•	DRIGINAL NEW APPLICATION 0000189253	
	BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION	
1		
2	COMMISSIONERSArizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED	
3	TOM FORESE - Chairman	
4	ANDY TOBIN BOYD DUNN	
5	JUSTIN OLSON	
6	In the matter of: DOCKET NO. S-21048A-18-0159	
7	CORY R. WILLIAMS (CRD #4797256),) NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING	
8) REGARDING PROPOSED ORDER OF WILLIAMS ADVISORY GROUP, LLC) REVOCATION (CRD #175402), an Arizona limited liability)	
9	company,	
10	Respondents.	
11	NOTICE: EACH RESPONDENT HAS 10 DAYS TO REQUEST A HEARING	
12	EACH RESPONDENT HAS 30 DAYS TO FILE AN ANSWER	
13	The Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission")	
14	alleges that, under the Arizona Investment Management Act, A.R.S. § 44-3101 et seq. ("IM Act"),	
15	grounds exist for the revocation of Cory R. Williams' license as an investment adviser representative	
16	and Williams Advisory Group, LLC's license as an investment adviser.	
17	I.	
18	JURISDICTION	
19	1. The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article XV of the Arizona	
20	Constitution, and the IM Act.	
21	II.	
22	RESPONDENTS	
23	2. Williams Advisory Group, LLC ("WAG") is a limited liability company organized	
24	under the laws of the state of Arizona on or about September 27, 2010.	
25	3. At all times relevant to this matter, Cory R. Williams ("WILLIAMS") has been a resident	
26	of Arizona.	

1	4.	At all times relevant to this matter, WILLIAMS has been the statutory agent and the		
2	managing member of WAG.			
3	5.	From on or about April 17, 2015, until December 31, 2016, WAG was licensed with the		
4	Commission (CRD #175402) as an investment adviser.			
5	6.	On December 31, 2016, WAG's licensure with the Commission as an investment adviser		
6	expired, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-3158(A).			
7	7.	Since at least October 28, 2011 to December 31, 2016, WILLIAMS was licensed with		
8	the Commission (CRD #4797256) as an investment adviser representative, in association with dealers			
9	Triumph Wealth Advisors, Inc. [October 28, 2011 through October 30, 2015], and WAG [October 26,			
10	2015 through December 31, 2016], based in Arizona.			
11	8.	On December 31, 2016, WILLIAMS' licensure with the Commission as an investment		
12	adviser representative expired, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-3158(A).			
13	9.	WAG and WILLIAMS may be referred to collectively as "Respondents".		
	III.			
14		III.		
14 15		III. FACTS		
	10.			
15	KURDATTAADO 1949	FACTS		
15 16	("CFTC") fil	FACTS On May 3, 2017, the United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission		
15 16 17	("CFTC") fil	FACTS On May 3, 2017, the United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission ed a Complaint in the United States District Court, for the District of Arizona against and WAG for violations of the Commodity Exchange Act, and CFTC Regulations		
15 16 17 18	("CFTC") fil WILLIAMS	FACTS On May 3, 2017, the United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission ed a Complaint in the United States District Court, for the District of Arizona against and WAG for violations of the Commodity Exchange Act, and CFTC Regulations		
15 16 17 18 19	("CFTC") fil WILLIAMS ("CFTC Con 11.	FACTS On May 3, 2017, the United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission ed a Complaint in the United States District Court, for the District of Arizona against and WAG for violations of the Commodity Exchange Act, and CFTC Regulations aplaint").		
15 16 17 18 19 20	("CFTC") fil WILLIAMS ("CFTC Com 11. Arizona filed	FACTS On May 3, 2017, the United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission ed a Complaint in the United States District Court, for the District of Arizona against and WAG for violations of the Commodity Exchange Act, and CFTC Regulations nplaint"). On September 27, 2017, the United States Attorney General's Office, District of		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	("CFTC") fil WILLIAMS ("CFTC Com 11. Arizona filed	FACTS On May 3, 2017, the United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission ed a Complaint in the United States District Court, for the District of Arizona against and WAG for violations of the Commodity Exchange Act, and CFTC Regulations hplaint"). On September 27, 2017, the United States Attorney General's Office, District of an Information (the "Information") in the United States District Court, for the District		
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	("CFTC") fil WILLIAMS ("CFTC Con 11. Arizona filed of Arizona (t 12.	FACTS On May 3, 2017, the United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission ed a Complaint in the United States District Court, for the District of Arizona against and WAG for violations of the Commodity Exchange Act, and CFTC Regulations nplaint"). On September 27, 2017, the United States Attorney General's Office, District of an Information (the "Information") in the United States District Court, for the District the "Court") against WILLIAMS for violating the United States Code ("U.S.C.").		
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	("CFTC") fil WILLIAMS ("CFTC Com 11. Arizona filed of Arizona (t 12. States Attorn	FACTS On May 3, 2017, the United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission ed a Complaint in the United States District Court, for the District of Arizona against and WAG for violations of the Commodity Exchange Act, and CFTC Regulations nplaint"). On September 27, 2017, the United States Attorney General's Office, District of an Information (the "Information") in the United States District Court, for the District the "Court") against WILLIAMS for violating the United States Code ("U.S.C."). On September 27, 2017, WILLIAMS entered into a Plea Agreement with the United		
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	("CFTC") fil WILLIAMS ("CFTC Com 11. Arizona filed of Arizona (t 12. States Attorn guilty to the I	FACTS On May 3, 2017, the United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission ed a Complaint in the United States District Court, for the District of Arizona against and WAG for violations of the Commodity Exchange Act, and CFTC Regulations nplaint"). On September 27, 2017, the United States Attorney General's Office, District of an Information (the "Information") in the United States District Court, for the District the "Court") against WILLIAMS for violating the United States Code ("U.S.C."). On September 27, 2017, WILLIAMS entered into a Plea Agreement with the United ary's Office, District of Arizona, which was accepted by the Court. WILLIAMS plead		

