1	MARC J. FAGEL (Cal. Bar No. 154425) ROBERT TASHJIAN (Cal. Bar No. 191007) tashjianr@sec.gov LLOYD FARNHAM (Cal. Bar No. 202231) farnhaml@sec.gov
2	ROBERT TASHJIAN (Cal. Bar No. 191007) tashjianr@sec.gov
3	MARC J. FAGEL (Cal. Bar No. 154425) ROBERT TASHJIAN (Cal. Bar No. 191007) tashjianr@sec.gov LLOYD FARNHAM (Cal. Bar No. 202231) farnhaml@sec.gov  Attorneys for Plaintiff
. 4	Attorneys for Plaintiff
5	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  44 Montgomery Street, 26th Floor
6	San Francisco, California 94104
7	Telephone: (415) 705-2500 Facsimile: (415) 705-2501 <b>E-filing</b>
8	L-11111Y
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11	SI
12	
13	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,   Case No.
14	Plaintiff, V 09 1882
15	v.  COMPLAINT
16	NASSER M. MARDINI,
17	Defendant.
18	
19	Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") alleges:
20	SUMMARY OF THE ACTION
21	1. This action involves insider trading by Defendant Nasser Mardini. On at least one
22	occasion, Mardini purchased securities and tipped others after learning from his friend Michael
23	Kara that the company was the target of a potential acquisition. Michael Kara received the
24	information from his brother Maher Kara, who at the time was an employee of the Investment
25	Banking Division of Citigroup Global Markets, Inc. ("Citigroup").
26	2. In March 2007, Michael Kara tipped Mardini about an upcoming acquisition
27	involving Biosite, Inc., a medical device company. Before the acquisition was announced,
28	Mardini directed a friend to purchase Biosite call options for his benefit, caused another person

1	to purchase Biosite call options, and purchased Biosite stock in another person's account. The
2	profits in these three accounts totaled \$291,723.
3	JURISDICTION AND VENUE
4	3. The Commission brings this action pursuant to Sections 21(d), 21(e), and 21A of
5	the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d), 78u(e), and 78u-1].
6	4. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Sections 21(e), 21A and 27
7	of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(e), 78u-1 and 78aa].
8	5. The Defendant, directly or indirectly, made use of the means or instrumentalities
9	of interstate commerce, or of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange in
10	connection with the transactions, acts, practices and courses of business alleged herein.
11	6. Venue in this District is proper pursuant to Section 27 of the Exchange Act
12	[15 U.S.C. § 78aa] because a substantial part of the acts and transactions constituting the
13	violations alleged in this Complaint occurred within the Northern District of California.
14	INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT
15	7. Under Civil Local Rule 3-2, this civil action should be assigned to the San
16	Francisco or Oakland Divisions, because a substantial part of the events or omissions which give
۱7	rise to the claim occurred in Alameda County and Contra Costa County.
18	DEFENDANTS
9	8. Nasser N. Mardini, age 52, is a resident of Stockton, California. He owns and
20	operates a small business is Stockton.
21	RELEVANT ACQUISITION TARGET
22	9. Biosite, Inc. ("Biosite") was a Delaware corporation with its principal place of
23	business in San Diego, California. During the relevant time period, Biosite common stock was
24	listed on the NASDAQ Global Market. Prior to its acquisition in 2007, Biosite developed and
25	sold diagnostic medical tests.
26	
27	
28	

## **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

### A. Maher Kara's access to nonpublic information

10. Maher Kara was employed by Citigroup as an investment banker from 1999 to April 2007, and specialized in healthcare companies beginning in 2002. Maher Kara learned about confidential upcoming transactions and other confidential information regarding Citigroup's clients through his position in the Healthcare Group. As an employee of Citigroup with access to confidential information, Maher Kara was subject to restrictions regarding confidential information he obtained in the course of his employment.

# B. Trading in the Securities of Biosite, Inc.

- learned that one of its clients, Beckman Coulter Inc., a medical equipment company based in Fullerton, California, was in advanced discussions with an acquisition target and would seek financing for the acquisition from Citigroup. The planned acquisition of Biosite and Beckman Coulter's work with Citigroup was confidential and not publicly disclosed. Maher Kara was aware that Citigroup's client was seeking to acquire Biosite. At least as of March 19, 2007, Beckman Coulter had taken the following steps toward its planned acquisition of Biosite, including (1) entering into a confidentiality agreement; (2) engaging legal and financial advisors; (3) negotiating with Biosite management and board of directors regarding a tender offer price; and (4) securing financing commitments for the proposed acquisition.
- 12. Maher Kara misappropriated material nonpublic information, in breach of his duty of confidentiality to Citigroup, by tipping his brother Michael Kara about the planned Biosite acquisition. Maher Kara tipped Michael Kara to confer a benefit on himself or to provide a gift to his brother.
- 13. On March 22, 2007, Michael Kara provided Mardini with material nonpublic information about the plan to acquire Biosite. At the time he tipped Mardini, Michael Kara was in possession of material nonpublic information regarding Biosite, and he knew or was reckless in not knowing that Maher Kara disclosed this information in breach of a duty of confidentiality.

