

IN THE MATTER OF THE SECURITIES ACT
R.S.O. 1990, c.S.5, as amended

JACK MARKS
(Applicant)

- and -

CNSX MARKETS INC. and ONTARIO SECURITIES COMMISSION
(Respondents)

SECTIONS: 8 and 21.7

PUBLIC

PURPOSE: Motion/Merits hearing

VOLUME: 3

HELD ON: May 19, 2026

HELD AT: Ontario Securities Commission
20 Queen Street West, 17th Floor
Toronto, Ontario

HELD BEFORE:

Adjudicator Andrea Burke - Chair of the Panel
Adjudicator Jane Waechter
Adjudicator Dale Ponder

APPEARANCES:

Charlie Pettypiece For the Commission

Andrew McCoomb For CNSX Markets Inc.

Sandy Lockhart For CNSX Markets Inc.

Jack Marks On his own behalf

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX OF EXAMINATIONS:

PAGE NO.

HEARING COMMENCES:.....	4
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McCOOMB:.....	8
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PETTYPIECE:.....	55
REPLY SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McCOOMB:.....	80
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MARKS:.....	85

1 --- Upon commencing on Tuesday, May 19, 2026 at 12:30 p.m.

2 HEARING COMMENCES:

3 CHAIR: Please be seated, everyone.

4 Okay. Good morning, everyone.

5 MR. MARKS: Good morning.

6 CHAIR: We are back here in the matter of Jack Marks v.
7 CNSX Markets Inc. and the Ontario Securities Commission. This is
8 the continuation of the merits hearing in this matter. It's an
9 application for a hearing in review of a decision of the panel of
10 the board of directors of CNSX.

11 I'm Adjudicator Burke. I'm chairing this panel. To my
12 left is Adjudicator Ponder, and to my right is
13 Adjudicator Waechter.

14 Just looking around the room.

15 And on the video, good morning -- well, I guess it's
16 good morning your time Mr. Marks; good afternoon our time.

17 MR. MARKS: Good morning and good afternoon.

18 CHAIR: Thanks.

19 And then I see Mr. McCoomb here and Mr. Lockhart for
20 CNSX.

21 MR. MCCOOMB: Good afternoon.

22 CHAIR: Good afternoon.

23 And Mr. Pettypiece here for the Ontario Securities
24 Commission. And if you wouldn't mind introducing your colleagues
25 as well for the record.

26 MR. PETTYPIECE: Yeah, good afternoon. My colleagues
27 are just observing today.

28 CHAIR: Okay.

1 So my plan is just to walk through quickly how, from a
2 timing perspective, I see this afternoon going and also to ask
3 are there any issues that any of the parties want to raise before
4 we resume with Mr. McCoomb's submissions. So we have until 4:30
5 today. When we broke last day, I said everybody should eat their
6 lunch, be prepared to go right through with just the 15-minute
7 breaks that we would normally do on an hour and a half or so. So
8 at this point, I think we're looking at going until about 1:45,
9 taking a 15-minute break until 2:00, then coming back and taking
10 a second 15-minute break around the 3:30 mark, and we'll see
11 where we get to.

12 We may not need the whole day. But Mr. McCoomb is
13 making submissions, then we'll hear from Mr. Pettypiece. We'll
14 hear whether Mr. McCoomb has anything he wants to respond to from
15 the OSC's submissions.

16 And then, Mr. Marks, you have an opportunity to reply
17 to anything new that has come up in the CNSX submissions or the
18 Ontario Securities Commission submissions. Is that clear?

19 MR. MARKS: Yeah, it's fine. But I just have a
20 question. I submitted two supplemental submissions for the Panel
21 on Friday. I was answering questions you had about the
22 recognition order -- I think it was Rule 4 -- and also the
23 Panel's question about the definition of "overpromotion".

24 CHAIR: Yes.

25 MR. MARKS: So I just want to...

26 CHAIR: So, Mr. Marks, the Panel has those materials.
27 What I'm going to say is that it's unusual to be filing written
28 submissions in a matter where you haven't been asked to do that

1 by the Panel or sought permission to do that from the Panel and
2 where you've completed your submissions on the merits orally
3 while the other parties are now mid-submission. So it's an
4 unusual circumstance, and it's not a matter of course that the
5 Panel will allow those submissions in.

6 Can I hear from CNSX and from the Ontario Securities
7 Commission about whether the Panel should be taking those
8 submissions? I'm going to note one thing, which is that
9 certainly the first submission having to do with the recognition
10 order -- and I think your statement is if the policies of the CSE
11 haven't been appropriately approved, this could raise some
12 issues. I mean, I see that as a completely new issue that is not
13 raised in your Notice of Application as a ground for this
14 application. So I think the Panel has some hesitancy, certainly
15 about that, notwithstanding that we did ask a question about it
16 because it came up in your materials.

17 MR. McCOOMB: That would've been the first comment that
18 I would make, is that it's a new ground, if you can put it that
19 way, supporting Mr. Marks' application. It wasn't raised in the
20 Notice. I'm prepared to address the substance of that question
21 if the Panel wants to know our answer when we get there in my
22 submissions. But leaving aside the procedural question of
23 Mr. Marks delivering submissions midstream like this, that issue
24 isn't properly before this panel when it comes to Mr. Marks'
25 submissions on the recognition order, approval of policy
26 question.

27 CHAIR: Okay. And do you have any submissions on the
28 second set of submissions that we received last Friday from

1 Mr. Marks, going to the issue of standards and what is
2 overpromotion and promotion?

3 MR. MCCOOMB: I'm going to address that question in my
4 own submissions. The promotion question was problematic.

5 So, yeah, I take issue with the delivery of written
6 submissions mid-hearing. But, candidly, I'm less troubled by it
7 because we are going to address it directly. So, sure, we
8 formally object to them coming in, but in the interest of getting
9 this done, I'd rather address the matter on substance, if that
10 makes sense.

11 CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Mr. McCoomb.

12 Mr. Pettypiece.

13 MR. PETTYPIECE: Thank you.

14 I don't think we'd object to considering written
15 submissions. I think we would echo the Panel's comments that
16 it's, you know, procedurally difficult to deal with in
17 submissions midstream. But at least the OSC's prepared to
18 address maybe in one or two minutes the recognition order point
19 in any event. So, yeah, no objection on our end.

20 CHAIR: Okay. Mr. Marks, given the positions as stated
21 by the CSE and the OSC, the Panel will accept your written
22 submissions, and we'll give them the appropriate weight that they
23 deserve. It's not acknowledging in any way that the issue around
24 the recognition order is a ground that was raised in your Notice
25 of Application, which would define the scope of your hearing and
26 review and the grounds for your hearing and review. So we're not
27 expanding those grounds, but we'll take them and consider them as
28 appropriate. Okay?

1 MR. MARKS: I appreciate that. Thank you.

2 CHAIR: Mr. McCoomb.

3 MR. MCCOOMB: Thank you.

4 And just for my own housekeeping and timekeeping
5 purposes, by my notes, I used about 20 minutes of the estimated
6 time last time. I think I should be able to finish by 1:45,
7 which would keep me around that time estimate that I had given
8 previously, give or take how much engagement that we have between
9 us over the next little while.

10 SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MCCOOMB:

11 MR. MCCOOMB: But on that subject, my note is that I
12 largely told you what I wanted to tell you about January 8th.
13 But I know that the Panel had entrusted me with, sort of,
14 preparation for a question around the October 2nd and 3rd
15 correspondence delivering the basis for the decision on
16 Mr. Marks' unsuitability. This is, of course, in the New World
17 case. And so this is me saying I'm prepared to grapple with that
18 question right now at the outset of the submission from here,
19 though I appreciate it's customary for people to kind of get
20 their feet under them before they beckon a question from their
21 panel.

22 CHAIR: I've got lots of questions.

23 MR. MCCOOMB: Great. Well, I anticipate --

24 CHAIR: But I'm at January 8th still.

25 MR. MCCOOMB: Pardon me?

26 CHAIR: I'm at January 8th still.

27 MR. MCCOOMB: Okay.

28 CHAIR: From the --

1 MR. McCOOMB: Well, then I think now would be a
2 perfectly practical time to engage it, then, unless there's
3 something obvious that I hadn't touched on.

4 CHAIR: Sure. So with that implication, Mr. McCoomb,
5 my understanding of the facts based upon the materials in the
6 record is that AI/ML announced that it had terminated its
7 agreement with, I think, the Octagon company that Mr. Marks is
8 affiliated with, or was affiliated with at the time, and
9 announced that on December 8, 2023. And so it's not apparent to
10 me why the Listing Committee goes on to make a decision in either
11 late December or early January, as you described it, January
12 2024, given that by the CSE's own submissions, that became moot.

13 MR. McCOOMB: Right. So the reason, as I understand
14 it, that a process continued and a determination was made about
15 Mr. Marks' suitability was based on the fact that his
16 correspondence -- so you have the timing right, December 8th
17 that's announced. Shortly after that, you see the correspondence
18 with Mr. Marks engaging with Mr. Faulkner asking for an
19 investigation of AI/ML executives based on fraud. You see them
20 go back and forth, and you see the record in the memorandum of
21 the January 8th determination of social media posts to the same
22 effect from around that same time, right, December 13th, December
23 14th.

24 So the situation you have is, from the CSE's
25 perspective, they have this engagement with an individual,
26 Mr. Marks, who's a known stock promoter, and they make a
27 determination within the Listing Committee that this is someone
28 who needs to have a 5 out of 5 risk rating, a 5 out of 5

1 suitability rating, because there's a possibility that he may
2 come back around in the future. And they want to have that on
3 file connected to his PIF so that there's a red flag there so
4 that if there is a problem with an issuer or there's a proposed
5 transaction with an issuer -- of course, as they did in October
6 of 2024 -- they assess it fresh. But that determination is there
7 in their records for archival purposes so that they know. They
8 know what they thought of him at the time.

9 It doesn't make sense to throw away that learning,
10 especially -- just take, for example, the situation which
11 Mr. Faulkner leaves his role, and someone replaces him. They
12 need to know through sort of institutional memory what's happened
13 with engagements with individuals, what determinations or
14 conclusions had been drawn. And so you don't throw that
15 determination away; you put it in the file for when this person
16 comes back around.

17 CHAIR: So would the CSE acknowledge, then, that that
18 decision in January of 2024 is a decision that impacted
19 Mr. Marks?

20 MR. McCOOMB: I think we'd acknowledge that it had the
21 potential to impact Mr. Marks. In that moment, it didn't have
22 any impact on Mr. Marks because he had no affiliation with a
23 CSE-listed issuer.

24 And as I'll get into, and this is the most important
25 part of this case, in September -- well, really, August and
26 September of 2024, as I think the Panel already appreciates in
27 the questions it put to Mr. Marks, if Boughton Law had properly
28 described this transaction, the New World transaction, and

1 properly described the role that Mr. Marks was anticipated to
2 have in that company, the suitability process would've flagged
3 this issue then and there. And all of Mr. Marks' concerns and
4 complaints about being led down a path to believe that he had no
5 problem would've been resolved with him being told while there
6 was a prior determination of suitability, it creates an issue for
7 your involvement with this company.

8 And, again, it would've been assessed afresh, just like
9 it was in October, and he would've been told that. He would've
10 been told that in advance of closing a transaction. But because
11 that transaction's true nature was obscured, that determination
12 didn't happen. One of, I would say, three very unique features
13 of this case that make it quite bizarre: The first one being
14 that the original transaction under which the suitability
15 determination was made was pulled as an amount. The second
16 bizarre feature is this fact that Boughton Law described one
17 transaction, and then we found out by a press release the
18 transaction was quite different. That's New World. And then the
19 third feature that makes it a very unique case is the fact that
20 the individual appealing the decision went on the campaign of
21 defamation that Mr. Marks did while his appeal was pending.
22 Three very unique --

23 MR. MARKS: Objection. I have a clarification.

24 CHAIR: No.

25 MR. MARKS: Okay.

26 CHAIR: You want a clarification of the submission? Or
27 are you trying to get, like, prior facts --

28 MR. MARKS: I --

1 CHAIR: You'll have the opportunity to do so in reply.

2 MR. MARKS: Okay. It was the timeline. I guess there
3 was no timeline. I think my learned colleague skipped something
4 in that timeline. You --

5 CHAIR: You can make that submission in reply.

6 MR. MARKS: Okay.

7 CHAIR: Okay?

8 MR. MARKS: Sure.

9 CHAIR: Okay.

10 MR. MARKS: Yeah.

11 MR. McCOOMB: I appreciate, Adjudicator Burke, I've
12 taken you on a bit of a tangent there in closing an answer to
13 that question. But I don't presume that the list of questions is
14 closed.

15 CHAIR: Well, Mr. Marks made the submission that
16 because he wasn't informed of the January 8, 2024 decision until
17 late September, early October time frame of 2024, that he was
18 effectively denied an opportunity to appeal from that decision.
19 What does the CSE say to that, and does it depend on the
20 submission that the decision was actually moot and didn't have an
21 impact?

22 MR. McCOOMB: So, sorry, I was with you, and then I
23 lost you at the last --

24 CHAIR: Sorry. So Mr. Marks that made the submission
25 that he was effectively deprived of the ability to appeal from
26 the January 8, 2024 decision because he wasn't notified of it.
27 What does the CSE say in response? And I guess I'm just
28 anticipating, does that response depend upon the Panel agreeing

1 that the January 8, 2024 decision was either moot or not relevant
2 or not effective?

3 MR. McCOOMB: The January 8th decision was effectively
4 the CSE archiving a conclusion it had reached about Mr. Marks
5 based on its interactions with him and his social media activity
6 in the promotion space. I think you can take it as given the
7 fact that Mr. Marks was not notified of the termination at the
8 time and that if he had the ability to appeal, he was denied that
9 ability in January. I can't but accept that because it's a fact,
10 an accepted fact, that he didn't have notice at the time.

11 Because the transaction -- whether you want to call it
12 moot or irrelevant, there was no severance issue for the CSE to
13 act upon at the time and so no reason to communicate anything to
14 the issuer. To be clear, the CSE communicates with issuers in
15 its role as the listing exchange. And so there was nothing to
16 communicate back to AI/ML because AI/ML had terminated the
17 relationship. Imagine, just for sake of argument, how odd it
18 would be for the CSE to follow along and tell AI/ML by the way,
19 we know you terminated this relationship, but in the
20 circumstances, we wouldn't allow you to have that relationship
21 because we find this individual to be unsuitable.

22 CHAIR: Did communication of the October 23, 2024
23 decision go directly to Mr. Marks?

24 MR. McCOOMB: It did. It did in the context of him
25 having asked about it. But he was in discussion with the CSE
26 about that after notice of it was brought to Boughton Law's
27 attention on September 27th.

28 So your question is did that approach effectively deny

1 him the ability to appeal. I think necessarily if that was an
2 appealable determination, it did. I'm not sure it was an
3 appealable determination in the circumstances because what it
4 really was was the CSE making a note in its files that this
5 person was problematic, and we wouldn't want them associated with
6 a CSE-listed issuer based on the information that we have
7 available to us right now.

8 None of this denies Mr. Marks any procedural fairness
9 is the important part of the analysis, though, for two reasons:
10 One, because the process commencing on October 3rd gave him the
11 procedural rights he needed to address the issue via an appeal.
12 But more importantly -- and I'll walk through the timeline just
13 to make sure everyone's clear on it. It sounds like Mr. Marks
14 has a question about this for his own reply -- had Boughton
15 properly described the transaction, we have every reason to
16 believe that Mr. Marks and New World would've been given notice
17 of the unsuitability determination, assuming it was made.

18 And then Mr. Marks would've had the ability to address
19 that issue in advance of closing a transaction. He would've had
20 the ability to raise whatever information he wanted to raise with
21 the Listing Committee about his profile to disabuse the Listing
22 Committee about any concern it has about his market activity.
23 And if that didn't work, he could've appealed from there.

24 CHAIR: From a factual point of view, was it only the
25 information about tipping over the 20% in terms of a control
26 person that triggered an unsuitability review? Or was it
27 something else? Because he was disclosed to have been a
28 shareholder --

1 MR. McCOOMB: Only.

2 CHAIR: -- previously.

3 MR. McCOOMB: Only, yes.

4 CHAIR: But was he also disclosed to be the chairman
5 previously?

6 MR. McCOOMB: Not even a board member. I don't see
7 that in the disclosure between Ms. Cosgrove and the associate at
8 Boughton Law. And I can walk you through that.

9 But the disclosure in the case -- you see this in one
10 of those classic, you know, my response is highlighted in blue
11 below to your questions kind of e-mails. But you see the back
12 and forth where it disclosed that Mr. Marks is to be a
13 significant shareholder in the range of 18%, 19%. But there is
14 no reference to him being a board member. And, of course,
15 there's no reference to exceeding 20%.

16 We only heard in Mr. Marks' submissions the other day
17 the first bit of an explanation as to why this happened. He
18 blamed it on Boughton, and he suggested something happened with
19 another investor sort of falling through. So accepting what he
20 said as true, as evidence, what should've happened in that moment
21 when a shareholder fell away and the new structure of the
22 transaction involved Mr. Marks being a 20% or greater
23 shareholder, i.e., a control person under all the relevant
24 definitions, is Boughton Law should've been on the horn to the
25 CSE to advise them of a change to the transaction. This specific
26 question was raised: Is this transaction creating a control
27 person? And the answer was no.

28 So at that point in time, had that disclosure been

1 accurate or been corrected in advance of a press release
2 announcing a closed deal, these issues would've been raised.
3 Because they were raised immediately when it was properly
4 disclosed to the CSE that Mr. Marks was going to become a control
5 person.

6 CHAIR: Is it fair to say that the January 8, 2024
7 decision had broader application than just to Mr. Marks'
8 relationship with AI/ML? Because you've indicated it was
9 important to document it, put it in, code him as 5 out of 5 as a
10 concern. And I understand it was recording it as a concern with
11 respect to any relationship with any issuer.

12 MR. McCOOMB: And to take it a step further,
13 Adjudicator Burke, I don't think there's anything in the nature
14 of that determination that is particularly specific to AI/ML,
15 which is to say it's not as though the concern was about
16 something in the nature of that relationship in a vacuum. It was
17 more a concern about Mr. Marks' conduct at large. And so, yes, I
18 think that's a fair proposition to state, that the nature of the
19 determination as at January 2024 was about Mr. Marks' engagement,
20 likely with any market participant on the CSE.

21 CHAIR: Okay, and my last question, because I am taking
22 over the airwaves here --

23 MR. McCOOMB: By invitation.

24 CHAIR: -- at last session of January 8th --

25 MR. McCOOMB: By invitation.

26 CHAIR: -- at this point, is where do I find the
27 materials that were before the Listing Committee when that
28 decision was made? Are they only the materials that are referred

1 to in the January 8, 2024 memo, according to Reasons for the
2 Decision?

3 MR. McCOOMB: Candidly, I don't know. But that
4 decision's not before you; so you don't have the record of the
5 original proceeding of that determination. And I couldn't tell
6 you. I wouldn't be in a position to tell this panel that you
7 have every document or reference was that before the Listing
8 Committee when that determination was made. And I can't lead you
9 astray on that; I don't know. The original record of proceeding
10 to allow you to understand the relevant materials before the
11 Listing Committee is the one that's been prepared as of
12 October 3rd.

13 CHAIR: So then when we get to October 3rd, and we're
14 told on October 3rd the Listing Committee considered the
15 materials that were before the Listing Committee on January 8,
16 2024, nobody can tell me what those were?

17 MR. McCOOMB: I can't tell you, other than to say that
18 whatever they were have to be subsumed within the October
19 materials. Right? So I couldn't point you to a specific subset
20 and say this item was, and this item wasn't. I don't have that
21 data to show you.

22 CHAIR: Okay.

23 MR. McCOOMB: I wouldn't dare presume you're the only
24 person with questions about January 8th.

25 CHAIR: I'm looking to my right and my left.

26 MR. McCOOMB: Okay. Well, with that -- and, again,
27 revisit as you like, but I would propose to take you through some
28 of those key pieces of correspondence on the Boughton issue to

1 explain why, as I've already indicated, so much of the issue in
2 this case comes from. Maybe before I do, I'll just observe what
3 I told you at the top of my submissions is I wanted to vector
4 everything through Canada Malting. And I don't propose as sort
5 of a road exercise to go through the five-point list in Canada
6 Malting and say you don't have this; you don't have that. But
7 you don't.

8 On the basis of a January 8th determination, an
9 archival determination as to whether Mr. Marks was suitable, a
10 record that the CSE kept for future posterity, you don't have any
11 issue engaging those five factors. There's no proceeding on an
12 incorrect principle. There's no error of law. There's no issue
13 or allegation that the committee overlooked material evidence,
14 nor is there any such evidence here that would undermine the
15 determination.

16 CHAIR: Which determination?

17 MR. McCOOMB: That Mr. Marks, as at that time, was
18 unsuitable. I recognize --

19 CHAIR: January 8th. Okay.

20 MR. McCOOMB: As at that time, yes.

21 CHAIR: Okay.

22 MR. McCOOMB: And a submission I'll make over and over
23 but not beat a dead horse about, there is no daylight between the
24 CSE's perception of the public interest and what I would submit
25 the panel's perception of the public interest ought to be or the
26 Commission's perception of the public interest ought to be. The
27 motivating factors behind determinations about Mr. Marks'
28 suitability in every case, in every discussion that's brought

1 about here have to do with the things he's saying publicly, the
2 extremity of his commentary, the language that he approaches his
3 commentary with. Mr. Marks will tell you that everything he does
4 is part and parcel of fair comment and criticism. He's a market
5 participant with an important voice and issues he wants to raise.

6 And that's never been the problem. The problem has
7 never been that Mr. Marks is prepared to raise his concerns or
8 voice his opinion. It's the manner in which he goes about doing
9 that. And we've seen that morph from commentary about issuers in
10 which he's involved to commentary about the Exchange itself.

11 So October 3rd. There's something I want to talk about
12 some of the background. I'm moving through my notes to be as
13 expedient as possible. I'm going to start -- and, Sandy, if you
14 can help me with this, please, looking at page 220 on the Bates
15 numbering of the record of original proceeding. This is that
16 chain of correspondence that I mentioned already, beginning
17 August 9, 2024.

18 So, Sandy, if I don't mind just scrolling just above
19 the page line so we can see the e-mail time.

20 So you'll see Friday, August 9, 2024. The subject line
21 is "Proposed transaction: New World Solutions Inc.," the
22 company. It's an exchange between Alexandra Cosgrove from the
23 CSE and Angela So, who's an associate at Boughton Law, copying
24 the price protection line from the CSE. So the folks you'd reach
25 out to to get a fixed price for a transaction and someone from
26 Boughton. And like I said, this is one of those classic black
27 and blue exchange e-mails where you get answers in lines of
28 questions.

1 And so if we scroll down and -- thank you. Sandy's
2 helpfully highlighted the answer here. So:

3 "With respect to confidential price protection, the
4 Company may request it by answering the following:

5 (a) the level of intended or anticipated insider
6 participation, including under the proposed issuer. Issuance
7 will result in a new insider or Control Person or Materially
8 Affect Control," et cetera, et cetera.

9 The answer -- the blue text is from Boughton Law:

10 "No insider participation. The proposed issuance will
11 result in a new insider, being Jacob Marks, but no new control
12 person, nor will it materially affect control, which was
13 determined on the basis that Mr. Marks will hold 18.21% of the
14 issuer's shares post-issuance on a non-diluted basis, 19.95% on a
15 partially-diluted basis."

