities; Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5.		

Filing / Order		
Auctus Fund, LLC, et ano. v. Sunstock, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/13/2018	D. Mass.	18-cv-12568
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §12(a)(2); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Mass. Uniform Securities Act §§ 101; breach of contract; breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; unjust enrichment; breach of fiduciary duty; fraud & deceit; negligent misrepresentation; Mass. Consumer Protection Act (M.G.L. c. 93A §§ 2 & 11).		

Filing / Order		
United American Corp. v. Bitmain, Inc. et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/6/2018	S.D. Fla.	18-cv-25106
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act; negligent misrepresentation; negligence; equitable estoppel; unjust enrichment; conversion; injunctive relief.		

Filing / Order		
818Computer, Inc. v. Sentinel Insurance Company, Ltd., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/5/2018	C.D. Cal.	19-cv-9
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; violation of business and professional code Section § 17200, et seq., Negligent Misrepresentation.		

Filing / Order		
Coinmint, LLC v. Main Mill Street Investments, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/30/2018	N.D.N.Y.	18-cv-1404
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraudulent inducement; Breach of contract.		

Filing / Order		
Blockchain Mining Supply and Services Ltd., v. Super Crypto Mining, Inc., and DPW Holdings, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/28/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-11099
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; promissory estoppel.		

Filing / Order		
Patterson et al. v. Budbo, Inc. et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/20/2018	W.D. Tex.	18-cv-998
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty & conversion; common law fraud; and securities fraud in violation of Rule 10b-5; Ultra Vires Acts (§124(1) of the Delaware Corporation Law).		

Filing / Order		
Galavis v. Bank of America and Visa		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/8/2018	C.D. Cal.	18-cv-9490
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. § 1601 (Truth in Lending Act); breach of contract; tortious interference; declaratory judgment.		

Filing / Order		
Loong Chee Min et ano v. Longfin Corp. et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/14/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-10635
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §12(a)(2); Securities Act §15(a); Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20(a); Fraud.		

Filing / Order		
Cryplex, Inc. v. Bitmain Technologies Holding Company		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/8/2018	Santa Clara County Superior Courts, California	18-cv-337836
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
breach of contract (nondisclosure agreement); misappropriation of trade secrets; breach of contract (MOU); & violation of California's unfair competition law (UCL).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order overruling the demurrer to the first, second and third causes of action, and sustaining with 10 days leave to amend the demurrer to the fourth cause of action.		

Filing / Order		
Smoak v. Bitcoin Market, LLC, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/7/2018	W.D.Ok.	18-cv-1096-G
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Second Amended Complaint.		

Filing / Order		
Bitmain v. Doe		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/7/2018	W.D.Wa.	18-cv-1626
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CFAA, 18 U.S.C. § 1030(a)(5)(A)(ii), (iii) (unauthorized access); Washington Cybercrime Act, CWA § 9A.90.040 (computer trespass in the second degree); Washington Cybercrime Act, CWA § 9A.90.100 (electronic data theft); conversion.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Plaintiff's Voluntary Notice of Dismissal Without Prejudice.		

Filing / Order		
Beranger v. Harris et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/1/2018	N.D. Ga	18-cv-5054
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §12(a); Securities Act §15(a); Control Person Liability under the Georgia Uniform Securities Act.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order granting in part, and denying in part Defendants' motion to dismiss. First Amended Complaint.		

Filing / Order		
Weathersbee v. Meenavalli et al. (Longfin)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/1/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-10182
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Derivative complaint for breach of fiduciary duties; unjust enrichment; abuse of control; corporate waste.		

Filing / Order		
Fintz v. O'Rourke (Riot Blockchain)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/22/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-9640
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Derivative complaint for breach of fiduciary duties; unjust enrichment; corporate waste.		

Filing / Order		
Clarity LLC v. CG Blockchain, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/19/2018	Supreme Court of New York, County of New York	655211/2018
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; unjust enrichment; account stated.		

Filing / Order		
[Confidential T-Mobile Customer] v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/11/2018	American Arbitration Association	01-18-0003-7835
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Declaratory judgment (unenforceability of T-Mobile consumer agreement as unconscionable); breach of Fed. Comm. Act (47 U.S.C. §§ 206.222) (“FCA”); breach of implementing regs. of FCA (47 U.S.C. § 64.2001 et seq.); negligence; negligent misrepresentation; negligent training & supervision; breach of contract; breach of implied contract; breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing.		

Filing / Order		
[Confidential AT&T Customer] v. AT&T, Inc., AT&T Mobility, LLC a/k/a AT&T Wireless		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/11/2018	American Arbitration Association	01-18-0003-7841
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Declaratory judgment (unenforceability of AT&T consumer agreement as unconscionable); breach of Fed. Comm. Act (47 U.S.C. §§ 206.222) (“FCA”); breach of implementing regs. of FCA (47 U.S.C. § 64.2001 et seq.); negligence; negligent misrepresentation; negligent training & supervision; breach of contract; breach of implied contract; breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing.		

Filing / Order		
Wanlin Wang, Bibox Grou Holdings, Ltd. v. Wei Liu		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/10/2018	Supreme Court of New York, County of New York	655050/2018
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud; conversion; unjust enrichment; breach of contract; unfair competition; faithless servant; tortious interference; constructive trust; declaratory relief; permanent injunction.		

Filing / Order		
Klingberg v. MGT Capital Investments et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/28/2018	D.N.J.	18-cv-14380
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 9(a) and (f); Exchange Act § 20(a).		

Filing / Order		
Blockchain Luxembourg S.A. v. Paymium, SAS		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/20/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-8612
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Trademark infringement; unfair competition; false advertising; deceptive acts and practices; injury to business reputation and dilution; misappropriation.		

Filing / Order		
Rothesay Ltd., individually and derivatively on behalf of The Iconic Deo Volente Corp. v. Patrick Damien O'Brien et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/12/2018	Del. Ch. Ct.	2018-0674
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty (usurping corporate opportunity and self-dealing); aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty; intentional interference with business relations; civil conspiracy; unjust enrichment.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
This action has settled.		

Filing / Order		
Winklevoss Capital Fund, LLC v. Shrem		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/11/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-8250
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty; fraud; constructive trust; accounting		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
<p>Order of prejudgment attachment.</p> <p>Order denying Plaintiff's motion to confirm order of attachment.</p> <p>Order denying Defendant's motions to dismiss and to strike.</p>		

Filing / Order		
Martinangeli v. Akerman, LLP		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/4/2018	S.D.Fla.	18-cv-23607
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraudulent inducement; negligent misrepresentations; negligent retention and supervision; constructive trust/disgorgement.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order dismissing case.		

Filing / Order		
John Hastings, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated v. Unikrn, Inc., a Delaware Corporation; Unikrn Bermuda, Ltd, a Bermuda corporation; Rahul Sood, an individual, Karl Flores, an individual, and DOES 1-25		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/13/2018	Superior Court of Washington for King County	18-2-20306-6
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5; Securities Act § 12(a)(1); Securities Act § 15.		

