FINANCIAL INDUSTRY REGULATORY AUTHORITY
OFFICE OF HEARING OFFICERS

DEPARTMENT OF ENFORCEMENT, Complainant, v. KIRK CROSSEN (CRD No. 2742256), Respondent.	Disciplinary Proceeding No. 2023079069001 Hearing Officer–MPD

ORDER ESTABLISHING DEADLINE FOR AMENDED ANSWER

On November 11, 2025, the Department of Enforcement filed a two-count Complaint against the Respondent Kirk Crossen. In the First Cause of Action, Enforcement alleges that Respondent borrowed money from a customer, in violation of FINRA Rules 3240 and 2010. In the Second Cause of Action, Enforcement alleges that Respondent separately violated FINRA Rule 2010 by making false statements to his member firm employer on two compliance questionnaires about the loans he received from the customer.

Respondent filed an Answer on March 25, 2026, in which he generally denies the allegations of wrongdoing.

Enforcement has asserted that Respondent's Answer does not comply with the requirements of FINRA Rule 9215(b) because it "fails to admit, deny, or state that Respondent is unable to obtain sufficient information to admit or deny, each allegation in the Complaint."[1] Respondent has agreed to file an amended Answer, and he has requested until April 24, 2026, to do so.

As stated on the record at the Initial Pre-Hearing Conference on April 15, 2026, Respondent is directed to file an amended Answer that complies with the requirements of FINRA Rule 9215(b) by **April 24, 2026**. The amended Answer shall contain numbered paragraphs corresponding to each numbered paragraph in the Complaint. As required by FINRA Rule 9215(b), Respondent should admit, deny, or state that he does not have and is unable to obtain sufficient information to admit or deny each allegation of the Complaint. If Respondent fails to deny or state that he has insufficient knowledge with respect to any specific paragraph of

[1] Enforcement's Unopposed Motion for Leave to Allow Respondent to File Rule-Compliant Answer, at 1.

the Complaint, I may deem the allegations in any such paragraphs to be admitted. Respondent also should assert any affirmative defenses in his amended Answer.

For the avoidance of doubt, in the meantime, Enforcement's obligation under FINRA Rule 9251(d) to commence making discovery available to Respondent shall not be stayed.[2]

SO ORDERED.

Megan P. Davis
Megan P. Davis
Hearing Officer

Dated: April 15, 2026

Copies to:

Kirk Crossen, Respondent (via OHO Docket Portal)
Jennifer Cullinane, Esq., FINRA Enforcement (via OHO Docket Portal)
John Luburic, Esq., FINRA Enforcement (via OHO Docket Portal)
Melissa Meyers, Esq., FINRA Enforcement (via OHO Docket Portal)

[2] *See* OHO Order 19-05 (2016051493704) (Mar. 1, 2019), at 3 ("Even a non-compliant Answer is generally sufficient to trigger the discovery timing provisions of FINRA Rule 9251(d)."), https://www.finra.org/sites/default/files/2019-10/OHO_Order_19-05_2016051493704.pdf.