



KITSMAN
INVESTMENT
MANAGEMENT

600 S. TYLER, SUITE 1702
AMARILLO, TEXAS 79101
806-322-4825

CHARLES B. KITSMAN
CHUCK@KITSMANINV.COM

April 21, 2025.

Ms. Jennifer Piorko Mitchell

Office of the Corporate Secretary

FINRA

1735 K Street Washington, DC 20006

Re: Request for Comment on Regulatory Notice 25-05

Dear Ms. Mitchell,

As an owner of a Registered Investment Advisory (RIA) firm, also being a registered representative at a member firm that is independent and not affiliated in any manner with my RIA firm, I strongly object to the newly proposed Rule 3290 in Regulatory Notice 25-05.

This proposed Rule would subject certain independent RIA/IAs to an additional layer of corporate and regulatory oversight that doesn't exist for other RIA/IAs that do not have FINRA licensure. Further, the proposed Rule claims jurisdiction over real estate, banking and insurance businesses, which FINRA has no right to regulate under its Charter or are otherwise subject to regulation by other Federal and/or State(s) agencies.

I have read the Comment Letter submitted by Mr. Purcell of PKS Investments, and I fully agree with his stated arguments against promulgating the proposed Rule 3290. It will be impossible to comply with client privacy mandates, and his citation of voluminous conflicting rules and guidance presages greater regulatory confusion and turmoil should Rule 3290 be adopted.

Fundamental to the fiduciary relationship that exists between our firm and our clients is the trust that our clients have that their personal information and objectives will remain confidential. This trust, and the confidentiality of the advisor-client relationship, is critical to our function as fiduciaries and advisors.

Advisor-client confidentiality, and specifically the confidentiality of client non-public personal information, is protected under federal law and specifically Regulation SP. State privacy laws also protect the confidential information of investment advisory clients, in some states more stringently than Regulation SP.

Forcing an investment advisor to provide non-public personal information of an advisory client to an unaffiliated broker-dealer violates the privacy rights of the advisory client under federal and state law and undermines the confidentiality that advisory clients expect and deserve in their advisory relationship. Providing unaffiliated broker-dealers access to confidential advisory client information exposes the client's sensitive financial information to parties who are neither entitled to it nor directly responsible for managing the client's assets, thereby violating the advisor's ethical obligations regarding client confidentiality.

Registered Investment Advisory firms are already regulated by the SEC and the States and are not subject to FINRA jurisdiction. We are fiduciaries and subject to those standards. Imposition of FINRA Rules, that are in no way related to my business, on only those RIA firms that have person(s) also registered with a FINRA member creates an uneven regulatory environment and serves no purpose other than an unwarranted expansion of FINRA's jurisdiction.

I strongly believe that the proposed Rule 3290 as currently written, together with the guidance and analysis provided within Regulatory Notice 25-05, should not be adopted. I respectfully ask that FINRA reconsider the proposed Rule as originally drafted and discussed in Regulatory Notice 18-08.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Charles B. Kitsman