Filing / Order		
Michael Terpin v. AT&T INC.; AT&T Mobility, LLC; and DOES 1-25		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/15/2018	C.D.Ca	18-cv-6975
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Declaratory relief: Unenforceability of consumer agreement as unconscionable and contrary to public policy; Federal Communications Act 47 U.S.C. §§ 206, 222 (Unauthorized disclosure of customer confidential proprietary information and proprietary network information); Cal. Penal Code § 502 <i>et seq.</i> (Assisting unlawful access to computer); Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 <i>et seq.</i> (Unlawful business practice); Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 <i>et seq.</i> (Fraudulent business practice); Cal. Civ. Code § 1750 <i>et seq.</i> (CA Consumer Legal Remedies Act); Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1709, 1710 (Deceit by concealment); Misrepresentation; Negligence; Negligent supervision and training; Negligent hiring; Breach of contract; Breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order granting, in part, and denying, in part, Defendants' motion to dismiss and denying Defendants' motion to strike (7/19/2019).		
Order granting, in part, and denying, in part, Defendant's motion to dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (2/24/2020).		
On March 28, 2023, the Court granted AT&T's motion for summary judgment.		

Filing / Order		
Johnsen v. Kirtz et al		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/2/2018	S.D.Fla.	18-cv-81019
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Securities Act § 5; Texas Securities Act; Florida fraudulent transfer.		

Filing / Order		
Greenwald v. Ripple Labs, Inc		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/8/2018	N.D.Ca	18-cv-4790
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5; Securities Act § 12(a)(1); Securities Act § 15.		

Filing / Order		
Gladius Network LLC v. Krypton Blockchain Holdings Ltd.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/23/2018	D.D.C.	18-cv-1713
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Declaratory judgment; misrepresentation.		

Filing / Order		
BDI Capital, LLC v. Bulbul Investments LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/16/2018	N.D. Ga	18-cv-3392
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud by deceptive device or contrivance; Theft by Conversion; Fraudulent Misrepresentation; Negligent Misrepresentation; Unjust Enrichment; Attorneys' Fees and Expenses.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order on Motion for Summary Judgment.		

Filing / Order		
Ox Labs, Inc. v. Bitpay, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/6/2018	C.D. Cal.	18-cv-5934
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Conversion; unjust enrichment.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order on Defendant's motion for JMOL and Plaintiff's Pretrial Dispositive Motion (both granted in part, denied in part).		

Filing / Order		
Srinivasan v. Kenna, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
7/2/2018	N.D. Cal.	18-cv-3977
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of warranty; Intentional misrepresentation; Negligent misrepresentation; Conversion; Violation of CA. Unfair Competition Act.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order granting defendants' motion to dismiss. Order granting defendants' motion to dismiss second amended complaint.		

Filing / Order		
Joseph Bents, derivatively on behalf of Longfin Corp. v. Venkat S Meenavalli; Vivek K Ratakonda; Ghanshyam Dass; Yogesh Patel; Linda M Gaddi; David Nichols; John Parker; Henry Wang; Longfin Corp.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/26/2018	Supreme Court of New York, County of New York	653216/2018
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty; Unjust enrichment; Abuse of control; Gross mismanagement; Waste of corporate assets.		

Filing / Order		
Balestra v. Cloud With Me LTD., Gilad Somjen, and Asaf Zamir		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/19/2018	W.D. Pa.	05-mc-02025
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 12(a)(1); Securities Act § 15(a).		

Filing / Order		
Solis v. Latium Network, Inc. et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/6/2018	D.N.J.	18-cv-10255
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a); Securities Act § 15(a).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Denied.		

Filing / Order		
Founder Starcoin, Inc. v. Launch Labs Inc. (d/b/a Axiom Zen)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/16/2018	S.D. Cal.	08-cv-972
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; trade secret misappropriation; intentional interference with prospective economic advantage; and unfair competition.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Case closed following notice of voluntary dismissal.		

Filing / Order		
Telegram Messenger Inc v. Lantah, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/11/2018	N.D. Cal.	18-cv-2811
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
False designation of origin; trademark infringement; unfair competition.		

Filing / Order		
Denke v. Citibank		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/8/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-4133
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
15 U.S.C. § 1601 (Truth in Lending Act).		

Filing / Order		
Coffey v. Ripple Labs et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/3/2018	Superior Court of California, San Francisco County (removed to N.D. Cal.)	18-cv-3286
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5, § 12(a)(1); Cal. Corp. Code § 25110, 25503 (unregistered sale of securities); Securities Act § 15; Cal. Corp. Code § 25110, 25504 (control person liability).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order denying plaintiff's motion to remand case to state court. Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice.		

Filing / Order		
Eckhardt v. State Farm Bank		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
5/2/2018	C.D. Ill.	18-cv-1180
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.), Regulation Z, breach of contract.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Motion to dismiss granted in part, denied in part.		

Filing / Order		
Chen Wei v. Longfin Corp., et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/19/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-3462
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20(a).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Dismissal without prejudice.		

Filing / Order		
Tucker v. Chase Bank USA, N.A.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/10/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-3155
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.); Regulation Z.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Decision on motion to dismiss (partially granted; partially denied).		

Filing / Order		
Squeeze, LLC v. Biricik, LLC and Cemhan Biricik		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/9/2018	Circuit Court for the Fifteenth Judicial Circuit, Palm Beach County, Florida	50-18-CA-004290-XXXX-MB
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Rescission of Agreements; Fraudulent Inducement; Conversion; Unjust Enrichment.		

Filing / Order		
Liston v. Peterson et al. (Forecast Foundation)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/9/2018	Superior Court of California, San Francisco County	CGC-18-565915
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Fraud, declaratory judgment, conspiracy to commit fraud, breach of contract, and breach of implied duty of good faith and fair dealing.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Amended complaint as of 5/10/2018.		

Filing / Order		
Miller v. Longfin Corp. et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/9/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-3121
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20(a).		

Filing / Order		
Dunleavy v. Lux Vending, LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/6/2018	S.D. Fla.	18-cv-21367
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Telephone Consumer Protection Act (47 U.S.C. § 227).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Dismissal without prejudice.		

Filing / Order		
Brola v. Nano et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/6/2018	E.D.N.Y.	18-cv-2049
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 12(a)(1) and 15; negligent misrepresentation; unjust enrichment; civil conspiracy.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Voluntary dismissal with prejudice.		

Filing / Order		
Alibaba Group Holding Ltd. v. Alibabacoin Foundation et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/2/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-2897
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Trademark infringement; unfair competition; false advertising; trademark dilution (federal and New York state).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order denying Preliminary Injunction. Opinion and Order Granting Renewed Application for Preliminary Injunction. Opinion and Order denying Defendants' motion to dismiss.		

Filing / Order		
Babiak v. Mizuho Bank, Ltd.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/28/2018	E.D. Va.	18-cv-352
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Tortious interference with contract		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order granting Defendant's motion to dismiss. Judgment dismissing case.		