16 This is the answer. Is it as clear as it could've
17 been, given obviously subsequent to this, we learned that the
18 transaction has a different character? We learned it from a
19 press release. But this is the answer that was given.

20 And the most important part of this e-mail is the date
21 on it. We're talking about an exchange from August 9th. And so
22 if a correct answer is given or more disclosure is given at that
23 time, suitability review can happen then, the PIF is checked,
24 Mr. Marks' name is flagged in the database, current information
25 about the company is reviewed, and a suitability determination is
26 made and communicated then and there. And if Mr. Marks wants to
27 address the Listing Committee about that -- and I say that,
28 importantly, because in theory, there's nothing stopping him from

1 reaching out to the Listing Committee and saying here's
2 information that you should consider to balance out your analysis
3 that maybe you didn't have before you. But, otherwise, if he
4 doesn't do that, then there's an appeals process. He has access
5 to that as of August 9th, almost two months before this issue
6 becomes something of a very different character.

7 And so then if we scroll up the chain -- and the nice
8 thing about it, this is a rare case where you get almost
9 everything in one document. So if we scroll up the chain to
10 September 13th -- so this would be on page 213 of the record --
11 so here's the follow-up. And this is close to the press release:

12 "Hi Angela.

13 "Did this transaction create a new control person?

14 "Jacob Marks."

15 So as of the 13th, you've got the CSE asking questions
16 about the variation of the nature of the transaction. If we keep
17 scrolling up, you get an answer on September 16th. I didn't
18 check the dates. My guess is this is probably a Friday to a
19 Monday, but could be wrong about that. You get the answer from
20 Boughton, "The Company confirms that Jacob Marks is a new Control
21 Person, as he owns more than 20% of his voting rights."

22 CHAIR: What's the Bates number there?

23 MR. McCOOMB: 212. Thank you.

24 And if you keep scrolling up the chain, you see the
25 rest of this exchange. And it's important because you see on the
26 same day notification from the CSE going to Ms. So saying,
27 "Pursuant to our e-mail exchange as of August 9th, you
28 represented that there was not going to be a control person."

1 And she observes that because this transaction is going to create
2 a control person, then it is subject to security holder approval,
3 which hadn't in obtained. It's a whole other kettle of fish
4 there, but that ends up being something that is piquing the
5 Exchange's interest, and there's a reference to
6 Policy 4.6(2)(a)(iv). I think there's actually a missing digit
7 in there. But that's the CSE policy requiring security holder
8 approval over a transaction and creating a control person.

9 CHAIR: So the creation of a new insider itself doesn't
10 require the filing of a PIF?

11 MR. McCOOMB: Not as I understand it. But what you
12 also get from this, the reality of this, as far as I can tell, if
13 this transaction had proceeded on the basis disclosed by Boughton
14 Law, i.e., Mr. Marks just becoming an 18% or 19% shareholder,
15 there wouldn't have been an issue. I don't see a basis in the
16 record for the CSE raising a suitability concern based on the
17 transaction had it proceeded as disclosed.

18 So then what you get further up the chain, there's a
19 back and forth; there are some attempts to schedule phone calls.
20 And eventually where that takes you to is page 2 of 7. And I
21 won't take you to it -- just for your notes if you need it. The
22 press release announcing the transaction with Mr. Marks as
23 potential control person is at page 166-167 of the original
24 record of proceeding and by Bates numbers.

25 And so as of the 27th, you see Ms. Cosgrove
26 recommending that if a party's seeking to become a control
27 person, they should send in their PIF. Of course, we've already
28 covered the PIF isn't a decision document; it's just a current

1 record of an individual's details on file. But I think it's
2 apparent that had Boughton indicated to the CSE, "Hey, we've got
3 an individual who is proposing to become a control person under
4 this transaction; here is his PIF," would've been the same PIF
5 that Mr. Marks has pointed to in the record that's on file with
6 the CSE. Two and two would be put together, and a prior
7 unsuitability rating of 5 out of 5 would've brought to the
8 Listing Committee's attention, and he would've been notified then
9 and there. But in actual fact, he learns on September 27th as a
10 result of these backs and forth that an unsuitability
11 determination had been made. And then this is crystallized on
12 October 2nd and 3rd, when he's given the decision document, which
13 states on October 3rd the basis for that finding, which sets off
14 appeal rights.

15 Sorry, Adjudicator Burke. Just as I was speaking, you
16 -- I thought you were going to ask me a question.

17 CHAIR: Well, I think that where he would be advised on
18 September 27th is just down the chain on this page; isn't it?

19 MR. McCOOMB: Yes.

20 CHAIR: It's the e-mail before the one we had --

21 MR. McCOOMB: I think that's right.

22 CHAIR: No, maybe lower.

23 MR. McCOOMB: It's one more down if you carry on.

24 CHAIR: I think --

25 MR. McCOOMB: This one. From the 26th.

26 CHAIR: Oh, sorry. Yeah.

27 MR. McCOOMB: So I don't intend to spend much time on
28 the October 3rd document itself, the decision document. But

1 briefly, what it does is it confirms the unsuitability
2 determination based on the various information available to it.
3 And I want to take you to some examples of the information. I
4 actually want to go back to one thing in the e-mail chain with
5 Boughton because it's an important data point.

6 So, Sandy, if I don't mind going back to that same
7 exchange from August 9th.

8 And just bear with me for a moment. My apologies; just
9 bear with me for a moment. Here, 228.

10 Sandy, if you don't mind, 228. So if we can just
11 scroll up so I can catch the top of the e-mail to orient it in
12 time.

13 So this is from July 25, 2024, from Boughton Law to
14 Ms. Cosgrove, again, talking about this proposed transaction.

15 If we just scroll down to page 228.

16 So this is just Q&A and description of what is going on
17 with this deal. And if you look three lines down, you'll see,
18 "Numco" -- so this is a reference to the performer company.
19 "Numco is not expected to earn revenue in the first 12 months
20 following the closing of the Transaction. " So this is what the
21 law firm was representing to the Exchange about the proposed
22 transaction.

23 I apologize for the pause here. I'm just making --
24 truncating of my notes, which helps get through some stuff.

25 So where I'm going to take you is you recall we had the
26 discussion about the January 8, 2025 letter that went to
27 Mr. Marks' counsel disclosing social media activity at issue.
28 And the reason I want to go to it is because it provides a useful

1 summary of a bunch of Twitter activity in a short period of time
2 from the beginning of September of 2024.

3 CHAIR: I think that was marked as Exhibit 10.

4 MR. McCOOMB: I think that's right. In the interest of
5 using your time better than I am now, I'm going to come back to
6 this point, just to make sure we don't waste any time.

7 So I think I've taken you through the relevant data
8 points in that chronology. What I'm going to show you, as soon
9 as we have it available, is a list of tweets, in particular where
10 Mr. Marks is commenting on projected revenues for New World with
11 rocket ship emojis and commentary on expecting the company to
12 reach potentially \$5 million to \$10 million in revenue. And when
13 we talk about problematic promotion, I would suggest that where
14 the law firm representing the transacting company is representing
15 to the CSE that the company's not going to earn any revenue in
16 the first 12 months, and yet its stock promoter CEO and chairman
17 is online commenting about breakout revenue raise, you have a
18 promotions problem.

19 So what we've got on the screen, it's Bates number 379
20 from the record of original proceeding. This is one of the
21 pieces of correspondence that went over to Mr. Narwal describing
22 in summary fashion with links tweets that Mr. Marks was putting
23 on X as of the beginning of September 2024.

24 CHAIR: These were attached to the January 8, 2025
25 letter --

26 MR. McCOOMB: They were.

27 CHAIR: -- that has subsequently been marked with the
28 attachments as part of Exhibit 10. But the letter isn't an

1 exhibit.

2 MR. McCOOMB: That letter isn't, but this piece of
3 correspondence is part of the original record. If you scroll up,
4 you'll see what it is. What we're looking at right now is part
5 of the original record of proceeding. So this is material that
6 we re-sent to Mr. Narwal but that had been communicated to him as
7 early as January 8th.

8 So we go back to 379, please.

9 But the summary is helpful because you can see this
10 kind of content in sequence in rapid fire.

11 CHAIR: But we can't actually review any of this
12 content.

13 MR. McCOOMB: You can't review the contents from the
14 links because the links aren't attached. All of these tweets, to
15 my knowledge, are still on Twitter, as are there TikTok videos.
16 I don't think any of this has been removed. But you can see the
17 content that's been captured here in this letter. And I haven't
18 seen anyone say that these have been inaccurately captured, these
19 quotes.

20 So the references on this page are talking about,
21 "1000% increase," rocket emoji; "Could this be our biggest winner
22 ever?" And I'm not focused here on disclaimers. It's accurate
23 to state that in some cases, Mr. Marks does provide disclaimers
24 as to his interest in New World, particularly in his TikTok
25 videos, which are quite long. It's not uncommon for him to do
26 so. He didn't do so in a hundred percent of the cases, and we
27 pointed out instances where he didn't provide any disclosure.
28 But that's not my focus.

1 Keep going, Sandy.

2 MR. McCOOMB: So what you see here, so the handful of
3 references. In (t), for example, as Sandy highlighted, "They all
4 laughed at me! But a 5-cent stock [moon rocket emoji] to 250 in
5 four months," which is not a reference to New World. And then
6 the next two increased to 1,000. So what he's suggesting is
7 potentially tying the New World projection to what happened in
8 another case.

9 Look at number (y), "Could it double in the next 10
10 days?" This is the prospective chairman of a company with
11 20%-plus interest in the company on Twitter to his followers and
12 his stock-promoter community, again, tied to the Penny Stock
13 Billionaire Gang handle as well asking the question whether the
14 stock price can double in the next 10 days. "Can this 2-cent
15 stock make you rich? Get your share of \$31 billion luxury watch
16 market. 3-cent stock ready to double again." And this is from a
17 TikTok video. We include the commentary, the capture of
18 Mr. Marks introducing his comments to his followers by
19 saying, "I've got some insider information for you" and
20 disclosing where it's from, right, that he's the chairman of this
21 company, that he's a major shareholder talking about insider
22 information, which I would suggest is all part and parcel of him
23 trying to lend credibility to what he's putting out into the
24 market to create demand and interest in acquiring these stocks,
25 very much acting as a stock promoter while he's also wearing his
26 chairman's hat.

27 Anyway, I'm going to circle back on the revenue point.
28 I'm going to take a short break later, and I'll just make sure

1 I've got the right details. But the point I want to emphasize,
2 as I said, has to do with Mr. Marks what I would say is hyping
3 the revenue projections of New World that he's putting on Twitter
4 in a manner that's different from what's being disclosed to the
5 Exchange. So --

6 CHAIR: And you equate revenue projections with
7 projections about what happens to the stock?

8 MR. McCOOMB: No, I'm referring specifically to revenue
9 projections. And I'll give you the commentary. He's talking
10 about a \$5 million to \$10 million anticipated revenue for New
11 World in circumstances where the disclosure about the revenue to
12 the Exchange is different. I apologize if my notes are failing
13 me, but I'll find those for you and give you those points before
14 we finish.

15 So what you have in the October 3rd decision is a
16 decision that, of course, reviews a determination that had been
17 made in January. It explicitly references it. It looks at
18 subsequent information. So that subsequent information is what
19 I'm showing you on the screen; in part, tweets and TikToks and
20 YouTube videos in the subsequent time between January 8th and
21 September and into October of 2024. And it concludes, based on
22 all that information, that Mr. Marks is unsuitable to be
23 affiliated with the CSE-listed issuer, communicates that to him.
24 And this appeal process, this feature of the eventual appeal
25 process, is kicked off.

26 So I feel like you've got a question on the tip of your
27 tongue. I --

28 CHAIR: But if you need to finish your sentence, and

1 then I'll jump in. I don't want to --

2 MR. McCOOMB: Well, all I was going to say is from a
3 procedural fairness standpoint, he's given the determination,
4 he's given the basis for that determination, and he's allowed to
5 exhaust his procedural rights, again, as this is all part and
6 parcel of doing.

7 CHAIR: So can you just take me to the October 3rd
8 decision?

9 MR. McCOOMB: Yes.

10 CHAIR: And show me where the October 3rd Reasons say
11 that it involved a review of the January 8th Reasons and a review
12 of additional materials from January 8th to the time of that
13 decision? Because I don't see that there.

14 MR. McCOOMB: I don't think it says anything quite so
15 explicit.

16 CHAIR: I mean, what I see instead is -- let me go to
17 the right page. Page 177 Bates number, for the record. Sorry,
18 I'm looking at a different version; that's fine. Or a different
19 copy of it in the record. 177?

20 MR. McCOOMB: Yes.

21 So what you have on 177 is a notation that a
22 determination had been made in January. It wasn't communicated
23 to Mr. Marks. The CSE says at the bottom of the communication
24 decision paragraph that it confirms that decision as of the date
25 of this letter.

26 And then the following section provides the rationale.
27 There's a reference to the 1998 SEC settlement. There's a
28 comment that that on its own likely wouldn't be enough to ground

1 an unsuitable determination. And then just turning over to 178,
2 at the top of the page where it says, "The nature of the conduct
3 alleged by the SEC does not raise investor protection concerns,"
4 et cetera, However, if there's no aggravating factors over a
5 significant period of time, the CSE would not object solely on
6 the basis of that settlement. So that's putting the 1998 SEC
7 piece to one side.

8 "It's the position of the Exchange, however, that there
9 are significant aggravating factors: the promotional materials
10 published by you and your promotional activity on
11 wallstreetreporter.com, social media platforms such as TikTok and
12 X, and investor forums such as CEO.ca give rise to investor
13 protection concerns."

14 So, no, it doesn't say, you know, including in the
15 period between January 8th and October 3rd, nor would I suggest
16 that it matters that it doesn't.

17 CHAIR: But, okay, so just a few things. If you go to
18 the communications decision section --

19 MR. McCOOMB: Yes.

20 CHAIR: -- on its face, the first sentence of that, or
21 reading that paragraph altogether, it's referring to, "a decision
22 made in January of 2024 that is now being communicated to you,"
23 not a new decision that is based upon a review of the
24 January 2024 decision and additional materials. I don't know;
25 aren't those two different things?

26 MR. McCOOMB: I think they are. I think what the
27 paragraph is saying, or at least -- I don't want to give you
28 evidence as to what someone intended.

1 CHAIR: No, I understand. I mean, all I can do is read
2 it.

3 MR. McCOOMB: Exactly. And it says what it says to
4 some extent. What it's telling the reader where it says, "The
5 Exchange confirms its decision," it's saying the determination
6 that you are unsuitable, we confirm that.

7 And then subsequently in the letter on page 178, it
8 refers to the various materials, not chapter and verse, but it
9 refers to the categories of materials on which that determination
10 is based. So as I read it, it's saying as of January 8th, we
11 determine that you were unsuitable. This matter is now before us
12 again. We've looked at all these materials; we've determined
13 that you're unsuitable. We confirm that determination, is what
14 it's saying. And to parse it into treating the January 8th
15 decision like a formal confirmed decision based on this writing,
16 I think this writing leaves much to be desired, much --

17 CHAIR: Not being a different decision, being the same
18 decision.

19 MR. McCOOMB: Well, this is actually saying as of
20 October 3rd that that decision is confirmed. It's not the same
21 decision; it's a determination that is confirmed and formally
22 communicated to the individual. That determination that
23 Mr. Marks was unsuitable in January was made and archived so that
24 you have it on file if it ever became relevant again. And the
25 Committee went and looked at the materials it had available to it
26 , including a wealth of additional social media activity, all of
27 which pointed in the same direction, that this individual was a
28 problematic person not associated with the Exchange. And so that

1 determination was confirmed.

2 And I told you when I started these submissions that
3 this is an evergreen obligation, that these determinations are
4 not static. And you see that in the very example of the SEC
5 settlement, that that once upon a time might've been a basis on
6 its own for a finding that he shouldn't be affiliated with
7 anybody on the Exchange. But you see in this correspondence the
8 Exchange saying given the passage of time, that on its own is not
9 enough, that there are aggravating factors here.

10 CHAIR: If it's a new decision in October, why bother
11 to say that because we didn't notify you in January of the
12 decision that the time for the appeal didn't run from then as in
13 Mr. Faulkner's cover e-mail in the record delivering this
14 decision?

15 MR. McCOOMB: To be very careful about what it actually
16 says in that cover e-mail, it refers both to January and to
17 September 27th -- or 26th, which is why Ms. Cosgrove put Boughton
18 Law on notice that there was an unsuitability issue here. So to
19 the extent anyone was wondering when does my appeal run from,
20 what the CSE is communicating is notwithstanding that there is
21 some procedural history here, the appeal starts -- the timing
22 starts from right then.

23 And you're saying why tie it together. Probably
24 shouldn't have been tied together. This whole situation would be
25 tidier if there was no reference to January at all, and the
26 Listing Committee simply said we've got a new matter before us
27 with fresh eyes. There's a note in our file that this person is
28 a 5 out of 5 risk rating, but let's not call that a determination

1 or a decision; let's make this happen afresh. We would be in a
2 much tidier situation right now.

3 What I've said to you before, I think, stands. This is
4 a case where messiness is created by three bizarre circumstances
5 colliding at once in a perfect storm. And I told you what those
6 circumstances are. That's why we find ourselves here.

7 CHAIR: So what are the materials that are before the
8 Listing Committee in making the October 3, 2024 decision? How do
9 I figure that out? Because I don't see them referred to in the
10 Reasons. And you've just told me that it was the materials that
11 were before the Listing Committee for the January 8th decision --
12 but we don't know exactly what those were -- and also
13 supplemented by social media activity from January 8th up until
14 October 3rd.

15 Although when I read the Faulkner affidavit, I think
16 the Faulkner affidavit says that they considered new postings
17 from the point in time where Mr. Marks was appointed chairman of
18 New World. And there's not a reference to additional social
19 media from January 8th onwards. So I don't know where to go.

20 MR. McCOOMB: To put together the record of what was
21 before the Listing Committee as of October 3rd?

22 CHAIR: Yeah.

23 MR. McCOOMB: My understanding is that the place where
24 that is captured is in combination with that January 8th
25 disclosure to Mr. Narwal, which was repeated in part in May. And
26 some of that material goes past the date of that decision, some
27 of the material disclosed in May. But my understanding is it's
28 captured as of what was disclosed to Mr. Narwal, who asked the

1 question what social media are you relying on. And he was given
2 references to the social media that the CSE had records of having
3 looked at, which were, effectively, Mr. Marks' tweets in that
4 period.

5 CHAIR: So I would have to go back to the record in --
6 if I wanted to figure out what was actually before the Listing
7 Committee for the October 3rd decision taking into account -- I'd
8 have to go back to the record, and I'd have to identify simply
9 what things predate and postdate October 3rd?

10 MR. McCOOMB: Yeah, I wouldn't put that on you. I
11 think what I'm saying is if we look at that letter from
12 January 8th, or we look at page 379 --

13 CHAIR: January 8, 2025?

14 MR. McCOOMB: Yes.

15 CHAIR: Right? Okay.

16 MR. McCOOMB: If we look at page 379 where we were
17 previously in the record in the correspondence going over with
18 Mr. Narwal, you will see pieces of social media with date stamps
19 on them to identify where they're from. So, yes, there will be
20 pieces in that disclosure that postdate because it was made clear
21 to everybody as the appeal process evolved -- and, of course,
22 it's the appeal record that matters for purposes of this
23 proceeding. But the appeal materials eventually came to include
24 subsequent conduct from Mr. Marks that affected the CSE board's
25 decision, in my submission, at the time. But these items are
26 date-stamped marked September 3rd, September 9th. They are in
27 order to know what came before and what came after. And so I
28 would put to this panel that materials dated before October 3rd

1 would've been before the Listing Committee.

2 CHAIR: But maybe they weren't gathered by the Listing
3 Committee as of October 3rd. I mean, they were gathered
4 subsequently, and then they would predate October 3rd.

5 MR. McCOOMB: And I don't have that evidence. I don't
6 have that evidence either way. I'm not going to represent that I
7 do.

8 CHAIR: Okay.

9 MR. McCOOMB: So I think that I've already conceded
10 that the language of some of these pieces leave something to be
11 desired in terms of the link back to October 8th and the
12 determination of unsuitability then. But none of the issues
13 around process and fairness, in my submission, again, engage any
14 of the Canada Malting factors. Remembering, of course, that the
15 decision under review in this proceeding is the decision of the
16 board.

17 CHAIR: Except, I mean, you'll agree with me that -- I
18 think I'm paraphrasing, but the decision of the board in May
19 actually says that it agrees that the October 3rd decision was
20 justified on the basis of what was before the Listing Committee.
21 I believe that...

22 MR. McCOOMB: And representations to that effect were
23 made to the board as part of the submissions. But your question
24 is, well, what exactly was there. Right? That's what you're
25 getting at?

26 CHAIR: Well, no, it's sort of a reaction to your
27 statement that all we need to do is look at the decision of the
28 board. If the board is leveraging off the decision on

1 October 3rd and saying we agree with it, there's an argument
2 perhaps that it's deferring to the Listing Committee's decision
3 of October 3rd to some extent.

4 MR. McCOOMB: I don't know if I would use the
5 words "leveraging" or "deferring" because of the process that the
6 CSE board has for an appeal.

7 And that is a pretty good segue to talk about Chapter 3
8 of this set of issues, which is to talk about the appeal itself.
9 And as you know from our factum, what we've said and what is
10 correct, in our submission, is that this application for hearing
11 review concerns the appeal decision and not the October 3rd
12 decision and determination from January 2024. But what we've
13 also explained is that the process for that appeal allowed the
14 parties to introduce new evidence should they so choose. And so
15 there was an opportunity for the parties to present their case to
16 the board, to present new information -- new evidence if they so
17 chose -- and to argue the issues at that level.

18 Now, the approach that Mr. Marks took through his
19 counsel was very much a criminal law disclosure approach, to
20 demand disclosure and then complain that it was insufficient, as
21 opposed to making the positive case for suitability. Now, I
22 surmise that happened because that ship on suitability had sailed
23 as of May 2025. And the reason I say that is because Mr. Marks,
24 by that point in time, had spent eight months calling the CSE
25 pedophiles and rapists and robbers and thugs. Pardon me; he didn't
26 call them thugs.

27 So that was the approach that was adopted by counsel,
28 was to take a critical view of the CSE's processes, to challenge

1 the procedural fairness and the disclosure, rather than to make
2 out a positive case. And what we've shown in our factum is that
3 where, in an appeal process, a party is given those effective de
4 novo rights to state a positive case or to contradict evidence
5 against, that that washes away potential procedural irregularity
6 with steps leading up to that appeal.

7 CHAIR: One just minor point, Mr. McCoomb. I know that
8 this statement is also set in your written submissions. I think
9 it's at paragraph 52 of your factum.

10 MR. MCCOOMB: Yes.

11 CHAIR: There's no authority cited for that. Is that
12 just obvious based on the language of the appeal policy?

13 MR. MCCOOMB: Let me just pull up the submission
14 itself.

15 So your question is about when we say that the CSE's
16 process allows for, effectively, a hearing de novo, where does
17 that come from?

18 CHAIR: Yeah.

19 MR. MCCOOMB: Sorry, I misunderstood your question. It
20 flows from the description that Ms. Stern, in her correspondence,
21 provided to Mr. Marks about how the appeal was to work. And it's
22 otherwise described in our factum, cited to the evidence. So,
23 for example, the paragraphs that follow, I believe, 57. And
24 there's also 53. Yeah, sorry, I apologize, Adjudicator Burke.
25 The itemized list in paragraph 53 --

26 CHAIR: Okay.

27 MR. MCCOOMB: -- sets out the features of the appeal
28 policy that give it effective de novo rights, including the

1 ability to introduce evidence, to make written submissions, to
2 argue your case in front of the panel, et cetera, et cetera.