Michael Kara tipped Mardini about the plan to acquire Biosite to receive a personal benefit or to confer a gift of the information to Mardini.

- 14. On March 22 and 23, 2007, Mardini directed a friend to purchase Biosite call options for his benefit, caused another person to purchase Biosite call options by recommending that he purchase the options, and executed trades in another person's brokerage account.
- 15. At the time he made these trades, tipped others, or caused others to purchase Biosite securities, Mardini was in possession of material nonpublic information regarding Biosite and knew or was reckless in not knowing that this information was obtained in breach of a duty of confidentiality. Mardini also knew or had reason to know that the information was nonpublic, and knew or had reason to know that the information originated from the offering company, the target company, or any person working on their behalf. Mardini provided tips to others to receive a personal benefit or to confer a gift of the information to friends or family members.
- 16. On Sunday, March 25, 2007, Beckman Coulter announced that it had reached an agreement with the management of Biosite to acquire the company in a tender offer at a price of \$85 per share. The price of Biosite shares rose 51 percent from a \$55.45 closing price on Friday, March 23 to close at \$83.80 per share on Monday, March 26, with the trading volume on March 26 more than 38 times the trading volume on March 23.
- 17. The trading in Biosite by either Mardini, the friend he directed to purchase Biosite securities, or others he tipped resulted in illegal profits of \$291,723.

#### FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violation of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5

- 18. Paragraph nos. 1 through 17 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.
- 19. The Defendant, while in the possession of material nonpublic information regarding Andrx and Biosite traded in the securities of those companies.
- 20. The Defendant, while in the possession of material nonpublic information regarding Biosite, traded in the securities of those companies or tipped others using material nonpublic information.

.26

- 21. The Defendant tipped others with material nonpublic information and received a benefit, either financial, reputational, or social, from the tips provided to others.
- 22. The Defendant knew or was reckless in not knowing that the information he used to tip others or that he possessed at the time of the trading was obtained through the breach of a duty of confidentiality or trust.
- 23. The Defendant committed the alleged acts or omissions in connection with the purchase or sale of securities, and by the use of means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or the facilities of a national securities exchange.
- 24. Based on the above conduct and the factual allegations contained in this Complaint, the Defendant violated, and unless restrained and 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

- 25. Paragraph nos. 1 through 17 are re-alleged and incorporated herein by reference.
- 26. The Defendant was in possession of material information relating to a tender offer, which information he knew or had reason to know was nonpublic, which information he knew or had reason to know had been acquired directly of indirectly from (1) the offering entity or person; (2) the issuer of the securities to be sought by such tender offer; or (3) any officer, director, partner, employee or any other person acting on behalf of the offering entity or person or the issuer. While in possession of this material nonpublic information relating to a tender offer, the Defendant purchased, sold, or caused to be purchased or sold, securities of the issuer sought to be acquired in the proposed tender offer.
- 27. At the time of the purchase of sale of the securities of the issuer sought to be acquired in the proposed tender offer, offering entities had taken a substantial step or steps to commence a tender offer for the issuer.
- 28. Based on the above conduct and the factual allegations contained in this Complaint, the Defendant violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate,

1	Section 14(e) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78n(e)] and Rule 14e-3 thereunder [17 C.F.R.
2	§ 240.14e-3].
3	PRAYER FOR RELIEF
4	WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that this Court:
5	I.
6	Permanently enjoin the Defendant from directly or indirectly violating Sections 10(b) and
7	14(e) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b) and 78n(e)], and Rules 10b-5 and 14e-3
8	thereunder [17 C.F.R. §§ 240.10b-5 and 240.14e-3].
9	II.
10	Order the Defendant to disgorge the ill-gotten gains derived from illegal trading and
11	tipping, plus prejudgment interest.
12	III.
13	Order the Defendant to pay civil penalties pursuant to Section 21A of the Exchange Act
14	[15 U.S.C. § 78u-l]; and
15	IV.
16	Grant such other relief as this Court may deem just and appropriate.
17	
18	Dated: April 30, 2009 Respectfully submitted,
19	$\mathcal{L}$
20	LLOYD FARNHAM
21	Attorney for Plaintiff SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
22	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	