DANIEL M. HAWKE 1 HawkeD@sec.gov ELAINE C. GREENBERG 2 GreenbergE@sec.gov MICHAEL J. RINALDI 3 RinaldiM@sec.gov 4 COLLEEN K. LYNCH LynchCK@sec.gov 5 DAVID W. SNYDER SnyderD@sec.gov 6 7 Attorneys for Plaintiff SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION 8 Mellon Independence Center 701 Market Street, Suite 2000 9 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106 Telephone: (215) 597-3100 10 Facsimile: (215) 597-2740 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 12 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 13 '11CV1220 IEG NLS SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE Case No. COMMISSION, 14 15 Plaintiff, 16 COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE v. FEDERAL SECURITIES LAWS 17 DEAN A. GOETZ, 18 Defendant. 19 Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") alleges: 20 SUMMARY OF THE ACTION 21 22 1. This case involves unlawful insider trading by Defendant Dean A. Goetz (the 23 "Defendant"), an attorney who is a resident of Carlsbad, California. In December 2008, the 24 Defendant's daughter ("Daughter") was visiting her parents for the holidays and stayed at 25 Defendant's home. At the time, Daughter was a corporate associate in the Los Angeles office of a 26 large, international law firm (the "Firm") who was working on an impending merger and 27 acquisition involving Abbott Laboratories ("Abbott") and her Firm's client, Advanced Medical 28

Optics, Inc. (which hereinafter is referred to by its former New York Stock Exchange ticker symbol, "EYE"). Because the timing of her visit coincided with the anticipated closing of the Abbott-EYE transaction in January 2009, Daughter performed deal-related work in various locations in Defendant's home while she was staying there and worked on deal-related documents that identified EYE by name.

- In breach of his duty of trust and confidence to Daughter, the Defendant misappropriated from her material, nonpublic information regarding the impending Abbott-EYE merger while she worked in her family home.
- 3. On January 8, 2009, the day the deal was scheduled to be announced, shortly before the market was to close, Defendant bought 900 shares of EYE, the company Daughter's Firm was advising, through an online brokerage account he had not accessed in almost a year. Four days later, on January 12, 2009, EYE publicly announced that it had entered into an agreement with Abbott pursuant to which Abbott planned to acquire EYE at the cash price of \$22.00 per share through a tender offer. Ultimately, Defendant sold all 900 shares of EYE stock, making a profit of \$11,418.
- 4. Through his conduct, Defendant violated Sections 10(b) and 14(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") [15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b) & 78n(e)] and Rules 10b-5 and 14e-3 thereunder [17 C.F.R. §§ 240.10b-5 & 240.14e-3].

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 21(e), 21A, and 27 of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(e), 78u-1, and 78aa]. Defendant, directly or indirectly, made use of the means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or the mails, or the facilities of a national securities exchange in connection with the transactions, acts, practices, and courses of business alleged in this Complaint.

6. The Commission brings this action pursuant to Section 21A of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u-l]. The Commission seeks a permanent injunction against the Defendant, enjoining him from engaging in the acts, practices, and courses of business alleged in this Complaint, disgorgement of all profits realized, prejudgment interest, civil money penalties, and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and appropriate.

7. Venue in this District is proper pursuant to Section 27 of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78aa]. Defendant is an inhabitant of and transacts business in the Southern District of California, and certain of the acts, practices, and courses of business constituting the violations of the federal securities laws alleged herein occurred within the Southern District of California.

DEFENDANT

8. Defendant Dean A. Goetz, age 62, resides in Carlsbad, California. Defendant graduated from the University of North Dakota in 1970 and from the University of North Dakota School of Law in 1975. Currently, Defendant is an attorney with a solo practice in Solana Beach, California, principally handing the litigation of personal injury matters. Defendant is a member of the California bar.

