Enforcement Action by FCA 2016

Posted on 17 June 2016

The FCA can take action such as:

- withdrawing a firm's authorisation;
- prohibiting individuals from carrying on regulated activities;
- suspending firms or individuals from undertaking regulated activities;
- fining firms or individuals who breach our rules or commit market abuse;
- applying to the Court for injunctions and restitution orders; and
- bringing criminal prosecutions to tackle financial crime, such as insider dealing or unauthorised business

1 FINES 2016

The table below contains information about fines published during 2016 by the FCA, with additional background information on each incident.

The total amount of fines according to the FCA to-date is £7,220,685 (excluding Mr Shay Jacob Reches' additional penalty).

Amount	Company or person fined	Date	What was the fine for?	FCA findings
£2,360,900	CT Capital Limited	01/06/2015	The fine: For breaches of **PRIN 3 and PRIN 6** related to **complaints-handling and the unfair treatment of customers in the general insurance** and protection sector. Brief facts: • 2000- 2008, the CT Capital group sold 31,591 regulated PPI policies; receiving £3 million worth of net commission. • They knew PPI complaints came in force in December 2010. CT did not have a complaints procedure in place until November 2011.	• FCA found that they breached Principles 3 (management and control) and 6 (customers' interests) of the FCA's Principles for Businesses. • Failing to handle complaints appropriately means that firms risk treating customers unfairly for a second time and it's important that firms get this right. • *"[…] there's no excuse for firms continuing to get it wrong. We remain determined to ensure that firms put right the harm caused by PPI mis-selling and regain the trust of the public […] and will not hesitate to take action where we see firms not complying with their obligations."*

Amount	Company or person fined	Date	What was the fine for?	FCA findings
			• May 2011- November 2013, CT had 6, 669 PPI complaints. • It failed to have a proper complaints procedure, and failed to direct the complaints handlers sufficiently on how to handle matters. • It also failed to analyse decision of the Financial Ombudsman Service or use them to inform its on-going complaints handling process. • By Jan 2016, CT Capital group paid approximately £74 million in redress from PPI complaints. • Note that were it not for CT settling, this fine could have been £2,951,179.	
£36,285	Mark Samuel Taylor	13/05/2016	The fine: For breaches of **FIT** as well as section 118(2) Financial Services and Markets Act 2000, related to **market abuse** and a lack of fitness/propriety in the wealth management and private banking sector. Brief facts: • February 2015, Mark was still working at Towry, which made an offer to acquire Ashcourt Rowan (wealth management company) for £2.70 per share. • Discussions continued into March 2015 without a deal being finalised, and on 12 March 2015, the firm sent an internal email to all Towry employees that they increased the offer to £3.49 per share. This email was re-called shortly after due to potential insider information. • Mark acted on the information from the e-mail and told his broker to purchase 5,582 shares for £15,011.82 in Aschcourt. • After the public announcement of the increased offer, Mark sold his shares for £18, 509.91 (making a profit of	• *"There can be no let-up in tackling insider dealing and this case shows the consequences will be grave and serious ones for perpetrators, even in small cases like this one".* • Were it not for Mark's early interview and agreeing to settle, plus his evidence on 'financial hardship', the FCA would've fined him £78,819. • They also banned him from engaging in the market for at least 2 years.

