

This document is subject to the provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974, and may require redaction before disclosure to third parties. No redaction has been performed by the Office of Inspector General. Recipients of this report should not disseminate or copy it without the Inspector General's approval.



REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

**UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

Case No. OIG-526

**Investigation of the SEC's Response to Concerns
Regarding Robert Allen Stanford's Alleged Ponzi Scheme**

March 31, 2010

REDACTION KEY

AC = Attorney-Client Privilege

DPP = Deliberative Process Privilege

LE = Law Enforcement Privilege

PII = Personal Identifying Information

PP = Personal Privacy

WP = Attorney Work Product

This document is subject to the provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974, and may require redaction before disclosure to third parties. No redaction has been performed by the Office of Inspector General. Recipients of this report should not disseminate or copy it without the Inspector General's approval.

Report of Investigation

Investigation of the SEC's Response to Concerns Regarding Robert Allen Stanford's Alleged Ponzi Scheme

Case No. OIG-526

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
SCOPE OF THE OIG INVESTIGATION	2
I. E-MAIL SEARCHES AND REVIEW OF E-MAILS.....	2
II. DOCUMENT REQUESTS AND REVIEW OF RECORDS	3
III. TESTIMONY AND INTERVIEWS	4
RELEVANT STATUTES, RULES AND REGULATIONS	10
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	16
RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATION	29
I. IN 1997, THE FWDO EXAMINATION STAFF REVIEWED STANFORD'S BROKER-DEALER OPERATIONS AND MADE A REFERRAL TO ENFORCEMENT DUE TO A CONCERN THAT ITS SALES OF CDs CONSTITUTED A PONZI SCHEME.....	29
A. Two Years After Stanford Group Company Began Operations, the SEC Identified It as a Risk and a Target For an Examination Based on Suspicions That Its CD Sales Were Fraudulent.....	29
B. After Conducting a Short Examination, the Examination Staff Concluded That Stanford Was Probably Operating a Ponzi Scheme.....	30
C. As a Result of Their Concerns That Stanford Was Operating a Ponzi Scheme, the Examination Staff Referred Their Stanford Findings to the Enforcement Staff.....	33

This document is subject to the provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974, and may require redaction before disclosure to third parties. No redaction has been performed by the Office of Inspector General. Recipients of this report should not disseminate or copy it without the Inspector General’s approval.

II.	EIGHT MONTHS AFTER THE EXAMINATION STAFF REFERRED STANFORD, THE ENFORCEMENT STAFF OPENED, AND QUICKLY CLOSED, A MATTER UNDER INQUIRY.....	34
A.	The 1998 Stanford MUI Was Likely Not Even Opened in Response to the Examination Staff’s Referral, But in Response to a Concern From the U.S. Customs Department That Stanford Was Laundering Money.....	34
B.	After Stanford Refused to Produce Documents, No Further Investigative Steps Were Taken.....	36
C.	The Enforcement Staff Closed the 1998 Stanford MUI Three Months After It Was Opened.....	37
1.	The Enforcement Staff Told the Examination Staff That an Investigation of Stanford Was Not Warranted Because of the Lack of U.S. Investors.....	38
2.	The Enforcement Staff Told the Examination Staff That an Investigation of Stanford Would Be Too Difficult Because of the Staff’s Inability to Obtain Records From Antigua.....	39
3.	SGC’s Outside Counsel, a Former Head Of The SEC’s Fort Worth Office, May Have Assured Barasch That “There Was Nothing There”.....	40
III.	IN 1998, THE FWDO EXAMINATION STAFF EXAMINED SGC’S INVESTMENT ADVISER OPERATIONS AND REACHED THE SAME CONCLUSION AS THE BROKER-DEALER EXAMINERS: STANFORD’S CD SALES WERE PROBABLY FRAUDULENT.....	42
A.	The 1998 Examination Concluded That SGC’s Sales of SIB CDs Were Not Consistent With SGC’s Fiduciary Obligation to Its Clients Under the Investment Advisers Act.....	44
B.	The Enforcement Staff Failed to Consider the Investment Adviser Examiners’ Concerns in Deciding Not to Investigate Stanford Further	46

This document is subject to the provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974, and may require redaction before disclosure to third parties. No redaction has been performed by the Office of Inspector General. Recipients of this report should not disseminate or copy it without the Inspector General's approval.

IV. IN 2002, THE SEC EXAMINERS EXAMINED SGC'S INVESTMENT ADVISER OPERATIONS AGAIN AND REFERRED STANFORD TO ENFORCEMENT	47
A. In the 2002 Examination, the Examiners Found That Stanford's CD Sales Had Increased Significantly, Which Led to Concerns That the Potential Ponzi Scheme Was Growing	47
B. The 2002 Examination Found That SGC Was Violating the Investment Advisers Act By Failing to Conduct Any Due Diligence Related to the SIB CDs	50
C. During the 2002 Examination, the FWDO Enforcement Staff Received a Letter From the Daughter of an Elderly Stanford Investor Concerned That the Stanford CDs Were Fraudulent	53
D. The FWDO Did Not Respond to the Complainant 1 Letter and Did Not Take Any Action to Investigate Her Claims.....	55
E. Although a Decision Was Made to Forward the Complainant 1 Letter to the Texas State Securities Board, the Letter Was Never Forwarded	56
F. In December 2002, the Examination Staff Referred Their Stanford Findings to the Enforcement Staff	56
G. Based on the Earlier Decision to Forward the Complainant 1 Letter to the TSSB, the "Matter" Was Considered Referred to the TSSB Even Before the 2002 Examination Report Was Sent to Enforcement.....	57
H. The Enforcement Staff Did Not Open an Inquiry Into Stanford and Did Not Even Review the 2002 Examination Report.....	58
I. The Enforcement Staff Did Not Refer the 2002 Examination Report Findings to the TSSB.....	59
J. In December 2002, the SEC Examination Staff Attempted to Interest the Federal Reserve in Investigating Stanford, But Concluded That the Federal Reserve Had DPP of Stanford	60