Filing / Order		
Archer v. Coinbase, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/27/2018	SF City & Cty Super. Ct.	18-cv-565281
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; negligence; conversion		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Summary judgment in favor of Coinbase. Appeal from order granting summary judgment.		

Filing / Order		
Greenhouse v. Polychain Fund I LP, et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/26/2018	Del. Ch.	2018-0214
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Records request (DGCL § 220).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Stayed pending arbitrator's decision on arbitrability. Memorandum and Order granting Defendant's motion on the pleadings.		

Filing / Order		
Moss v. Giga Watt		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/19/2018	E.D. Wash.	18-cv-100; 18-cv-103
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 12(a)(1) and 15; Washington Securities Act RCW 21.20; rescission.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Consolidation Order.		

Filing / Order		
Anotek LLC v. Cryptotickets S.A.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/13/2019	D. Del.	18-cv-398
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of Contract; Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing; Unjust Enrichment.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Notice of Settlement.		

Filing / Order		
Faasse v. Coinbase, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/2/2018	N.D. Cal.	18-cv-1382
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
California's Unclaimed Property Law, Cal. Civ. Proc. Code §§ 1500, et seq.; Unlawful and Unfair Business Practices, Cal. Bus. Prof. Code §§ 17200; conversion		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Dismissed sua sponte for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Joint Stipulation of Voluntary Dismissal.		

Filing / Order		
Berk v. Coinbase, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
3/1/2018	N.D. Cal.	18-cv-1364
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
California Unfair Competition Law; negligence and negligent misrepresentation, Commodities Exchange Act		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Dismissed without prejudice (except for CEA claim, which was dismissed with prejudice). Order denying motion to compel; granting in part and denying in part motion to dismiss.		

Filing / Order		
White v. Sharabati		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/18/2018	Superior Court of the State of Delaware	N18C-02-170
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Replevin (DE common law); 11 Del. C. § 931, et seq. (Misuse of Computer System Information Act); Fraud; Conversion; Unjust Enrichment; 10 Del. C. § 6501 (Declaratory Relief).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Opinion granting Defendant's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and staying Defendant's motion for return or escrow of funds garnished under the vacated default judgment.		

Filing / Order		
Takata v. Riot Blockchain		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/17/2018	D.N.J.	18-cv-2293
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20(a).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Case dismissed.		

Filing / Order		
Kleiman v. Wright		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/14/2018	S.D. Fl.	18-cv-80176
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Conversion; misappropriation; replevin; breach of fiduciary duty; breach of partnership agreement; unjust enrichment.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order Granting Motion to Stay Discovery. Order Denying Defendant's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings. Order Denying Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. Trial judgment.		

Filing / Order		
Ezra C. Sultan v. Coinbase, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/13/2018	E.D.N.Y.	18-cv-934
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Negligence; Breach of Contract; Breach of Bailment; Gross Negligence.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Memorandum and Order Compelling Arbitration.		

Filing / Order		
Kline v. Bitconnect et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/7/2018	S.D. Fla.	18-cv-319
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Securities Act §§ 12(a)(1) and 15; Securities Act § 17(a); Exchange Act § 20(a); common law fraud; aiding and abetting; FDUPTA; Fla. Stat. § 517.011; Rhode Island Gen. Laws § 6-13.1 et seq. (consumer protection); Rhode Island Gen. Laws § 7-11 (securities laws).		

Filing / Order		
Tapang v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/4/2018	W.D. Wash.	18-cv-167
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
FCA § 222; breach of contract; negligence; Washington Consumer Protection Act 19.86 et seq.; negligent hiring, retention, and supervision; negligent infliction of emotional distress.		

Filing / Order		
Kimmelman v. Wayne Insurance Group		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
2/1/2018	Oh. Ct. of Common Pleas, Franklin County	18-cv-1041
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; lack of good faith.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Decision and Entry Denying Defendant's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings.		

Filing / Order		
Davy v. Paragon Coin, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/30/2018	N.D. Cal.	18-cv-671
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 12(a)(1) and 15(a).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Default Judgment entered as to defendant Taylor, aka "The Game." On June 23, 2021, a renewed motion for default judgment was granted.		

Filing / Order		
Paige v. Bitconnect et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/29/2018	W.D. Ky.	18-cv-58
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Kentucky securities laws (KRS 292.310 et seq.); Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); breach of contract; fraud by concealment; Kentucky Consumer Protection Act, KRS 367.120.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order granting preliminary injunction against Defendant Ryan Maasen. Order extending temporary restraining order as to Bitconnect Defendants.		

Filing / Order		
Pearce v. Karpeles		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/24/2018	E.D. Pa.	18-cv-306
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Negligence; fraud; tortious interference with contract.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Memorandum and Opinion granting Mizuho's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. Order granting Mizuho's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and dismissing Mizuho from case. Order denying Karpeles motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction.		

Filing / Order		
Wildes et al. v. Bitconnect Int'l PLC et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/24/2018	S.D. Fla.	18-cv-80086
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Securities Act § 17(a); rescission; Fla. Stat. § 517.011; FDUPTA; fraudulent inducement; fraudulent misrepresentation; negligent misrepresentation; conversion; civil conspiracy.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order denying motion for temporary restraining order. Consolidation Order. 11th Circuit Decision vacating dismissals, holding that mass media communications qualify as a solicitation under the Securities Act.		

Filing / Order		
Hamel derivatively on behalf of The Crypto Company v. Poutre et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/24/2018	C.D. Cal.	18-cv-616
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of fiduciary duty; unjust enrichment.		

Filing / Order		
Peng Li Secretary of the Interior v. Xunlei Limited; Lei Chen; Eric Zhou; Tao Thomas Wu		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/24/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-646
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20(a).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Consolidation Order.		

Filing / Order		
Dookeran v. Xunlei Ltd.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/18/2018	S.D.N.Y.	18-cv-467
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20(a).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Opinion & Order granting Defendants' motion to dismiss.		

Filing / Order		
Shaw v. Vircurex et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
1/10/2018	D. Colo.	18-cv-67
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; conversion; constructive fraud; unjust enrichment		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Default judgment entered against Defendants.		
Plaintiff's motion for default judgment denied without prejudice, dismissing case without prejudice.		
Case dismissed.		

Filing / Order		
Stormsmedia, LLC v. GigaWatt, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/28/2017	E.D. Wash.	17-cv-438
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); rescission.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Case dismissed.		

Filing / Order		
Balestra v. ATBCoin LLC		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/21/2017	S.D.N.Y.	17-cv-10001
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 12(a)(1) and 15(a)		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Motion to dismiss denied (finding that token was a security under <i>Howey</i> , and that personal jurisdiction existed).		
Case settled, \$250k recovery to Plaintiffs.		

Filing / Order		
Shepherdson v. The Crypto Company		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/21/2017	C.D. Cal.	17-cv-9157
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5; Exchange Act § 20(a).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Case dismissed.		