П

24

In the Factual Basis of the Plea Agreement, WILLIAMS admits that the following
 facts are true:

3	From March 2014 through November 2016, WILLIAMS solicited his family,	friends,
4	and members of his church into turning over their money to WILLIAMS in o	rder for
5	him to invest on their behalf;	
6	• WILLIAMS attracted and retained investors by representing that he was a	highly
7	successful trader in the futures market when, in fact, he was not;	
8	• WILLIAMS raised more than \$13,000,000 from at least 40 investors, WILL	LIAMS
9	represented to these investors they would be participating in a pooled inve	estment
10	vehicle wherein WILLIAMS would trade E-Mini S&P 500 futures in his p	ersonal
11	account for the benefit of the investors;	
12	• WILLIAMS lost more than \$8,000,000 of the investors' funds through tradi	ng and
13	did not disclose those loses to the investors, instead WILLIAMS misreprese	nted to
14	the investors that their investments were making a profit;	
15	• WILLIAMS used more than \$3,000,000 of the investors' funds to repay	certain
16	investors who requested a return of their funds, which helped to conceal his fra-	udulent
17	scheme;	9
18	• WILLIAMS diverted more than \$800,000 of the investors' funds to his own p	ersonal
19	use; and	
20	• WILLIAMS continued to send text messages to the investors reporting fat	oricated
21	weekly profits even after he lost all of their money.	
22	14. On March 16, 2018, United States District Judge, the Honorable John Tuchi is	sued an
23	Order [including a Default Judgment] in the CFTC action against WILLIAMS and WA	G (the
24	"Order").	
25	111	
26	111	
	3	
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	

15. 1 In the Findings of Fact section of the Order, the Court found that the following was 2 sufficiently alleged in the CFTC Complaint: From at least April 2014 through December 2016, WILLIAMS, individually and as 3 4 agent and officer of WAG, fraudulently solicited and directly accepted \$13,131,390 5 from at least 40 individual and or entities ("pool participants" or "participants") to participate in a pooled investment vehicle for the purported purpose of trading 6 7 commodity futures contracts; WILLIAMS traded significant volumes of E-Mini S&P 500 futures contracts in his 8 9 personal trading accounts using participants' funds and consistently suffered heavy losses [approximately \$8,300,000 in losses]; 10 WILLIAMS lost money every single month he traded from April 2014 through 11 December 2016, all the while falsely representing to participants that he was trading 12 13 profitably on their behalf; WILLIAMS returned \$3,406,373 of the original \$13,131,390 in participant funds to 14 15 certain participants as withdrawals of principal or as trading "profits" in furtherance of his fraudulent scheme; 16 17 WILLIAMS used approximately \$1,300,000 of participants' funds for his personal 18 expenses; 19 At no time did WILLIAMS operate the pool as legal entity separate from that of the 20 pool operator, nor did WILLIAMS ever open a pool trading account for the benefit of 21 the participants; and 22 WILLIAMS, individually and as an agent and officer of WAG, omitted material facts 23 in his communications to participants, by failing to disclose his misappropriation of 24 participants' funds, his failure to register as a commodity pool operator ("CPO"), his 25 failure to operate the pool as a separate legally cognizable entity, and his commingling of funds. 26