RELATED ENTITIES

- 9. The Firm is a large, international law firm with offices located in the United States and abroad, including Los Angeles, California. The Firm served as legal counsel for EYE in connection with Abbott's tender offer to acquire the outstanding shares of EYE.
- 10. Advanced Medical Optics, Inc. (or "EYE") was a manufacturer of medical products for the eye headquartered in Santa Ana, California. It now operates as Abbott Medical Optics, Inc., a subsidiary of Abbott. Before the January 12, 2009 public announcement that Abbott would acquire EYE through a tender offer, EYE traded on the New York Stock Exchange under the ticker symbol "EYE."

FACTS

A. EYE Sought Strategic Options, Including a Possible Acquisition by Abbott

- 11. In October 2008, EYE hired an investment banking firm (the "Investment Bank") to assist it in exploring several strategic options for the company, including capital raising transactions and possibly the sale of the company. During the week of October 13, at the request of EYE, the Investment Bank contacted Abbott to gauge Abbott's interest in acquiring EYE or some other strategic transaction involving both companies.
- 12. In late October 2008, EYE sought the Firm's assistance in connection with EYE's search for strategic options, including a possible acquisition by Abbott.
- 13. The Firm is a major international law firm and is one of the largest merger and acquisitions firms in the country. Daughter, then an associate in the Firm's Los Angeles office, began working on the transaction in early November 2008. Among other things, Daughter assembled the "data room" at the Firm's offices so that Abbott and its legal and financial advisors could conduct due diligence of EYE. Daughter also assisted in the drafting of the merger agreement, drafted various disclosure schedules, and performed other administrative tasks related to the transaction.

B. <u>During a Visit by His Daughter, Defendant Misappropriated Material, Nonpublic Information Regarding the Impending Abbott-EYE Merger</u>

- 14. From about December 17 or 18, 2008, to about January 1, 2009, Daughter stayed at her parents' home in Carlsbad, California. Because the Abbott-EYE merger was expected to close in January 2009, Daughter worked at her parents' house during her visit and, indeed, could not participate in family activities.
- 15. While she was at her parents' home, Daughter prepared the disclosure schedules related to the Abbott-EYE transaction, which identified, among other things, EYE's license agreements, material contracts to which EYE was a party, employment and indemnification

agreements between EYE and certain of its employees, EYE's products, EYE's subsidiaries, and the lawsuits in which EYE was engaged. Significantly, unlike other deal-related documents circulated among the members of the Abbott-EYE deal team, the draft schedules that Daughter worked on at her parents' home did not substitute a code name for EYE to preserve confidentiality and identified the company by name. In addition, the schedules identified the names of certain individuals with whom the company had employment or indemnification agreements.

- 16. Daughter worked in several areas of her parents' home, including a desk in a common area of the home, her bedroom, and Defendant's home office. When she worked on the deal-related documents, Daughter would "park" herself in common work spaces, including Defendant's home office, and spread out her work.
- On or about December 31, 2008, Daughter learned that the Abbott-EYE transaction was going to close earlier than expected and that Abbott's acquisition of EYE would be announced on January 8, 2009, after the close of the market. As a result, Daughter cut short her visit to her parents' home and returned to work in Los Angeles on January 1, 2009. When she left, she told her parents that she had to return to work because she was working on a transaction and that "[h]opefully we'll close soon."

C. <u>Defendant Misappropriated Material, Nonpublic Information from His Daughter About the Abbott-EYE Transaction and Traded EYE Stock on the Basis of That Information</u>

- 18. Defendant misappropriated material, nonpublic information regarding the impending Abbott-EYE merger from Daughter while she was staying at his home and working on the transaction.
- 19. On January 8, 2009, at or about 12:28 p.m. Pacific time shortly before the close of the market on the day the merger was supposed to be announced Defendant logged on to his online brokerage account. This was the first time Defendant had logged on to his brokerage

account in almost a year. At or about 12:36 p.m. Pacific time, Defendant purchased 500 shares of EYE stock at an average price of \$8.82 per share. At 12:45 p.m. Pacific time, Defendant purchased an additional 400 shares of EYE stock at an average price of \$8.79 per share.