Filing / Order		
Hodges v. Monkey Capital		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/19/2017	S.D. Fla.	17-cv-81370
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Securities Act § 17(a); rescission; alter ego; Fla. Stat. § 517.011; FDUPTA.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Final default Judgment. Order on Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment (against Pro Se Defendant). Final Judgment Awarding Damages.		

Filing / Order		
Rensel v. Centra Tech, Inc. et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/13/2017	S.D. Fla.	17-cv-24500
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 12(a)(1) and 15(a).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order granting Plaintiff's renewed motion for TRO and finding that token is a security under <i>Howey</i> test. Omnibus Order granting Defendants' Motions to Dismiss.		
Morrison Cohen Notes		
December 13, 2019 – order on damages in crypto vis-à-vis fiat (uses CoinMarket Cap.com as source of pricing).		

Filing / Order		
MacDonald v. Dynamic Ledger Solutions et al. (Tezos)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/13/2017	N.D. Cal.	17-cv-7095
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Cal. Corp. Code § 25110; unfair competition.		

Filing / Order		
Oksuko v. Dynamic Ledger Solutions et al. (Tezos)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/28/2017	N.D. Cal.	17-cv-6829
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act §§ 12(a)(1) and 15(a).		

Filing / Order		
GGCC v. Dynamic Ledger Solutions et al. (Tezos)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/26/2017	N.D. Cal.	17-cv-6779
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Securities Act § 15.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Motions to dismiss by Defendants Dynamic Ledger Solutions and Tezos Foundation denied; Motions to dismiss by Defendants Bitcoin Suisse and Draper granted.		

Filing / Order		
Gaviria v. Dynamic Ledger Solutions et al. (Tezos)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
11/13/2017	M.D. Fla.	17-cv-1959
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Securities Act § 17(a); rescission; alter ego; Fla. Stat. § 517.011; FDUPTA.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Case dismissed without prejudice following Plaintiff's notice of voluntary dismissal.		

Filing / Order		
Confidential v. Payward, Inc. (Kraken)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/31/2017	JAMS arbitration	
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Negligence; breach of contract; unjust enrichment; fraudulent inducement; fraudulent misrepresentation; negligent misrepresentation.		

Filing / Order		
Baker v. Dynamic Ledger Solutions et al. (Tezos)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
10/25/2017	Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco	CGC-17-562144
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Securities Act § 5(a) and 5(c); Securities Act § 17(a); false advertising; unfair competition; alter ego		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order granting Defendant Tezos Stiftung's Motion to Quash Service of Summons. Stipulation of Settlement.		

Filing / Order		
Elev3n, LLC v. Vanbex Group, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/29/2017	E.D. Pa.	17-cv-4350
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
CAFA (18 U.S.C. § 1030); conversion; copyright violations; breach of contract; unjust enrichment; declaratory judgment.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Order on motion to dismiss; voluntary stipulation of dismissal.		

Filing / Order		
R3 HoldCo LLC v. Ripple Labs, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/8/2017	Delaware Chancery	2017-0652
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Breach of contract; tortious interference with contract.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Dismissal for lack of personal jurisdiction over an indispensable party.		

Filing / Order		
Leidel v. Coinbase, Inc.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/13/2016	S.D. Fla.	16-cv-81992
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty; conversion; negligence; unjust enrichment.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Denial of motion to compel arbitration. Order granting Defendant's motion to stay litigation pending appeal. Appellate order affirming denial of motion to compel arbitration. Order denying without prejudice plaintiff's motion for a protective order.		

Filing / Order		
Audet v. Garza et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
6/15/2016	D. Conn.	16-cv-940 (MPS)
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Exchange Act; Connecticut Uniform Securities Act; common law fraud		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Plaintiffs alleged securities law violations and common law fraud arising out of cryptocurrency mining companies' (GAW Miners LLC and ZenMiner LLC) sale of various cryptocurrency-related products. The case eventually went to trial against Stuart Fraser, an investor in the mining companies, and the jury found no liability for him. Plaintiffs moved for a new trial on the grounds that "the jury's finding that Hashlets, Paycoin, HashPoints, and HashStakers were not investment contract was against the weight of the evidence." The District Court granted the motion with respect to Paycoin only.		

Filing / Order		
Leidel and Wilson v. Project Investors Inc. (Cryptsy)		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
12/13/2016	S.D. Fla.	16-cv-80060
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Conversion; negligence; unjust enrichment; specific performance; FDUPTA; injunctive relief; fraudulent conveyance; civil conspiracy.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Settlement Order.		

Filing / Order		
Bitstamp Ltd. v. Ripple Labs et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
4/1/2015	N.D. Cal.	15-cv-1503
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Interpleader.		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Joint stipulation and order to dismiss.		

Filing / Order		
Raggio v. Mt. Gox et al.		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
9/18/2014	Cir. Ct. of Hinds Cty, Miss.	14-cv-71
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
Negligence, gross negligence, fraud, conversion, breach of contract, unjust enrichment, UCC.		

Filing / Order		
Liquid Bits v. Shavers		
Filing Date	Court	Docket No.
8/4/2014	S.D. Fla.	14-cv-61771
Causes of Action / Relevant Authority		
FDUPTA; fraudulent inducement; civil theft statute (Fla. Stat. 772.11); Florida SPIA (Fla. Stat. 517.011).		
Ruling / Orders of Note		
Final default judgment.		

Select U.S. Regulatory Pronouncements

Date	Topic
The White House	
March 2023	Economic Report of the President
9/16/2022	Fact Sheet: White House Releases First-Ever Comprehensive Framework for Responsible Development of Digital Assets
3/9/2022	Executive Order on Ensuring Responsible Development of Digital Assets
SEC	
2/6/2024	Notice of the adoption of final rule Further Definition of “As a Part of a Regular Business” in the Definition of Dealer and Government Securities Dealer in Connection with Certain Liquidity Providers (a/k/a the “Dealer Rule”)
1/10/2024	Statement on the Approval of Spot Bitcoin Exchange-Traded Products (Chair Gary Gensler); Out, Damned Spot! Out, I Say![1]; Statement on Omnibus Approval Order for List and Trade Bitcoin-Based Commodity-Based Trust Shares and Trust Units (Commissioner Hester M. Peirce); Statement Dissenting from Approval of Proposed Rule Changes to List and Trade Spot Bitcoin Exchange-Traded Products (Commissioner Caroline A. Crenshaw); Statement Regarding the Commission’s Approval of Proposed Rule Changes to List and Trade Shares of Spot Bitcoin Exchange-Traded Products (Commissioner Mark T. Uyeda)
4/14/2023	Supplemental Information and Reopening of Comment Period for Amendments to Exchange Act Rule 3b-16 Regarding the Definition of “Exchange”
3/10/2023	Statement Regarding the Commission’s Disapproval of a Proposed Rule Change to List and Trade Shares of the VanEck Bitcoin Trust (Commissioners Hester M. Peirce and Mark T. Uyeda)
4/4/2022	Prepared Remarks of Gary Gensler On Crypto Markets, Penn Law Capital Markets Association Annual Conference
11/9/2021	Statement on DeFi Risks, Regulations, and Opportunities
10/12/2021	Digital Asset Securities – Common Goals and a Bridge to Better Outcomes
10/6/2021	PLI Broker/Dealer Regulation and Enforcement 2021
6/10/2021	Funds Trading in Bitcoin Futures – Investor Bulletin
2/26/2021	The Division of Examinations’ Continued Focus on Digital Asset Securities
12/23/2020	Statement and Request for Comment, “Custody of Digital Asset Securities by Special Purpose Broker-Dealers”
11/9/2020	Staff Statement on WY Division of Banking’s “NAL on Custody of Digital Assets and Qualified Custodian Status”
2/6/2020	Running on Empty: A Proposal to Fill the Gap Between Regulation and Decentralization (Commissioner Hester M. Peirce)
10/28/2019	No-Action Letter (Paxos Trust Company, LLC) [and Request Letter]
10/11/2019	Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change Related to Adopting Rules to Govern the Trading of Equity Securities on the Exchange Through a Facility of the Exchange Known as the Boston Security Token Exchange LLC
10/11/2019	Joint Statement on Activities Involving Digital Assets (CFTC, FinCEN, SEC)