3 CHAIR: But it's not a source from the policy itself.
4 It's from the description that was conveyed to Mr. Narwal?

5 MR. McCOOMB: That's right.

6 CHAIR: Okay.

7 MR. McCOOMB: That's right.

8 CHAIR: Thank you.

9 MR. McCOOMB: And Mr. Lockhart points out to me that
10 it's all also baked into the October 3rd decision letter. So set
11 out from that point in time as to what the process is going to
12 be.

13 CHAIR: If you going to move away from the October 3rd
14 letter, can I ask a question, please?

15 MR. McCOOMB: By all means.

16 CHAIR: So the first paragraph of the letter describes
17 the decision as a determination that the CSE will object to any
18 association between Mr. Marks and New World that would require
19 the filing of a PIF, specifically, "You must not be an officer,
20 director, promoter, or a shareholder with holdings greater than
21 10%." That seems to me to be inconsistent with what I think you
22 were telling me earlier, Mr. McCoomb, when I asked you whether
23 the creation of a new insider itself requires the filing of a
24 PIF, and you said no.

25 MR. McCOOMB: Right.

26 CHAIR: This suggests that it's fraught with -- so it's
27 not just the issue of Mr. Marks tipping into being a controlling
28 shareholder that was an issue from the CSE's perspective, based

1 on this decision.

2 MR. McCOOMB: And what I'll ask -- and I'm just mindful
3 of the time -- I'll take this question away to get you a specific
4 answer over the break.

5 CHAIR: Okay.

6 MR. McCOOMB: Regardless, I think for purposes of --
7 well, I don't want to answer a question that you didn't ask. So
8 I'll take that question away, if you don't mind, and come back
9 with something specific.

10 CHAIR: Okay.

11 MR. McCOOMB: Which may except the inconsistency or
12 explain it.

13 CHAIR: Okay.

14 MR. McCOOMB: If you don't mind.

15 But just in the interest of trying to use the next six
16 minutes helpfully, and I am getting towards the end of the
17 submission, recognize that most of what I've said about
18 October 3rd -- pardon me; about the appeal decision -- is heavily
19 reliant on our factum. Because, of course, we've dealt with that
20 head-on. And what I've wanted to do with these submissions
21 orally is focus as much as I can on what Mr. Marks has put before
22 the panel as his concern. Because he's done very little in the
23 response to the board decision itself. That does not seem to be
24 his focus.

25 And so it does follow that if panel accepts what we've
26 said, which is, first of all, that the decision under review is
27 the board decision and the board decision only; and second of
28 all, that if the rights attached to the board decision create a

1 hearing at that level that is such that it washes away any
2 procedural irregularity of the pieces before it, then most of
3 what Mr. Marks is raising as concerns don't really go anywhere.
4 They don't affect that board decision, which should, in my
5 submission, clear away those prior problems. Because I won't
6 pretend as though there aren't elements of messiness in the way
7 this was developed in the correspondence, as we've covered in the
8 questions and back and forth.

9 So the reference I wanted to give you, just so you'll
10 have it -- and I'll use the easiest one possible because I know
11 you already have it in front of you. So paragraph 73 of our
12 written submission, on page 24 of the written submission, embeds
13 a quote from one of the relevant tweets from Mr. Marks about
14 revenue run rate, talking about asking the question of whether
15 New World Solutions could hit \$5 million to \$10 million in
16 revenue in 2025. I didn't want to leave that unaddressed.
17 That's the sort of thing, on this question of promotion, that
18 causes, I think, great concern when you contrast it against what
19 Boughton Law was saying to the CSE about the projections for this
20 company, which raises this question of promotion and what is
21 overpromotion.

22 And I would cast it a little bit differently and submit
23 that the issue is problematic promotion. And there are, of
24 course, as Mr. Marks has pointed out in written submissions from
25 Friday, resources and policy that address the question of stock
26 promoter activity. It's partly 43-101. And there are at least
27 three categories. I think it's a closed list, but I think
28 there's at least three categories of promotional activity that

1 could be problematic, which is to say could give rise to a
2 finding of unsuitability if it came to the attention of the
3 Exchange.

4 So one category is undisclosed conflicts of interest.
5 A second category would be overly aggressive or optimistic or
6 assertive promises of stock price growth or share price growth.
7 And a third category -- and obviously this is more than just a
8 stock promotion problem, but just misrepresentation. And I think
9 what you see across the various pieces of social media activity
10 that animate the board's decision and have put us here is a
11 combination of some or all of those categories, depending on the
12 piece of commentary.

13 So we had drawn the panel's attention, for example, the
14 board's attention, to pieces of commentary where there was no
15 disclosure, no disclosure of Mr. Marks' role or interests.
16 That's one category. Paragraph 73, in its reference to
17 \$5 million to \$10 million in revenue, is an example of commentary
18 that, at least based on what Boughton Law was willing to tell the
19 CSE, looks like it could be misrepresentative.

20 And that third category of overly assertive suggestions
21 of growth -- and I appreciate Mr. Marks, his principal occupation
22 is as a stock promoter. He's paid by issuers to try to create
23 demand for their equities. He makes no bones about that role.
24 If you read his book, if you look at his website, he discloses
25 that. And in some cases, talking about potential growth for an
26 entity is part and parcel of the job. Of course, promising
27 anything, making people believe that something is guaranteed is
28 always going to be a problem. But when you're in his role, in

1 his shoes as the chairman and controlling shareholder of a
2 company, talking about the stock price doubling or going a 1000%,
3 putting timelines in it, this becomes very problematic for people
4 who want to believe that his role with the company creates
5 legitimacy and goes beyond mere stock hyping.

6 At the very outset of my submissions, I told this panel
7 that there is no bright line on these activities, on what would
8 make somebody unsuitable. In these circumstances, I don't think
9 it takes much to look at the particular activities that Mr. Marks
10 engaged in starting back when, starting with AI/ML or earlier and
11 all the way through to October, saying nothing about the campaign
12 of defamation, to see that the individual's conflict of interest,
13 disclosed or not, in Mr. Marks' interest and role with New World
14 is highly problematic.

15 I think the notion of unsuitability, as it's grounded
16 in Policy 2.18, is heavily based on the notion of fiduciary duty.
17 Not every person in those roles, in the various roles that the
18 CSE could object to having an association, is going to be a
19 fiduciary. But in many cases, they will be. And what Mr. Marks'
20 commentary makes clear is that he doesn't appear to be prepared
21 to put the company's interests ahead of his own, to put
22 shareholders' interests or stakeholders' interests ahead of his
23 own as a fiduciary. What he appears to be doing is trying to
24 hype the stock price, trying to drive it in a way that is not
25 common and, I would submit, not appropriate for someone who is,
26 in fact, a driver of the business from the inside.

27 Posting videos to TikTok talking about how he's sharing
28 with his followers insider information, which if true -- I mean,

1 if it really is insider information that he's sharing, he's
2 sharing it in completely the wrong forum. Right? That shouldn't
3 be happening. But he's doing this to lend legitimacy and
4 credibility to the claims he makes about the company to get
5 people interested buying shares that will affect the value of his
6 own investment.

7 And from the perspective of the policies, the animating
8 words in Policy 2.18 about the Exchange itself, bringing the
9 Exchange into disrepute, protecting investors on the Exchange,
10 you can see why his conduct would raise concerns that could lead
11 to an unsuitability finding. It's not, on the basis of the
12 disclosure in the record before the board, a hard conclusion to
13 reach.

14 Mr. Lockhart, last week or the week prior, did most of
15 the heavy lifting to underline why the campaign of defamation is
16 significant in your overall fact pattern. And I'm not going to
17 double down on that. You, again, have that information before
18 you as to why -- say you were to allow in the subsequent evidence
19 even post the appeal decision. But regardless, we have the
20 defamatory material between October 3 and May 13, 2025. It's not
21 difficult to understand how that kind of conduct triggers the
22 element of Policy 2.18 to bring the Exchange into disrepute.

23 CHAIR: Is there one place you can point me to where
24 the defamatory content is identified in that time frame?

25 MR. McCOOMB: Sorry, identified from what time frame?

26 CHAIR: For that time frame, from October 3rd through
27 to May 13th. One place where there's defamatory content.

28 MR. McCOOMB: There's two places. So some of it, I

1 believe, is included in the January 8, 2025 memo to Mr. Narwal.
2 And it's further included if you go to page 379 of the record,
3 that correspondence from me to Mr. Narwal putting all that before
4 him. It's also included, I believe, in no small detail, in our
5 submissions from -- I believe it's March 25, 2025, the factum
6 submission document. We embedded instances of the defamatory
7 content right in that submission. So Mr. Marks and Mr. Narwal
8 both had notice of those pieces of the puzzle, and they were
9 included in the record in that regard.

10 CHAIR: Thank you.

11 MR. McCOOMB: I'm mindful of the time, and this is what
12 we'd identified for a break. I don't have too much more to say.
13 I would like to take away your question on policy and of course
14 answer any further questions. But I think for the balance of my
15 submissions, subject to questions you may have, we'll probably
16 rely mostly on our factum.

17 CHAIR: Okay. I do have a question -- and I don't
18 think it's been answered; so you take that away for break as
19 well -- is walk me through in the record of the original
20 proceeding what was before the board.

21 MR. McCOOMB: Okay.

22 CHAIR: Thank you. So we'll come back at 2:05.

23 --- Recess taken at 1:49 p.m.

24 --- On resuming at 2:05 p.m.

25 CHAIR: Everyone please be seated. Just a moment while
26 we get logged back in.

27 Whenever you're ready, Mr. McCoomb.

28 MR. McCOOMB: Thank you.

1 So let's start with the related persons question. And
2 it will take me walking back a little bit with what I said
3 before, to be clear.

4 Thank you, Sandy.

5 So CSE's Policy 2.9 would require the filing of a PIF
6 for individuals proposing to become a related person. So it's
7 not just for control persons, but it includes as low as the 10%
8 threshold for related persons, which marries up with the first
9 paragraph of the October 3rd letter. Of course, the natural next
10 question is would that not have triggered a requirement to
11 deliver a PIF with Mr. Marks becoming a 19% shareholder. And it
12 looks like on the face of the policy, it would have.

13 It doesn't appear that one was delivered. In fairness,
14 it doesn't appear that one was requested. Whether it's requested
15 or not I don't think is necessarily here nor there. But I'll
16 acknowledge it doesn't look like it was requested, and there was
17 information in that correspondence sufficient to identify that it
18 could've been appropriate to request one so as to line up the
19 individuals and understand who you were looking at.

20 My understanding -- and I don't want to give evidence
21 in this, but it's a resourcing question. I don't believe the CSE
22 in every case with a related person asks for a PIF and does a
23 suitability review. So that obviously is a revision to
24 information I gave you earlier. I apologize for that. I do not
25 mean to mislead the Panel.

26 CHAIR: No.

27 MR. McCOOMB: I hope this is clearer than we were
28 before.

1 CHAIR: Thank you.

2 MR. McCOOMB: Your other question -- again, not
3 presuming that I'm at the end of the list of those that you may
4 have for me, but was to walk you through the record of what was
5 before the board. And I'll be very transparent and say on the
6 record we have before us, it is not perfectly clear. And I'll
7 explain what I mean by that. But by reference to the original
8 record of proceeding --

9 CHAIR: I'm going to pull it up.

10 MR. McCOOMB: And, really, just working off the Table
11 of Contents is the easiest way for us to do this. What I can
12 tell you is the formal record, as in the appeal book, that was
13 prepared by the CSE and delivered to the parties is the record
14 that runs from page 10 to page 176 -- or I guess 181.

15 CHAIR: Not the Notice of Intent to Appeal?

16 MR. McCOOMB: Sorry, I think we started with that. Let
17 me double-check.

18 CHAIR: Page 10 starts -- is Tab 3, for the record.

19 MR. McCOOMB: It's referenced in -- the same document,
20 I think, is Tab A in Mr. Narwal's correspondence. They're both
21 letters dated November 1st.

22 CHAIR: Oh, I see. Yeah.

23 MR. McCOOMB: So it's been added again just so it heads
24 the document, but then it forms part of the appeal binder.

25 CHAIR: So the formal appeal record is the contents of
26 Tab 3 of what we marked as Exhibit 9?

27 MR. McCOOMB: That's my understanding. That would've
28 been the appeal book that was circulated to the parties, which --

1 CHAIR: And to, well, prepare what was before the
2 panel, right?

3 MR. McCOOMB: Right. So that's my first part of the
4 answer. Because in addition to that -- so what you have
5 following Tab 3 is the materials that were exchanged and
6 disclosed between the parties. A lot of that is what was sent
7 over to Mr. Narwal related to social media activity, which wasn't
8 formally built into the appeal book, but reference was made to
9 aspects of it during that appeal.

10 And I'm making this representation to the panel. I
11 mean, at one point in time during the appeal, we played one of
12 Mr. Marks' TikTok videos live. So that's not captured in the
13 record, but it was something that was shown. Now, I can't tell
14 you which one it was. And, unfortunately -- this is why I say
15 it's a little bit unclear -- I can't give you a much more precise
16 answer than that.

17 So these materials were made available to the parties.
18 They didn't get into a document crystallized as the record of
19 that particular appeal. And so I can't tell you that the appeal
20 panel laid eyes on any particular document or documents in Tab 4.
21 The ones that we know they would've had access to and recourse to
22 were the ones that were captured or attached or captioned in our
23 submissions, which are included in Tab 3.

24 CHAIR: We've marked this as the record of original
25 proceeding. What do we do with this? I mean, in one scenario,
26 the materials that were not before the panel could arguably be
27 characterized as new evidence.

28 MR. McCOOMB: Yes. Yes, if they were not before the

1 panel.

2 CHAIR: About which we don't have a motion because it's
3 at least my understanding that in the process before this
4 tribunal, the parties agreed to what was a part of the original
5 proceeding is including all of these materials.

6 MR. McCOOMB: Right. It wouldn't necessarily answer
7 the question for the Panel about whether it was admissible.

8 CHAIR: No, although, I mean, as the case management
9 adjudicator, I expected that something called the Record of
10 Original Proceeding was what was before the panel below.

11 MR. McCOOMB: I take your point. And I don't have an
12 immediate answer for you. I'm hesitant to ask for a break,
13 having just had one. Perhaps if we do -- we're going to hear our
14 friend's submission. Perhaps I can do a bit more diligence on
15 this particular question for you.

16 Because to be practically candid with you, I think
17 these materials were put together as having been exchanged
18 between the parties as sort of the disclosure between the
19 parties. What I'm not certain of -- so let me put it this way.
20 What I'm not certain of is to the formality in which any of these
21 materials made it into the panel's hands. So, for example, there
22 was disclosure in Mr. Faulkner's January 8, 2025 letter to
23 Mr. Narwal of posts and materials. I'm not sure, standing here
24 today, that that landed in the Panel's hands in a formal
25 capacity, though some of those materials were referred to during
26 the hearing. If I can take some time to run that down, I'll try
27 to get you some better definition on that.

28 In the absence of getting you a link to explain that

1 that material does properly form part of the record outside of
2 the appeal book, then I think you would have to approach it -- I
3 mean, the parties have treated it as if it's the record. It is
4 instructive to this Panel's decision-making to have all that in
5 front of you. There's no issue of disclosure as between the
6 parties. And submissions were made on the basis of this material
7 that everybody had access to, both parties. And so there's no
8 fairness issue that's created, but I do appreciate the concern
9 that from a formalistic standpoint and from a how have we been
10 looking at this standpoint that there could be a concern about
11 that. We have to own that. Yeah.

12 CHAIR: Okay.

13 MR. McCOOMB: I don't have much more I'd like to say to
14 you in terms of submissions because I think our factum walks
15 through the Canada Malting factors and addresses the concerns
16 procedurally and substantively that Mr. Marks has raised with
17 respect to the approach here. And I said it before the break:
18 When you take the sum total of the things that he's said and
19 done, I don't think it's hard to arrive at a determination that
20 he's unsuitable to be participating in the Exchange. And while
21 there are elements of this approach that have been untidy, the
22 conclusions are all grounded in what's gone on and are fully
23 supportable on the Canada Malting standard.

24 Of course, you're going hear from the OSC, and I
25 understand my friend's submission, which is you should take a
26 step back -- as I understand it, if I'm recapitulating before he
27 says it -- take a step back and looking at all of the evidence
28 that you have, approach this from the perspective of a hearing de

1 novo and make your own determination, consistent with the CSE's
2 determination but not the CSE's determination, which is to say
3 find on your own accord that Mr. Marks is unsuitable to
4 participate in the market. Of course, we're happy with that
5 conclusion, though notwithstanding the questions and the answers
6 that we've given with our submission that the appeal process
7 should not be interfered with and should stand on its own with
8 this just simply being denied. But, of course, if you accept the
9 OSC's submission on getting to that hearing de novo, then of
10 course we support the same conclusion, as we set out in our
11 correspondence.

12 CHAIR: I think I have one further question. So it'll
13 be maybe a bit of a random question, given where we are in your
14 submissions, Mr. McCoomb. But just to make sure I covered off, I
15 wanted to ask you -- can we go to paragraph 54 of your written
16 submissions?

17 MR. McCOOMB: Yes.

18 CHAIR: Let me just pull that up. Just a second.

19 MR. McCOOMB: Due process, yes.

20 CHAIR: Due process.

21 MR. McCOOMB: And to some extent -- and I don't mean to
22 presuppose this -- if you do want to ask the question about
23 Mr. Marks' submissions on approval of CSE, we can also pick that
24 up here. But I'll take your question first, of course.

25 CHAIR: So we've got the extract, provision 6.1, due
26 process:

27 "For any decision made by the Exchange that affects a
28 participant or issuer," and it goes on, "or an applicant to be a

1 participant or issuer, the Exchange ensures that:

2 "(a) parties are given an opportunity to be heard or
3 make representations, and it keeps a record of, gives Reasons
4 for, and provides for appeals or reviews of its decisions."

5 So I'd be interested in hearing from you as to how, if
6 at all, the opportunity to be heard and make representations
7 applies at the stage of the Listing Committee. Because when I
8 track it through, I think an argument could be made that the
9 Exchange is making a decision at the Listing Committee stage.

10 MR. McCOOMB: That the Exchange is making a decision at
11 the Listing Committee stage. And your question is ought not the
12 CSE Listing Committee give the person these participatory rights.

13 CHAIR: Yeah.

14 MR. McCOOMB: That --

15 CHAIR: And I'm going to tie it to the written
16 submissions from the OSC, and, in particular, the reference to
17 the McLeod decision of the Alberta Court of Appeal, where as I
18 read it -- I mean, there's a finding that there should be the
19 ability to at least make submissions in writing on a suitability
20 decision. And I recognize that there's maybe a factual
21 difference in that case because there, it looked like there were
22 not two levels of decision within the relevant exchange. It was
23 an Exchange decision, and then it was appealed to the Alberta
24 Securities Commission, whereas at the CSE, we've got the two
25 layers. We've got the Listing Committee, and then we've got an
26 appeal to the board. But I'm not sure that that distinction
27 makes a difference. So...

28 MR. McCOOMB: Help me just with that last comment about

1 you're not sure the distinction makes a difference?

2 CHAIR: Well, just from the facts in the McLeod
3 decision, it looked like there was only one decision that was
4 made at the Exchange level. Like, it was one decision, and that
5 went right to the Securities Commission on a hearing review, as
6 opposed to what we have here, which was we have a decision first,
7 the Listing Committee, and then there's an internal appeal for a
8 hearing and review to the panel of the board. But to me,
9 definitionally, a decision of the Exchange, I think, could be
10 broad enough to encompass a decision of the Listing Committee
11 itself.

12 MR. McCOOMB: Well, I think you're right. And I think
13 what we've told you, that the process that we are expected to
14 address, to meet in this case flows from the recognition order.
15 So we are setting this out as the process that is relevant.

16 I hear you on the question of -- we've also
17 characterized October 3rd as a decision --

18 CHAIR: Of the Exchange.

19 MR. McCOOMB: And it's been communicated in that
20 respect.

21 So the first thing I would tell you is what we've said
22 before about the law around hearings de novo clearing up any
23 procedural irregularity is part the answer. And your question is
24 should Mr. Marks have been given the opportunity to be heard or
25 make representations. I don't know; I'd have to take another
26 look at Mr. Faulkner's correspondence with him around
27 October 2nd. I don't recall any invitation in that
28 correspondence to provide any information that Mr. Marks would

1 say would be, you know, mitigating, for example. And, in
2 fairness, at that point in time, he hadn't been given the basis
3 document for the suitability finding.

4 So there's an exchange obviously around that time.
5 He's told about the determination. The formal decision document
6 comes out. I think I would be in position to have to concede
7 that if you accept that that determination is a decision, that
8 pursuant to the procedural requirement here, that that's
9 something that would've been expected.

10 What the recognition order is setting out is the
11 delegation to the CSE of its authority, rather than dictating
12 what the policy ought to be. Right? So this is saying CSE, we
13 are going to give you the ability to make your own process here.
14 Go ahead and make your process, and it should conform to these
15 standards. And if it doesn't, then that's a basis on which
16 potentially the approach wasn't consistent with the recognition
17 order. Though, again, I would say that that defect is cured by
18 what happened subsequently with an appeal that fits within the
19 requirements of due process as set out by the OSC in the
20 recognition order.

21 I think practically speaking, Mr. Marks clearly did
22 have the opportunity to be heard. If you look when the decision
23 was made -- now, in fairness, it was communicated to him as a
24 decision, and it wasn't communicated to him as something that was
25 pending or something that was live or an issue that was open, and
26 we'd like to hear from you. But he certainly did make his
27 position known to the Exchange in his correspondence at the time.

28 CHAIR: But after the decision was made.

1 MR. McCOOMB: After the decision was made.

2 CHAIR: And after he was told if he had a problem, he
3 could appeal it.

4 MR. McCOOMB: Adjudicator Burke, I throat-cleared with
5 that to start, right?

6 CHAIR: Okay.

7 MR. McCOOMB: It happened not as a live issue. But I
8 don't think it would be fair to say that he didn't have the
9 opportunity to speak to the issue. And as I've said before,
10 these decisions aren't static, right? And if there was a
11 mitigating circumstance that he could've raised in his response,
12 he had the ability to go and do that and for those things to be
13 considered afresh and changed. It's not impossible for these
14 determinations to be changed if new information gets before the
15 Listing Committee. In either direction, right? Up or down. And
16 so in large measure, I'm accepting the proposition that I think
17 you're putting to me, which is this is a potential problem. But
18 I think that it's one that under the procedural fairness of the
19 circumstances, it...

20 CHAIR: Thank you.

21 MR. McCOOMB: Okay.

22 CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. McCoomb.

23 MR. McCOOMB: Thank you.

24 CHAIR: Mr. Pettypiece.

25 MR. PETTYPIECE: Thank you.

26 Andrew?

27 CHAIR: We're happy for you to move up, because right
28 now I can't see your face.

1 MR. PETTYPIECE: Sorry about it. If we lower that, I
2 think we're okay. And then I understand that he's got to make
3 reply submissions potentially after. So I'm happy for him to sit
4 there if the Panel is.

5 MR. McCOOMB: It's rare that I'm blocking somebody's
6 view.

7 MR. PETTYPIECE: So thank you, Adjudicators. I'll try
8 and keep my submissions as brief as possible, that I've timed
9 around 40 minutes. So with questions, we might be butting up
10 against the second break today.