- 20. At the time Defendant purchased the 900 shares of EYE stock, substantial steps had been taken to commence a tender offer, including, but not limited to, the drafting of a merger agreement.
- 21. When Defendant misappropriated information about the pending Abbott-EYE transaction from Daughter and then traded on the basis of this information, he breached his duty of loyalty and confidentiality to Daughter.
- 22. At or about 5:01 a.m. Pacific time on January 12, 2009, EYE announced that it had entered into an agreement with Abbott pursuant to which Abbott planned to acquire EYE at the cash price of \$22.00 per share through a tender offer. Following this announcement, EYE's stock price closed at \$21.50 on January 12, 2009, an increase of \$12.65 per share, or approximately 143% over the prior trading day's closing price of \$8.85 per share.
- 23. On February 19, 2009, Defendant sold his 900 shares of EYE stock at \$21.93 per share and, accordingly, made a profit of \$11,418.

D. <u>Defendant Breached His Fiduciary Duty to His Daughter When He Traded on the</u> Basis of the Material, Nonpublic Information to Which His Daughter Had Access

- 24. Based on the close nature of their relationship, Defendant owed to Daughter a duty of trust and confidence.
- 25. At all times, Defendant knew or should have known that Daughter, due to her employment and position at the Firm, had access to material, nonpublic information about prospective mergers or acquisitions involving Firm clients.

26.

confidential information to which Daughter had access in connection with her employment, that he should not use that information to his personal benefit.

27. Defendant breached this duty of trust and confidence when he improperly obtained

Defendant similarly knew or should have known that if he obtained access to

27. Defendant breached this duty of trust and confidence when he improperly obtained from Daughter material, nonpublic information about the impending Abbott-EYE transaction and traded on the basis of this information.

28. Similarly, because Defendant knew or should have known that the material, nonpublic information about the impending tender offer came from Daughter (who worked for the legal advisor for EYE) Defendant knew or had reason to know that the information to which he had access, either directly or indirectly, about the pending Abbott-EYE merger was material and nonpublic and that he was prohibited from causing the purchase or sale of the security to be sought by the tender offer.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF Violation of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 Thereunder

- 29. The Commission re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 28, inclusive, as if they were fully set forth herein.
- 30. At the time of Defendant's trades, the misappropriated information was nonpublic, held by the Firm as confidential information related to a client representation.
- 31. The misappropriated information was material it would be important to a reasonable investor in making his or her investment decision, and indeed was important to Defendant, when misappropriating the information. There is a substantial likelihood that the disclosure of the misappropriated information would have been viewed by a reasonable investor as having significantly altered the total mix of information available to investors.
- 32. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant acted knowingly and/or recklessly.

- 33. By engaging in the conduct described above, Defendant, directly or indirectly, in connection with the purchase or sale of securities, by the use of means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or the mails, or the facilities of a national securities exchange, with scienter:
 - a. employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud;
 - b. made untrue statements of material facts or omitted to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; and/or
 - c. engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon any person in connection with the purchase or sale of any security.
- 34. By engaging in the foregoing conduct, Defendant violated, and unless enjoined will continue to violate, Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)] and Rule 10b-5 thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5].

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF Violation of Section 14(e) of the Exchange Act and Rule 14e-3 Thereunder

- 35. The Commission re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 34, inclusive, as if they were fully set forth herein.
- 36. The Firm was the legal advisor to EYE in connection with Abbott's tender offer for the securities of EYE.
- 37. By January 8, 2009, the date on which Defendant placed his illegal trades, one or more substantial steps had been taken to commence the tender offer for EYE securities.
- 38. Because Defendant knew or should have known that the material, nonpublic information about the Abbott tender offer came from Daughter, who worked for the legal advisor to EYE, Defendant knew or had reason to know that the information that he received, directly or

indirectly, about the pending merger was material and nonpublic and that he was prohibited from causing the purchase or sale of the security to be sought by the tender offer.

