1 2 3	MARC J. FAGEL (Cal. Bar No. 154425) ROBERT L. TASHJIAN (Cal. Bar No. 191007) tashjianr@sec.gov ELENA RO (Cal. Bar No. 197308) roe@sec.gov Attorneys for Plaintiff		
4 5 6 7	Attorneys for Plaintiff SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION 44 Montgomery Street, Suite 2600 San Francisco, California 94104 Telephone: (415) 705-2500 Facsimile: (415) 705-2501		
8			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
11	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
12	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, Leve No. 10 1358		
13	Plaintiff,		
14	vs. COMPLAINT		
15	STEPHEN C. BOND,		
16	Defendant.		
17			
18	Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") alleges:		
19	SUMMARY OF THE ACTION		
20	1. From 2001 to 2008, defendant Stephen C. Bond participated in a multimillion		
21	dollar fraud in bogus Silicon Valley-based hedge funds. Working with Albert K. Hu, Bond		
22	helped to raise more than \$5 million from investors for funds affiliated with Asenqua, Inc.,		
23	Asenqua Capital Management, LLC, AQC Asset Management, Ltd., and Fireside Capital		
24	Management, Ltd. (collectively, the "Asenqua funds").		
25	2. Bond claimed to be the investment manager of the Asenqua funds. Hu, the		
26	Asenqua funds' founder, introduced Bond to investors at meetings to solicit investments.		
27	During these meetings, Bond spoke to potential investors about industry market trends and the		
28	Asenqua funds' investment strategy. Bond's introduction was designed to provide an air of		

.

legitimacy and security to the Asenqua funds. Bond and Hu showed potential investors presentations and documents that purported to describe the funds' high investment returns.

- 3. In reality, the Asenqua funds were a fiction. Bond managed no portfolio of investments for the Asenqua funds. Investors' funds were not invested in the manner described in fund documents and during investor presentations. Instead, Hu used investor funds to pay Bond and himself. Despite having no investment portfolio to manage, Bond received approximately \$900,000 for his role in the scheme, nearly 20 percent of the funds raised from investors.
- 4. Bond has violated, and continues to violate, the antifraud provisions of the federal securities laws, by making materially false and misleading statements and omissions in connection with the purchase or sale of securities. In addition, Bond participated in acts, practices and a course of business which operated as a fraud. Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") seeks an injunction against Bond to prevent further violations of the securities laws. The Commission further seeks an order requiring Bond to disgorge his ill-gotten gains, with prejudgment interest. Finally, the Commission seeks an order requiring Bond to pay a civil money penalty.

JURISDICTION

- 5. The Commission brings this action pursuant to Sections 21(d) and 21(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d) and 78u(e)], and Sections 209 and 214 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 ("Advisers Act") [15 U.S.C. §§ 80b-9 and 80b-14].
- 6. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 21(d), 21(e) and 27 of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d), 78u(e) and 78aa], and Sections 209 and 214 of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 80b-9 and 80b-14]. The defendant, directly or indirectly, has made use of the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange in connection with the acts, practices and courses of business alleged in this complaint.

--

7. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to Section 27 of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78aa] and Section 214 of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-14]. During the period described in this complaint, Bond resided in the Northern District of California, and acts or transactions constituting violations occurred in this district.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

8. Assignment to the San Jose Division is appropriate pursuant to Civil Local Rules 3-2(c) and 3-2(d) because acts and omissions giving rise to the Commission's claims occurred, among other places in this district, in Santa Clara County.

DEFENDANT

9. **Stephen C. Bond**, age 42, has resided in Castro Valley, California and Walnut Creek, California, from approximately 2001 to the present. Bond served as the purported portfolio manager of the Asenqua funds. Bond is a Chartered Financial Analyst, or "CFA". Bond received the CFA designation from the CFA Institute in April 1998. In sworn testimony during the Commission's investigation, Bond invoked his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination and refused to answer questions regarding his involvement in the Asenqua funds, as alleged in this complaint.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Bond and Hu Fraudulently Solicited Investors for the Asenqua Funds

- 10. Beginning no later than 2001, Bond and Hu approached potential investors with ties to the technology center in and around Santa Clara Valley. Bond and Hu solicited investments in the Asenqua funds, purported "hedge funds" that they claimed to manage.
- 11. In meetings with potential investors, Hu described himself as the founder and president of the Asenqua funds. Hu introduced Bond, who attended the meetings with Hu, as the investment manager of the Asenqua funds. Hu highlighted Bond's background in finance, including his designation as a Chartered Financial Analyst. At meetings with potential investors, Bond and Hu claimed that the Asenqua funds primarily invested in the securities of high technology companies.