11 SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PETTYPIECE:

12 MR. PETTYPIECE: And I'll start just with a road map.
13 I only intend to cover what is really a subset of the issues
14 addressed in our written submissions on April 23rd and,
15 specifically, four topics.

16 The first topic is whether the Canada Malting
17 assessment should result in a fresh consideration of the
18 Applicant's suitability under Exchange policies. We say it
19 should, for reasons that are obvious having read our submissions.
20 The new evidence submitted by the CSE triggers the corresponding
21 element of general framework supporting setting aside the CSE
22 decision and considering the matter fresh. So that's issue one.

23 Issue two, if that's the approach this panel takes, we
24 submit why it would be appropriate in the circumstances for this
25 tribunal to conduct that suitability assessment rather than do
26 anything else, being remitting the matter back to the CSE for
27 determination or doing nothing and just simply setting the
28 decision aside. And my submissions in that second issue will

1 really cover any eventuality that triggers Canada Malting,
2 whether it's a process issue that triggers a fresh assessment or
3 the tendering of new evidence.

4 The third part of my submissions is really to get to
5 the meat of the suitability point, which is when conducting an
6 assessment under Policy 2.18 of the CSE's policies, the Tribunal
7 should find that the evidence demonstrated the Applicant's
8 association with New World is unacceptable. And there again, we
9 are focusing on the post-decision conduct, the abusive and
10 harassing comments made towards the CSE and its personnel.

11 And then the fourth issue -- I guess it's time
12 permitting -- is to address the question of remedy if this Panel
13 decides to consider the matter de novo and makes a suitability
14 finding, answering the question what's next. And to a large
15 extent, we addressed that in our written submissions delivered a
16 week ago on May 12th. But I'll highlight a few aspects of those
17 submissions.

18 So that's the plan for me today. I'll just touch on
19 what I don't intend to cover in case the Panel has questions on
20 those issues, and I can just deal with them right up front. So I
21 don't need intend to discuss the regulatory framework around
22 recognizing exchanges or the suitability policies themselves.
23 The CSE reviewed that in detail as well, and its in our written
24 submissions.

25 I don't intend to address the standard of review, the
26 fact that the Canada Malting framework applies in the
27 circumstances. I don't think there's any serious debate on that
28 question. I also don't intend to get into issues of due process

1 and procedural fairness that have featured prominently, I would
2 say, today so far.

3 I think what we've done in our written submissions is
4 to try and provide the panel a framework and some substance,
5 first explaining the requirements in the recognition order and
6 then adding meat to that requirement by explaining what does
7 "opportunity to be heard" mean in the circumstances, what
8 decisions have been made, and what Reasons require in the
9 circumstances. And then what we also do in our written
10 submissions is try and situate those questions of procedural
11 fairness within the Canada Malting framework. We try and
12 explain, you know, how the Panel is to make that decision at the
13 Canada Malting step. But we don't go further, take it a step
14 further and provide our own position on how potential process or
15 fairness issues in this case trigger the Canada Malting
16 framework.

17 I'll just pause there and maybe first deal with the
18 Panel's question on the level at which procedural fairness is
19 required under the recognition order. And for that, I would just
20 point to the CSE Listing Policy 1.5(2).

21 CHAIR: Sorry, can you repeat the number.

22 MR. PETTYPIECE: Sorry. 1.5(2).

23 CHAIR: Thanks.

24 MR. PETTYPIECE: It says:

25 "At the request of either the Appellant or Exchange
26 management, the matter may first be considered by the Listing
27 Committee for an advisory opinion. But the Listing Committee
28 shall not have the power to make a final determination of the

1 matter. "

2 Now, I think this may be an open question as to whether
3 that request was made in this case. But I think the point of
4 that provision is the Listing Committee isn't making the final
5 determination; the CSE board is making the final determination.
6 And I think the substance of the requirement in the recognition
7 order is that before that final determination is made, there's an
8 opportunity to be heard, and there are Reasons provided. And I
9 think most naturally that determination occurs at the final stage
10 before the board. There are potentially issues of efficiency,
11 expediency in providing a full hearing process at every stage.
12 You know, when you're dealing with an exchange that's making
13 important decisions every day on a number of issues, the process
14 is really provided before the board, in our view.

15 I also wanted -- and I mentioned this at the outset of
16 the hearing -- to quickly address for one or two minutes the
17 point Mr. Marks makes about the recognition order and the
18 approval of appeal procedures. The short answer is the
19 procedures themselves, the appeal procedures, which I have
20 identified at Tab 3B of the record of original proceedings
21 attached to an April 11, 2025 order -- the short answer is the
22 procedures themselves are not rules that are required to be filed
23 with the OSC under the recognition order. And Mr. Marks fairly
24 points out -- he points to the Cboe example of appeal procedures
25 that are similar in nature, having been approved by the OSC in
26 the past. And what I can note is the recognition order that
27 applied to the predecessor of the Cboe Exchange had an explicit
28 requirement to approve those appeal procedures. That

1 requirement's no longer there in that order, and the requirement
2 does not appear in the CSE recognition order.

3 So that sort of explains, you know, what might on its
4 face look like a discrepancy. But the view is the procedures
5 aren't rules that are required to be filed or approved by the
6 OSC. I'm not sure where the issue goes in any event, but I just
7 wanted to provide that clarification.

8 CHAIR: Mr. Pettypiece, before you go on with your
9 submissions, I just want to clarify one thing, that when the
10 Commission's materials refer to and advocate for a hearing de
11 novo in this case, I'm understanding that as code for a fresh
12 hearing based upon admission of the CNSX levels.

13 MR. PETTYPIECE: Yes. I don't know that it's code.

14 CHAIR: Well --

15 MR. PETTYPIECE: It's a fresh consideration of his
16 suitability, in consideration of all the evidence that's before
17 the Panel.

18 CHAIR: Right. But there could also be a hearing de
19 novo with this Panel reconsidering the issue, a fresh
20 consideration of the issue based upon the evidence that was
21 before the panel, for example.

22 MR. PETTYPIECE: The evidence before the CSE director's
23 panel?

24 CHAIR: Yes.

25 MR. PETTYPIECE: Yes. Yeah. So there are a number of
26 different roads that this Panel, the Tribunal, can go down to
27 consider this fresh. It could set aside part of the decision; it
28 could set aside the whole decision. There's a lot of different

1 permutations that -- we haven't addressed every single
2 permutation in our written submissions, nor do I intend to today.

3 But I think how you can interpret our submissions is
4 that if you admit the new evidence and you agree with our
5 position that the subsequent conduct of the Applicant is of an
6 overriding concern that needs to be addressed in the public
7 interest, you can set aside the entire CSE director's decision,
8 consider the matter fresh. And we, of course, only make
9 submissions on that aspect of the evidence. That doesn't mean
10 this Panel can't also address other aspects of the evidence that
11 was put before the CSE board with --

12 CHAIR: But we'd only get to that if we find that some
13 element of Canada Malting warrants it, right?

14 MR. PETTYPIECE: Absolutely. Yeah.

15 CHAIR: So, I mean, your submissions skirt over all of
16 the issues -- refer to potential problems, nuances that may need
17 to be taken into account and maybe weren't implicitly -- like,
18 I'm paraphrasing, but you don't get into that in your
19 submissions. You just go right to let in the new evidence and
20 conduct a hearing de novo based on the new evidence.

21 MR. PETTYPIECE: That's right. There's a lot of ways
22 Canada Malting can be engaged. And in any of those different
23 circumstances, whether you're engaging with the procedural
24 complaints that Mr. Marks is making, whether you find issues with
25 the Reasons themselves, all the roads lead to the same
26 destination, which is a fresh consideration of his suitability.
27 And, you know, we'll get into our submission that if you're going
28 to conduct a fresh consideration of suitability, you should be

1 considering the most current information available to the Panel,
2 in accordance with the Exchange's gatekeeping obligations and the
3 regulatory framework.

4 So that's how we get there. We have one option that's
5 presented in our factum for crossing the Canada Malting
6 threshold, which is you recognize this new and compelling
7 evidence, and you get to a new hearing. There are different ways
8 to get to a new hearing; we acknowledge that. We're just not
9 providing submissions on those other alternatives. We're
10 focusing on what we feel is the overriding concern in this case.

11 CHAIR: Okay. So in addition to the issues that you
12 say you want to address today, is the Commission prepared to
13 address the question of how this Panel, were it to reassess the
14 evidence that was before the panel and apply its own suitability
15 or suitability decision, what standards, what should be taken
16 into account, where we should go with that? You described it as
17 a nuanced process to consider overpromotion. But we don't have
18 any submissions from the Commission on that.

19 MR. PETTYPIECE: No, and we won't be making submissions
20 on the promotional side of this case. Our focus is entirely on
21 the subsequent conduct, which we, again, view as an overriding
22 concern. That's not to say that the Panel can't engage in that
23 analysis on a fresh consideration of the evidence. You have
24 submissions from the CSE. You have submissions from Mr. Marks.
25 You have some authorities. You can engage in that. You just
26 won't have the Commission's assistance in that endeavour.

27 So I'll just provide, I guess, by way of overview --
28 and I think I've touched on some of these themes. But, really,

1 my intention here today is to focus attention on what we view as
2 the core of the case. And we think the parties are, really,
3 fundamentally at odds about what's at the heart of this
4 proceeding.

5 I take the Applicant's submissions as, really, an
6 opportunity to put Exchange processes on trial and have this
7 Tribunal essentially vindicate his conduct by confirming his view
8 surrounding the procedural unfairness that he allegedly suffered.
9 Of course, that's, as we discussed, a route that this panel can
10 take. But what I'm hearing from him is he views this unfairness,
11 these concerns that he has with process, as justification or
12 excuse for all of the conduct that followed.

13 And in a way, he's saying you don't need to, Tribunal,
14 focus on everything that happened afterwards. All you need to
15 look at is what unfairness I suffered before the CSE. And you
16 can end the analysis there. In our view, that's a fundamentally
17 misguided way of approaching this proceeding.

18 What's at issue is the Applicant's suitability. And,
19 plainly, his post-decision conduct is not justified, period.
20 There's nothing that justifies that conduct. However unfair any
21 process might have been, it doesn't justify or excuse the nature
22 and scope of the abusive and harassing comments that were
23 directed to the Exchange and its people. And most importantly,
24 the Applicant's conduct amounts to independent and sufficient
25 grounds under the applicable Exchange policies to find him
26 unsuitable.

27 And we really focus on two main reasons for why it
28 provides sufficient grounds under Exchange policies. The first

1 is that the conduct itself represented a direct attack on the
2 reputation of the Exchange, which very clearly engages a
3 reputational component of Policy 2.18. So it both harms the
4 reputation of the Exchange, but in doing so, also undermines
5 confidence in the markets.

6 The second main reason we want to focus on is what he
7 did was engage in a lengthy campaign of harassment, intimidation,
8 and threats that were directed towards regulatory decision-makers
9 because he faced an unfavourable outcome before the CSE that he
10 viewed as unfair. We say this type of retaliatory conduct
11 independently engages the public interest under Policy 2.18. It
12 demonstrates a disregard for regulatory authority, and in a way
13 that independently undermines regulatory process and confidence
14 in the capital markets. And what follows from that position is
15 that allowing individuals who engage in this type of
16 objectionable behaviour towards regulatory decision-makers to
17 continue to occupy positions of control and influence in public
18 issuers, in our view, sends a deeply concerning message about
19 what standards of conduct are appropriate for regulators,
20 decision-makers, and in Canada's capital markets generally. So
21 that, in our view, is the fundamental focus of this case. And
22 that's why we are singularly focused on that issue. We see an
23 overriding public interest concern with this conduct.

24 So I'll transition just to briefly touch on the first
25 of the four issues that I present at the beginning, which is how
26 Canada Malting is engaged. I'll be extremely brief because I
27 think I'm really overlapping with the submissions I made on the
28 8th of why the new evidence should go in. And that's simply

1 because the new evidence presented by the CSE meets the new and
2 compelling standard. It meets that standard for the admission of
3 the new evidence, and it meets the same standard under Canada
4 Malting. Elaborating on that in a little bit.

5 Exchange policies in the public interest require a
6 reassessment of suitability where new material information comes
7 to light. We've been talking about the evergreen nature of the
8 suitability assessment. The Court has made findings in response
9 to escalating misconduct towards the Exchange and its people.
10 And in our view, the CSE is really forced to grapple with that
11 finding. It has to determine what it means to have a public
12 court decision saying someone has irreparably harmed the
13 Exchange, and what that means under an Exchange policy that
14 requires consideration of reputational harm. So in our view, it
15 would be artificial to ignore the present state of affairs and
16 the record of Mr. Marks' conduct to date.

17 And, you know, the final issue being the Exchange wants
18 this finally resolved as well. And this sort of dovetails into
19 my next submission, but to sort of ignore that issue and proceed
20 on the original issues before the CSE directors focusing on
21 promotional activity likely would result in a repetition of this
22 whole process. But I'll get to that in my second submission,
23 which is, you know, why it's this tribunal that should perform
24 the assessment, a fresh consideration of suitability, rather than
25 remitting the matter back to the CSE or not doing anything.

26 So we've sort of covered this in response to your
27 questions, but however Canada Malting is engaged, if it's
28 engaged, the Tribunal has a choice. It can either determine to

1 set aside the decision and take no further steps -- or an aspect
2 of the decision. It can set aside the decision and remit the
3 matter back to the CSE for redetermination. And the third option
4 is it can set it aside and conduct its own fresh assessment or de
5 novo assessment of that issue or the entire suitability
6 assessment.

7 So there's three options. On Wednesday, I heard the
8 Panel ask the Applicant, well, what's his plan. You know, if
9 he's right about these procedural concerns and we want to set
10 aside the decision, what's next? What are we supposed to do?
11 What I took from that discussion was, you know, Mr. Marks is
12 looking to return to the status quo before he was found to be
13 unsuitable but do so without considering any of his new conduct.
14 So I think what that really amounts to is the first option, set
15 aside the decision and do nothing. It's to make, you know,
16 findings that support Mr. Marks' comments about procedural
17 unfairness, set the decision aside, and then take no further
18 steps. So I think that we're really engaged with this option
19 here.

20 There are some likely and perhaps necessary
21 consequences that would flow from a do-nothing approach. The
22 first is that the CSE is likely obligated under its recognition
23 framework to conduct its own assessment immediately, and that if
24 this Tribunal's not going to engage with the new evidence and all
25 his conduct and the decision of the Superior Court, the Exchange
26 is going to be essentially compelled to conduct that assessment
27 itself and reach a new decision. If it does reach a new
28 decision, we've heard Mr. Marks: He doesn't agree that that's an

1 appropriate basis to find him unsuitable. He's explained all of
2 these statements I made, they were just a reaction to the
3 unfairness I suffered. You know, they should be looked at in
4 that context.

5 So if that's the CSE's subsequent decision, I think we
6 can expect another application back to this tribunal considering
7 the same conduct, and we'll be here in a few months or a year
8 arguing about the same record and the same conduct, which, you
9 know, in the OSC's view, doesn't support the overarching goal of
10 conducting just, expeditious, and cost-effective hearings. The
11 parties will be put to significant expense to run through an
12 entirely new hearing process covering all the same material
13 that's currently before this tribunal today and ultimately just
14 prolong a final determination of this matter. So that's our view
15 on the appropriate -- you know, if there is to be a de novo
16 assessment, or if there's -- I should back up -- if Canada
17 Malting is engaged in some way, we think the appropriate way of
18 dealing with that is a fresh consideration by this tribunal. And
19 you have all the evidence, and you have all the submissions
20 before you to conduct that assessment today.

21 Subject to any questions from the panel, I'll move on
22 to I think what's really the meat of my submission, which is
23 focusing on Policy 2.18 and why we say the Tribunal should find
24 Mr. Marks as unsuitable under that policy if it conducts a de
25 novo assessment. So I'll just start by saying and, I guess,
26 repeating something I said earlier, which is our focus is purely
27 on Policy 2.18 because we view his more recent conduct as
28 overriding in public importance. And because our focus is on

1 that conduct, 2.18 is the only policy that's engaged by that
2 conduct. It's the policy that focuses on the reputation and
3 public interest.

4 I want to reiterate too with respect to Policy 2.18, it
5 doesn't require a finding of regulatory misconduct. It doesn't
6 require a breach of securities laws. What it does require is
7 conduct that gives rise to investor protection concerns, conduct
8 that could bring the Exchange into disrepute, or conduct that's
9 otherwise contrary to the public interest. Just summarizing
10 2.18.

11 To get to your point about standard, I think, you know,
12 you've asked the Applicant that question, certainly, how he
13 interprets suitability and, you know, what's the standard. What
14 standard are we applying? And as I mentioned, I can at least
15 speak to the reputational component and the public interest
16 argument that we're making. And what we would say is that in
17 this context, the standard you're applying is looking whether
18 conduct negatively impacts, harms, or undermines the Exchange's
19 reputation or confidence in the capital markets. That's what we
20 say the standard is: negative impact,
21 harm, or undermining of those elements.

22 We cite some cases in our factum in support of this
23 view. I think we acknowledge that there's no decision directly
24 on point of what it means to bring an exchange into disrepute,
25 but it's obviously an implication on the exchange's reputation.
26 And we focus on some cases that talk about what it means to bring
27 capital markets into disrepute more generally. And those tend to
28 focus on undermining confidence in the capital markets.

1 So that's what we say is the standard in this case.
2 That's not to say that different elements of the public interest
3 may not be engaged in other instances where Policy 2.18's
4 applied, but that's just how we read it in this context. And
5 before launching into, you know, the conduct specifically, I just
6 want to take a step back and explain a little bit about why
7 fundamentally it's important to consider issues of reputation and
8 public interest when you're assessing suitability. Like, where's
9 the connection between those concepts, and why are we focused on
10 those when looking at suitability.

11 And I think I'll start with what's probably an obvious
12 statement, but confidence in the market and regulatory authority
13 is foundational in securities regulation. Fostering confidence
14 in the capital markets is a core purpose of the Securities Act,
15 section 1.1. The BCSC in the Nichols case, which we cite in our
16 factum, has gone so far as to say the very existence of an
17 exchange depends on public confidence. That's at paragraph 47 of
18 that case.

19 And focusing in on reputation, confidence obviously
20 relies on trust and the integrity, professionalism, and good
21 faith not only of the regulators, but in other institutions
22 operating and overseeing market prices. We submit that a loss of
23 trust can have a detrimental effect on the exchange itself, but
24 also on capital markets more broadly. It could impact a wide
25 spectrum of market participants, the issuers, investors, anyone
26 involved in the exchange.

27 And I want to take a moment to focus on these
28 positions, the ones that require suitability determinations, so

1 persons who hold these governance and leadership roles in public
2 companies or exert influence over those that do occupy positions
3 of heightened expectation and responsibility. The Applicant
4 seems to agree with this submission. I noted in his May 12th
5 written submissions that he accepted that individuals
6 participating in the capital markets should be held to high
7 standards of integrity, professionalism, and conduct.

8 This, in our view, is the basis for requiring
9 suitability determinations and Personal Information Forms when
10 you have the related persons under Exchange policies. These are
11 positions that have public-facing roles. They interact directly
12 with regulators. They interact directly with investors. And
13 they themselves are subject to a suite of securities law
14 requirements.

15 There's duties on directors and officers. There's
16 disclosure requirements. You're in a special relationship if
17 you're his insider. So there's tipping and trading requirements.
18 In essence, these are people who occupy a special category of
19 market participants, carry different obligations, and who have
20 the ability to set and affect standards and norms across the
21 market. And it's for this reason the Exchange exercises its
22 gatekeeping function to assess their suitability.

23 So with that sort of, you know, background, I suppose,
24 on the policy and why it's important, I'll switch to focusing in
25 on those two aspects of our suitability submissions, the first
26 being the fact that the conduct is a direct attack on reputation,
27 and that's part of the assessment in Policy 2.18. And the second
28 is the retaliatory aspect of the conduct. It's a response to

1 unfavourable regulatory outcomes and an attack on decision-makers
2 that's independently contrary to the public interest.

3 So starting with the first, getting to reputational
4 impact. I'm not going to repeat the statements that are in the
5 record from Mr. Marks. I frankly think it's kind of embarrassing
6 to repeat them. I think Mr. Lockhart's done a great job of
7 canvassing some of the more egregious statements last day.

8 What I'll say is that I think it's difficult to imagine
9 a more clear case of conduct that negatively impacts the
10 reputation of an exchange where conduct is arguably directed at
11 harming the reputation of an exchange. You have Mr. Marks
12 calling the Exchange a scam on many occasions, a Third-World
13 shithole exchange, the worst failing stock exchange on the
14 planet, corrupt, brazenly fraudulent. I see him smiling to all
15 these statements. He's heard them all before. The conduct was
16 severe enough to warrant an interim injunction for defamation,
17 which is an extremely high standard. To find that, the Court has
18 to find that the words are clearly defamatory and impossible to
19 justify, such that the case at trial is close to iron-clad.

20 Now, Adjudicator Waechter asked me, I think on May 8th,
21 you know, what are we to make of the Court's engagement with this
22 matter. And I would still say the Court's making a decision
23 under a different framework. Its findings are obviously not
24 binding on this tribunal, whichever way they go. But they are
25 persuasive in that they're considering the impact of the exact
26 same statements on the reputation of the Exchange. And I think
27 for that reason, they warrant careful consideration by this
28 panel.

1 And I think this Panel will have to grapple with the
2 fact that the Court has made a finding on an extremely high
3 standard. We're not advocating for that high of a standard to
4 make a finding under Policy 2.1. Certainly not. We're talking
5 purely about conduct that undermines or harms the reputation of
6 an exchange, not clearly defamatory, impossible to justify
7 conduct. I think that's a much higher standard.

8 I want to make a few submissions on Mr. Marks' comments
9 about the lack of evidence in this case, and specifically
10 evidence of harm to the reputation of the Exchange and evidence
11 that the capital markets have somehow been harmed by what he's
12 done. The reality is these are not the types of harm that lend
13 themselves to quantification. This is something courts in
14 defamation cases have long acknowledged. And I'm going to give
15 you a citation from an Ontario Court of Appeal case that digs
16 into this issue a little bit further.

17 It's called Rutman v. Rabinowitz. The cite is 2018
18 ONCA 80. Without delving into the meat of that case, what you
19 essentially have is an appellant defendant saying trial judge
20 made an error because the plaintiff acknowledged during the trial
21 that he didn't suffer any pecuniary loss, and he didn't suffer
22 any reputational harm as a result of what they described as an
23 Internet defamation campaign. The Court of Appeal responded
24 saying this is problematic for several reasons.

25 And I'm going to read a few parts from paragraphs 62
26 and 65 of that decision, just so you have the references. First,
27 the Court of Appeal said:

28 "...it is trite law that general damages and libel

1 cases are presumed from the very publication of the false
2 statement. The injured plaintiff bears no obligation to prove
3 actual loss or injury. The appellants' focus on the alleged lack
4 of pecuniary or reputational damage to Rutman discounts this
5 foundational principle."

6 And paragraph 65, they say:

7 "The inability to point to specific reputational harm
8 is not an admission that such harm did not occur. To the
9 contrary, the courts have accepted that, 'the consequences which
10 flow from the publication of an injurious false statement are
11 invidious.'"

12 And they get even more colourful than that. They go on
13 to say:

14 "A defamatory statement can seep into the crevasses of
15 the subconscious and lurk there, ever ready to spring forth and
16 spread its cancerous evil. The unfortunate impression left by a
17 libel may last a lifetime."

