

**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 DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

On June 20, 2025, Respondent sent an email to the Office of Hearing Officers and to the Department of Enforcement requesting that I reconsider my denial of his motion for an extension of 12 months to file his Answer in this matter.¹ I have treated Respondent's June 20, 2025, email as a motion for reconsideration of my June 18, 2025, Order ("Reconsideration Motion"). For the reasons discussed below, the Reconsideration Motion is **DENIED**.

Reconsideration is generally appropriate only "when new evidence surfaces, a new development changes the law, the order is clearly erroneous, or reconsideration is required to prevent a manifest injustice."² The Reconsideration Motion does not meet any of these requirements. It consists entirely of a rehash of the identical arguments and evidence that I already considered and rejected in my June 18, 2025, Order.³

¹ Order Regarding Respondent's Motion to Extend his Time to Answer (June 18, 2025).

² OHO Order 16-13 (2014040968501), at 5–6 (Mar. 3, 2016), https://www.finra.org/sites/default/files/OHO_Order%2016-13_2014040968501_0_0_0_0.pdf (quoting *Dep't of Enforcement v. Thompson*, No. 2011025785602, 2015 FINRA Discip. LEXIS 9, at *15 (OHO Mar. 30, 2015)) (internal quotations omitted).

³ Because the June 18, 2025, Order, did not describe in detail two medical records that Respondent attached to his original motion for an extension of time to file an Answer—(1) the results of a diagnostic test performed more than one year ago, on April 22, 2024, and (2) a purported "expert opinion" from a non-treating physician opining on the alleged causal connection between "emotional stress" and Respondent's underlying medical condition—Respondent suggests that I overlooked these records. He is incorrect. I reviewed and considered both documents before issuing my June 18, 2025, Order. Neither document supports Respondent's request for a 12-month delay of this proceeding. Although I minimized my discussion of those documents in the interest of preserving Respondent's privacy, *see* June 18, 2025, Order, at 1 n.1, I have reconsidered my decision to exclude them from the record in light of Respondent's reliance upon them. The two documents will be added to the record for this matter as attachments to Respondent's motion for an extension of 12 months to file his Answer.

If anything, the Reconsideration Motion reinforces my conclusion that a 12-month extension of Respondent's time to answer is unnecessary. Respondent concedes in the Reconsideration Motion that, notwithstanding his health issues, he continues to work as a principal and compliance officer at his four-person broker-dealer. Respondent tries to explain this inconsistency by claiming his work at his member firm is "predictable, routine and mundane." But this argument misses the point. As a currently registered person, who is actively employed in the securities industry, Respondent cannot avoid his regulatory obligations by claiming he needs to minimize stress.

For these reasons, as well as the reasons set forth in my June 18, 2025, Order, the Reconsideration Motion is **DENIED**.⁴ If Respondent wants to participate in this proceeding, he must file and serve his Answer to the Complaint on or before **June 30, 2025**. Alternatively, Respondent can wait to file and serve his Answer until 14 days after Enforcement serves him with the Second Notice of Complaint.

In either case, Respondent can answer the Complaint by manually writing next to every numbered paragraph of the Complaint that he "Admits," "Denies," or "Lacks Sufficient Information to Admit or Deny" the allegations, depending upon which response is appropriate.⁵ He should also list any affirmative defenses he would like to assert at the end of his Answer.⁶ Finally, Respondent should specify in his Answer whether he is requesting a hearing or whether he would prefer that this matter be decided based on written submissions.⁷

⁴ In addition to seeking reconsideration, Respondent also requests information on how to appeal my June 18, 2025, Order. FINRA Rule 9148 authorizes interlocutory appeals to the National Adjudicatory Council as a matter of right in very limited circumstances—when an attorney or party representative is excluded from a disciplinary hearing or conference for contumacious conduct under FINRA Rule 9280—that are not applicable here. To the extent Respondent is seeking leave from me to pursue an interlocutory appeal, his request is denied. *See generally* OHO Order 98-28 (CAF970011), at 2 (July 20, 1998), https://www.finra.org/sites/default/files/OHODecision/p007761_0_0.pdf (except for appeals of orders under FINRA Rule 9280, interlocutory appeals "are limited to extraordinary circumstances and may be pursued only if the Hearing Officer grants review"). Respondent may challenge the denial of his request for a 12-month extension of his time to answer at the conclusion of this proceeding as part of any appeal from a decision issued pursuant to FINRA Rule 9268 or 9269.

⁵ *See* FINRA Rule 9215(b).

⁶ *See id.*; *see also* Guide to the Disciplinary Hearing Process, <https://www.finra.org/rules-guidance/adjudication-decisions/office-hearing-officers-oho/hearing-process> ("An affirmative defense is an assertion that constitutes a defense to all or a portion of the Complaint, assuming the facts alleged in the Complaint are true. In other words, an affirmative defense attacks the legal grounds for the Complaint, not the truth of the claim.").

⁷ *See* FINRA Rule 9221(a).

I caution Respondent that, if he does not file and serve an Answer within the time periods set forth in this Order, he may be deemed to be in default, in which case, the allegations in the Complaint may be treated as admitted, and a default decision may be entered against him.⁸

SO ORDERED.



Megan P. Davis
Hearing Officer

Date: June 24, 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)

⁸ See FINRA Rules 9215(f), 9269(a).