- 12. Bond provided his analysis of market trends to potential investors at the meetings. Bond appeared to speak knowledgeably about hedge fund investment strategies in order to lead investors into believing that Bond would oversee the Asenqua funds' investment portfolio.
- 13. Hu told potential investors at the meetings that the Asenqua funds followed a special trading strategy, in which the funds took offsetting positions in strong and weak companies in the same market sectors. Hu assured potential investors that this trading strategy lowered investment risk. With Bond in attendance at the meetings, Hu boasted about the purported investment returns generated by the Asenqua funds. According to Hu and documents that he provided potential investors at the meetings and later, the Asenqua funds generated high returns for investors. Among various figures, Hu claimed that the Asenqua funds returned 42 percent in 2001, 30 percent in 2002, and 34 percent in 2003.
- 14. Throughout the relevant period, both Bond and Hu reinforced the impression that Bond managed the Asenqua funds. Hu gave investors and potential investors marketing materials and detailed written descriptions of the Asenqua hedge funds known as "private placement memoranda." These investment documents described Bond's and Hu's roles in the investment decisions of the Asenqua funds. According to the investment documents, investor funds were to be pooled in a "master fund" for the Asenqua funds. As the managers of the Asenqua funds, Bond and Hu were to execute the Asenqua funds' investment strategy using the master fund and allocate fees and returns among the investors. The investment documents, and other marketing materials provided to investors, described Bond's experience in finance and his responsibility for managing the Asenqua funds' investments.
- 15. Bond also described himself as the Asenqua funds' "fund manager" in e-mail messages. From time to time, investors communicated with Bond to ask about certain market trends, and Bond purported to research their questions and provide answers. As late as December 2007, Bond participated in a discussion with at least one investor where he described particular investments in companies that Asenqua had made as part of the hedge fund strategy. Bond's apparent involvement in the management of the Asenqua funds was

COMPLAINT - 4 - SEC V. BOND

significant to investors, who decided to invest after meeting and speaking with Bond and after receiving investment documents describing Bond's investment role with the Asenqua funds.

- 16. Contrary to the representations to investors, however, Bond did not act as the investment manager for the Asenqua funds. Bond did not manage any of Asenqua funds' investments and executed no trades on behalf of any of the Asenqua funds. Hu did not deposit any investor funds into financial accounts held in the name of the master fund. Although the master funds were supposed to be the basis for the portfolios that Bond purportedly managed, neither Bond nor Hu established any master fund on behalf of the Asenqua funds. By participating in meetings with potential investors and in subsequent communications with investors, Bond knowingly or recklessly misled investors about his role as the investment manager of the Asenqua funds.
- 17. Furthermore, contrary to representations to investors, Bond and Hu did not use investors' funds to execute an investment strategy on behalf of the Asenqua funds, nor did they invest any funds in the manner described to investors in meetings and in Asenqua fund investment documents. By participating in meetings with potential investors and in subsequent communications with investors, Bond knowingly or recklessly misled investors into believing that the Asenqua funds would generate investment returns based on investment strategies presented by Bond and Hu.
- 18. In addition, Bond knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that the Asenqua funds' investment documents made material misrepresentations and omissions to investors concerning the funds' legal counsel, auditors, and administration. Among other things, the Asenqua funds' investment documents stated that the Asenqua funds had retained prominent international law firms as legal counsel. In fact, the law firms identified in the investment documents had not been retained as legal counsel to the Asenqua funds. Similarly, the investment documents claimed that independent auditors and a known and reputable fund administrator assisted in the oversight, accounting, and administration of the hedge funds. In fact, however, the Asenqua funds had no independent auditors, the fund administrator was not