Date	Topic
10/9/2019	Self-Regulatory Organizations; NYSE Arca, Inc.; Order Disapproving a Proposed Rule Change, as Modified by Amendment No. 1, Relating to the Listing and Trading of Shares of the Bitwise Bitcoin ETF Trust Under NYSE Arca Rule 8.201-E
7/25/2019	No-Action Letter (Pocketful of Quarters, Inc.) [and Request Letter]
7/8/2019	SEC/FINRA Joint Staff Statement on Broker-Dealer Custody of Digital Asset Securities
4/3/2019	Framework for “Investment Contract” Analysis of Digital Assets (Strategic Hub for Innovation and Financial Technology (“FinHub”))
4/3/2019	No-Action Letter (TurnKey Jet, Inc.) [and Request Letter]
3/15/2019	SEC Staff to Hold Fintech Forum to Discuss Distributed Ledger Technology and Digital Assets
3/7/2019	Letter Response From Jay Clayton to Hon. Ted Budd re: Application of Federal Securities Laws to Digital Assets
11/16/2018	Statement on Digital Asset Securities Issuance and Trading
10/23/2018	Improving Information For Investors In The Digital Age
10/19/2018	Request Form for FinTech-Related Meetings and Other Assistance
10/11/2018	Investor Alert: Watch Out For False Claims About SEC And CFTC Endorsements Used To Promote Digital Asset Investments
9/20/2018	Measuring the Impact of the SEC’s Enforcement Program (Stephanie Avakian, Co-Director, Division of Enforcement)
9/20/2018	Statement on Order of Suspension of Trading of Certain Bitcoin/Ether Tracking Certificates (Division of Trading and Markets and Division of Corporation Finance)
8/22/2018	Self-Regulatory Organizations; NYSE Arca, Inc.; Order Disapproving a Proposed Rule Change to List and Trade the Shares of the ProShares Bitcoin ETF and the ProShares Short Bitcoin ETF
8/22/2018	Self-Regulatory Organizations; Cboe BZX Exchange, Inc.; Order Disapproving a Proposed Rule Change to List and Trade the Shares of the GraniteShares Bitcoin ETF and the GraniteShares Short Bitcoin ETF
8/22/2018	Self-Regulatory Organizations; NYSE Arca, Inc.; Order Disapproving a Proposed Rule Change Relating to Listing and Trading of the Direxion Daily Bitcoin Bear 1X Shares, Direxion Daily Bitcoin 1.25X Bull Shares, Direxion Daily Bitcoin 1.5X Bull Shares, Direxion Daily Bitcoin 2X Bull Shares, and Direxion Daily Bitcoin 2X Bear Shares Under NYSE Arca Rule 8.200-E
7/26/2018	Self-Regulatory Organizations; Bats BZX Exchange, Inc.; Order Setting Aside Action by Delegated Authority and Disapproving a Proposed Rule Change, as Modified by Amendments No. 1 and 2, to List and Trade Shares of the Winklevoss Bitcoin Trust
6/14/2018	Digital Asset Transactions: When Howey Met Gary (Plastic) (speech by William Hinman, Director, Division of Corporation Finance)
5/22/2018	Statement on NASAA’s Announcement of Enforcement Sweep Targeting Fraudulent ICOs and Crypto-Asset Investment Products
5/16/2018	Statement from the Co-Directors, Division of Enforcement, re: Oversight of the SEC’s Division of Enforcement
5/15/2018	“HoweyCoins” website (SEC Investor Advisory)

Date	Topic
4/23/2018	Order Instituting Proceedings to Determine Whether to Approve or Disapprove a Proposed Rule Change Relating to Listing and Trading of the Direxion Daily Bitcoin Bear 1X Shares, Direxion Daily Bitcoin 1.25X Bull Shares, Direxion Daily Bitcoin 1.5X Bull Shares, Direxion Daily Bitcoin 2X Bull Shares and Direxion Daily Bitcoin 2X Bear Shares Under NYSE Arca Rule 8.200-E
4/5/2018	Order Instituting Proceedings to Determine Whether to Approve or Disapprove a Proposed Rule Change to List and Trade the Shares of the GraniteShares Bitcoin ETF and the GraniteShares Short Bitcoin ETF Under BZX Rule 14.11(f)(4), Trust Issued Receipts
3/23/2018	Order Instituting Proceedings to Determine Whether to Approve or Disapprove a Proposed Rule Change to List and Trade the Shares of the ProShares Bitcoin ETF and the ProShares Short Bitcoin ETF under NYSE Arca Rule 8.200-E, Commentary .02
3/7/2018	Statement on Potentially Unlawful Online Platforms for Trading Digital Assets
2/6/2018	Written Testimony of Jay Clayton Before the United States Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: "Virtual Currencies: The Oversight Role of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission"
1/25/2018	Statement by SEC Chairman Jay Clayton and CFTC Chairman J. Christopher Giancarlo: Regulators are Looking at Cryptocurrency
1/22/2018	Opening Remarks At The Securities Regulation Institute
1/19/2018	Joint statement from CFTC and SEC Enforcement Directors Regarding Virtual Currency Enforcement Actions
1/18/2018	Staff Letter: Engaging on Fund Innovation and Cryptocurrency-related Holdings
12/11/2017	Statement on Cryptocurrencies and Initial Coin Offerings
11/8/2017	Governance and Transparency at the Commission and in Our Markets
11/1/2017	Statement on Potentially Unlawful Promotion of Initial Coin Offerings and Other Investments by Celebrities and Others
8/28/2017	Investor Alert: Public Companies Making ICO-Related Claims
7/25/2017	SEC Issues Investigative Report Concluding DAO Tokens, a Digital Asset, Were Securities (the "DAO Report")
5/7/2014	Investor Alert: Bitcoin and Other Virtual Currency-Related Investments
7/1/2013	Investor Alert: Ponzi Schemes Using Virtual Currencies (in conjunction with Shavers case)
CFTC	
9/22/2022	Dissenting Statement of Commissioner Summer K. Mersinger Regarding Enforcement Actions Against: 1) bZeroX, LLC, Tom Bean, and Kyle Kistner; and 2) Ooki DAO
1/13/2022	Remarks of Commissioner Dawn D. Stump: We Can Do Hard Things
10/15/2021	Concurring Statement by Commissioner Dawn D. Stump Regarding Tether and Bitfinex Settlement
9/28/2021	Concurring Statement of Commissioner Dawn D. Stump Regarding Enforcement Action Against Payward Ventures, Inc. (d/b/a Kraken)
10/21/2020	Accepting Virtual Currencies from Customers into Segregation