18 So there, the Court of Appeal's quoting from a Supreme
19 Court of Canada decision on defamation. I don't go through that
20 to say the law of defamation applies 1:1 with what you're hearing
21 today. But the Court has grappled with this issue of how does
22 one prove loss to reputation. And the simple point is the
23 absence of specific evidence of reputational harm is not an
24 obstacle to making a finding.

25 CHAIR: Mr. Pettypiece, have you shared that case with
26 Mr. Marks and also Mr. McCoomb?

27 MR. PETTYPIECE: I have not. But I can send them the
28 cite.

1 CHAIR: I think just because Mr. McCoomb is
2 self-represented, it might easier to just actually send him the
3 case.

4 MR. PETTYPIECE: Yeah, absolutely.

5 CHAIR: And I'm hoping that he would have that before
6 he has to make any reply.

7 MR. PETTYPIECE: Yeah. Will do.

8 One other point I would add is you're not just focused
9 on past time. This isn't a civil case where you're focused on
10 damages for past actions. You're focused on future conduct.
11 You're focused on setting a standard and the question of, really,
12 what standards and norms will be set by either condoning or
13 condemning Mr. Marks' conduct and how this tribunal's decision
14 will reflect on our exchanges and our markets more broadly. So
15 it's not just a question of past action that can be proven; it's
16 a question of preventing future harm and setting standards.

17 So that's the first part of my submission focusing on
18 reputation. The second aspect was the retaliatory aspect. And
19 I'll get to that very quickly. We say retaliating against an
20 adverse regulatory outcome by personally attacking and
21 threatening regulatory decision-makers is independently contrary
22 to the public interest under Policy 2.18, shows a lack of respect
23 for the process and authority of the Exchange, and it
24 independently undermines the integrity of the regulatory process
25 and confidence in the markets. We say that allowing such conduct
26 to persist without consequence risks normalizing intimidation as
27 a response to these unwanted regulatory outcomes.

28 And I want to turn for a second to the Applicant's

1 submissions. First of all, he admits or he doesn't dispute
2 making any of these statements. That's not an issue. And he
3 even goes so far as to admit that his comments were -- and these
4 are based on my notes of his submissions, but they were extreme,
5 they were unquestionably aggressive, very inflammatory, and
6 they're juvenile. I would agree with all of those.

7 What he does go further to do, though, is he attempts
8 to justify his statements. In his written submissions from
9 May 12th, he characterizes them as criticism in response to the
10 CSE's conduct. So if I'm understanding him correctly, he's
11 saying if not for not those wrongs that I faced before the
12 Listing Committee, before the CSE directors, he would not have
13 launched his abusive campaign at the CSE and as a result, this
14 Tribunal shouldn't be focused on that conduct. You should be
15 focused on all these procedural issues that he raised.

16 At one point in his submissions, he likened this case
17 to being pulled over for speeding without a posted speed limit.
18 The point being, I think, is to highlight the unfairness.
19 There's no standard by which he's being measured. And he's
20 saying, you know, it's like being pulled over without there being
21 a speed limit.

22 I think it might be helpful to carry that analogy
23 forward and, you know, consider after being stopped by a police
24 officer for speeding, you might have any number of fairness
25 complaints. You might say I didn't see the road signs; there
26 were a number of other speeders; this person was going faster
27 than me. You might be treated poorly by the officer. You might
28 have certain fairness -- or issues with how you're dealt with.

1 There are obviously appropriate and lawful ways to deal
2 with concerns about fairness. I think my friends from the CSE
3 highlighted that. Mr. Marks' counsel was taking those steps.
4 But Mr. Marks took a different approach in parallel. And in the
5 same way at a roadside stop there are unlawful and fundamentally
6 unwise ways of dealing with unfairness at a roadside stop, by
7 responding with threats, intimidation, aggression, you can
8 essentially engage an independently actual wrong which very
9 quickly becomes the focus of the interaction and any consequences
10 that flow from that.

11 Coming back to the facts of this case, you know, even
12 if the Applicant has a genuine belief that he was treated
13 unfairly and even if this Tribunal makes findings in support of
14 that belief, holding that belief or those findings can't justify
15 the nature of the conduct that he engaged in. And what I think
16 is worse about the conduct, which distinguishes it from, you
17 know, a heat-of-the-moment reaction at a roadside stop, is he
18 knows its wrong. He's admitted as much. And yet he engaged in a
19 prolonged campaign against these people spanning months, hundreds
20 of messages. And it took a court-ordered injunction to get him
21 to stop.

22 And it's no answer to point to the unfairness in terms
23 -- I've made this point, but he's characterized it as speech that
24 just criticizes regulators. He's sort of trying to describe it
25 as some sort of legitimate or intelligent critique of the
26 Exchange's process. I think that just a cursory review of his
27 comments, you know, would dispel any notion that what he's doing
28 is some form of intelligent criticism or critique. You know,

1 making public assertions calling CSE personnel rapists,
2 pedophiles, pig fuckers. You know, not to mention I think -- and
3 most importantly, threatening that CSE decision-makers are going
4 to be hanging from a rope. And he repeatedly suggests, in those
5 words and other words, that they should commit suicide. There's
6 no rationale or justifiable link between comments like that and
7 having concerns about process. There's just no connection there.
8 And it was no wonder the Superior Court was compelled to find
9 these statements impossible to justify.

10 So I have one final comment on these submissions on the
11 merits, and that's to deal with a theme of the Applicant's
12 submissions where he suggested essentially what the Tribunal is
13 doing is engaging in some sort of balancing exercise. You're
14 looking at, on one end, the public interest harm caused by his
15 commentary towards the Exchange. But on the other end, you
16 should be considering, well, what's the harm to the New World
17 shareholders. He's made repeated references to millions of
18 dollars worth of loss and harm to the shareholders. So he's
19 saying you've got to balance these two things, saying on one
20 hand, you have got no evidence of harm to the Exchange; on the
21 other hand, you've got real harm to shareholders.

22 So I just want to make this crystal clear. I think
23 this is fundamentally misunderstanding the nature of this
24 proceeding. The CSE's decision to suspend trading is a decision
25 under a separate policy. It's Policy 2.10.

26 That's a separate decision from the suitability
27 decision. It involves a separate public interest assessment. No
28 application was brought by the issuer or anyone else to challenge

1 the suspension decision. It was not made part of the appeal
2 before the CSE directors. It's not part of this application for
3 review. So the question of what harm, if any harm, resulted from
4 the suspension is not part of the assessment of suitability.
5 That assessment's focused solely on Mr. Marks' conduct and
6 doesn't account for some weighting of other potential
7 consequences that might flow from that.

8 So just a final word on procedural fairness because
9 it's featured so much in the discussion today. I want to make it
10 clear that our lack of focus on procedural fairness isn't an
11 intention to downplay the importance those issues. Certainly,
12 processes of fairness before the Exchange are critically
13 important. They are enshrined in the recognition order.

14 We discuss at length in our submissions the standards
15 that apply. And the Tribunal can make the determination it finds
16 necessary. But, again, findings by this tribunal that there was
17 an inadequate process don't immunize or excuse the Applicant's
18 subsequent abusive conduct towards the Exchange and others,
19 which, again, we say independently and squarely engages
20 Policy 2.18. So those are my submissions on the third bucket,
21 the third topic, which is why the Applicant should be found
22 unsuitable under Policy 2.18.

23 I have a couple points to make on remedy, but I'll
24 pause to see if the Panel has questions.

25 CHAIR: So I have a question, a clarification, just
26 going to paragraph 87 of the Commission's written submissions.

27 MR. PETTYPIECE: Sorry, you said 87?

28 CHAIR: 87, yeah.

1 MR. PETTYPIECE: Yes.

2 CHAIR: So the Commission talks here about let's call
3 it the "new evidence" as eclipsing all of the other issues in
4 terms of the probity of the evidence.

5 MR. PETTYPIECE: Yeah.

6 CHAIR: I'm summarizing, again. It obviously speaks
7 for itself.

8 MR. PETTYPIECE: Mm-hmm.

9 CHAIR: It also refers to a more nuanced analysis of
10 how the Applicant's promotional indications intersected with
11 suitability requirements having to be done in the event that
12 we're not looking at the evidence but supposedly eclipses that.
13 So there's an acknowledgement there at least, I think, by the
14 Commission that the overpromotion piece of an unsuitability -- or
15 suitability characterization, I should say, is more complex or
16 nuanced. Do you have anything to say to that, other than to
17 acknowledge that there -- I mean, is it an acknowledgment that
18 the necessary nuance wasn't present in the May 2025 decision, for
19 example? Or are you not going that far?

20 MR. PETTYPIECE: No, definitely not going that far. I
21 think maybe "nuance" isn't the best word to use in that context.
22 I think we're not saying this is a weaker, you know, reason to
23 find him unsuitable. We're not making a comment about the
24 strength of that, nor are we making a comment about how the board
25 dealt with that issue.

26 I think the Commission just sees the subsequent
27 campaign of abuse and harassment as a black-and-white issue,
28 couldn't be more clear under the CSE policy. Easy to find your

1 way to a decision of unsuitability. The assessment of
2 promotional activity or overpromotional activity involves a
3 little bit more engagement with the law and policy around
4 promotional activity, which you've heard from my friends, and
5 you've heard from Mr. Marks. That's all it's intended to say.
6 And I'm sorry, but I can't provide anything more than that.

7 Unless there's any questions, I can just touch on
8 remedy very briefly. So as I mentioned, last Tuesday we
9 delivered supplemental written submissions on the issue of remedy
10 if the Tribunal decided to conduct a de novo assessment. And
11 this is, really, in response to submissions delivered by the
12 other parties on May 6th. I won't repeat those, but I just want
13 to highlight one point, which is that, you know, our position is
14 that all that's ultimately required if you choose to engage in a
15 de novo assessment of suitability is a finding under the policy.
16 There's no further order or direction that needs to be made
17 beyond making a finding under the policy.

18 It may have been lost a little bit in my submissions in
19 a footnote, but I referenced a decision of
20 Chief Adjudicator Moseley in Ziaian, Z-i-a-i-a-n, a 2021 decision
21 which I think you know, although in a very different context,
22 provides a similar roadmap for coming to a finding. That was a
23 review of an IIROC decision. The IIROC Panel in the context, I
24 believe, of an enforcement proceeding, overruled a respondent's
25 objection to hold a virtual hearing. And the respondent sought a
26 review of that response to his objection.

27 And the Tribunal conducted a Canada Malting assessment,
28 and it found it was appropriate to engage its original

1 jurisdiction and engage in a fresh assessment of that ruling,
2 whether it was appropriate to overrule an objection to hold an
3 in-person hearing. And what ultimately happened is the Tribunal
4 arrived at the exact same result as the IIROC panel. It found it
5 was entirely appropriate to hold a virtual hearing, but for
6 different reasons. And so the panel was not in a position to
7 dismiss the application. It made a finding; so it couldn't
8 dismiss the application. But instead, what it did was it simply
9 concluded the hearing on the merits of the allegations against
10 Mr. Ziaian may proceed as the Hearing Panel directs, including by
11 videoconference if that's its choice.

12 So it made the finding. It said over to you, IIROC;
13 it's in your court now. No order, no further direction. And in
14 our view, the same process should be followed in this case. The
15 CSE has tools to deal with any findings this Tribunal makes.
16 And, of course, that's the situation we're in right now. They
17 have made that finding, and it would just be returned to that
18 same situation.

19 So subject to any further questions from the Panel,
20 those are the OSC's submissions.

21 CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Pettypiece.

22 Mr. McCoomb.

23 REPLY SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MCCOOMB:

24 MR. MCCOOMB: Very briefly. I just have a couple of
25 observations, and they aren't so much in the form of reply.
26 Mr. Lockhart and I have confirmed that the information contained
27 in Tab 4 of that original record of proceeding that we delivered
28 was shared with the panel of the CSE board -- which is to say, to

1 put a finer point on it, in the 394-page PDF, just going from the
2 Table of Contents in that document, everything from page 10 to
3 page 383, in essence, was before the board.

4 CHAIR: And then the remainder, is the remainder just
5 the decision form?

6 MR. McCOOMB: The remainder is the decision and the
7 preamble materials before Tab 10 -- or right before page 10.
8 It's just the decision that's left at page 384. Piece number
9 one.

10 Number two, and it's the only comment I have, really,
11 in reply, other than to say that moments after Mr. Pettypiece
12 referred to it, Mr. Lockhart sent a copy of that defamation
13 damages decision to Mr. Marks. So he has reference to it, though
14 I'll just represent that, as you can imagine, many of the similar
15 concepts to what Mr. Pettypiece raised in his quite eloquent
16 comments on defamation have been canvassed with Mr. Marks in the
17 ongoing civil defamation proceeding.

18 But the only comment I have in reply to what
19 Mr. Pettypiece has said, by and large, the substance of
20 everything that he's said, we would agree with, other than what I
21 told you in preamble to what he was going to say, which is that
22 we don't think that there's a Canada Malting basis to interfere
23 with any of the decision below. And so you don't have to adopt
24 his approach. But of course if you do, his conclusion is right.

25 The only thing I'll say about the specifics of what he
26 said about Mr. Marks' online content, he used the
27 word "retaliation". And he used it quite a few times. And I
28 agree there's a retaliatory character to what Mr. Marks has done

1 online in response to the October 3rd decision being communicated
2 to him, but I would put it a slightly different way instead of
3 retaliation. Because in my submission, what Mr. Marks has done
4 has been extraordinarily tactical. And Mr. Pettypiece also used
5 the word "juvenile". Retaliation can come with a connotation of
6 an emotional, reactionary response, doing something tit for tat.
7 And in my submission, that's not at all what Mr. Marks has been
8 doing.

9 Mr. Marks' campaign of defamation has been a calculated
10 attack with a view to causing the CSE to reverse its policy
11 decision, to reverse its determination that he's unsuitable to
12 trade, because being excluded from an entrepreneurial stock
13 exchange is a problem for a stock promoter who owns the handle
14 "Penny Stock Billionaire Gang". His entire approach -- and you
15 see this in the new evidence that we filed, specifically, for
16 example, communications with our firm from Mr. Marks on the Peter
17 Nygård question. He is specifically threatening disclosure of
18 these materials with a view to getting a result, to forcing the
19 CSE to capitulate. And so I think that just is a slightly spin
20 from the notion of retaliation, a slightly different
21 characterization. Otherwise, I have no notes on what
22 Mr. Pettypiece shared.

23 CHAIR: Thank you.

24 So we're at about 3:12 right now, Mr. Marks. We can go
25 right into your reply. But I'd also, if you need some time to
26 collect your thoughts or review that additional case that you
27 were just sent, be content to take the 15-minute break now if
28 that would be of assistance.

1 MR. MARKS: How much time will I have to reply?

2 CHAIR: So we have until the end of the day today,
3 4:30.

4 MR. MARKS: Okay.

5 CHAIR: That doesn't mean you need to take it all. I
6 mean, reply should be, as I've said, focused on what you've heard
7 from the other side, as opposed to rearguing points that we've
8 already heard you argue.

9 MR. MARKS: Right.

10 CHAIR: So if I do hear you going -- you know, it's my
11 job to control the process and make sure that we're efficient.

12 MR. MARKS: I appreciate it.

13 CHAIR: If I see that you're treading over familiar
14 territory, I will caution you. That being said, if you have
15 appropriate reply, we can go right to 4:30. So it's really a
16 matter of do we take a break now, or do you want start now and
17 take a break in 15 minutes or so.

18 MR. MARKS: Let's take a break now. But I just want to
19 be clear. So my reply is not going to retread over, you know,
20 the original -- you know, you don't want me to retread what I
21 discussed in the original presentation, i.e., if the document
22 backed it, you know, all that stuff. That's not going to be
23 discussed.

24 CHAIR: No. No.

25 MR. MARKS: We're only talking about --

26 CHAIR: It's not a chance -- and saying something twice
27 doesn't make it anymore powerful. So we've noted your
28 submissions. We have your written submissions.

1 MR. MARKS: Yes.

2 CHAIR: We have your oral submissions.

3 MR. MARKS: Okay.

4 CHAIR: It's really --

5 MR. MARKS: I brought fresh material.

6 CHAIR: -- to answer to certain things that you think
7 gives it a different perspective. Right?

8 MR. MARKS: I do. Yeah, I have a response. It's all
9 fresh material, I think. You're not going to be bored.

10 CHAIR: Okay. I'll take that as a promise.

11 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

12 CHAIR: And obviously we're both smiling right now. I
13 don't want it to sound like I'm not being fair to you, Mr. Marks.
14 We're both smiling.

15 So do you want to take a break, then, until 3:30?

16 MR. MARKS: Yeah.

17 CHAIR: And we'll come back at 3:30?

18 MR. MARKS: Yeah. That's fine.

19 CHAIR: And we can go up until 4:30, but you don't need
20 to. And certainly if you don't need to take the full hour,
21 everybody's happy to finish earlier. So...

22 MR. MARKS: Okay. I'll try to be as brief as
23 possible. Thank you.

24 CHAIR: Okay. Great. So we'll take a recess now until
25 3:30.

26 --- Recess taken at 3:16 p.m.

27 --- On resuming at 3:30 p.m.

28 CHAIR: Thank you, everyone. Please be seated.

1 Just before we turn to Mr. Marks, just an
2 administrative matter.

3 Mr. Pettypiece, can you also arrange to have the
4 Ontario Court of Appeal decision e-mailed to the registrar so the
5 Panel has it.

6 MR. PETTYPIECE: Yes.

7 CHAIR: Thank you.

8 Mr. Marks, over to you.

9 SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MARKS:

10 MR. MARKS: Okay. I have some prepared remarks. I
11 just want to address a couple things. I raised some objections
12 that came up earlier with my learned friend's presentation.

13 Again, it included a lot of new -- you know, there's
14 been a consistent theme, which is constantly introducing new
15 theories. You know, again, it's the Stalinist approach. The CSE
16 has decided -- they made a decision. They're going to ban me
17 from the Exchange for whatever reason, and they're going to use
18 whatever feeling, whatever rationale to do so. And I think the
19 OSC, for whatever reason, is going along with it, which I find
20 very interesting because, again, it totally contradicts the
21 public interest, and damage is costly to address.

22 So, again, the CSE statement didn't go into, you know,
23 show me the man; I'll show you the crime. You know, I had a
24 bunch of notes about a lot of the contradictions that came up,
25 which, again, everything that my colleague at the CSE said really
26 contradicts totally everything that Mark Faulkner said in his
27 affidavit and, of course, examination. There's a lot of new
28 theories.

1 But before I get to my prepared remarks, I just want to
2 address one last thing, which is Mr. Pettypiece from the OSC, I
3 think he used a metaphor. I talk about the roadside stop. I
4 think he was talking about the roadside stop. And, now, so what
5 I said in my remarks last week was that essentially the rules
6 about overpromotion is kind of like it's a road with no speed
7 limits, and you're pulled over.

8 Now, I think what Mr. Pettypiece from the OSC was
9 saying is that I'm speeding on this road. There's no speed
10 limits. I get pulled over, and then I start arguing with the
11 officer, and that is wrong. That's kind of where he left off.

12 Really, what happens, it's not only pulled over for
13 speeding on a road with no limits. It's that there is no ticket.
14 I didn't get a ticket. Instead, I was executed, okay?

15 And that's exactly what happened here. The OSC deemed
16 me to be unsuitable, allegedly, essentially banned me from the
17 Exchange with no evidence, no nothing, after I got involved with
18 a public company weeks and weeks later. Again, I'm not going to
19 relitigate everything we discussed. So let's say -- I'm going to
20 move on to my prepared remarks, which directly address everything
21 today.

22 Members of the panel, at the end of the day, this case
23 should rise or fall based on the original January determination
24 and the CSE hearing panel decision that followed. That is the
25 decision the Tribunal is being asked to examine, not shifting
26 theories developed later; not involving rationales, again, which
27 we've heard today; not distractions, you know, about the abstract
28 evergreen gatekeeping patterns. There's been a lot of

1 distractions. I think, you know, my learned friend at the CSE,
2 he's tried every distraction except pointing and saying, Oh, look
3 there's a puppy. Okay? I mean, every time a distraction.

4 The essential question is simple: Was the original
5 decision fair, evidence-based? Was it evidence-based? We have
6 not seen any evidence about overpromotion, any examination or
7 analysis of overpromotion. I think they tried to do -- today, I
8 think Mr. McCoomb tried, but it quite didn't work.

9 Within proportion. Okay, within proportion. I'm not
10 aware of anybody who has made allegedly overpromotional
11 statements that was summarily executed. I'm not aware of anybody
12 summarily executed for making allegedly overpromotional
13 statements, okay?

14 We have people on the CSE board of directors who have
15 been fined millions of dollars for ripping off their own
16 investors in a mutual fund. I'm talking about the Caldwell
17 family. Okay? So they're major shareholders of the CSE, already
18 have been fined over \$2 million. That's not a small fine. By
19 the OSC. By, you know, Charles Pettypiece's boss.

20 If it was the CSE was consistent with procedural
21 fairness -- I respectfully submit the evidence showed that it was
22 not. There was no evidence. There was no warning, no notice, no
23 opportunity to respond. No contemporaneous evidence established
24 so-called overpromotional activity. Nothing. And there was no
25 expert analysis.

26 And most importantly, there was zero investor harm
27 caused by my conduct, zero. And despite the severity of
28 effectively banning somebody from participation in the capital

1 markets, the CSE imposed one of the harshest sanctions imaginable
2 for conduct that historically would've at most resulted in
3 notice, guidance, or other regulatory engagement, not a
4 career-ending unsuitability finding, which also -- beyond my own
5 issues, this directly affected 4,000 shareholders of New World
6 Solutions and \$5 million in lost investor savings as a direct
7 result of the CSE's actions.

8 And I meant to also add to -- Mr. Pettypiece brought up
9 the OSC. I'm actually shocked the OSC has made almost no mention
10 of the investor harm caused by the CSE's actions. Because
11 apparently they don't care. It has not come up.

12 I think he's tried to do say that the reason the stock
13 was halted was something else. No, the stock was halted because
14 the CSE wanted me to step down. And then after I stepped down,
15 then they said if I remained a shareholder, then the stock would
16 remain halted. Okay? So and they want to unwind the
17 transaction, which would make the stock go to zero.

18 So, again, the mental gymnastics is world-class,
19 Olympic-level contortionist, which we had last Friday's evidence
20 hearing, when he came up with all sorts of very creative reasons
21 why the CSE should not have to show us this alleged evidence, the
22 e-mail, you know, the Listing Committee. Apparently the Listing
23 Committee made this decision to do that sort of by e-mail.
24 That's what they said, according to Mr. Faulkner. I asked for
25 this evidence, and, you know, Mr. Pettypiece came up with a very
26 prudent reason why we should not -- this should not be made
27 public, these e-mails. I don't know what they're trying to hide.

28 But anyway, what makes this even more troubling is the

1 CSE hearing panel that compounded those failures by upholding the
2 decision based on a rule that did not even exist. Again, so you
3 have major problems. But, again, the CSE's panel which was
4 chaired by a lawyer by appointing Michael Bluestein. He's the
5 director. He upheld the decision with a non-existent rule
6 claiming that I did not identify myself as a control person when
7 making promotional statements.

8 Again, we've shown this before: There is no such rule.
9 In other words, the decision was ultimately upheld through a
10 retroactive rule creation. That is not due process. That is not
11 regulatory certainty. And that is not what the public interest
12 demands.

13 Most importantly, the consequences extended far beyond
14 the personal. The CSE's actions effectively destroyed New World
15 Solutions, disrupted the market, caused substantial investor
16 harm, affected thousands of investors. Approximately \$5 million
17 in shareholder value was wiped out not because of fraud, theft,
18 operational collapse, business problems. No, it was because of a
19 procedurally unfair, fundamentally ineffective regulatory
20 process.

