

**FINANCIAL INDUSTRY REGULATORY AUTHORITY
OFFICE OF HEARING OFFICERS**

DEPARTMENT OF ENFORCEMENT,

Complainant,

v.

TEJINDER SINGH
(CRD No. 2547590),

Respondent.

Disciplinary Proceeding
No. 2023078835001

Hearing Officer–MPD

**ORDER REGARDING RESPONDENT'S
MOTION TO EXTEND HIS TIME TO ANSWER**

I. Introduction

On May 2, 2025, the Department of Enforcement filed a two-cause Complaint against Respondent Tejinder Singh alleging he violated FINRA Rules 8210 and 2010 by failing to fully respond to requests for the production of information and documents (Cause One) and by failing to appear and provide on-the-record testimony (Cause Two) that FINRA requested as part of its investigation into whether he made material misrepresentations to obtain a loan on behalf of an allegedly undisclosed outside business.

The Notice of Complaint informed Respondent the deadline for him to file his Answer to the Complaint was May 30, 2025. Two days before that deadline, on May 28, 2025, Respondent sent an email to the Office of Hearing Officers, with copies to Enforcement, in which he requested that his time to answer the Complaint be extended by 12 months. Respondent stated he was requesting the extension based on medical advice, and he attached to his email, among other documents, a May 23, 2025, letter from his primary care physician. In the letter, the doctor recommended, as part of the treatment for an underlying medical condition, that Respondent “avoid stress for the next year” and “avoid testimonies, hearings.”

The Hearing Officer previously assigned to this matter advised the parties he would treat Respondent’s May 28, 2025, email as a request for a postponement of the deadline for him to file an Answer to the Complaint.¹ On June 5, 2025, the Chief Hearing Officer reassigned this matter

¹ Order Setting Deadline for Enforcement to Respond to Respondent’s Request for an Extension of Time to File an Answer (May 29, 2025). Consistent with the prior Hearing Officer’s May 29, 2025, Order, I have treated Respondent’s May 28, 2025, email as a motion for an extension of time to file an Answer (“Motion”). The Motion will be made a part of the record in this matter along with a copy of the May 23, 2025, letter from Respondent’s

to me. Shortly after the reassignment, on June 6, 2025, Respondent sent a second email to the Office of Hearing Officers and to Enforcement in which he reiterated his request for an extension of 12 months to file his Answer.² Later that same day, Enforcement filed its opposition to the Motion.³ Respondent sent a third email regarding his Motion to the Office of Hearing Officers and Enforcement approximately two hours later.⁴

For the reasons discussed below, Respondent's request for a 12-month extension of his time to answer the Complaint is **DENIED**. Nonetheless, I find that a shorter extension of one month from the date when Respondent's Answer was originally due is appropriate. Accordingly, Respondent's time to file and serve his Answer to the Complaint is extended until **June 30, 2025**. If Respondent fails to file and serve his Answer by that deadline, Enforcement is directed to serve Respondent with a Second Notice of Complaint, in accordance with FINRA Rule 9215(f).

II. Discussion

FINRA Rule 9215(a) authorizes the Hearing Officer to extend a respondent's time to answer a complaint "for good cause." FINRA Rule 9222(a) similarly provides that the Hearing Officer may grant an extension of the time limit for the filing of any papers "for good cause shown." The Hearing Officer's authority to grant such extensions is further limited by FINRA Rule 9222(b)(2), which provides that an extension "shall not exceed 28 days unless the Hearing Officer states on the record or provides by written order the reasons a longer period is necessary." These limitations promote the "[e]xpeditious resolution of disciplinary proceedings," which "serves the interests of the industry and the investing public."⁵

Respondent claims that good cause exists based on his health. However, even accepting as true Respondent's proof of his underlying medical condition, his doctor's vague recommendation that he "avoid stress" is insufficient to establish good cause to delay these proceedings for 12 months.

primary care physician. In the interest of preserving Respondent's privacy, I find it unnecessary to include as a part of the record the other medical documents that Respondent attached to the Motion.

² I have treated Respondent's second email, received by the Office of Hearing Officers on June 6, 2025, at 12:41 a.m. ET, as a supplement to the Motion ("Supplement to Respondent's Motion"). As with the original Motion, the Supplement to Respondent's Motion will be made a part of the record in this matter. The medical records attached to the Supplement to Respondent's Motion, which are identical to the medical records attached to the original Motion, will not be made part of the record.