39. By engaging in the foregoing conduct, Defendant violated, and unless enjoined will continue to violate, Section 14(e) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78n(e)] and Rule 14e-3 thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 240.14e-3].

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court enter a Final Judgment:

I.

Permanently restraining and enjoining Defendant from, directly or indirectly, engaging in conduct in violation of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)] and Rule 10b-5 thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5] and from engaging in conduct in violation of Section 14(e) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78n(e)] and Rule 14e-3 thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 240.14e-3];

II.

Ordering Defendant to disgorge the unlawful trading profits derived from the activities set forth in this Complaint, together with prejudgment interest thereon;

III.

Ordering Defendant to pay a civil penalty pursuant to Section 21A of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78u-1]; and

IV. Granting such other and further relief as the Court may deem just, equitable, and necessary. Respectfully submitted, By: /s/ Michael J. Rinaldi Daniel M. Hawke Elaine C. Greenberg Michael J. Rinaldi Colleen K. Lynch David W. Snyder Attorneys for Plaintiff SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE **COMMISSION** Mellon Independence Center 701 Market Street, Suite 2000 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106 Telephone: (215) 597-3100 Facsimile: (215) 597-2740 RinaldiM@sec.gov Dated: June 3, 2011

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS		
Securities and Exchange Commission		Goetz, Dean A.	<u>'11CV1220 IEG</u>	NLS
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		NOTE: IN LAN	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.	
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)		Attorneys (If Known)		
Michael J. Rinaldi, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, 701		on, 701 John D. Kirby, 1	010 Second Ave., Ste.	1850, San Diego, Cal.,
	Phila., Pa., 19106, (215) 597-3100	92101, (619) 55		±
II. BASIS OF JURISI	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF I	PRINCIPAL PARTIES	
X 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) 		TF DEF 1	
2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity	Citizen of Another State	2 Incorporated and P	
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		of Business In A	Another State
		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 G 3 Foreign Nation	06 06
IV. NATURE OF SU	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	Poleigh County		
CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY		OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUI 310 Airplane 362 Personal Injury		 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust
☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpracti	ce G 625 Drug Related Seizure	28 USC 157	430 Banks and Banking
 ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment 	Liability		PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation
& Enforcement of Judgmen	t Slander 🗆 368 Asbestos Person	al G 640 R.R. & Truck	☐ 820 Copyrights	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product Liability Liability	☐ 650 Airline Regs. ☐ 660 Occupational	☐ 830 Patent ☐ 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPEI ☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud	RTY Safety/Health G 690 Other		☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 810 Selective Service
(Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability 371 Truth in Lendin	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	850 Securities/Commodities/
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Personal ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damag	☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards e Act	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	Exchange 875 Customer Challenge
■ 190 Other Contract	Product Liability 385 Property Damag	ge 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC 3410
 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 	☐ 360 Other Personal Product Liability Injury	y ☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITION OF STANDARD STAND		FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act ☐ 893 Environmental Matters
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure	441 Voting 510 Motions to Vaca	790 Other Labor Lingation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	or Defendant)	☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act
 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 	Accommodations Habeas Corpus: 530 General	Security Act	871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act
245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 535 Death Penalty	IMMIGRATION		☐ 900Appeal of Fee Determination
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	U 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 540 Mandamus & O Employment 550 Civil Rights	ther 462 Naturalization Application 463 Habeas Corpus -	n	Under Equal Access to Justice
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities - 555 Prison Condition			950 Constitutionality of
	Other 440 Other Civil Rights	Actions		State Statutes
🕱 1 Original 🗖 2 F	an "X" in One Box Only) temoved from		sferred from G Multidistrict Litigation	
VI CALISE OF ACT	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you 15 U.S.C. §§ 78J(b) & 78n(e)			
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	insider trading			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTIO UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: Yes No
VIII. RELATED CAS	SE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD				
06/03/2011 /s/ Michael J. Rinaldi				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY				
RECEIPT#	AMOUNT APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	OGE