Amount	Company or person fined	Date	What was the fine for?	FCA findings
			£3,498). • He got scared he would be fined for misconduct and told his broker to reverse the deal but the broker noted he can't. He got suspicious and reported this to the FCA.	
£10,000	Terence Andrew Joint	09/05/2016	The fine: For breaches of **APER 6, APER 7, FIT and CASS** related to **a lack of fitness/propriety** and **client money/assets misconduct** in the general **insurance** and protection sector. Brief facts: • Mr. Joint held a controlled function (CF1 (Director)) in Joint Aviation which was found by the FCA to have breached CASS and mismanaged insurance premiums. • The misapplication of client insurance premiums by Joint Aviation, and failure by Mr Joint to take adequate steps to inform himself about the business and financial affairs led to Joint Aviation owing £150,253.81 to insurers. • This was in relation to net outstanding insurance premiums for policies arranged by Joint Aviation for its clients with those insurers. Those insurance premiums had been used by Joint Aviation to pay its business expenses. • They also failed to take reasonable steps to ensure that Joint Aviation handled one of its client premium bank accounts in accordance with CASS, such that Joint Aviation mixed funds of a separate entity with Joint Aviation's client insurance premiums.	• The found that Mr Joint breached Principle 6, by failing to exercise due skill, care and diligence in managing the business of Joint Aviation. • Also found a breach in Principle 7 in relation to mixing client funds (also a breach of CASS) • The FCA imposed a penalty of £10,000 after it was taken to the Upper Tribunal (Tax and Chancery Chamber) to reduce it to that amount from the initial £20,000 that was imposed on Mr Joint by the FCA • There is also a ban in place to stop him from performing any significant influence functions in relation to any regulated activity carried on by any authorised person, exempt person or exempt professional firm.
£450,000	Timothy Alan Roberts	08/04/2016	The fine: For failure to comply with Statement of **Principles 1 and 6** of the Authority's Statements of **Principle for Approved Persons**. Brief facts:	• The FCA found that there was a breach of Principle 6 allegation (failure to exercise due skill, care and diligence) and Principle 1 in that he acted without integrity. • They imposed a penalty of £450,000 in addition to withdrawing their approval for Mr. Roberts to carry out controlled functions or any function in relation to any

Amount	Company or person fined	Date	What was the fine for?	FCA findings
			• 20 November 2009- 26/05/2010, Mr Roberts permitted Catalyst Investment Group Ltd to collect funds from potential investors in respect of ARM (adjustable rate mortgages) bonds that had not been issued (tranches 9 – 11), and did not prevent it from doing so, at a time when ARM Asset Backed Securities SA ("ARM") was prohibited from issuing bonds and the full regulatory position had not been properly disclosed to bondholders. • They also sent two misleading letters to IFAs/bondholders around the time. • Mr. Roberts did not inform the compliance officer that the Commission de Surveillance du Secteur Financier ("CSSF"), the Luxembourg regulator, was of the view that ARM required a licence.	regulated activities carried on by any authorised or exempt persons, or exempt professional firm.
£1,200,000	W H Ireland Limited	23/02/2016	The fine: For breaching **PRIN 3 and SYSC** related to market protection, culture/governance and conflicts of interest in the wealth management and **private banking sector** Brief facts: • 1 January 2013- 19 June 2013, WHI failed to ensure it had proper systems and controls in place to prevent market abuse from being detected or occurring. • At the time of the regulatory failings, WHI had around 9,000 private wealth clients with approximately £2.5 billion of assets under management. These clients may have bought and sold financial instruments or may have been advised to do so by the firm without the necessary protections in place. • It failed to take reasonable care to organise and control effective systems and controls to protect against the risk of market abuse occurring during. • They had deficient controls to ensure inside information	• The FCA noted that *"we expect all firms to have the right controls in place to mitigate risks and protect their clients and the integrity of the markets.In this case, WHI's failings were aggravated by the failure to implement adequately the skilled person's recommendations. It is one thing to be given a chance; for the chance not to be taken up is especially culpable."* • The fines imposed were £1.2 million (after applying a 20% discount for settlement), along with 72 days restriction on its Corporate Broking Division, from taking on new clients in relation to the carrying on of its regulated activities.