- 19. Between 2001 and 2007, Bond and Hu raised more than \$5 million from at least eight investors in the Asenqua funds. These funds were misappropriated by Bond and Hu within days of receipt. Between 2001 and 2008, Hu transferred investor funds to accounts under Hu's control, and on more than 50 occasions from November 2005 to December 2008, Hu transferred investor funds to businesses and persons unrelated to the master fund specified in the investment documents. Neither Bond nor Hu informed investors of the transfers.
- 20. Bond personally profited from his role in the scheme. Between 2001 and 2008, Hu sent Bond approximately \$900,000 of the funds raised from Asenqua investors. Bond received irregular payments from Hu, and on more than one occasion shortly after investors made investments in the Asenqua funds. For example, Bond and Hu solicited funds in a meeting with an investor in March or April 2007. On April 24, 2007, the investor transferred \$2 million to an Asenqua fund account controlled by Hu. On May 1, 2007, Hu sent \$56,000 by wire transfer to Bond—the largest single payment Bond received in 2007 from Asenqua. Bond thus knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that the payments that he received from Hu were funds misappropriated from investors and not proceeds from "returns" generated from the Asenqua funds.
- 21. Bond's participation in meetings with investors, his communications with investors, and his acceptance of investor funds from Hu substantially assisted Hu's material misrepresentations and omissions to investors and potential investors. Bond participated knowingly or recklessly in acts, practices, and a course of business that operated as a fraud upon investors in the Asenqua funds.
- 22. Beginning in 2006, investors made "redemption" requests, asking for the Asenqua funds to return their investments and purported profits. Bond and Hu failed to return any funds to most of the investors who requested redemptions. For those few investors who received redemptions, the amount was far less than the value Hu had represented their

investment was then worth. Bond has not returned any funds that he received from Hu to investors.

investors

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 by Defendant Bond, or, in the Alternative, Aiding and Abetting Hu's Violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 by Defendant Bond

- 23. The Commission realleges and incorporates by reference Paragraph Nos. 1 through 22, above.
- 24. By engaging in the acts and conduct alleged above, Bond, directly or indirectly, in connection with the purchase or sale of securities, by the use of means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or of the mails, or of a facility of a national securities exchange, with scienter: (a) employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud; (b) made untrue statements of material fact or omitted to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; and (c) engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon other persons, including purchasers and sellers of securities.
- 25. Alternatively, by engaging in the acts and conduct alleged above, Hu, directly or indirectly, in connection with the purchase or sale of securities, by the use of means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or of the mails, or of a facility of a national securities exchange, with scienter: (a) employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud; (b) made untrue statements of material fact or omitted to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; and (c) engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon other persons, including purchasers and sellers of securities.
- 26. By engaging in the conduct alleged above, Bond knowingly provided substantial assistance to Hu's violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)], and Rule 10b-5 [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5], thereunder.
- 27. By engaging in the forgoing conduct, Bond has violated and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)],

COMPLAINT - 7 - SEC V. BOND

and Rule 10b-5 [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5], thereunder. Alternatively, by engaging in the 1 forgoing conduct, Bond has aided and abetted violations by Hu, and unless restrained and 2 enjoined will continue to aid and abet violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act 3 [15 U.S.C. § 78i(b)], and Rule 10b-5 [17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5], thereunder. 4 5 SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF 6 Aiding and Abetting Hu's Violations of Section 206(1) and 206(2) of the Advisers Act by Defendant Bond 7 28. The Commission realleges and incorporates by reference Paragraph Nos. 1 8 through 22, above. 9 29. At all relevant times. Hu acted as an investment adviser, as defined by 10 Section 202(a)(11) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-2(a)(11)], to the Asenqua hedge 11 funds and investors in the Asenqua hedge funds. 12 30. By engaging in the acts and conduct alleged above, Hu, directly or indirectly, 13 through use of the means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate 14 commerce or of the mails, and while engaged in the business of advising others for 15 compensation as to the advisability of investing in, purchasing, or selling securities: 16 (a) employed devices, schemes, and artifices to defraud; and (b) engaged in acts, practices, or 17 courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon clients or 18 prospective clients. 19 31. By engaging in the conduct alleged above, Bond knowingly provided 20 substantial assistance to Hu's violations of Sections 206(1) and 206(2) of the Advisers Act 21 [15 U.S.C. §§ 80b-6(1) and 80b-6(2)]. 22 32. By reason of the foregoing conduct, Bond has aided and abetted Hu's 23 violations of Sections 206(1) and 206(2) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 80b-6(1) and 24 80b-6(2)]. Unless restrained and enjoined, Bond will continue to aid and abet such violations. 25 26 27