³ Enforcement's Opposition to Respondent's Motion for an Extension of Time to File an Answer ("Opposition").

⁴ Although Respondent did not seek permission to file a reply, as is required under FINRA Rule 9146(h), I will treat his third email, received by the Office of Hearing Officers on June 6, 2025, at 1:53 p.m. ET, as a reply in further support of the Motion ("Reply"). The Reply also will be made a part of the record in this matter.

⁵ OHO Order 97-7 (CAF970002) (Nov. 13, 1997), at 2, https://www.finra.org/sites/default/files/OHODecision/p007818_0_0.pdf.

The Complaint in this case, which consists of two causes of action both alleging violations of FINRA Rule 8210, is not complex. To answer the Complaint—which is all that is required at this stage of the proceedings⁶—Respondent need only “admit, deny, or state that [he] does not have and is unable to obtain sufficient information to admit or deny, each allegation.”⁷ Nothing in Respondent’s Motion suggests he is currently unable to complete this task, much less that he needs a delay of 12 months to do so.

In fact, Respondent’s Motion suggests exactly the opposite. In the Motion and the Supplement to Respondent’s Motion, Respondent provides a detailed account of his purported efforts to comply with FINRA’s requests for information and documents.⁸ This account appears to respond to many of the allegations in the Complaint and contains precisely the kind of information that respondents generally include in an Answer.

The fact that Respondent is currently registered with FINRA as the sole owner and manager, Financial and Operations Principal, and Chief Compliance Officer for his broker-dealer is also inconsistent with his request for a postponement of 12 months to avoid stress.⁹ Respondent fails to explain why his health allegedly prevents him from answering the Complaint but not from continuing to work as a principal and compliance officer in the securities industry.

For all of these reasons, I find that Respondent has failed to establish good cause to justify extending his time to answer the Complaint by 12 months. However, given that this is Respondent’s first request for an extension, and taking into consideration his *pro se* status, I find it appropriate to give Respondent a shorter extension of one month from the date when his Answer was originally due. Accordingly, Respondent’s time to file and serve his Answer to the Complaint is extended until **June 30, 2025**. If Respondent fails to file and serve his Answer by that deadline, Enforcement is directed to serve Respondent with a Second Notice of Complaint, in accordance with FINRA Rule 9215(f), which, in effect, will provide Respondent with an additional 14 days to file his Answer.

⁶ Enforcement has represented it is amenable to accommodating Respondent’s health at a hearing through, for example, shortened hearing days and breaks during the day. *See* Opposition, at 4 n.12. If this matter proceeds to a hearing—which would not take place for several months—Respondent remains free to request an accommodation at that time.

⁷ FINRA Rule 9215(b). To assist *pro se* parties like Respondent, the Office of Hearing Officers publishes on its website a Guide to the Disciplinary Hearing Process, available at <https://www.finra.org/rules-guidance/adjudication-decisions/office-hearing-officers-oho/hearing-process>, which includes an explanation of the process for answering a Complaint along with a sample Answer.


⁸ *See* Motion, at 1–3; Supplement to Respondent’s Motion, at 1–4.

⁹ *See* Opposition, at 3 n.7 (describing Respondent as “the sole direct owner and executive officer, as well as the FINOP and Chief Compliance Officer” of his broker-dealer) (citing FINRA BrokerCheck, <https://brokercheck.finra.org/firm/summary/131793>); *accord* Compl. ¶¶ 5–7.

III. Order

For the reasons set forth above, Respondent's request for a 12-month extension of time to file an Answer is **DENIED**. Respondent shall file and serve his Answer to the Complaint on or before **June 30, 2025**. If Respondent fails to file and serve his Answer by that deadline, Enforcement is directed to serve Respondent with a Second Notice of Complaint, in accordance with FINRA Rule 9215(f).

SO ORDERED.



Megan P. Davis
Hearing Officer

Date: June 18, 2025

Copies to:

Tejinder Singh, Respondent (via email)
Matthew Ryan, Esq., FINRA Enforcement (via email)
Matthew Aglialoro, Esq., FINRA Enforcement (via email)
Tricia Lyons, Esq., FINRA Enforcement (via email)
Adam Balin, Esq., FINRA Enforcement (via email)
Jennifer L. Crawford, Esq., FINRA Enforcement (via email)