Amount	Company or person fined	Date	What was the fine for?	FCA findings
			did not leak from the private to public side of its business (no proper checks to ensure those that crossed the 'Chinese Wall' were properly audited). In the absence of clear controls and procedures for wall-crossing, there is an obvious and serious risk of market abuse. • It did not ensure disclosure to external parties were conducted adequately with proper safeguards in place • Failed to maintain an effective conflicts of interest policy along with failure to maintain an adequate control environment in respect of market abuse via compliance oversight, poor governance including a lack of clearly allocated responsibilities, reporting lines and accountability. A lack of challenge and review by the Board and its Committee plus an oversight of training audit to check who has undertaken what types of activities. • The failings were identified by a Skilled Person appointed by the FCA in a report of August 2013. In July 2014, WHI commissioned a follow-up report to look at the extent to which it had complied with the Skilled Person's recommendations. This second report showed that there were some recommendations which had not been implemented adequately within the time set by the Skilled Person.	
£792,900	Achilles Othon Macris	09/02/2016	The fine: For Breaching **Statement of Principle 4** Brief facts: • From 28 March 2012- 29 April 2012, Mr Macris was the head of CIO International for JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. He was responsible for a number of portfolios including Synthetic Credit Portfolio (SCP). He was also authorised as an approved person by the FCA.	• The FCA found that Mr. Macris' conduct fell below the standards expected of an approved person in his position. • They therefore imposed a high financial penalty to support their strategic objective of ensuring that the relevant markets function well and the FCA's operational objective of protecting and enhancing the integrity of the UK financial system (including its soundness and stability). • Further, it is consistent with the importance placed by the FCA on the accountability of those in senior positions at

Amount	Company or person fined	Date	What was the fine for?	FCA findings
			• As an approved person, he was aware of the 'close and continuous' supervisory relationship by the FCA as they were deemed to be high risk (in respect to breaching the FCA's objectives). • From January 2012- March 2012, the SCP began to make lots of losses (approximately $610m) and Mr Macris decided to instruct the front office to stop trading (aside from long risk positions which were permitted), and held daily meetings with them and the CIO Risk team for risk reports. • It had already breached two internal risk limits • Mr Macris failed to inform the FCA of the extent of the losses and risks, therefore failing to deal with the authorities in an open and cooperative manner which is in breach of principle 4.	authorised firms.
£13,130,000	Shay Jacob Reches (additional penalty) (Threadneedle Asset Management Ltd)	01/02/2016	The fine: For breaching section **63A of** the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 and **FIT** Brief facts: • Threadneedle's fund managers were initiating, booking and executing their own trades which were then raised to the FCA. The firm then issued a report to the FCA noting that they appointed specified individuals to be responsible for all aspects of dealing. • A month later, a fund manager on the emerging markets desk initiated, booked and executed a trade worth $150 million on behalf of 3 funds at four times their market value. This was deemed as an unauthorised transaction which the back office side of the firm had to stop. • The firm could have been liable to compensation for the funds loss of approximately £70 million.	• The FCA imposed a financial penalty of £6,038,504 on Threadneedle Asset Management Limited for breaches of Principles 3 and 11. The high figure reflected the seriousness of the breach, which regarded a failure to notify the FCA of information it would reasonably expect to be notified of. • Threadneedle agreed to settle at an early stage of the Authority's investigation, therefore qualified for a 20% stage 2 discount. Were it not for the discount, the FCA would have imposed a financial penalty of £7,548,130.
			The insurance scandal	