21 And that's why this case matters. And respectfully,
22 this is why this tribunal should not merely overturn the
23 decision, but seriously consider whether stronger remedies are
24 required to protect confidence in the integrity of Canadian
25 capital markets. Because when a recognized Exchange can secretly
26 impose career-ending sanctions without notice and rely on
27 shifting explanations and ultimately uphold those sanctions
28 through non-existent rules and have thousands of investors suffer

1 millions of dollars in damages, the issue ceases to be an
2 isolated error -- or I think as my learned colleagues called it,
3 bizarre circumstances and extraordinary circumstances. It
4 becomes a serious public interest concern requiring meaningful
5 intervention by the tribunal.

6 So the CSE asks this Tribunal to accept an
7 extraordinary proposition, that because it performs a gatekeeping
8 role, it possesses effectively evergreen and near unlimited
9 discretion to deem someone unsuitable at any time without proper
10 notice, without timely disclosure, without approved procedures,
11 without proportionality, and without meaningful scrutiny. And
12 for sure, they don't want any scrutiny. They don't want any
13 criticism. And I think the OSC has been very clear they do not
14 like criticism.

15 And even though an Exchange such as the CSE -- it's a
16 matter of the public record that the Exchange is the
17 worst-performing exchange on the planet. It is down over 80% in
18 the last five years. And if they don't want any criticism, why
19 is the CEO posting a picture with someone, the convicted
20 pedophile rapist Peter Nygård on an Instagram page for eight
21 years? If they're worried about reputation, why do they have
22 that picture up there now for eight years? I find that shocking.

23 Look, this case, again, it's no longer about an
24 individual or one suitability determination. It's about the
25 limits of Exchange power, the rule of law in Canadian capital
26 markets, and whether public interest authority can be exercised
27 without procedural errors, accountability, proportionality. I
28 think proportionality is absolutely critical, low proportionality

1 or meaningful oversight.

2 The authorities do not support that position. The
3 jurisprudence, including Canada Malting, Re Imex Systems, and
4 mostly, Re Eco Oro Minerals Corp., establishes the exact
5 opposite. The jurisprudence establishes that exchange gatekeeper
6 authority is conditional, not absolute. In Canada Malting, the
7 Supreme Court recognized deference to Exchange because of their
8 specializing regulatory role. However, Re Imex Systems Inc., the
9 British Columbia Securities Commission held that such deference
10 is inappropriate where Exchange acts without proper diligence or
11 sufficient factual foundation. Most importantly, in Eco Oro
12 Minerals Corp v. Ontario Securities Commission, the OSC
13 overturned the TSX decision entirely because the Exchange
14 overlooked material evidence, proceeded on incorrect principles,
15 improperly applied its governing framework -- again, sounds
16 familiar -- and misconceived the public interest. Again, it's,
17 you know, déjà vu.

18 These cases confirm the Exchange authority is
19 conditional, not absolute. Deference is earned through
20 procedural integrity, fairness, consistency, lawful exercise of
21 delegated power, and rational connection to the public interest.
22 It is not automatic. It is not limitless, and it is not immune
23 from review. In Eco Oro, the Ontario Securities Commission made
24 this principal unmistakably clear. The OSC intervened directly
25 and overturned a TSX-approved transaction because the Exchange
26 had overlooked material evidence, misconceived public interest,
27 and it failed to properly exercise discretion. The Commission
28 did not do so blindly simply because the TSX was a recognized

1 Exchange performing a gatekeeping role. The OSC recognized that
2 the Exchange conduct itself can undermine confidence in the
3 market and therefore were made fully reviewable in the public
4 interest. And that principle is directly applicable here. The
5 CSE cannot invoke Canada Malting while simultaneously relying on
6 a process marked by shifting rationales, procedural unfairness,
7 lack of morals, one-track justification, invented standards -- my
8 favourite -- and what appears to be reliance on policies and
9 procedures that may have never been approved under its own
10 recognition order framework.

11 I think that the jury is still out on whether the OSC
12 is in compliance or not in compliance with their appeals policy
13 and procedure. From what we understand, it was not approved by
14 the OSC under section 4 of the recognition order. And the facts
15 here go even further. Not only was I deemed unsuitable through a
16 fundamentally unfair process, but the CSE's own appeal panel
17 upheld the decision based on a rule that did not even exist. And
18 I think that point is extraordinary. And the Panel should, you
19 know, I think, pay a lot of attention to that.

20 The CSE Appeal Panel held a career-ending suitability
21 determination on the basis that I allegedly failed to disclose I
22 was a control person. Again, no such disclosure rule formally
23 exists within their governing policies or rules. The CSE, again,
24 upheld a decision based on a non-existent rule. So this is not
25 merely an interpretive disagreement. It strikes at the legality
26 and the legitimacy of the entire process, which, again, brings
27 back to the point I was making earlier about the previous cases
28 that set the precedent.

1 A self-regulatory organization exercising
2 quasi-government authority cannot invent standards after the fact
3 and then impose devastating sanctions based on requirements that
4 do not exist within its own rule book. If an exchange can create
5 overwhelming obligations retroactively and use them to justify
6 suitability bans, then no market participant has meaningful
7 notice of the standards governing their conduct. That is the
8 opposite of procedural fairness. And reviewed together with the
9 shifting rationales, the lack of notice, the alleged backdating
10 issues -- well, actually, they're not alleged. The Exchange
11 admitted that they backdated documents -- the retroactive
12 justifications, again, disproportionate sanctions, and their
13 apparent deficiencies in the CSE's approval framework, the
14 pattern becomes deeply concerning.

15 This Tribunal must also consider the extraordinary
16 disproportionality of the sanction itself, to deem me unsuitable,
17 basically to ban from my exchange, something that has never
18 happened. As far as I know, there's never been anybody banned
19 from the CSE or any of the exchanges in Canada without, you know,
20 notice, without warnings, without anything. They just decided to
21 ban me, you know, months in, weeks after I was already involved
22 with a public company.

23 So the CSE did not merely criticize my conduct or
24 request additional disclosure. It deemed me unsuitable,
25 effectively banning me from participation in the Exchange, and
26 this was allegedly based on concerns regarding, quote/unquote,
27 "overpromotional behaviour". In my respectful submission, the
28 evidence showed no investment losses caused by my conduct. No

1 fraud allegations, no misappropriation, no market manipulation
2 finding, and no demonstrated investor harm arising from my
3 actions.

4 And there's never been any evidence or analysis.
5 There's never been any analysis of which statements were, you
6 know, overpromotion. There was never any independent analysis.
7 There was never any deep analysis. I think Mr. McCoomb tried to
8 go there today, but I can argue with the points that he brought
9 up, which were completely wrong.

10 Yet the CSE -- again, they imposed the most extreme
11 sanction available. The disproportionality is impossible to
12 ignore. Again, Canadian regulators -- I sent a memo to Canadian
13 regulators -- historically addressed disclosure or promotional
14 concerns through ordinary and regulatory engagement. They would
15 send you a notice, some sort of warning, a letter. I received
16 none of that from the CSE. Instead, I was banned weeks after,
17 you know, I became involved with a public company. And, yes,
18 they did know I was getting involved. They knew about that I was
19 a major shareholder.

20 And I can address these issues about a control person,
21 not a control person. That would not have mattered for them.
22 This unsuitability finding came weeks, weeks, weeks after the
23 control person issue. That was weeks afterwards.

24 Even more troubling is the evidence that is a sort of
25 glaring inconsistency and double standards within the CSE itself.
26 Evidence before the Tribunal showed that many people associated
27 with the Exchange, including senior insiders, had major orders
28 connected to significantly more serious regulatory findings and

1 substantial monetary sanctions, i.e., \$2 million fines by the
2 OSC.

3 CHAIR: Mr. Marks.

4 MR. MARKS: Yes.

5 CHAIR: The point about these other people, you made
6 them in your original submissions.

7 MR. MARKS: Oh, I'm sorry. Sorry.

8 CHAIR: I don't think any of the other parties
9 addressed them. So it's not really reply; it's repeating.

10 MR. MARKS: Okay. Yeah, I'm sorry. Yes, I didn't
11 realize. Yes. You know, I'm sorry. This statement was made
12 before you told me I couldn't repeat myself; so I didn't have a
13 chance to check the script. I apologize. The rest of the
14 material is all fresh.

15 So if the CSE can selectively impose the most severe
16 sanction available against one participant for alleged
17 promotional conduct causing no proven investor harm while others
18 associated with far more serious fines remain fully acceptable to
19 the Exchange, the process ceases to resemble principled
20 regulation and begins to resemble arbitrary and inconsistent
21 enforcement. This is precisely why tribunals such this panel
22 exist. And that is precisely why Eco Oro matters. I believe the
23 Eco Oro case was actually -- Grant Vingoe was the Chair of that
24 panel, and he's, I believe, the Chair of the OSC today. So this
25 is an interesting case.

26 The implied rationale for deference under Canada
27 Malting depends on the assumption that the Exchange is operating
28 lawfully, fairly, proportionally and within an approved

1 regulatory structure. The procedures themselves were never
2 properly approved. And that jury, again, still out on that.
3 That hasn't been analyzed fully. If the Exchange is relying on
4 non-existent rules -- and that has been proven. The rules were
5 non-existent about control person disclosure -- and the sanctions
6 imposed are wildly disproportionate and inconsistently applied,
7 then the foundation for deference completely collapses. An
8 exchange cannot claim extraordinary gatekeeper authority while
9 simultaneously disregarding the safeguards that legitimize that
10 authority.

11 And the facts here demonstrate precisely why those
12 safeguards matter. Again, thousands of investors were damaged,
13 millions of dollars of savings were lost because of the CSE's
14 failed processes. The CSE allegedly deemed me unsuitable, yet
15 failed to notify me, failed to warn me, failed to provide
16 opportunity to respond before irreversible reputational and
17 professional harm occurred. This said, the CSE allowed me to
18 proceed openly into a public company transaction, become chairman
19 and public issuer and allow investors to participate. Millions
20 and millions of shares traded. The stock went up 300%. The
21 market voted in favour of the transaction, apparently, based on
22 the market reaction following the news. The CSE later advanced
23 shifting and retroactive explanations for its conduct.

24 So that's not only doing a gatekeeper function. A true
25 gatekeeper acts proportionately to protect the market. It does
26 not remain silent while a transaction proceeds. Again, the CSE
27 knew I was involved for two months. Actually more; three months,
28 because if you count three weeks after the transaction closed.

1 And my PIF raised no concerns. You're talking about three
2 months. So it was only later that these concerns arose.

3 So the CSE now attempts to characterize this as
4 evergreen authority, as though it may retroactively and
5 indefinitely deem me unsuitable over concerns whenever
6 convenient. But Eco Oro and Imex Systems confirm public interest
7 discretion is not a blank cheque. Public interest authority must
8 remain connected to fairness, evidence, investor protection,
9 proportionality, and lawful process.

10 And importantly, this case is not merely theoretical.
11 The consequences here were devastating. Again, thousands of
12 investors were harmed. \$5 million of savings was destroyed as a
13 result of the CSE's actions.

14 In my respectful submission, that was not investor
15 protection. That was investor harm by the CSE. Public
16 confidence in the market is not strengthened when regulatory
17 powers are exercised through inconsistent standards, procedural
18 unfairness, invented rules, disproportionate sanctions, and
19 potentially unapproved process. It's damaged. And I'm surprised
20 that the OSC does not see that.

21 I think that it's very ironic that they don't see the
22 damage to the confidence and to the integrity of the Canadian
23 capital markets caused by the CSE's actions here. The CSE
24 increasingly relies not on evidence of market harm, but on my
25 criticism of the Exchange after these events unfolded. But
26 criticism of a regulator, even harsh criticism, is not evidence
27 of danger to investors or capital markets. Otherwise, any person
28 subject to unfair treatment could be punished twice. First, by

1 the flawed decision itself, and, second, for objecting to it.
2 And that is a profoundly dangerous principle. Profoundly
3 dangerous.

4 Again, the core of this case, as far as the CSE is
5 concerned, is I'm guilty because I complained about an unfair
6 process, which they haven't defended their process. They
7 literally haven't brought any legitimate defence to their
8 process. Everything about this case has been a distraction to
9 focus on my criticism of the Exchange -- to my criticism of their
10 process. So, I mean, it's mind-boggling. It's been a circular
11 argument presented by the CSE, and then the OSC has apparently,
12 you know, rubber-stamped that.

13 And speaking of rubber stamps, I believe that this
14 Tribunal's role is not to rubber stamp Exchange conduct simply
15 because an Exchange invokes the words "public interest" or
16 "gatekeeper". The Tribunal's duty is to determine whether those
17 powers were exercised fairly, lawfully, proportionally and
18 consistently with the principles of procedural fairness and
19 market integrity that underpin the securities regulatory system
20 itself. Eco Oro confirms that this Tribunal not only has the
21 authority to intervene where Exchange discretion is improperly
22 exercised, it has an obligation to do where public confidence and
23 fairness are at stake. The OSC in Eco Oro took the extraordinary
24 step of overturning a completed Exchange-approved transaction
25 because the public interest required. That precedent has already
26 been set.

27 And in this case, the public interest, the 4,000
28 shareholders of New World Solutions and shareholders of other

1 companies that are going to be affected in the future, that
2 public interest requires that intervention again. Because if the
3 CSC's theory is accepted that an Exchange could silently --
4 again, the CSC's theory, which is absolutely crazy, is that an
5 Exchange can silently deem somebody unsuitable, provide no
6 evidence, no warning, no opportunity to respond, permit a
7 transaction and investments by the public to proceed, and then
8 later -- weeks later, almost a month later -- retroactively
9 invoke an undefined "evergreen authority", quote/unquote, or even
10 non-existent rules, which the panel used -- again, used
11 non-existent rules -- to justify, you know, a career-ending
12 sanction. So that is not procedural fairness.

13 And as my learned friend likes to -- he refers to the
14 CSE as the "entrepreneurial exchange". The CSE, their conduct
15 has shown that it is anything but entrepreneurial. And I would
16 say that there are no entrepreneurials involved. There's no
17 founders involved. You basically have a caretaker management
18 that is sclerotic and that is set in to basically act in manners
19 that are not in the public interest. They are basically there to
20 protect themselves, their pensions, et cetera.

21 So that is not procedural fairness. That is not
22 accountable regulation. It is not what Canada Malting, Imex, or
23 Eco Oro authorized. Members of the panel, I respectfully submit
24 the evidence has demonstrated that the CSE acted improperly,
25 unfairly, inconsistently with its own governing framework, in
26 disproportion -- in a manner fundamentally incompatible with the
27 rule of law, principles that govern delegated, regulatory power
28 or even natural law.

1 At some point, this ceases to be mere error. It
2 becomes a serious public interest concern about institutional
3 conduct itself. The public interest is not served by insulating
4 such conduct from the scrutiny, which is what -- I'm shocked that
5 the OSC has apparently turned a blind eye to, you know, many
6 serious questions that were raised. But apparently the OSC, the
7 Ontario Securities Commission, doesn't want to have scrutiny.
8 The public interest is served by restoring accountability,
9 restoring proportionality and restoring procedural fairness,
10 restoring confidence in the integrity of the markets, and
11 affirming that even exchanges exercising gatekeeper functions
12 remains subject to the rule of law.

13 So I therefore respectfully ask this Tribunal to
14 overturn this lawless and procedurally defective decision, to
15 reject the CSE's claim of effectively owning an evergreen
16 authority, and to reaffirm the principle established in Eco Oro
17 and Imex Systems that exchange power not absolute, that deference
18 is earned through fairness and lawful conduct, and that where
19 those principles fail, this Tribunal must intervene in the public
20 interest.

21 CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Marks.

22 MR. MARKS: I have no --

23 CHAIR: Oh, sorry.

24 MR. MARKS: I --

25 CHAIR: You were saying you have no further
26 submissions?

27 MR. MARKS: I'm done, yes.

28 CHAIR: Thank you.

1 MR. MARKS: For today.

2 CHAIR: I'm just looking to my colleagues to see if
3 anybody has any follow-up questions.

4 Thank you very much for your submissions.

5 So with that, I think our hearing is concluded.

6 Is there anything that anybody wants to raise? We will
7 be reserving our decision. And I'm seeing nobody has anything to
8 raise.

9 MR. MARKS: No.

10 CHAIR: So I just want to thank everyone on behalf of
11 the panel for your helpful submissions today.

12 And with that, we are adjourned. Thank you.

13 --- Whereupon proceedings adjourned at 4:02 p.m.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 I HEREBY CERTIFY THE FOREGOING to be a true and accurate
22 transcription of my shorthand notes to the best of my skill and
23 ability.
24

25
26 
27 Crystal Murray, Court Reporter
28 Computer-Aided Transcription

[1,000 - 6.1]

1

1	1:1 72:20 1:45 5:8 8:6 1:49 44:23 1st 46:21	2026 1:19 4:1 21.7 1:12 212 21:23 213 21:10 220 19:14 228 24:9,10,15 23 13:22 23rd 55:14 24 40:12 25 24:13 44:5 250 27:4 26th 23:25 32:17 27th 13:27 22:25 23:9,18 32:17 2:00 5:9 2:05 44:22,24 2nd 8:14 23:12 52:27	3rd 8:14 14:10 17:12,13,14 19:11 23:12,13,28 28:15 29:7,10 30:15 31:20 33:14,21 34:7,9,26,28 35:3 35:4,19 36:1,3,11 38:10,13 39:18 43:26 45:9 52:17 82:1
1,000 27:6 1.1. 68:15 1.5 57:20,22 10 25:3,12,28 27:9 27:14 28:10 38:21 40:15 41:17 45:7 46:14,18 81:2,7,7 1000 26:21 42:2 11 58:21 12 24:19 25:16 12:30 4:1 12th 56:16 69:4 74:9 13 43:20 13th 9:22 21:10,15 43:27 14th 9:23 15 5:6,9,10 82:27 83:17 166-167 22:23 16th 21:17 176 46:14 177 29:17,19,21 178 30:1 31:7 17th 1:21 18 15:13 22:14 18.21 20:13 181 46:14 19 1:19 4:1 15:13 22:14 45:11 19.95 20:14 1990 1:3 1998 29:27 30:6	2 2 22:6,20 27:14 57:20,22 87:18 95:1 2.1. 71:4 2.10. 76:25 2.18 42:16 43:8,22 56:6 66:23,27 67:1,4 73:22 2.18's 68:3 2.18. 63:3,11 67:10 69:27 77:20 77:22 2.9 45:5 20 1:21 8:5 14:25 15:15,22 21:21 27:11 2018 71:17 2021 79:20 2023 9:9 2024 9:12 10:6,18 10:26 12:16,17,26 13:1,22 16:6,19 17:1,16 19:17,20 24:13 25:2,23 28:21 30:22,24 33:8 36:12 2025 24:26 25:24 34:13 36:23 40:16 43:20 44:1,5 48:22 58:21 78:18	3 3 1:18 27:16 33:8 36:7 43:20 46:18 46:26 47:5,23 300 96:20 31 27:15 379 25:19 26:8 34:12,16 44:2 383 81:3 384 81:8 394 81:1 3:12 82:24 3:16 84:26 3:30 5:10 84:15,17 84:25,27 3b 58:20	4 4 3:5 5:22 47:20 80:27 92:14 4,000 88:5 98:27 4.6 22:6 40 55:9 43-101 40:26 47 68:17 4:02 101:13
			5 5 9:28,28,28,28 16:9,9 23:7,7 25:12 27:4 28:10 32:28,28 40:15 41:17 88:6 89:16 97:12 52 37:9 53 37:24,25 54 50:15 55 3:7 57 37:23
			6 6.1 50:25

[62 - advance]

2

62 71:25	able 8:6	acknowledgement	additional 29:12
65 71:26 72:6	above 19:18	78:13	30:24 31:26 33:18
6th 79:12	absence 48:28	acknowledging	82:26 93:24
7	72:23	7:23	address 6:20 7:3,7
7 22:20	absolute 91:6,19	acknowledgment	7:9,18 14:11,18
73 40:11 41:16	100:17	78:17	20:27 40:25 52:14
8	absolutely 60:14	acquiring 27:24	56:12,25 58:16
8 1:12 3:6 9:9	73:4 90:28 99:4	act 1:2 13:13	60:10 61:12,13
12:16,26 13:1	abstract 86:27	68:14 99:18	85:11,21 86:2,20
16:6 17:1,15	abuse 78:27	acted 99:24	94:20
24:26 25:24 34:13	abusive 56:9	acting 27:25	addressed 55:14
44:1 48:22	62:22 74:13 77:18	action 73:15	56:15 60:1,6
80 3:8 71:18 90:17	accept 7:21 13:9	actions 73:10 88:7	94:13 95:9
85 3:9	50:8 53:7 90:6	88:10 89:14 94:3	addresses 49:15
87 77:26,27,28	acceptable 95:18	97:13,23	adjourned 101:12
8th 8:12,24,26	accepted 13:10	activities 42:7,9	101:13
9:16,21 13:3	69:5 72:9 99:3	activity 13:5 14:22	adjudicator 1:25
16:24 17:24 18:8	accepting 15:19	24:27 25:1 30:10	1:26,27 4:11,12
18:19 26:7 28:20	54:16	31:26 33:13 40:26	4:13 12:11 16:13
29:11,12 30:15	accepts 39:25	40:28 41:9 47:7	23:15 37:24 48:9
31:10,14 33:11,13	access 21:4 47:21	64:21 79:2,2,4	54:4 70:20 79:20
33:19,24 34:12	49:7	87:24	adjudicators 55:7
35:11 63:28 70:20	accord 50:3	acts 91:10 96:25	administrative
9	accordance 61:2	actual 23:9 72:3	85:2
9 19:17,20 46:26	account 34:7	75:8	admissible 48:7
9th 20:21 21:5,27	60:17 61:16 77:6	actually 12:20	admission 59:12
24:7 34:26	accountability	22:6 24:4 26:11	64:2 72:8
a	90:27 100:8	31:19 32:15 34:6	admit 60:4 74:3
ability 12:25 13:8	accountable 99:22	35:19 73:2 88:9	admits 74:1
13:9 14:1,18,20	accurate 16:1	93:10 95:23 96:27	admitted 75:18
38:1 51:19 53:13	26:22 101:21	add 73:8 88:8	93:11
54:12 69:20	acknowledge	added 46:23	adopt 81:23
101:23	10:17,20 45:16	adding 57:6	adopted 36:27
	61:8 67:23 78:17	addition 47:4	advance 11:10
	acknowledged	61:11	14:19 16:1
	71:14,20		

[advanced - appellant]

