

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
VLADIMIR OKHOTNIKOV,)	
JANE DOE a/k/a LOLA FERRARI,)	
MIKAIL SERGEEV,)	
SERGEY MASLAKOV,)	Case No. 22 C 3978
SAMUEL D. ELLIS,)	
MARK F. HAMLIN,)	Judge Jorge L. Alonso
SARAH L. THEISSEN,)	
CARLOS L. MARTINEZ,)	
RONALD R. DEERING,)	
CHERI BETH BOWEN, and)	
ALISHA R. SHEPPERD,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

**PLAINTIFF’S AGREED MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENTS BY CONSENT
AS TO DEFENDANTS SAMUEL D. ELLIS AND SARAH L. THEISSEN**

Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission respectfully moves the Court for entry of the following proposed judgments by consent: (i) Final Judgment as to Defendant Samuel D. Ellis (“Ellis”); and (ii) Partial Judgment as to Defendant Sarah L. Theissen (“Theissen”).

In support of this motion, the SEC shows the Court as follows:

1. The SEC filed its Complaint in this matter on August 1, 2022 (Dkt# 1) alleging, among other things, that Defendants violated the registration and antifraud provisions of the federal securities laws – specifically, Section 5 of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”),

15 U.S.C. § 77e; Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77q(a); and Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5.

2. Ellis has agreed to settle all of the SEC's claims. Attached as Exhibit 1 is Ellis' signed consent to the proposed final judgment. Accordingly, upon entry of the final judgment, the case against Ellis will be resolved in full.

3. Theissen has agreed to a partial settlement of the SEC's claims. Attached as Exhibit 2 is her signed consent to the proposed partial judgment. This judgment obviates the need to litigate substantive liability on the part of Theissen, and it permanently enjoins her from violating the federal securities laws at issue in the complaint as well as from engaging in certain other activity. The proposed judgment further provides that monetary relief sought by the SEC – in the form of disgorgement, prejudgment interest and a civil penalty – shall be determined by the Court at a later date on the SEC's motion. We anticipate moving for such monetary relief after the claims against the remaining Defendants are resolved. District courts routinely have entered judgments based on this type of “bifurcated” settlement in SEC enforcement actions, and have adopted the procedures described in the attached consents for the monetary relief portion of the proceedings. *See, e.g., SEC v. Daubenspeck*, 469 F. Supp. 3d 859, 860 (N.D. Ill. 2020); *SEC v. Zenergy Int'l, Inc.*, No. 13-5511, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 127630, at *2-4 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 20, 2016); *SEC v. Integrity Fin. AZ, LLC*, No. 10-782, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6758, at *3-4 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 20, 2012).

4. In the attached consents, both Ellis and Theissen have agreed the SEC “may present the [proposed judgment] to the Court for signature and entry without further notice.” (*See* Ex. 1-2, at ¶ 16.) Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b), there is no just reason to delay entry of the proposed judgments, and the SEC submits entry of these judgments will conserve judicial

resources and streamline the issues in this litigation. In addition, there is little risk of piecemeal appeals as both Ellis and Theissen have waived their right to appeal from the judgment. (*See* Ex. 1-2, at ¶ 7.)

5. This case will proceed in full as to the remaining Defendants – Vladimir Okhotnikov; Jane Doe a/k/a Lola Ferrari; Mikail Sergeev; Sergey Maslakov; Mark F. Hamlin; Carlos L. Martinez; Ronald R. Deering; Cheri Beth Bowen; and Alisha R. Shepperd – and is not affected by entry of the proposed judgments.

6. Pursuant to the Court’s Individual Practices, the proposed judgments in Word format are being emailed separately to Chambers.

WHEREFORE, for the reasons cited above, the SEC respectfully requests the Court grant this motion and enter the proposed judgments.

DATED: August 2, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

By: /s/ Timothy S. Leiman

Timothy S. Leiman (leimant@sec.gov) (IL #6270153)
Chicago Regional Office
175 W. Jackson Blvd., Suite 1450
Chicago, IL 60604
Telephone: (312) 353-5213

Patrick R. Costello (costello@sec.gov) (FL #75034)
Christopher J. Carney (carney@sec.gov) (DC #472294)
Washington, DC Office
100 F Street NE
Washington, DC 20549-5949
Telephone: (202) 551-3982
Pro Hac Vice Admission Pending

Attorneys for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on August 2, 2022, I caused to be served the foregoing PLAINTIFF'S AGREED MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENTS BY CONSENT AS TO DEFENDANTS SAMUEL D. ELLIS AND SARAH L. THEISSEN on Defendants at the addresses and by the means set forth on the attached Service List.

/s/ Timothy S. Leiman
Timothy S. Leiman

Service List

Samuel D. Ellis, <i>pro se</i> 3726 West Broadway Louisville, KY 40211 samellis1989@gmail.com	By electronic mail
Mark F. Hamlin c/o Ryan Willis, Christian Dysart, James Kurosad Dysart Willis 530 Hillsborough Street, Suite 200 Raleigh, NC 27603 ryan@dysartwillis.com christian@dysartwillis.com james@dysartwillis.com	By electronic mail
Sarah L. Theissen c/o Gregg N. Sofer and Patrick Coffey Husch Blackwell LLP 111 Congress Avenue, Suite 1400 Austin, TX 78701-4093 Gregg.sofer@huschblackwell.com patrick.coffey@huschblackwell.com	By electronic mail
Carlos L. Martinez c/o Matthew Wilson and David Benowitz Price Benowitz LLP 409 7th St NW, #100 Washington, DC 20004 mwilson@pricebenowitz.com David@pricebenowitz.com	By electronic mail
Ronald R. Deering c/o Peter King and Cindy Innocent Guerra King P.A. The Towers at Westshore 1408 N. Westshore Blvd., Suite 1010 Tampa, FL 33607 pking@guerraking.com cinnocent@guerraking.com	By electronic mail
Cheri Beth Bowen, <i>pro se</i> 719 Leesburg Rd. Pelahatchie, MS 39145-3142	By US mail

Alisha R. Shepperd c/o Matthew Mueller Fogarty Mueller Harris, PLLC 100 E Madison St., Suite 202 Tampa, FL 33602-4703 matt@fmhlegal.com	By electronic mail
--	--------------------