Amount	Company or person fined	Date	What was the fine for?	FCA findings
£1,050,000	Shay Jacob Reches	01/02/2016 for all.	The fine: For breaching **section 63A** of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 **and FIT.** Brief facts: **Mr Recher** • Mr Reches was an active entrepreneur in the UK and European insurance market. Note that he was never an approved person • He was in control of and connected to a number of insurance firms involved in providing Solicitor's PII cover, such as: Aderia, Millburn Insurance Company, and Coverall. He set up two reinsurance companies, Balva and Sinclair. • Both of the reinsurance firms he was in control of failed to have the sufficient funds to pay out on guarantees and claims on Solictor PII, so he approached a third party re-insurer, Berliner. • Mr Recher approached the firms that were in the initial agreements for Solictor's PII insurance and told them that they were to be reinsured by Berliner, which was inaccurate at the time since Berliner did not sign up to that arrangement yet. • Once Berliner signed the agreement, they provided a limited of €5 million, which was not even sufficient enough to fund the replacement cover. This agreement became annulled and failed. • This left more than 900 solicitor's firms exposed to risk without mandatory Solicitor's PII cover. • Additionally, Mr Reches maintained CF1 (Director) controlled functions at authorised firms without FCA approval.	**Mr Reches** The FCA imposed a financial of £1,050,000 plus any of the sum of £13,130,000 which Mr Reches was proposing to pay to various insurers that remained They also made an order prohibiting Mr Reches from performing any function in relation to any regulated activities carried on by any authorised or exempt persons, or exempt professional firm. **Mr McIntosh** The FCA found that Mr McIntosh breached Statement of Principle 1, 4 and 7. Also breaching FIT and certain applicable rules set out by CASS. They noted that he failed to act with integrity in carrying out his controlled function, in breach of Statement of Principle 1, by recklessly failing to mitigate the risks to potential policyholders arising from contracts entered into by his company, Coverall. He unreasonably failed to ensure that his company, Aderia, took any steps, particularly in relation to Bar and Solicitors' PII, to mitigate risk, and therefore acted recklessly. Mr McIntosh breached Statement of Principle 7 by failing to take reasonable steps to ensure that the business of Coverall for which he was responsible in his controlled function, complied with the relevant requirements and standards of the regulatory system. He failed to deal with the FCA in an open and cooperative way and failed to disclose information of which the FCA would reasonably expect notice, in breach of Statement of Principle 4. His failure to ensure that Aderia complied with CASS 5 was that client money, including over £13.2 million in Solicitors' PII premiums for policies underwritten by Balva, was not adequately protected.
£51,600	Colin J McIntosh			
£37,400	Robert John Bygrave			
£18,700	Andrea Christine Sadler			
£38,600	Wayne Anthony Redgrave			
£1,137,500	Millburn Insurance Company Limited (in administration)			
£36,800	Coverall Worldwide Ltd			

Amount	Company or person fined	Date	What was the fine for?	FCA findings
			Mr McIntosh • Mr McIntosh was was head of three of the companies involved in Mr Recher's breaches of Solicitors PII insurance. • A particular risk to consumers arose when Coverall allowed Mr Reches to instruct Aderia to enter binding authority agreements (which purported to bind Berliner) without the requisite authority from Berliner to do so. Approximately 1,300 firms of solicitors were exposed to the significant risk that they would hold themselves out as being covered by business-critical Solicitors' PII provided by Berliner when this was not the case. • In respect of Solicitors' PII policies alone, the FSCS has paid £3.8 million in claims and has an estimated future liability of £10 million. • He also misconstrued details and hid facts of the situation to the FCA when the matter was brought to their attention. He provided an inaccurate and misleading response to a question posed by the Authority regarding the existence of written communications between Millburn and Balva regarding the Reinsurance Treaty. Mr McIntosh stated that there had been no written communications when, in fact, there had been a number of highly relevant written communications. **Mr Bygrave** • Mr Bygrave assumed responsibility for managing Aderia's finances from Mr McIntosh. He was then appointed a Director of Aderia in November 2012 then he was approved to perform the CF1 (Director(AR)) controlled function at Coverall and Millburn. • Mr Bygrave had been told that there was a risk transfer agreement and was aware that the practice before he joined the Group was to treat the premiums as insurer's	The FCA were right in considering that Mr McIntosh's conduct had fallen short of minimum regulatory standards and that he was not a fit and proper person to carry out any controlled function. It is interesting to note that the FCA did not fine Mr McIntosh more or similar figures to Mr Rechers even though this was a similar breach of rules. Even with the 30% discount they provided him with (if it did not apply then it would have been £73,949), it is still far smaller that Mr Rechers. **Mr Bygrave** The FCA found that Mr Bygrave breached Statement of **Principle 6,** FIT and certain applicable rules set out in **CASS**. He was responsible for implementing the finance function at Aderia and was relied upon by other controlled function holders at Aderia to manage Aderia's finances. He was therefore responsible for ensuring Aderia held insurance premiums correctly As a result of Mr Bygrave's failings, Aderia did not hold the insurance premiums it received in accordance with CASS, in particular CASS 5.5.19R, CASS 5.5.23R and CASS 5.5.63R. By holding these premiums in Aderia's current bank account, the monies were not segregated as required. The Authority considers that Mr Bygrave's actions posed a significant risk to the policyholders. Mr Bygrave breached Statement of Principle 6 because he failed to exercise due skill, care and diligence in managing the business of Aderia for which he was responsible as CF1(Director(AR)) by failing to take reasonable steps to adequately inform himself about: whether Aderia was required to treat insurance premiums it had received as client money in accordance with CASS, and arrangements which were allegedly in place to allow these premiums to be paid to third parties rather than to the insurer.

