

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

-against-

PREMIER LINKS, INC., DWAYNE  
MALLOY, CHRIS DAMON, THEIRRY  
RUFFIN a/k/a THEIRRY REGAN,

Defendants,

-and-

JOHN DESANTIS, ROBERT BLOOME,  
JOSEPH J. BYRNE, NICHOLAS SPINELLI,  
MARGARET RAVA a/k/a MARGARET  
AMATULLI, DARNEL JACKSON,  
FREDDIE ANDERSON, QUATRO  
HOLDINGS, INC., and NYC CLAIMS, INC.,

Relief Defendants.

-----X  
**AMON, United States District Judge:**

Plaintiff Securities & Exchange Commission (the "SEC") has moved for default judgment. (D.E. # 64.) The Court referred this motion to the Honorable Steven Tiscione, U.S. Magistrate Judge, who thereafter submitted a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") in which he recommended that the Court grant the SEC's motion in part and deny it in part. (D.E. # 72 ("R&R").) Specifically, Magistrate Judge Tiscione recommended (1) that the Court find Premier Links, Inc., Chris Damon, Dwayne Malloy, and Theirry Ruffin a/k/a Theirry Regan (the "Premier Links Defendants") liable for violating Section 5 of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §77e; Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77q(a); Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. §

**FILED**  
IN CLERK'S OFFICE  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y.  
★ FEB 23 2015 ★

**BROOKLYN OFFICE**

NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
**ORDER**  
14-CV-7375 (CBA) (ST)

78j(b); Rule 10b-5, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5; and Section 15(a) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78o(a); (2) that the Court permanently enjoin the Premier Links Defendants from committing or aiding and abetting future violations of the securities laws and rules they were alleged to have violated; and (3) that the Court decline to order disgorgement or a civil monetary penalty at this time and that the Court instead direct the SEC to provide supplemental information regarding these requests. (Id.)

No party has objected to the R&R, and the time for doing so has passed. When deciding whether to adopt a report and recommendation, a district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). To accept those portions of the R&R to which no timely objection has been made, “a district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record.” Jarvis v. N. Am. Globex Fund, L.P., 823 F. Supp. 2d 161, 163 (E.D.N.Y. 2011) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

The Court has reviewed the record and, finding no clear error, adopts the well-reasoned R&R as the opinion of the Court.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 21, 2018  
Brooklyn, New York

s/Carol Bagley Amon  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Carol Bagley Amon  
United States District Judge