Date	Topic
3/24/2020	CFTC Final Interpretive Guidance on Actual Delivery for Digital Assets (regarding the 28-day limitation)
10/11/2019	Joint Statement on Activities Involving Digital Assets (CFTC, FinCEN, SEC)
5/21/2018	Advisory with respect to Virtual Currency Derivative Product Listings
2/15/2018	Customer Advisory: Beware Virtual Currency Pump-and-Dump Schemes
2/6/2018	Written testimony of J. Christopher Giancarlo Before the United States Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
1/19/2018	Joint statement from CFTC and SEC Enforcement Directors Regarding Virtual Currency Enforcement Actions
1/4/2018	Explanation of Oversight and Approach to Virtual Currency Markets
12/15/2017	Retail Commodity Transactions Involving Virtual Currency
12/15/2017	Customer Advisory: Understand the Risks of Virtual Currency Trading
12/1/2017	CFTC Backgrounder on Self-Certified Contracts for Bitcoin Products
10/17/2017	A CFTC Primer on Virtual Currencies
Department of Justice	
9/6/2022	The Report of the Attorney General Pursuant to Section 5(b)(iii) of Executive Order 14067: The Role of Law Enforcement in Detecting, Investigating, and Prosecuting Criminal Activity Related to Digital Assets
10/6/2021	Deputy Attorney General Lisa O. Monaco Announces National Cryptocurrency Enforcement Team
October 2020	Cryptocurrency Enforcement Framework
FinCEN / Treasury Department	
May 2024	Illicit Finance Risk Assessment of Non-Fungible Tokens
August 2023	Gross Proceeds and Basis Reporting by Brokers and Determination of Amount Realized and Basis for Digital Asset Transactions
April 2023	Illicit Finance Risk Assessment of Decentralized Finance
September 2022	Action Plan to Address Illicit Financing Risks of Digital Assets
September 2022	Crypto-Assets: Implications for Consumers, Investors, and Businesses
September 2022	The Future of Money and Payments
August 2022	Treasury Department Sanctions Virtual Currency Mixer Tornado Cash
June 2022	FinCEN Issues Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for No-Action Letter Process
February 2022	Study of the Facilitation of Money Laundering and Terror Finance Through the Trade in Works of Art
October 2021	Sanctions Compliance Guidance for the Virtual Currency Industry
9/21/2021	Updated Advisory for Potential Sanctions Risks for Facilitating Ransomware Payments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sanction of SUEX, a virtual currency platform, for facilitating transaction from ransomware variants

Date	Topic
12/30/2020	Enforcement Release – OFAC Enters Into \$98,830 Settlement with BitGo, Inc. for Apparent Violations of Multiple Sanctions Programs Related to Digital Currency Transactions
12/18/2020	Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, “Requirements for Certain Transactions Involving Convertible Virtual Currency or Digital Assets”
10/11/2019	Joint Statement on Activities Involving Digital Assets (CFTC, FinCEN, SEC)
5/9/2019	Advisory on Illicit Activity Involving Convertible Virtual Currency
5/9/2019	Application of FinCEN’s Regulations to Certain Business Models Involving Convertible Virtual Currencies
4/18/2019	FinCEN Penalizes Peer-to-Peer Virtual Currency Exchanger for Violations of Anti-Money Laundering Laws
8/9/2018	Prepared Remarks of FinCEN Director Kenneth A. Blanco, delivered at the 2018 Chicago-Kent Block (Legal) Tech Conference
2/13/2018	Oversight and Enforcement Capabilities of FinCEN over Virtual Currency Financial Activities Letter
8/14/2015	Application of FinCEN’s Regulations to Persons Issuing Physical or Digital Negotiable Certificates of Ownership of Precious Metals
10/27/2014	Request for Administrative Ruling on the Application of FinCEN’s Regulations to a Virtual Currency Payment System
10/27/2014	Request for Administrative Ruling on the Application of FinCEN’s Regulations to a Virtual Currency Trading Platform
1/30/2014	Application of FinCEN’s Regulations to Virtual Currency Mining Operations
1/30/2014	Application of FinCEN’s Regulations to Virtual Currenc Software Development and Certain Investment Activity
3/18/2013	Guidance on the Application of FinCEN’s Regulations to Persons Administering, Exchanging, or Using Virtual Currencies
White House Office of Science and Technology Policy	
September 2022	Climate and Energy Implications of Crypto-Assets in the United States
September 2022	Policy Objectives for a U.S. Central Bank Digital Currency System
September 2022	Technical Evaluation for a U.S. Central Bank Digital Currency System
Department of Commerce	
September 2022	Responsible Advancement of U.S. Competitiveness in Digital Assets
FINRA	
7/8/2019	SEC/FINRA Joint Staff Statement on Broker-Dealer Custody of Digital Asset Securities
7/6/2018	FINRA Encourages Firms to Notify FINRA if They Engage in Activities Related to Digital Assets
1/8/2018	2018 Regulatory and Examination Priorities Letter
New York State Attorney General’s Office	
10/18/2021	Attorney General James Directs Unregistered Crypto Lending Platforms to Cease Operations In New York, Announces Additional Investigations