Amount	Company or person fined	Date	What was the fine for?	FCA findings
			funds, rather than client money. He therefore did not segregate the premiums, when in fact there was no such risk transfer agreement. As a result, the Solicitors' PII premiums should have been treated as client money by Aderia and held in a segregated client bank account before being transferred to Balva which was providing the insurance to the policyholders. The Solicitors' PII premiums should have been paid to the insurer, Balva, but instead, he paid £9.8m of these premiums to third parties on the instructions of Mr Reches. **Mrs Sadler** • Mrs Sadler was liable for essentially letting Mr Reche's get away with his fraud. **Mr Regrave** • As a part of Mr Reche's fraud, Mr Redgrave was in charge of the Bar's negligent failure to conduct adequate due diligence concerning insurance arrangements for policyholders and for sending a letter to over 1,300 of Bar's customers inducing them to enter into contracts of insurance on the basis of materially inaccurate and misleading information. • Mr Redgrave also had reasonable grounds to question the position, standing and authority of Mr Reches. • These grounds for concern should have caused Mr Redgrave to scrutinise more carefully the nature of Bar's business relationship with Mr Reches, Aderia and Berliner and to exercise greater due diligence concerning the arrangement. **Millburn Insurance** • In late 2012, the FCA was provided with a signed copy of a reinsurance treaty ("the Reinsurance Treaty") between Millburn and Balva Insurance Company AAS ("Balva") by	**Mrs Sadler** The FCA found that Mrs Sadler breached Statement of Principle 6 because she failed to exercise due skill care and diligence in managing the business of Aderia for which she was responsible as CF1 (Director(AR)) by failing to take reasonable steps to ensure that appropriate contractual arrangements were in place for the insurer to provide insurance cover, and failing to put appropriate systems and controls in place to prevent Mr Shay Reches, an unapproved person, materially influencing Aderia's operations. She failed to meet minimum regulatory standards in terms of lack of competence and capability. As a result of the above, the FCA noted that she is not a fit and proper person to perform authorised/ controlled functions. **Mr Regrave** Mr Regrave was fined for breaching Statement of Principle 6 and certain applicable rules set out by ICOBS. He breached Statement of Principle 6, in that he did not exercise due skill, care and diligence by failing to ensure that Bar, prior to sending the letter, had carried out sufficient and adequate due diligence to ensure that the agreements between Berliner and Aderia, had a sufficient premium income limit to meet the proposed cover, when he had reason to doubt that this was the case. He was also in breach of failing to take reasonable care to ensure that the advice to solicitor customers to cancel their current policies with Balva, and communicated information to Bar's customers in a way which was misleading. **Millburn Insurance** The FCA found that these breaches were particularly serious as, Millburn was not being open and cooperative with them about the circumstances of the signing of the Reinsurance Treaty. Millburn sought to avoid further regulatory scrutiny at that time.

