This Decision has been published by the NASDR Office of Hearing Officers and should be cited as OHO Redacted Decision ARB980029.

NASD REGULATION, INC. OFFICE OF HEARING OFFICERS

DEPARTMENT OF ENFORCEMENT,	: : :
Complainant,	Non-Summary Suspension Proceeding No. ARB980029
V.	: Hearing Officer - AHP
	: DECISION
Respondent.	: : :
	:

Digest

The Office of Dispute Resolution of NASD Regulation, Inc. (the "ODR"), pursuant to Rule
9513(a), notified Respondent ("") that his registration would be suspended, in
accordance with Article VI, Section 3 of the NASD By-Laws and Rule 9510 et seq., for failing to pay
the amount due in settlement of an NASD arbitration requested a hearing, pursuant to Rule
9514(a), at which he acknowledged that he had not paid the full amount due, but he argued that he
should not be suspended because he was financially unable to make the required payments. The
Hearing Officer, sitting as the Hearing Panel pursuant to Rule 9514(b), held that adequately
demonstrated his bona fide inability to pay the amount due under the terms of the settlement agreement
and dismissed the proceeding.

This Decision has been published by the NASDR Office of Hearing Officers and should be cited as OHO Redacted Decision ARB980029.

Tippew witees
Jacqueline D. Whelan, Esq., Regional Counsel, Denver, Colorado, and Rory C. Flynn, Chief
Litigation Counsel, Washington, DC, for the Department of Enforcement.
, pro se.
DECISION
Introduction
Pursuant to Rule 9513(a), the ODR notified, by letter dated November 3, 1998, that
his registration would be suspended in accordance with Article VI, Section 3 of the NASD By-Laws
and Rule 9150, et seq., as a result of his failure to pay the full amount due under the terms of a
Stipulation dated March 31, 1998, settling the claims against him and ("") in
NASD Arbitration No. 97-00376 (the "Settlement Agreement"). By letter dated November 23, 1998,
requested a hearing pursuant to Rule 9514(a). ¹
A hearing was held, by telephone, on January 8, 1999, at which the Department of Enforcement
("Enforcement") introduced five exhibits (C 1-5), and called to testify or
his behalf and introduced two exhibits, including a completed Disclosure of Assets and Financial
Information ("Disclosure Form") (L 1). Mr is a Certified Financial Planner who assisted
with the preparation of his Disclosure Form.
¹ The ODR extended's deadline to request a hearing to November 25, 1998, because he alleged that the notice initiating this non-summary suspension proceeding dated November 3, 1998, had not been sent to him by

facsimile or overnight commercial courier as required by Rule 9513(a).

²

This Decision has been published by the NASDR Office of Hearing Officers and should be cited as OHO Redacted Decision ARB980029.

After a review of the entire record, the Hearing Officer finds that ______ has satisfactorily shown a <u>bona fide</u> inability to pay the award. Accordingly, this non-summary suspension proceeding will be dismissed.

Facts

On March 31, 1998, and entered into a stipulation of settlement of NASD
Arbitration No. 97-00376. (C 3.) Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, they are required to
pay the Claimants \$28,000 in 14 equal monthly installments commencing on May 1, 1998. Despite the
fact that and were jointly and severally obligated under the terms of the Settlement
Agreement, agreed to make all the payments because was not financially able to
contribute. (Tr. 34.) In furtherance of their agreement, paid the first three installments in the
total amount of \$6,000 before he discontinued further payments. No further payments have been made
by either or
On November 3, 1998, ODR sent a letter initiating this non-summary suspension
proceeding requested a hearing on the ground that he lacked the financial ability to make the
payments required under the terms of the Settlement Agreement.
In support of his claimed inability to pay, introduced his Disclosure Form. (L 1.)
Attached to the form were copies of his U.S. Individual Income Tax Returns for 1996 and 1997, a
Notice of Federal Tax Lien dated October 23, 1997, and other documents reflecting his debts.
's Disclosure Form shows that currently he has a negative net worth of (\$41,213) and
that he has earned only \$5,000 over the last 12 months from his employment at (L 1,
at 1.) His reported income for 1997 was \$18,083. Other than some furniture he values at \$2,300,

This Decision has been published by the NASDR Office of Hearing Officers and should be cited as OHO Redacted Decision ARB980029.
owns no tangible personal property, and he has no other source of funds that he could use to
make the payments under the terms of the Settlement Agreement.
According to's CRD record, he is currently associated with, Inc.
and registered with the NASD. (C 4, at 1.)
Discussion
A respondent in a non-summary suspension proceeding bears the burden of establishing his
bona fide inability to pay an arbitration award or settlement where such inability is raised as a defense to
suspension of the respondent's registration for failure to pay the award or settlement. ² An inability to
pay defense may be rejected if it appears that the respondent has the ability to divert funds from other
expenditures to pay the award, or could borrow the funds, or could make some meaningful payment
toward the award from available assets or income, even if he could not pay the full award. ³
satisfied this burden of proof. Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement,
is required to pay the Claimants another \$22,000 in monthly installments of \$2,000 each's
evidence establishes that his income is insufficient to meet this obligation's income is only
\$5,000 per year, which is not enough to make the required payments even though his living expenses

² <u>See In re: Bruce M. Zipper</u>, Exchange Act Release No. 33376, 55 S.E.C. Docket 2002 (Dec. 23, 1993) ("Because the scope of his assets is particularly with Zipper's knowledge, we think Zipper should properly bear the burden of adducing evidence with respect to those assets.").

³ District Business Conduct Committee for District No. 7 v. Escalator Securities, Inc. Complaint No. C07930034 (NBCC Feb. 19, 1998); District Business Conduct Committee for District No. 8 v. Miguel Angel Cruz, Complaint No. C8A930048 (NBCC Oct. 31, 1997); Herbert Garrett Frey, Exchange Act Release No. 39007 (Sept. 3, 1997); Michael H. Novick, Exchange Act Release No. 37503, 62 S.E.C. Docket 1129 (July 31, 1996); District Business Conduct Committee for District No. 7 v. Bruce M. Zipper, Complaint No. C07910138 (NBCC Oct. 31, 1994), aff'd, Exchange Act Release No. 35606, 58 S.E.C. Docket 235 (April 17, 1995).

This Decision has been published Decision ARB980029.	by the NASDR Office of Hearing Officers and should be cited as OHO Redacted
are minimal. Moreover,	does not have a source of funds that he could use to make a
meaningful payment toward the	e amount due. Accordingly, this proceeding is dismissed. ⁴
	Andrew H. Perkins Hearing Officer

⁴ The Hearing Officer considered all of the arguments of the parties. They are rejected or sustained to the extent they are inconsistent or in accord with the views expressed herein.