28

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Aiding and Abetting Hu's Violations of Section 206(4) of the Advisers Act and Rule 206(4)-8 by Defendant Bond

- 33. The Commission realleges and incorporates by reference Paragraph Nos. 1 through 22, above.
- 34. At all relevant times, Hu acted as an investment adviser, as defined by Section 202(a)(11) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-2(a)(11)], to the Asenqua hedge funds and investors in the Asenqua hedge funds.
- 35. At all relevant times, the Asenqua funds were pooled investment vehicles, as defined by Rule 206(4)-8(b) promulgated under the Advisers Act [17 C.F.R. § 275.206(4)-8(b)].
- 36. By engaging in the acts and conduct alleged above, Hu, while acting as an investment adviser to a pooled investment vehicle, by the use of the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce and of the mails, directly and indirectly, has engaged in transactions, practices, and courses of business which operate as a fraud or deceit upon investors in the Asenqua hedge funds. Hu made untrue statements of a material fact or omitted to state a material fact necessary to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading, to any investor or prospective investor in the Asenqua hedge funds, and otherwise engaged in acts, practices or courses of business that were fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative with respect to any investor or prospective investor in the Asenqua hedge funds.
- 37. By engaging in the conduct alleged above, Bond knowingly provided substantial assistance to Hu's violations of Section 206(4) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-6(4)] and Rule 206(4)-8 thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 275.206(4)-8].
- 38. By reason of the foregoing conduct, Bond has aided and abetted Hu's violations of Section 206(4) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-6(4)] and Rule 206(4)-8 thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 275.206(4)-8]. Unless restrained and enjoined, Bond will continue to aid and abet such violations.

1	PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
2	WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court:		
3	I.		
4	Enjoin Bond temporarily, preliminarily, and permanently from directly or indirectly		
5	violating Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)], and Rule 10b-5 thereunder		
6	[17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5].		
7	II.		
8	Enjoin Bond temporarily, preliminarily, and permanently from directly or indirectly		
9	violating Sections 206(1), 206(2), and 206(4) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 80b-6(1),		
10	80b-6(2), and 80b-6(4)] and Rule 206(4)-8 thereunder [17 C.F.R. § 275.206(4)-8].		
11	m.		
12	Order Bond to provide a verified accounting of all payments made to him by the		
13	Asenqua hedge funds.		
14	IV.		
15	Order Bond to disgorge his ill-gotten gains according to proof, plus prejudgment		
16	interest thereon.		
17	V.		
18	Order Bond to pay civil penalties pursuant to Section 21(d) of the Exchange Act		
19	[15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)] and Section 209(e) of the Advisers Act [15 U.S.C. § 80b-9(e)].		
20	VI.		
21	Retain jurisdiction of this action in accordance with the principles of equity and the		
22	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in order to implement and carry out the terms of all orders		
23	and decrees that may be entered, or to entertain any suitable application or motion for		
24	additional relief within the jurisdiction of this Court.		
25			
26			
27			
,,			

1	1 V	II.
2	Grant such other and further relief as this Court may determine to be just, equitable	
3	and necessary.	
4	4	
5	DATED: March 31, 2010 Re	espectfully submitted,
6	5	
7	7	E/_/_
8	B EI	LENA RO
9	At	ttorney for Plaintiff ECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
10	I	OMMISSION
11		•
12		
13	3	
14	•	
15	5	
16	5	