Amount	Company or person fined	Date	What was the fine for?	FCA findings
			Balva's regulator, the FCMC, which would have been liable to indemnify Balva for losses incurred under its UK portfolio, which included a significant amount of Solicitors' PII business. However, this reinsurance activity would have fallen within the "General Liabilities" class of insurance, which was outside of Millburn's permission. • Millburn was required under Principle 11 by the FCA to deal with them in an open and cooperative way, and to disclose to anything which they would reasonably expect notice, and by providing an inaccurate and misleading responses to a direct question asked by them. **Coverall Worldwide Ltd** • Coverall breached Principle 1 by recklessly failing to mitigate the risks to potential policyholders arising from the contracts entered into by Aderia. • Coverall knew about the arrangements and recognised the risk that were purportedly underwritten by Berliner but by which Berliner was not bound. Despite this, Coverall failed to take any steps to mitigate that risk and therefore acted recklessly.	In particular, Millburn concealed significant failings in its systems and controls, particularly regarding the extent of the influence over the firm of Mr Reches. Millburn breached Principle 11 in a number of instances and these breaches were committed with the knowledge and active participation of Millburn's CEO, Mr Colin McIntosh ("Mr McIntosh"). The effect of Millburn's breaches was to hinder the Authority in taking timely action to protect consumers. The imposition of a financial penalty on Millburn supports the FCA's objectives in terms of protecting consumers and the integrity of markets by emphasising the requirement for regulated entities to provide accurate information to them and to deal with them in an open and co-operative way. **Coverall** Breached Principles 1,3,10 and the Threshold Conditions through its conduct. The FCA found that Coverall's breach of Principle 3 was particularly serious because it effectively allowed Mr Reches to perform a controlled function, and to exercise a significant degree of influence over Aderia's activities which went beyond the scope of the delegated authority granted to him. This increased the risk that Coverall (through Aderia) would cause detriment to consumers. A particular risk to consumers arose when Coverall effectively allowed Mr Reches to instruct Aderia to enter binding authority agreements (which purported to bind Berliner) without the requisite authority from Berliner to do so. This action imposed by the FCA recognised that failure by one or more firms to comply with regulatory requirements that safeguard consumers and/or protect market integrity can distort competition. The FCA noted that their large financial fine and cancellation of

Amount	Company or person fined	Date	What was the fine for?	FCA findings
				their permission to conduct regulated activity was due to their aim in tackling conduct failures in order to ensure firms act with integrity, implement appropriate systems and controls, and arrange adequate protection for client assets, supports their operational objective to promote effective competition in the interests of consumers.

Key takeaways

CT Capital & WH Limited

- Note that the FCA was not amused at all by the improper handling of the PPI complaints by CT, or WH's deficient controls. From the FCA's comments, they do not take this type of issue lightly as they feel that the customers were betrayed by the industry not only once via the mis-selling of the PPI product, but a second time via how the company treated their complaints so poorly for CT. Regarding WH, the FCA already had the report from the skilled person thinking that the firm would make the necessary changes, but since these were not put in place, the FCA fined the firm as it puts in unnecessary risk to which could
- Last year, the FCA fined Clydesdale Bank Plc £20.6 million and the Lloyds Banking Group £117 million for failing to handle PPI complaints fairly, showing how serious the FCA takes this type of conduct.

Individual cases

- The FCA takes the breach of Principle 6 quite seriously as it shows a lack of responsibility from authorised individuals, especially in relation to insider dealing and the upcoming MAR rules.

The Mr Recher's scandal

- The FCA is willing to impose large fines as a punishment to the main perpetrator of fraud, along with the people that were knowingly/ unknowingly a part of the fraud. It goes to show that the FCA would leave no stone untouched as they take the responsibility each person has within their respective roles quite seriously.

2 BANS

NAME/ CORPORATE ENTITY NAME	DATE	REASON FOR BAN
Mr Gray & Mr Kelly/ PCD Wealth and Pensions Management (PCD)	09/06/2016	Between 2008 and 2010 PCD arranged for over 350 customers to be advised and invested nearly £24 million of customers' pension funds in potentially unsuitable investments, without customers' knowledge or consent. PCD also failed to declare to customers the fees it was receiving from a number of these investments. "These two individuals misused pension funds, endangering the retirement incomes of hundreds of people. While further investigations continue, the FCA considers it necessary to prohibit them to help protect consumers." Mr Gray provided investment advice to at least five customers in the knowledge that he had no qualifications or training to do so. He recklessly provided customers with misleading information in relation to costs and charges and arranged for customers to sign incomplete investment forms despite being aware of the risk that fees could later be added to the forms (and taken from customers' funds) without their knowledge. He also misled the FCA in a compelled interview The FCA banned Mark Kelly and Patrick Gray from working in the financial services industry on the basis that they lack integrity.
Peter Johnson/ Keydata Investment Services Ltd	19/05/2016	The FCA has banned Mr Peter Johnson, as he failed to act with integrity. The former compliance officer of Keydata is banned from performing any function in relation to any regulated financial activity and publicly censured him.
Mr. Paul White/ RBS	12/04/2016	The FCA has banned Paul White from performing any function in relation to any regulated financial activity and publicly censured him. Mr White formerly worked at the Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS) as a Japanese Yen (JPY) and Swiss Franc (CHF) LIBOR submitter. The FCA has found that Mr White is not a fit and proper person because he lacks integrity by virtue of his conduct when submitting RBS's JPY and CHF rates to the British Bankers Association (BBA), which used to administer LIBOR The FCA commented that *"as a LIBOR submitter, Mr White had an obligation to ensure the submissions he made were proper ones. By allowing his submissions to be set, in effect, by those with collateral financial interests in the outcome, Mr White recklessly disregarded the risk – the obvious risk - that his LIBOR submission might corrupt LIBOR's integrity. This ban should reinforce the message that working in financial markets entails obligations and responsibilities and that serious failure will result in substantial penalties including fines and prohibitions."*
Michael Ross Curtler/ Deutsche Bank AG	02/03/2016	The FCA has banned Michael Ross Curtler, a former trader at Deutsche Bank AG, from the UK financial services industry for lacking honesty and integrity following a criminal conviction for fraud in the US. The FCA noted that: *'Mr Curtler has admitted engaging in dishonest conduct in making USD LIBOR submissions. Dishonesty must disqualify him from*