3

advanced 96:22 adverse 73:20 advise 15:25 advised 23:17 advisory 57:27 advocate 59:10 advocating 71:3 affairs 64:15 affect 20:8,12 40:4 43:5 69:20 affected 34:24 88:5 89:16 99:1 affects 50:27 affidavit 33:15,16 85:27 affiliated 9:8,8 28:23 32:6 affiliation 10:22 affirming 100:11 afresh 11:8 33:1 54:13 afternoon 4:16,17 4:21,22,26 5:2 aggravating 30:4 30:9 32:9 aggression 75:7 aggressive 41:5 74:5 ago 56:16 agree 35:17 36:1 60:4 65:28 69:4 74:6 81:20,28 agreed 48:4 agreeing 12:28 agreement 9:7	agrees 35:19 ahead 42:21,22 53:14 ai 9:6,19 13:16,16 13:18 16:8,14 42:10 aided 101:28 airwaves 16:22 alberta 51:17,23 alexandra 19:22 allegation 18:13 allegations 80:9 94:1 alleged 30:3 72:3 88:21 93:9,10 95:16 allegedly 62:8 86:16 87:10,12 92:21 93:26 96:14 allow 6:5 13:20 17:10 43:18 96:19 allowed 29:4 36:13 96:17 allowing 63:15 73:25 allows 37:16 alternatives 61:9 altogether 30:21 amended 1:3 amount 11:15 amounts 62:24 65:14 analogy 74:22 analysis 14:9 21:2 61:23 62:16 78:9 87:7,25 94:4,5,6,7	analyzed 96:3 andrea 1:25 andrew 2:5 54:26 angela 19:23 21:12 animate 41:10 animating 43:7 announced 9:6,9 9:17 announcing 16:2 22:22 answer 6:21 12:12 15:27 20:2,9,16 20:19,22 21:17,19 39:4,7 44:14 47:4 47:16 48:6,12 52:23 58:18,21 75:22 84:6 answered 44:18 answering 5:21 20:4 56:14 answers 19:27 50:5 anticipate 8:23 anticipated 11:1 20:5 28:10 anticipating 12:28 anybody 32:7 87:10,11 93:18 101:3,6 anymore 83:27 anyway 27:27 88:28 apologies 24:8 apologize 24:23 28:12 37:24 45:24	95:13 apparent 9:9 23:2 93:13 apparently 88:11 88:22 96:21 98:11 100:5,6 appeal 11:21 12:18,25 13:8 14:1,11 23:14 28:24,24 32:12,19 32:21 34:21,22,23 36:6,8,11,13 37:3 37:6,12,21,27 39:18 43:19 46:12 46:15,24,25,28 47:8,9,11,19,19 49:2 50:6 51:17 51:26 52:7 53:18 54:3 58:18,19,24 58:28 71:15,23,27 77:1 85:4 92:16 92:20 appeal's 72:18 appealable 14:2,3 appealed 14:23 51:23 appealing 11:20 appeals 21:4 51:4 92:12 appear 42:20 45:13,14 59:2 appearances 2:1 appears 42:23 92:8 appellant 57:25 71:19
--	---	---	---

[appellants - aware]

4

appellants 72:3 applicable 62:25 92:4 applicant 1:6 50:28 60:5 65:8 67:12 69:3 75:12 77:21 applicant's 55:18 56:7 62:5,18,24 73:28 76:11 77:17 78:10 application 4:9 6:13,14,19 7:25 16:7 36:10 66:6 76:28 77:2 80:7,8 applied 58:27 68:4 91:15 96:6 applies 51:7 56:26 72:20 apply 61:14 77:15 applying 67:14,17 appointed 33:17 appointing 89:4 appreciate 8:1,19 12:11 41:21 49:8 83:12 appreciates 10:26 approach 13:28 36:18,19,27 49:2 49:17,21,28 53:16 55:23 65:21 75:4 81:24 82:14 85:15 approaches 19:2 approaching 62:17	appropriate 7:22 7:28 42:25 45:18 55:24 63:19 66:1 66:15,17 75:1 79:28 80:2,5 83:15 appropriately 6:11 approval 6:25 22:2,8 50:23 58:18 93:13 approve 58:28 approved 6:11 58:25 59:5 90:10 91:25 92:9,13 95:28 96:2 98:24 approximately 89:16 april 55:14 58:21 arbitrary 95:20 archival 10:7 18:9 archived 31:23 archiving 13:4 arguably 47:26 70:10 argue 36:17 38:2 83:8 94:8 arguing 66:8 86:10 argument 13:17 36:1 51:8 67:16 98:11 arising 94:2 arose 97:2 arrange 85:3	arrive 49:19 arrived 80:4 artificial 64:15 aside 6:22 55:21 55:28 59:27,28 60:7 65:1,2,4,10 65:15,17 asked 5:28 13:25 33:28 38:22 67:12 70:20 86:25 88:24 asking 9:18 21:15 27:13 40:14 asks 45:22 90:6 aspect 60:9 65:1 69:28 73:18,18 aspects 47:9 56:16 60:10 69:25 assertions 76:1 assertive 41:6,20 assess 10:6 69:22 assessed 11:8 assessing 68:8 assessment 55:17 55:25 56:2,6 64:8 64:24 65:4,5,6,23 65:26 66:16,20,25 69:27 76:27 77:4 79:1,10,15,27 80:1 assessment's 77:5 assistance 61:26 82:28 associate 15:7 19:23 associated 14:5 31:28 94:26 95:18	association 38:18 42:18 56:8 assuming 14:17 assumption 95:27 astray 17:9 attached 25:24 26:14 39:28 47:22 58:21 attachments 25:28 attack 63:1 69:26 70:1 82:10 attacking 73:20 attempts 22:19 74:7 97:3 attention 13:27 23:8 41:2,13,14 62:1 92:19 august 10:25 19:17,20 20:21 21:5,27 24:7 authorities 61:25 91:2 authority 37:11 53:11 63:12 68:12 73:23 90:26 91:6 91:18 93:2 96:8 96:10 97:4,7 98:21 99:9 100:16 authorized 99:23 automatic 91:22 available 14:7 24:2 25:9 31:25 47:17 61:1 94:11 95:16 aware 87:10,11
---	---	--	---

[back - british]

5

b	74:4 86:23 87:5,5	beyond 42:5 79:17	boggling 98:10
back 4:6 5:9 9:20	89:2 92:17,24	88:4 89:13	bones 41:23
10:2,16 13:16	93:3,26 96:21	biggest 26:21	book 41:24 46:12
15:11 22:19 24:4	basically 93:17	billion 27:15	46:28 47:8 49:2
24:6 25:5 26:8	99:17,18,19	billionaire 27:13	93:4
27:27 34:5,8	basis 8:15 18:8	82:14	bored 84:9
35:11 39:8 40:8	20:13,14,15 22:13	binder 46:24	boss 87:19
42:10 44:22,26	22:15 23:13 29:4	binding 70:24	bother 32:10
45:2 49:26,27	30:6 32:5 35:20	bit 12:12 15:17	bottom 29:23
55:26 64:25 65:3	43:11 49:6 53:2	40:22 45:2 47:15	boughton 10:27
66:6,16 68:6	53:15 66:1 69:8	48:14 50:13 64:4	11:16 13:26 14:14
75:11 84:17 92:27	81:22 92:21	68:6 71:16 79:3	15:8,18,24 17:28
backdated 93:11	bates 19:14 21:22	79:18	19:23,26 20:9
backdating 93:9	22:24 25:19 29:17	bizarre 11:13,16	21:20 22:13 23:2
backed 83:22	bcsc 68:15	33:4 90:3	24:5,13 32:17
background 19:12	bear 24:8,9	black 19:26 78:27	40:19 41:18
69:23	bears 72:2	blamed 15:18	brazenly 70:14
backs 23:10	beat 18:23	blank 97:7	breach 67:6
baked 38:10	beckon 8:20	blind 100:5	break 5:9,10
balance 21:2	becoming 22:14	blindly 91:28	27:28 39:4 44:12
44:14 76:19	45:11	blocking 55:5	44:18 48:12 49:17
balancing 76:13	beginning 19:16	blue 15:10 19:27	55:10 82:27 83:16
ban 85:16 93:17	25:2,23 63:25	20:9	83:17,18 84:15
93:21	begins 95:20	bluestein 89:4	breakout 25:17
banned 86:16	behalf 2:8 101:10	board 4:10 15:6	breaks 5:7
93:18 94:16	behaviour 63:16	15:14 35:16,18,23	brief 55:8 63:26
banning 87:28	93:27	35:28,28 36:6,16	84:22
93:25	belief 75:12,14,14	39:23,27,27,28	briefly 24:1 63:24
bans 93:6	believe 11:4 14:16	40:4 43:12 44:20	79:8 80:24
based 9:5,15,19	35:21 37:23 41:27	46:5 51:26 52:8	bright 42:7
13:5 14:6 22:16	42:4 44:1,4,5	58:5,10,14 60:11	bring 43:22 67:8
24:2 28:21 30:23	45:21 79:24 95:22	78:24 80:28 81:3	67:24,26
31:10,15 37:12	95:24 98:13	87:14	bringing 43:8
38:28 41:18 42:16	best 78:21 101:22	board's 34:24	brings 92:26
59:12,20 60:20	better 25:5 48:27	41:10,14	british 91:9

[broad - chair]

6

broad 52:10 broader 16:7 broadly 68:24 73:14 broke 5:5 brought 13:26 18:28 23:7 76:28 84:5 88:8 94:8 98:7 bucket 77:20 built 47:8 bunch 25:1 85:24 burke 1:25 4:11 12:11 16:13 23:15 37:24 54:4 business 42:26 89:18 butting 55:9 buying 43:5	canada 18:4,5 35:14 49:15,23 55:16 56:1,26 57:11,13,15 60:13 60:22 61:5 63:26 64:3,27 66:16 72:19 79:27 81:22 91:3,6 92:5 93:19 95:26 99:22 canada's 63:20 canadian 89:24 90:25 94:12,12 97:22 cancerous 72:16 candid 48:16 candidly 7:6 17:3 canvassed 81:16 canvassing 70:7 cap 33:28 capacity 48:25 capital 63:14,20 67:19,27,28 68:14 68:24 69:6 71:11 87:28 89:25 90:25 97:23,27 capitulate 82:19 captioned 47:22 capture 27:17 captured 26:17,18 33:24 47:12,22 care 88:11 career 88:4 89:26 92:20 99:11 careful 32:15 70:27	caretaker 99:17 carry 23:23 69:19 74:22 case 8:17 10:25 11:13,19 15:9 18:2,28 21:8 27:8 33:4 36:15,21 37:2,4 38:2 45:22 48:8 51:21 52:14 56:19 57:15 58:3 59:11 61:10,20 62:2 63:21 68:1 68:15,18 70:9,19 71:9,15,18 72:25 73:3,9 74:16 75:11 80:14 82:26 86:22 89:21 90:23 95:23,25 97:10 98:4,8,27 cases 26:23,26 41:25 42:19 67:22 67:26 71:14 72:1 91:18 92:27 cast 40:22 catch 24:11 categories 31:9 40:27,28 41:11 category 41:4,5,7 41:16,20 69:18 caused 76:14 87:27 88:10 89:15 93:28 97:23 causes 40:18 causing 82:10 95:17	caution 83:14 cboe 58:24,27 ceases 90:1 95:19 100:1 cent 27:4,14,16 ceo 25:16 90:19 ceo.ca 30:12 certain 48:19,20 74:28 84:6 certainly 6:9,14 53:26 67:12 71:4 77:11 84:20 certainty 89:11 certify 101:21 cetera 20:8,8 30:4 38:2,2 99:20 chain 19:16 21:7,9 21:24 22:18 23:18 24:4 chair 1:25 4:3,6 4:18,22,28 5:24 5:26 6:27 7:11,20 8:2,22,24,26,28 9:4 10:17 11:24 11:26 12:1,5,7,9 12:15,24 13:22 14:24 15:2,4 16:6 16:21,24,26 17:13 17:22,25 18:16,19 18:21 21:22 22:9 23:17,20,22,24,26 25:3,24,27 26:11 28:6,28 29:7,10 29:16 30:17,20 31:1,17 32:10 33:7,22 34:5,13
c			
c.s.5 1:3 calculated 82:9 caldwell 87:16 call 13:11 32:28 36:26 78:2 called 48:9 71:17 87:24 90:2 calling 36:24 70:12 76:1 calls 22:19 campaign 11:20 42:11 43:15 63:7 71:23 74:13 75:19 78:27 82:9			

[chair - comments]

7

34:15 35:2,8,17 35:26 37:7,11,18 37:26 38:3,6,8,13 38:16,26 39:5,10 39:13 43:23,26 44:10,17,22,25 45:26 46:1,9,15 46:18,22,25 47:1 47:24 48:2,8 49:12 50:12,18,20 50:25 51:13,15 52:2,18 53:28 54:2,6,20,22,24 54:27 57:21,23 59:8,14,18,24 60:12,15 61:11 72:25 73:1,5 77:25,28 78:2,6,9 80:21 81:4 82:23 83:2,5,10,13,24 83:26 84:2,4,6,10 84:12,17,19,24,28 85:7 95:3,5,8,23 95:24 100:21,23 100:25,28 101:2 101:10 chaired 89:4 chairing 4:11 chairman 15:4 25:16 27:10,20 33:17 42:1 96:18 chairman's 27:26 challenge 36:28 76:28 chance 83:26 95:13	change 15:25 changed 54:13,14 chapter 31:8 36:7 character 20:18 21:6 81:28 characterization 78:15 82:21 characterize 97:3 characterized 47:27 52:17 75:23 characterizes 74:9 charles 87:19 charlie 2:3 check 21:18 46:17 95:13 checked 20:23 cheque 97:7 chief 79:20 choice 64:28 80:11 choose 36:14 79:14 chose 36:17 chronology 25:8 circle 27:27 circular 98:10 circulated 46:28 circumstance 6:4 54:11 circumstances 13:20 14:3 28:11 33:4,6 42:8 54:19 55:24 56:27 57:7 57:9 60:23 90:3,3 citation 71:15 cite 67:22 68:15 71:17 72:28	cited 37:11,22 civil 73:9 81:17 clad 70:19 claim 96:8 100:15 claiming 89:6 claims 43:4 clarification 11:23 11:26 59:7 77:25 clarify 59:9 class 88:18 classic 15:10 19:26 clear 5:18 13:14 14:13 20:16 34:20 40:5 42:20 45:3 46:6 70:9 76:22 77:10 78:28 83:19 90:13 91:24 cleared 54:4 clearer 45:27 clearing 52:22 clearly 53:21 63:2 70:18 71:6 close 21:11 70:19 closed 12:14 16:2 40:27 96:28 closing 11:10 12:12 14:19 24:20 cnsx 1:10 2:5,6 4:7 4:10,20 5:17 6:6 59:12 code 16:9 59:11,13 collapse 89:18 collapses 96:7 colleague 12:3 85:25	colleagues 4:24,26 90:2 101:2 collect 82:26 colliding 33:5 colourful 72:12 columbia 91:9 combination 33:24 41:11 come 5:17 10:2 25:5 37:17 39:8 44:22 82:5 84:17 88:11 comes 6:24 10:16 18:2 53:6 64:6 coming 5:9 7:8 75:11 79:22 commences 3:5 4:2 commencing 4:1 14:10 comment 6:17 19:4 29:28 51:28 76:10 78:23,24 81:10,18 commentary 19:2 19:3,9,10 25:11 27:17 28:9 41:12 41:14,17 42:20 76:15 commenting 25:10,17 comments 7:15 27:18 56:10 62:22 65:16 71:8 74:3 75:27 76:6 81:16
--	--	--	--

[commission - conflicts]

8

commission 1:10 1:20 2:3 4:7,24 5:18 6:7 51:24 52:5 61:12,18 78:2,14,26 91:9 91:12,23,27 100:7 commission's 18:26 59:10 61:26 77:26 commit 76:5 committee 9:10,27 14:21,22 16:27 17:8,11,14,15 18:13 20:27 21:1 31:25 32:26 33:8 33:11,21 34:7 35:1,3,20 51:7,9 51:11,12,25 52:7 52:10 54:15 57:27 57:27 58:4 74:12 88:22,23 committee's 23:8 36:2 common 42:25 communicate 13:13,16 communicated 20:26 26:6 29:22 30:22 31:22 52:19 53:23,24 82:1 communicates 13:14 28:23 communicating 32:20 communication 13:22 29:23	communications 30:18 82:16 community 27:12 companies 69:2 99:1 company 9:7 11:2 11:7 19:22 20:4 20:25 21:20 24:18 25:11,14 27:10,11 27:21 40:20 42:2 42:4 43:4 86:18 93:22 94:17 96:18 company's 25:15 42:21 compelled 65:26 76:8 compelling 61:6 64:2 complain 36:20 complained 98:5 complaints 11:4 60:24 74:25 completed 6:2 98:24 completely 6:12 43:2 94:9 96:7 complex 78:15 compliance 92:12 92:12 component 63:3 67:15 compounded 89:1 computer 101:28 concede 53:6 conceded 35:9	concepts 68:9 81:15 concern 14:22 16:10,10,15,17 22:16 39:22 40:18 49:8,10 60:6 61:10,22 63:23 90:4 100:2 concerned 98:5 concerning 63:18 93:14 concerns 11:3 19:7 30:3,13 36:11 40:3 43:10 49:15 62:11 65:9 67:7 75:2 76:7 93:26 94:14 97:1 97:2,5 concluded 80:9 101:5 concludes 28:21 conclusion 13:4 43:12 50:5,10 81:24 conclusions 10:14 49:22 condemning 73:13 conditional 91:6 91:19 condoning 73:12 conduct 16:17 30:2 34:24 43:10 43:21 55:25 56:9 60:5,20,28 61:21 62:7,12,19,20,24 63:1,10,19,23	64:16 65:4,13,23 65:25,26 66:7,8 66:20,27 67:1,2,7 67:7,8,18 68:5 69:7,26,28 70:9 70:10,15 71:5,7 73:10,13,25 74:10 74:14 75:15,16 77:5,18 79:10 87:27 88:2 92:2 93:7,23,28 95:17 96:23 98:14 99:14 100:3,4,18 conducted 79:27 conducting 56:5 66:10 conducts 66:24 confidence 63:5 63:13 67:19,28 68:12,13,17,19 73:25 89:24 92:2 97:16,22 98:22 100:10 confidential 20:3 confirm 31:6,13 91:18 97:6 confirmed 31:15 31:20,21 32:1 80:26 confirming 62:7 confirms 21:20 24:1 29:24 31:5 98:20 conflict 42:12 conflicts 41:4
---	--	--	---

[conform - criticism]

9

conform 53:14 connected 10:3 94:28 97:8 connection 68:9 76:7 91:21 connotation 82:5 consequence 73:26 consequences 65:21 72:9 75:9 77:7 89:13 97:11 consider 7:27 21:2 56:13 59:27 60:8 61:17 68:7 74:23 89:23 93:15 consideration 55:17 59:15,16,20 60:26,28 61:23 64:14,24 66:18 70:27 considered 17:14 33:16 54:13 57:26 considering 7:14 55:22 61:1 65:13 66:6 70:25 76:16 consistency 91:20 consistent 50:1 53:16 85:14 87:20 consistently 98:18 constantly 85:14 contained 80:26 contemporaneous 87:23 content 26:10,12 26:17 43:24,27 44:7 81:26 82:27	contents 3:1 26:13 46:11,25 81:2 context 13:24 66:4 67:17 68:4 78:21 79:21,23 continuation 4:8 continue 63:17 continued 9:14 contortionist 88:19 contradict 37:4 contradictions 85:24 contradicts 85:20 85:26 contrary 67:9 70:2 72:9 73:21 contrast 40:18 control 14:25 15:23,26 16:4 20:7,8,11,12 21:13,20,28 22:2 22:8,23,26 23:3 45:7 63:17 83:11 89:6 92:22 94:20 94:21,23 96:5 controlling 38:27 42:1 convenient 97:6 conveyed 38:4 convicted 90:19 copy 29:19 81:12 copying 19:23 core 62:2 68:14 98:4	corp 91:4,12 correct 20:22 36:10 corrected 16:1 correctly 74:10 correspondence 8:15 9:16,17 17:28 19:16 25:21 26:3 32:7 34:17 37:20 40:7 44:3 45:17 46:20 50:11 52:26,28 53:27 corresponding 55:20 corrupt 70:14 cosgrove 15:7 19:22 22:25 24:14 32:17 cost 66:10 costly 85:21 could've 14:23 20:16 45:18 54:11 counsel 24:27 36:19,27 75:3 count 96:28 couple 77:23 80:24 85:11 course 6:4 8:16 10:5 15:14 22:27 28:16 34:21 35:14 39:19 40:24 41:26 44:13 45:9 49:24 50:4,8,10,24 60:8 62:9 80:16 81:24 85:27	court 51:17 64:8 64:12 65:25 70:17 71:2,15,23,27 72:18,19,21 75:20 76:8 80:13 85:4 91:7 101:27 court's 70:21,22 courts 71:13 72:9 cover 32:13,16 55:13 56:1,19 covered 22:28 40:7 50:14 64:26 covering 66:12 crazy 99:4 create 21:13 22:1 27:24 39:28 41:22 93:4 created 33:4 49:8 creates 11:6 42:4 creating 15:26 22:8 creation 22:9 38:23 89:10 creative 88:20 credibility 27:23 43:4 crevasses 72:14 crime 85:23 criminal 36:19 critical 36:28 90:28 critically 77:12 criticism 19:4 74:9 75:28 90:13,14,18 97:25,26,26 98:9 98:9
---	--	--	--

[criticize - deem]

10

criticize 93:23 criticizes 75:24 critique 75:25,28 crossing 61:5 crystal 76:22 101:27 crystallized 23:11 47:18 csc's 99:3,4 cse 6:10 7:21 10:17,23 12:19,27 13:4,12,14,18,25 14:4,6 15:25 16:4 16:20 18:10 19:23 19:24 21:15,26 22:7,16 23:2,6 25:15 28:23 29:23 30:5 32:20 34:2 34:24 36:6,24 38:17 40:19 41:19 42:18 45:21 46:13 50:23 51:12,24 53:11,12 55:20,21 55:26 56:10,23 57:20 58:5 59:2 59:22 60:7,11 61:24 62:15 63:9 64:1,10,20,25 65:3,22 74:12,13 75:2 76:1,3 77:2 78:28 80:15,28 82:10,19 85:15,22 85:25 86:24 87:1 87:14,17,20 88:1 88:14,21 89:1 90:6,15 92:5,20	92:23 93:19,23 94:10,16,25 95:15 96:14,17,22,26 97:3,15,23 98:4 98:11 99:14,14,24 cse's 9:12,24 18:24 36:28 37:15 38:28 45:5 50:1,2 56:6 66:5 74:10 76:24 88:7,10 89:3,14 92:16 93:13 96:13 97:13,23 100:15 cured 53:17 current 20:24 22:28 61:1 currently 66:13 cursor 75:26 customary 8:19 d dale 1:27 damage 72:4 85:21 97:22 damaged 96:12 97:19 damages 71:28 73:10 81:13 90:1 danger 97:27 dangerous 98:2,3 dare 17:23 data 17:21 24:5 25:7 database 20:24 date 20:20 29:24 33:26 34:18,26 64:16	dated 34:28 46:21 dates 21:18 day 5:5,12 15:16 21:26 58:13 70:7 83:2 86:22 daylight 18:23 days 27:10,14 de 37:3,16,28 49:28 50:9 52:22 56:13 59:10,18 60:20 65:4 66:15 66:24 79:10,15 dead 18:23 deal 7:16 16:2 24:17 56:20 57:17 75:1 76:11 80:15 dealing 58:12 66:18 75:6 dealt 39:19 74:28 78:25 debate 56:27 december 9:9,11 9:16,22,22 decided 79:10 85:16 93:20 decides 56:13 decision 4:9 8:15 9:10 10:18,18 11:20 12:16,18,20 12:26 13:1,3,23 16:7,28 17:2 22:28 23:12,28 28:15,16 29:8,13 29:24,24 30:18,21 30:23,24 31:5,15 31:15,17,18,20,21	32:10,12,14 33:1 33:8,11,26 34:7 34:25 35:15,15,18 35:19,27,28 36:2 36:11,12 38:10,17 39:1,18,23,26,27 39:27,28 40:4 41:10 43:19 49:4 50:27 51:9,10,17 51:20,22,23 52:3 52:3,4,6,9,10,17 53:5,7,22,24,28 54:1 55:22,28 56:9 57:12 59:27 59:28 60:7 61:15 62:19 63:8,16,20 64:12 65:1,2,2,10 65:15,17,25,27,28 66:5 67:23 70:1 70:22 71:26 72:19 73:13,21 76:3,24 76:24,26,27 77:1 78:18 79:1,19,20 79:23 81:5,6,8,13 81:23 82:1,11 85:4,16 86:24,25 87:5 88:23 89:2,5 89:9,23 91:13 92:17,24 98:1 100:14 101:7 decision's 17:4 decisions 51:4 54:10 57:8 58:13 deem 90:9 93:16 97:5 99:5
---	---	---	---