1	16. The Order finds that WILLIAMS and WAG violated 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(A)-(C)		
2	(2012) (Fraud in Connection with Commodity Futures Contracts). The Order further finds that		
3	WILLIAMS violated 7 U.S.C. § 60(1)(A) and (B) (2012) (Fraud by a Commodity Pool Operator).		
4	The Order further finds that WILLIAMS violated 17 C.F.R. § 4.20(a)(1), (b), and (c) (2016)		
5	(Prohibited Activities by a Commodity Pool Operator). The Order further finds that WILLIAMS		
6	violated 7 U.S.C. § 6m(1) (2012) (Failure to Register as a CPO).		
7	17. Pursuant to the Order, WILLIAMS and WAG are both permanently restrained,		
8	enjoined, and prohibited from directly or indirectly:		
9	a) Engaging in conduct that violates 7 U.S.C. § 6b(a)(1)(A)-(C), 6m(1), and 6o(1)(A)	8	
10	and (B) (2012), and 17 C.F.R. §§ 4.20(a)(1), (b), and (c) (2016);		
11	b) Entering into any transaction involving "commodity interests" for their own personal		
12	account or for any account in which they have direct or indirect interest;		
13	c) Having any commodity interest traded on their behalf;		
14	d) Controlling or directly trading for or on behalf of any other person in any account		
15	involving commodity interests;		
16	e) Soliciting, receiving, or accepting funds from any person for the purpose of		
17	purchasing or selling any commodity interests; and		
18	f) Applying for registration or claiming exemption from registration with the CFTC in		
19	any capacity, and engaging in any activity requiring registration or exemption from		
20	registration with the CFTC.		
21	18. According to the Order, WILLIAMS and WAG are ordered to pay, on a joint and		
22	several basis, restitution in the amount of \$9,725,017. WILLIAMS and WAG are further ordered to	53	
23	pay, on a joint and several basis, a civil monetary penalty in the amount of \$9,725,017,		
24	19. Notwithstanding that the Respondents are not currently licensed with the		
25	Commission, under A.R.S. § 44-3202(D) both Respondents continue to be subject to the		
26	Commission's jurisdiction within two years after termination of their licensure for the purpose of		

•

denying, suspending, or revoking their licensure in connection with conduct that began before the
 termination of their licensure.

IV.		
REMEDIES PURSUANT TO A.R.S. § 44-3201		
(Revocation of Investment Adviser and Investment Adviser Representative Licenses)		
20. Respondents' conduct is grounds to revoke Respondent WAG's license as an investment		
adviser and Respondent WILLIAMS' license as an investment adviser representative with the		
Commission, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-3201. Specifically, revocation of Respondents' licenses would		
be in the public interest, and:		
a) WILLIAMS and WAG are permanently enjoined by order of a court of		
competent jurisdiction from engaging in or continuing any conduct or practice involving a violation of		
any federal or state securities law or a violation of any other regulatory licensing requirement, within		
the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-3201(A)(9); and		
b) WILLIAMS and WAG have engaged in dishonest or unethical practices in		
business or financial matters, within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-3201(A)(14).		
v.		
REQUESTED RELIEF		
The Division requests that the Commission grant the following relief:		
1. Order the revocation of Respondent WAG's license as an investment adviser, and		
Respondent WILLIAMS' license as an investment adviser representative, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-3201;		
and		
2. Order any other relief that the Commission deems appropriate.		
VI.		
HEARING OPPORTUNITY		
Each Respondent may request a hearing pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-3212 and A.A.C. R14-4-306.		
If a Respondent requests a hearing, the requesting Respondent must also answer this Notice. A		
6		

request for hearing must be in writing and received by the Commission within 10 business days after
 service of this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing. The requesting Respondent must deliver or mail the
 request to Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona
 85007. Filing instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602) 542-3477 or on the
 Commission's Internet web site at http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/hearings/docket.asp.

If a request for a hearing is timely made, the Commission shall schedule the hearing to begin 20
to 60 days from the receipt of the request unless otherwise provided by law, stipulated by the parties, or
ordered by the Commission. If a request for a hearing is not timely made the Commission may, without
a hearing, enter an order granting the relief requested by the Division in this Notice of Opportunity for
Hearing.

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation such as a sign language 11 12 interpreter, as well as request this document in an alternative format, by contacting Kacie Cannon, 13 ADA Coordinator, voice phone number (602) 542-3931, e-mail kcannon@azcc.gov. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation. Additional 14 15 information about the administrative action procedure may be found at http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/securities/enforcement/AdministrativeProcedure.asp 16

VII.

ANSWER REQUIREMENT

17

18

19 Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-305, if a Respondent requests a hearing, the requesting Respondent 20 must deliver or mail an Answer to this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing to Docket Control, Arizona 21 Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, within 30 calendar days after the date of service of this Notice. Filing instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by 22 23 calling (602)542-3477 or on the Commission's Internet web site at http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/hearings/docket.asp. 24

Additionally, the answering Respondent must serve the Answer upon the Division. Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-303, service upon the Division may be made by mailing or by hand-delivering a copy of the Answer to the Division at 1300 West Washington, 3rd Floor, Phoenix, Arizona, 85007,
 addressed to Michael Shaw.

The Answer shall contain an admission or denial of each allegation in this Notice and the original signature of the answering Respondent or Respondent's attorney. A statement of a lack of sufficient knowledge or information shall be considered a denial of an allegation. An allegation not denied shall be considered admitted.

When the answering Respondent intends in good faith to deny only a part or a qualification
of an allegation, the Respondent shall specify that part or qualification of the allegation and shall
admit the remainder. Respondent waives any affirmative defense not raised in the Answer.

10 The officer presiding over the hearing may grant relief from the requirement to file an Answer 11 for good cause shown.

Dated this 15 day of June 2018. 12 13 14 Matthew J. eubert 15 Director of Securities 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 8