Date	Topic	
3/1/2021	Attorney General James Warns Investors About ‘Extreme Risk’ When Investing in Cryptocurrency, Issues Additional Warning to Those Facilitating Trading of Virtual Currencies	
9/18/2018	Virtual Markets Integrity Initiative Report	
4/17/2018	A.G. Schneiderman Launches Inquiry Into Cryptocurrency “Exchanges”	
New York State Department of Financial Services		
3/31/2023	Virtual Currency Licensee Assessments	
1/23/2023	Guidance on Custodial Structures for Customer Protection in the Event of Insolvency	
Updated 6/3/2022	DFS “Greenlist” (“Any entity licensed by DFS to conduct virtual currency business activity in New York may use coins on the Greenlist for their approved purpose(s). Note that if a licensed entity decides to use a coin on the Greenlist, it must inform DFS prior to beginning its use.”)	
10/21/2020	PayPal First Approved Entity for DFS Conditional Bitlicense	
6/24/2020	Request for Comments on a Proposed Framework for a Conditional Virtual Currency License	
6/24/2020	Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) expressing intent to launch a new SUNY-related virtual currency program, “SUNY BLOCK”	
6/24/2020	Final Guidance Regarding Adoption or Listing of Virtual Currencies	
12/11/2019	Proposed Guidance Regarding Adoption or Listing of Virtual Currencies	
4/10/2019	Termination of Bittrex License to Engage in Virtual Currency Business Activity	
9/10/2018	Press Release by DFS Announcing that DFS Has Authorized Gemini Trust Company LLC and Paxos Trust Company LLC to Each Offer Price-Stable Cryptocurrency Pegged to U. S. Dollar	
7/31/2018	Statement By DFS Superintendent Maria T. Vullo on Treasury’s Endorsement of Regulatory Sandboxes for FinTech Companies and the OCC’s Decision to Accept FinTech Charter Applications	
8/8/2015	NYCRR 23:200: Virtual Currencies (BitLicense Regulations)	
Office of the Director of National Intelligence		
9/2017	Risks and Vulnerabilities of Virtual Currency Cryptocurrency as a Payment Method	
American Bar Association (ABA)		
12/2020	Digital and Digitized Assets: Federal and State Jurisdictional Issues	
Other Regulatory Announcements		
Federal Reserve Board	2/23/2023	Joint Statement on Liquidity Risks to Banking Organizations Resulting from Crypto-Asset Market Vulnerabilities
Federal Reserve Board	1/27/2023	Federal Reserve Board announces denial of application by Custodia Bank, Inc. to become a member of the Federal Reserve System
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC)	8/19/2022	FDIC Issues Cease and Desist Letters to Five Companies For Making Crypto-Related False or Misleading Representations about Deposit Insurance

Date	Topic	
Financial Action Task Force (FATF)	10/28/2021	Virtual Assets and Virtual Assets Service Providers
California Department of Financial Protection and Innovation	9/2/2021 8/11/2021	Bitcoin ATMs are not money transmitters requiring an MTA license
New York Police Department	4/11/2021	Cryptocurrency Analysis Tools: Impact & Use Policy
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis	2/5/2021	Decentralized Finance: On Blockchain- and Smart Contract-Based Financial Markets
Wyoming Division of Banking	10/23/2020	No-Action Letter on Custody of Digital Assets and Qualified Custodian Status
Office of the Comptroller of Currency	7/22/2020	Authority of a National Bank to Provide Cryptocurrency Custody Services for Customers
California Blockchain Working Group	7/1/2020	Blockchain in California: A Roadmap
Internal Revenue Service	10/9/2019	Revenue Ruling 2019-24 (on hard forks and airdrops), with accompanying Q&A
National Futures Association	7/20/2018	Proposed Interpretive Notice: Disclosure Requirements for NFA Members Engaging in Virtual Currency Activities
North American Securities Administrators Association	5/21/2018	State and Provincial Securities Regulators Conduct Coordinated International Crypto Crackdown
Texas State Securities Board	4/10/2018	Widespread Fraud Found In Cryptocurrency Offerings
Executive Order	3/19/2018	Executive Order on Taking Additional Steps to Address the Situation in Venezuela
FTC	3/16/2018	It's time for a FTC Blockchain Working Group

Select Thought Leadership from Our Digital Assets Team

- [Developments in Decentralized Finance 2024](#) (PLI presentation), October 9, 2024
- Litigation Developments ([Fordham Law Blockchain Regulatory Symposium](#)), October 7, 2024
- [2nd Circ. Questions Crypto Co.'s 'Control' In Scam Token Suit](#), September 26, 2024
- [Recent Developments in Cryptocurrency Litigation and Regulatory Enforcement](#) (Beverly Hills Bar Association presentation), September 23, 2024
- [Why I Sued the SEC](#), September 11, 2024
- 10th Annual Alternative Finance Summit: Fintech, Blockchain, and Crowdfunding: [Developments in Cryptocurrency and Blockchain Enforcement](#) (PLI presentation), September 4, 2024
- [OpenSea's Wells Notice From the SEC Could Prove 'Disastrous'](#), August 28, 2024
- [Employment and securities law issues for global cryptocurrency companies](#), Reuters, August 27, 2024
- [The War on Crypto](#), August 20, 2024
- [The SEC continues to engage in 'strategic ambiguity,' lawyer says](#), August 4, 2024
- [NFT Artists Sue SEC to Head Off Regulation of Digital Art Sales](#), July 30, 2024
- Unchained Episode 653: [With Ether ETFs in the Works, How Else Might the SEC Pivot on Crypto?](#), May 31, 2024
- [SEC Ordered to Pay New York and Am Law 100 Firms \\$1.2M in Attorney, Receivership Fees](#), May 30, 2024
- [Compensation in Cryptocurrency Tokens and Other Digital Assets: What Employers Should Know](#), Reuters, May 28, 2024
- [Fintech Law Event Features SEC Commissioner Q&A With Students, Expert Panelists](#), April 5, 2024
- [SEC To Drop Debt Box Suit For Now, Amid Sanctions Threat](#), January 30, 2024
- [Andreessen Horowitz, Crypto Org. Escape 'Scam Token' Suit](#), August 30, 2023
- [The Crypto Market of the Future Needs a Flexible Legal Framework](#), Bloomberg Law, June 13, 2023
- [Old-School Rules Apply to New-School DeFi Exchanges](#), The Wall Street Journal, April 22, 2023
- [Crypto Companies May Use a Supreme Court Doctrine to Push Back Against SEC](#), Coinbase TV, April 18, 2023
- [No Complaints With Cryptocurrency: The Applicability of CPLR 3213's Summary Judgment in Lieu of Complaint to Obligations in Cryptocurrency](#), Legaltech News, November 16, 2022
- [Crypto Judgment Day: Issuing Judgments in Cryptocurrency in New York](#), New York Law Journal, October 5, 2022
- [Does Kim Kardashian's SEC fine mark the end of the crypto-celebrity gold rush?](#), Los Angeles Times, October 5, 2022
- [Legal Expert on Future of Crypto Regulation](#), CoinDesk Television, September 26, 2022
- [Novel action against Ooki Crypto Collective Draws Rebuke from Commodities Trading Commissioner](#), Reuters, September 23, 2022
- [Crypto Lawyers Bet Big on Class Action Lawsuits as Market Slides](#), Bloomberg Law, September 21, 2022
- [Lawsuit claims Mark Cuban and the Dallas Mavericks 'duped' customers into investing with the now-bankrupt crypto platform Voyager Digital](#), resulting in \$5 billion in losses, Yahoo! Sports, August 12, 2022
- [International Journal of Blockchain Law](#), Volume III, published by The Global Blockchain Business Council, "A Round Table Discussion on Stablecoins: Taking the World by Storm Or Storming the World?" July 2022
- [Coinbase, Flexa Dispute SEC's Claims That These 9 Cryptocurrencies Are Securities](#), MarketWatch, July 22, 2022