NAME/ CORPORATE ENTITY NAME	DATE	REASON FOR BAN
		UK financial services. Consequently, he must be prohibited.'

3 CONVICTIONS

NAME	DATE	REASON FOR CONVICTION
Operation Tabernula trial Martyn Dodgson, a senior investment banker, and Andrew Hind, a Chartered Accountant	12/05/2016	This has been the FCA's largest and most complex insider dealing investigation. The offending in this case was highly sophisticated and took place over a number of years, and was took place at the various banks Mr Dodgson was working in. Dodgson sourced inside information from within the investment banks at which he worked, either through working on transactions himself or through being able to glean what his colleagues were working on. He passed on this inside information to Hind who then affected secret dealing for the benefit of Dodgson and himself. The defendants put in place elaborate strategies designed to prevent the authorities from uncovering their activities. These included the use of unregistered mobile phones, encoded and encrypted records, safety deposit boxes and the transfer of benefit using cash and payments in kind. The pair were sentenced at Southwark Crown Court to 4.5 years and 3.5 years imprisonment, respectively, having been convicted of conspiring to insider deal between November 2006 and March 2010. Dodgson's sentence is the longest ever handed down for insider dealing in a case brought by the FCA. The FCA stated: *'Insider dealing is ever more detectable and provable. And this case shows lengthy terms of imprisonment, not profits are the real result.* These two convictions brings the total number of convictions secured in Operation Tabernula to five, alongside Paul Milsom, Graeme Shelley and Julian Rifat.
Damian Clarke, a former equities trader at Schroders	15/03/2016	Damian Clarke, a former equities trader at Schroders Investment Management Limited, pleaded guilty at Southwark Crown Court to nine counts of insider trading. He will be sentenced on 13 June 2016. He used information from his role at Schroders to place trades using accounts in his own name and that of close family members, in respect of which he had been provided with the account numbers and passwords. The total profits made from Mr Clarke's insider dealing amount to at least £155,161.98. *"Mr Clarke abused the trust that came with a city career by cheating the system and, in doing so, he let down the expectations of the whole community. The FCA remains dedicated to stamping out market abuse in all its forms."*
Alex Hope	12/02/2016	Southwark Crown Court ordered almost £2.65 million to be returned to investors who had invested in a fraudulent collective scheme established and operated by Alex Hope. In addition, Mr Hope was made the subject of a Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 (POCA) confiscation order in the sum of £166,696. Mr Hope must pay the order in full within three months or face a further sentence of 20 months' imprisonment in default, consecutive to the seven year sentence imposed upon him in January 2015 . *"This is the largest sum returned to victims of crime following an FSA/FCA prosecution and is the result of quick action in the first instance to restrain the proceeds of Mr Hope's offending. The FCA will continue to work hard to ensure wrongdoers are held to*

NAME	DATE	REASON FOR CONVICTION
		account not only for their wrongdoing but also for its consequences, especially to victims, to the fullest extent possible."