- [Coinbase Criticizes US SEC, Crypto Community Criticizes Coinbase over Insider Trading, and CFTC Chimes In](#), Cryptonews, July 22, 2022
- [Crypto Firms Could Face Fallout from SEC Insider Trading Case Against Former Coinbase Employee](#), The Block, July 22, 2022
- [SEC Calls 9 Cryptos 'Securities' in Insider Trading Case](#), CoinDesk and Nasdaq.com, July 21, 2022
- [Software Developer Wants Suit Over \\$55M Hack Axed](#), Law360, July 20, 2022
- [How Can Insiders Sue an Amorphous Crypto Collective? They Can't, Say bZx Defendants](#), Reuters, July 20, 2022
- [The Supreme Court's Wrecking Ball Could Impact SEC Authority](#), Forbes, July 1, 2022
- [CFTC Commissioner Pham suggests regulators stay tech-neutral on stablecoins](#), Forkast News, June 30, 2022 – broadcast with Caroline D. Pham, Commissioner of the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, "The Future of Stablecoins," hosted by Forkast, June 30, 2022
- Guest, CTV (Canadian Television Network) national program [Your Morning](#), on recent crash of cryptocurrency market and nature of lawsuits surging in the space, June 20, 2022
- [The Department of Justice Goes After Its First NFT Insider Trading Case](#), Laura Shin, Unchained Podcast (Ep 359), June 3, 2022
- [Has New York State Gone Astray in Its Pursuit of Crypto Fraud?](#), Cointelegraph.com, May 2, 2022
- Speaker, [Venture Capital Evening Summit](#), The Future of Crypto & Web3, March 31, 2022
- Panelist, [Emerging Practice Areas: Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning, Cybersecurity/Data Privacy, Information Governance/eDiscovery, and Cryptocurrency](#), March 24, 2022
- [Crypto Custody Case Shows DeFi Becoming Mainstream](#), Capital.com, March 23, 2022
- [Crack Down on Crypto? Maybe, but You Can't Ban Math](#), Coindesk March 3, 2022
- [A Round Table Discussion: Pressing Legal Issues in Decentralized Finance](#), The International Journal of Blockchain Law, Vol 2, March 2022 (Discussion)
- Law of Code Podcast with Jacob Robinson: Jason Gottlieb: Lawyers & DAOs, Morrison Cohen crypto-litigation tracker, Indexed Juris, NFTs & more, December 20, 2021
- Moderator, ["Spotlight Speech: Hester Peirce, Commissioner, SEC"](#) on the topic of cryptocurrency and SEC regulation of DAOs, held by DeFiCon, Brooklyn, December 18, 2021.
- Panelist, [NASAA Fintech / Cybersecurity Symposium](#), December 14, 2021
- [After 'Stealing' \\$16M, This Teen Hacker Seems Intent on Testing 'Code Is Law' in the Courts](#), Coindesk, October 22, 2021
- [How to Do Business as a DAO](#), Coindesk and Yahoo! Finance, October 20, 2021
- [Downvoted: Security Researchers Slam Votz Over Stance on White-Hat Hackers](#), Coindesk, October 6, 2020
- Lexis/Nexis Practical Guidance Video, ["Cryptocurrency Regulation Overview,"](#) September 30, 2021
- [Palantir Bug Gave FBI Unauthorized Access to Virgil Griffith Data](#), Decrypt, August 26, 2021
- [Crypto Scammers Rip Off Billions as Pump-and-Dump Schemes Go Digital](#), Bloomberg News, July 11, 2021
- [Virgil Griffith Should Return to Jail Pending Trial, Prosecutors Tell Judge](#), Nasdaq News, July 10, 2021
- [What Will The Ripple Effect Be In The Crypto Space?](#), Forbes, May 7, 2021
- ABA Podcast, ["The Law & Blockchain: Regulatory Enforcement and Defense,"](#) March 13, 2020
- [As SEC goes after Ripple and Bitcoin2Gen, is DeFi next in its line of fire?](#) Forkast News, February 1, 2021
- [Are US Regulators Finally Warming to Crypto and Digital Assets?](#) Forkast News, August 4, 2020
- [Novel Legal Strategy Bringing this ICO-Backed 'Micro-Mobility' Startup to Court](#), Coindesk (story also republished by Yahoo! Finance), June 20, 2020

- [Motions Fly High as Craig Wright Set to Face Kleiman Estate in Court](#), CoinTelegraph, May 15, 2020
- [Wall Street Blockchain Alliance Podcast, "Call the Lawyers,"](#) May 4, 2020
- [Wright v. Kleiman Enters Final Act — Document Reveal May Set Precedent](#), CoinTelegraph, April 17, 2020
- [Crypto faces 'The man who took on Wall Street'](#), Modern Consensus, April 9, 2020
- [Facing Uncertainty, Law Firms Seek Credit, Brace for Less M&A](#), The American Lawyer, March 20, 2020
- [Why Ripple's XRP Lawsuit Could Wreak Havoc on the Market](#), Decrypt, February 27, 2020
- [Digital Assets: What to Do When the SEC Comes Calling](#), Crowdfund Insider, January 26, 2020
- [Wall Street Blockchain Alliance Panel, "Digital Assets: What to Do When the SEC Comes Calling,"](#) January 23, 2020
- [National Asian Pacific American Bar Association 2018 Convention, "Securities, Smart Contracts, & Blockchain: Promises vs. Reality,"](#) November 9, 2019
- [LexisNexis Emerging Issues Webinar Series, "Cryptocurrency 2020: Understanding the Impact of a Crystallizing Regulatory & Enforcement Regime,"](#) October 29, 2019
- [Security Token Academy, "Security Token NYC Meetup,"](#) September 26, 2019
- [Investors Accuse Calif. Crypto Co. Of Abandoning Them](#), Law360, September 23, 2019
- [The SEC as World Police: What the World Should Know about the SEC's Jurisdiction](#), Forkast News, August 29, 2019
- [Judge Confirms Ruling: Craig Wright to Forfeit 50% of Bitcoin Holdings](#), Yahoo! Finance, August 27, 2019
- [Crypto Enforcement Actions and Litigation Report 2018](#), Bloomberg Law, March 15, 2019
- [The SEC's Paragon Coin and AirFox Settlements: a Path Forward?](#) Bloomberg Law, November 30, 2018
- [Cryptocurrency and Blockchain Litigation and Regulatory Enforcement](#), Lexis Practice Advisor Financial Services Regulation, November 2018 (updated regularly)
- [With States' Crypto Regulation, Problems Multiply](#), Law360, May 24, 2018
- [Jurisdictional Overreach by Regulators in Cryptocurrency Actions](#), Law360, April 12, 2018
- [Insider Trading and Cryptocurrency: A Primer for Traders](#), Bloomberg Law – Securities Regulation & Law Report, February 19, 2018
- [SEC, CFTC Testify to Senate Banking Committee About Hopes, Fears, and Future Actions on Cryptocurrencies](#), PaymentsJournal, February 7, 2018
- [For Blockchain, a Coming Wave of Change?](#) The National Law Journal, October 1, 2017



909 Third Avenue | New York, NY 10022-4784 | P 212.735.8600 | F 212.735.8708 | morrisoncohen.com

© Morrison Cohen LLP
2017-2025