[deemed - directors]

11

deemed 86:15 92:15 93:24 96:14 deep 94:7 deeply 63:18 93:14 defamation 11:21 42:12 43:15 70:16 71:14,23 72:19,20 81:12,16,17 82:9 defamatory 43:20 43:24,27 44:6 70:18 71:6 72:14 defect 53:17 defective 100:14 defence 98:7 defendant 71:19 defended 98:6 deference 91:7,9 91:19 95:26 96:7 100:17 deferring 36:2,5 deficiencies 93:13 define 7:25 definitely 78:20 definition 5:23 48:27 definitionally 52:9 definitions 15:24 delegated 91:21 99:27 delegation 53:11 deliver 45:11 delivered 45:13 46:13 56:15 79:9 79:11 80:27	delivering 6:23 8:15 32:13 delivery 7:5 delving 71:18 demand 27:24 36:20 41:23 demands 89:12 demonstrate 96:11 demonstrated 56:7 94:2 99:24 demonstrates 63:12 denied 12:18 13:8 50:8 denies 14:8 deny 13:28 depend 12:19,28 depending 41:11 depends 68:17 95:27 deprived 12:25 describe 75:24 described 9:11 10:28 11:1,16 14:15 37:22 61:16 71:22 describes 38:16 describing 25:21 description 24:16 37:20 38:4 deserve 7:23 desired 31:16 35:11 despite 87:27	destination 60:26 destroyed 89:14 97:12 detail 44:4 56:23 details 23:1 28:1 determination 9:14,21,27 10:6 10:15 11:6,11,15 14:2,3,17 16:14 16:19 17:5,8 18:8 18:9,15,16 20:25 23:11 24:2 28:16 29:3,4,22 30:1 31:5,9,13,21,22 32:1,28 35:12 36:12 38:17 49:19 50:1,2,2 53:5,7 55:27 57:28 58:5 58:5,7,9 66:14 77:15 82:11 86:23 90:24 92:21 determinations 10:13 18:27 32:3 54:14 68:28 69:9 determine 31:11 64:11,28 98:16 determined 20:13 31:12 detrimental 68:23 devastating 93:3 97:11 developed 40:7 86:26 dictating 53:11 didn 36:25	difference 51:21 51:27 52:1 different 11:18 20:18 21:6 28:4 28:12 29:18,18 30:25 31:17 59:26 59:28 60:22 61:7 68:2 69:19 70:23 75:4 79:21 80:6 82:2,20 84:7 differently 40:22 difficult 7:16 43:21 70:8 digit 22:6 digs 71:15 diligence 48:14 91:10 diluted 20:14,15 direct 63:1 69:26 88:6 directed 62:23 63:8 70:10 direction 31:27 54:15 79:16 80:13 directly 7:7 13:23 67:23 69:11,12 86:20 88:5 91:24 92:4 director 38:20 89:5 director's 59:22 60:7 directors 4:10 64:20 69:15 74:12 77:2 87:14
--	---	--	--

[directs - emotional]

12

directs 80:10 disabuse 14:21 disagreement 92:25 disclaimers 26:22 26:23 disclose 92:21 disclosed 14:27 15:4,12 16:4 22:13,17 28:4 33:27,28 42:13 47:6 discloses 41:24 disclosing 24:27 27:20 disclosure 15:7,9 15:28 20:22 26:27 28:11 33:25 34:20 36:19,20 37:1 41:15,15 43:12 48:18,22 49:5 69:16 82:17 90:10 92:22 93:24 94:13 96:5 discounts 72:4 discrepancy 59:4 discretion 90:9 91:27 97:7 98:21 discuss 56:21 77:14 discussed 62:9 83:21,23 86:19 discussion 13:25 18:28 24:26 65:11 77:9	dismiss 80:7,8 dispel 75:27 disproportion 99:26 disproportionality 93:16 94:11 disproportionate 93:12 96:6 97:18 dispute 74:1 disregard 63:12 disregarding 96:9 disrepute 43:9,22 67:8,24,27 disrupted 89:15 distinction 51:26 52:1 distinguishes 75:16 distraction 87:2,3 98:8 distractions 86:27 87:1 document 16:9 17:7 21:9 22:28 23:12,28,28 44:6 46:19,24 47:18,20 53:3,5 81:2 83:21 documents 47:20 93:11 doing 19:8 29:6 42:23 43:3 55:27 63:4 64:25 75:27 76:13 82:6,8 96:24 dollars 76:18 87:15 90:1 96:13	double 27:9,14,16 43:17 46:17 94:25 doubling 42:2 dovetails 64:18 downplay 77:11 drawn 10:14 41:13 drive 42:24 driver 42:26 due 50:19,20,25 53:19 56:28 89:10 duties 69:15 duty 42:16 98:16 déjà 91:17	eclipsing 78:3 eco 91:4,11,23 95:22,23 97:6 98:20,23 99:23 100:16 effect 9:22 35:22 68:23 effective 13:2 37:3 37:28 66:10 effectively 12:18 12:25 13:3,28 34:3 37:16 87:28 89:14 90:8 93:25 100:15 efficiency 58:10 efficient 83:11 egregious 70:7 eight 36:24 90:20 90:22 either 9:10 13:1 35:6 54:15 57:25 64:28 73:12 elaborating 64:4 element 43:22 55:21 60:13 elements 40:6 49:21 67:21 68:2 eloquent 81:15 embarrassing 70:5 embedded 44:6 embeds 40:12 emoji 26:21 27:4 emojis 25:11 emotional 82:6
		e	
		e 15:11 19:19,27 20:20 21:27 23:20 24:4,11 32:13,16 85:4 88:22,23,27 earlier 38:22 42:10 45:24 66:26 84:21 85:12 92:27 early 9:11 12:17 26:7 earn 24:19 25:15 earned 91:19 100:18 easier 73:2 easiest 40:10 46:11 easy 78:28 eat 5:5 echo 7:15 eclipses 78:12	

[emphasize - exchanges]

13

emphasize 28:1 encompass 52:10 endeavour 61:26 ends 22:4 enforcement 79:24 95:21 engage 9:2 35:13 61:22,25 63:7,15 65:24 75:8 79:14 79:28 80:1 engaged 42:10 60:22 63:26 64:27 64:28 65:18 66:17 67:1 68:3 75:15 75:18 engagement 8:8 9:25 16:19 70:21 79:3 88:3 94:14 engagements 10:13 engages 63:2,11 77:19 engaging 9:18 18:11 60:23 76:13 enshrined 77:13 ensures 51:1 entire 60:7 65:5 82:14 92:26 entirely 61:20 66:12 80:5 91:13 entity 41:26 entrepreneurial 82:12 99:14,15 entrepreneurials 99:16	entrusted 8:13 equate 28:6 equities 41:23 error 18:12 71:20 90:2 100:1 errors 90:27 escalating 64:9 especially 10:10 essence 69:18 81:3 essential 87:4 essentially 62:7 65:26 71:19 75:8 76:12 86:5,16 established 87:23 100:16 establishes 91:4,5 estimate 8:7 estimated 8:5 et 20:8,8 30:4 38:2 38:2 99:20 event 7:19 59:6 78:11 events 97:25 eventual 28:24 eventuality 56:1 eventually 22:20 34:23 evergreen 32:3 64:7 86:28 90:8 97:4 99:9 100:15 everybody 5:5 34:21 49:7 everybody's 84:21 everyone's 14:13 evidence 15:20 18:13,14 30:28	35:5,6 36:14,16 37:4,22 38:1 43:18 45:20 47:27 49:27 55:20 56:3 56:7 59:16,20,22 60:4,9,10,19,20 61:7,14,23 63:28 64:1,3 65:24 66:19 71:9,10,10 72:23 76:20 78:3 78:4,12 82:15 86:17 87:5,5,6,21 87:22,23 88:19,21 88:25 91:14,26 93:28 94:4,24,26 97:8,24,26 99:6 99:24 evil 72:16 evolved 34:21 exact 70:25 80:4 91:4 exactly 31:3 33:12 35:24 86:15 examination 85:27 87:6 examinations 3:3 examine 86:25 example 10:10 27:3 32:4 37:23 41:13,17 48:21 53:1 58:24 59:21 78:19 82:16 examples 24:3 exceeding 15:15 except 35:17 39:11 87:2	exchange 13:15 19:10,22,27 20:21 21:25,27 24:7,21 28:5,12 30:8 31:5 31:28 32:7,8 41:3 43:8,9,9,22 49:20 50:27 51:1,9,10 51:22,23 52:4,9 52:18 53:4,27 55:18 57:25 58:12 58:27 62:6,23,25 62:28 63:2,4 64:5 64:9,13,13,17 65:25 67:8,24 68:17,23,26 69:10 69:21 70:10,11,12 70:13,13,26 71:6 71:10 73:23 76:15 76:20 77:12,18 82:13 85:17 86:17 89:25 90:15,16,17 90:25 91:5,7,10 91:13,18,25 92:1 92:2 93:4,10,17 93:25 94:27 95:19 95:27 96:3,8 97:25 98:9,14,15 98:21,24 99:3,5 99:14 100:17 exchange's 22:5 61:2 67:18,25 75:26 exchanged 47:5 48:17 exchanges 56:22 73:14 93:19
---	--	--	--

[exchanges - filed]

14

100:11 excluded 82:12 excuse 62:12,21 77:17 executed 86:14 87:11,12 executives 9:19 exercise 18:5 76:13 91:20,27 exercised 90:26 97:17 98:17,22 exercises 69:21 exercising 93:1 100:11 exert 69:2 exhaust 29:5 exhibit 25:3,28 26:1 46:26 exist 89:2 92:17 93:4 95:22 existence 68:16 existent 89:5,28 92:24 96:4,5 99:10,11 exits 92:23 expanding 7:27 expect 66:6 expectation 69:3 expected 24:19 48:9 52:13 53:9 expecting 25:11 expediency 58:11 expedient 19:13 expeditious 66:10 expense 66:11	expert 87:25 explain 18:1 39:12 46:7 48:28 57:12 68:6 explained 36:13 66:1 explaining 57:5,6 explains 59:3 explanation 15:17 explanations 89:27 96:23 explicit 29:15 58:27 explicitly 28:17 extended 89:13 extent 31:4 32:19 36:3 50:21 56:15 extract 50:25 extraordinarily 82:4 extraordinary 90:3,7 92:18 93:15 96:8 98:23 extreme 74:4 94:10 extremely 63:26 70:17 71:2 extremity 19:2 eye 100:5 eyes 32:27 47:20 f face 30:20 45:12 54:28 59:4 faced 63:9 74:11	facing 69:11 fact 9:15 11:16,19 13:7,9,10 23:9 42:26 43:16 56:26 69:26 71:2 93:2 factors 18:11,27 30:4,9 32:9 35:14 49:15 facts 9:5 11:27 52:2 75:11 92:14 96:11 factual 14:24 51:20 91:11 factum 36:9 37:2 37:9,22 39:19 44:5,16 49:14 61:5 67:22 68:16 fail 100:19 failed 91:27 92:21 96:14,15,15,15 failing 28:12 70:13 failures 89:1 fair 16:6,18 19:4 54:8 84:13 87:5 fairly 58:23 95:28 98:17 fairness 14:8 29:3 35:13 37:1 45:13 49:8 53:2,23 54:18 57:1,11,15 57:18 74:24,28 75:2 77:8,10,12 87:21 91:20 93:8 97:8 98:18,23 99:12,21 100:9,18	faith 68:21 fall 86:23 falling 15:19 false 72:1,10 familiar 83:13 91:16 family 87:17 far 22:12 57:2 68:16 74:3 78:19 78:20 89:13 93:18 95:18 98:4 fashion 25:22 faster 74:26 faulkner 9:18 10:11 33:15,16 85:26 88:24 faulkner's 32:13 48:22 52:26 favour 96:21 favourite 92:8 feature 11:16,19 28:24 featured 57:1 77:9 features 11:12 37:27 feel 28:26 61:10 feeling 85:18 feet 8:20 fell 15:21 fiduciary 42:16,19 42:23 figure 33:9 34:6 file 10:3,15 23:1,5 31:24 32:27 filed 58:22 59:5 82:15
--	--	---	---

[files - full]

15

files 14:4 filing 5:27 22:10 38:19,23 45:5 final 57:28 58:4,5 58:7,9 64:17 66:14 76:10 77:8 finally 64:18 find 13:21 16:26 28:13 33:6 50:3 56:7 60:12,24 62:25 66:1,23 70:17,18 76:8 78:23,28 85:19 90:22 finding 23:13 32:6 41:2 43:11 51:18 53:3 56:14 64:11 67:5 71:2,4 72:24 79:15,17,22 80:7 80:12,17 88:4 94:2,22 findings 64:8 65:16 70:23 75:13 75:14 77:16 80:15 94:28 finds 77:15 fine 5:19 29:18 84:18 87:18 fined 87:15,18 finer 81:1 fines 95:1,18 finish 8:6 28:14,28 84:21 fire 26:10 firm 24:21 25:14 82:16	first 6:9,17 11:13 15:17 24:19 25:16 30:20 38:16 39:26 45:8 47:3 50:24 52:6,21 55:16 57:5,17,26 62:28 63:24 65:14,22 69:25 70:3 71:26 73:17 74:1 97:28 fish 22:3 fits 53:18 five 18:5,11 90:18 fixed 19:25 flag 10:3 flagged 11:2 20:24 flawed 98:1 floor 1:21 flow 65:21 72:10 75:10 77:7 flows 37:20 52:14 focus 26:28 39:21 39:24 61:20 62:1 62:14,27 63:6,21 66:26,28 67:26,28 68:27 72:3 75:9 77:10 98:9 focused 26:22 63:22 68:9 73:8,9 73:10,11 74:14,15 77:5 83:6 focuses 67:2 focusing 56:9 61:10 64:20 66:23 68:19 69:24 73:17 folks 19:24	follow 13:18 21:11 37:23 39:25 101:3 followed 62:12 80:14 86:24 followers 27:11,18 42:28 following 20:4 24:20 29:26 47:5 96:22 follows 63:14 footnote 79:19 forced 64:10 forcing 82:18 foregoing 101:21 form 49:1 75:28 80:25 81:5 formal 31:15 46:12,25 48:24 53:5 formalistic 49:9 formality 48:20 formally 7:8 31:21 47:8 92:22 forms 46:24 69:9 forth 9:20 15:12 22:19 23:10 40:8 72:15 forum 43:2 forums 30:12 forward 74:23 fostering 68:13 found 11:17 65:12 77:21 79:28 80:4 foundation 91:11 96:7	foundational 68:13 72:5 founders 99:17 four 27:5 55:15 63:25 fourth 56:11 frame 12:17 43:24 43:25,26 framework 55:21 56:21,26 57:4,11 57:16 61:3 65:23 70:23 91:15 92:10 93:13 99:25 frankly 70:5 fraud 9:19 89:17 94:1 fraudulent 70:14 fraught 38:26 fresh 10:6 32:27 55:17,22 56:2 59:11,15,19,27 60:8,26,28 61:23 64:24 65:4 66:18 80:1 84:5,9 95:14 friday 5:21 6:28 19:20 21:18 40:25 friday's 88:19 friend 87:1 99:13 friend's 48:14 49:25 85:12 friends 75:2 79:4 front 38:2 40:11 49:5 56:20 fuckers 76:2 full 58:11 84:20
---	--	--	--

[fully - harassment]

16

fully 49:22 92:3 95:18 96:3 function 69:22 96:24 functions 100:11 fund 87:16 fundamental 63:21 fundamentally 62:3,16 68:7 75:5 76:23 89:19 92:16 99:26 further 16:12 22:18 44:2,14 50:12 57:13,14 65:1,17 71:16 74:7 79:16 80:13 80:19 92:15 100:25 future 10:2 18:10 73:10,16 99:1	genuine 75:12 getting 7:8 35:25 39:16 48:28 50:9 70:3 82:18 94:18 give 7:22 8:8 28:9 28:13 30:12,27 37:28 40:9 41:1 45:20 47:15 51:12 53:13 71:14 given 7:20 8:7 9:12 13:6 14:16 20:17,19,22,22 23:12 29:3,4 32:8 34:1 37:3 50:6,13 51:2 52:24 53:2 gives 51:3 67:7 84:7 glaring 94:25 go 5:6 9:20 13:23 18:5 24:4,28 26:8 29:16 30:17 33:19 34:5,8 40:3 44:2 50:15 53:14 54:12 57:13 59:8,26 60:19 61:16 63:28 70:24 72:12,19 74:7 82:24 83:15 84:19 85:22 88:17 92:15 94:8 goal 66:9 goes 9:10 19:8 33:26 42:5 50:28 59:6 74:3 going 5:2,8,27 6:8 7:1,3,7 16:4 19:13 21:26,28 22:1	23:16 24:6,16,25 25:5,8,15 27:1,27 27:28 29:2 34:17 35:6 38:11,13 41:28 42:2,18 43:16 46:9 48:13 49:24 51:15 53:13 60:27 65:24,26 70:4 71:14,25 74:26 76:3 77:26 78:19,20 81:1,21 83:10,19,22 84:9 85:16,17,19 86:18 86:19 99:1 good 4:4,5,15,16 4:16,17,17,21,22 4:26 36:7 68:20 govern 99:27 governance 69:1 governing 91:15 92:23 93:7 99:25 government 93:2 grant 95:23 grapple 8:17 64:10 71:1 grappled 72:21 great 8:23 40:18 70:6 84:24 greater 15:22 38:20 ground 6:13,18 7:24 29:28 grounded 42:15 49:22 grounds 7:26,27 62:25,28	growth 41:6,6,21 41:25 guaranteed 41:27 guess 4:15 12:2,27 21:18 46:14 56:11 61:27 66:25 guidance 88:3 guilty 98:5 gymnastics 88:18
g			h
gang 27:13 82:14 gatekeeper 91:5 96:8,24,25 98:16 100:11 gatekeeping 61:2 69:22 86:28 90:7 92:1 gathered 35:2,3 general 55:21 71:28 generally 63:20 67:27			half 5:7 halted 88:13,13,16 hand 76:20,21 handful 27:2 handle 27:13 82:13 hands 48:21,24 hanging 76:4 happen 11:12 20:23 33:1 happened 10:12 15:17,18,20 27:7 36:22 53:18 54:7 62:14 80:3 86:15 93:18 happening 43:3 happens 28:7 86:12 happy 50:4 54:27 55:3 84:21 harassing 56:10 62:22 harassment 63:7 78:27

[hard - inaccurately]

17

hard 43:12 49:19 harm 64:14 67:21 71:10,12,22 72:7 72:8,23 73:16 76:14,16,18,20,21 77:3,3 87:26 88:10 89:16 94:2 95:17 96:17 97:15 97:24 harmed 64:12 71:11 97:12 harming 70:11 harms 63:3 67:18 71:5 harsh 97:26 harshest 88:1 hat 27:26 head 39:20 heads 46:23 hear 5:13,14 6:6 48:13 49:24 52:16 53:26 83:10 heard 15:16 51:2 51:6 52:24 53:22 57:7 58:8 65:7,28 70:15 79:4,5 83:6 83:8 86:27 hearing 1:17 3:5 4:2,8,9 7:6,25,26 36:10 37:16 40:1 48:26 49:28 50:9 51:5 52:5,8 58:11 58:16 59:10,12,18 60:20 61:7,8 62:10 66:12 72:20 79:25 80:3,5,9,10	86:24 88:20 89:1 101:5 hearings 52:22 66:10 heart 62:3 heat 75:17 heavily 39:18 42:16 heavy 43:15 heightened 69:3 held 1:19,20,24 69:6 91:9 92:20 help 19:14 51:28 helpful 26:9 74:22 101:11 helpfully 20:2 39:16 helps 24:24 hesitancy 6:14 hesitant 48:12 hey 23:2 hi 21:12 hide 88:27 high 69:6 70:17 71:2,3 higher 71:7 highlight 56:16 74:18 79:13 highlighted 15:10 20:2 27:3 75:3 highly 42:14 historically 88:2 94:13 history 32:21 hit 40:15	hmm 78:8 hold 20:13 69:1 79:25 80:2,5 holder 22:2,7 holding 75:14 holdings 38:20 hope 45:27 hoping 73:5 horn 15:24 horse 18:23 hour 5:7 84:20 housekeeping 8:4 hundred 26:26 hundreds 75:19 hype 42:24 hyping 28:2 42:5 i i.e. 15:23 22:14 83:21 95:1 identified 43:24 43:25 44:12 58:20 identify 34:8,19 45:17 89:6 ignore 64:15,19 94:12 iirroc 79:23,23 80:4 80:12 imaginable 88:1 imagine 13:17 70:8 81:14 imex 91:3,8 97:6 99:22 100:17 immediate 48:12 immediately 16:3 65:23	immune 91:22 immunize 77:17 impact 10:21,22 12:21 67:20 68:24 70:4,25 impacted 10:18 impacts 67:18 70:9 implication 9:4 67:25 implicitly 60:17 implied 95:26 importance 66:28 77:11 important 10:24 14:9 16:9 19:5 20:20 21:25 24:5 58:13 68:7 69:24 77:13 importantly 14:12 20:28 62:23 76:3 87:26 89:13 91:11 97:10 impose 89:26 93:3 95:15 imposed 88:1 94:10 96:6 impossible 54:13 70:18 71:6 76:9 94:11 impression 72:16 improperly 91:15 98:21 99:24 inability 72:7 inaccurately 26:18
--	---	---	---

[inadequate - investment]

18

inadequate 77:17 inappropriate 91:10 include 27:17 34:23 included 44:1,2,4 44:9 47:23 85:13 includes 45:7 including 20:6 30:14 31:26 37:28 48:5 80:10 91:3 94:27 incompatible 99:26 inconsistency 39:11 94:25 inconsistent 38:21 95:20 97:17 inconsistently 96:6 99:25 incorrect 18:12 91:14 increase 26:21 increased 27:6 increasingly 97:24 indefinitely 97:5 independent 62:24 94:6 independently 63:11,13 70:2 73:21,24 75:8 77:19 index 3:3 indicated 16:8 18:1 23:2	indications 78:10 individual 9:25 11:20 13:21 23:3 31:22,27 90:24 individual's 23:1 42:12 individuals 10:13 45:6,19 63:15 69:5 ineffective 89:19 inflammatory 74:5 influence 63:17 69:2 information 14:6 14:20,25 20:24 21:2 24:2,3 27:19 27:22 28:18,18,22 36:16 42:28 43:1 43:17 45:17,24 52:28 54:14 61:1 64:6 69:9 80:26 informed 12:16 injunction 70:16 75:20 injured 72:2 injurious 72:10 injury 72:3 inside 42:26 insider 20:5,7,10 20:11 22:9 27:19 27:21 38:23 42:28 43:1 69:17 insiders 94:27 instagram 90:20	instances 26:27 44:6 68:3 institutional 10:12 100:2 institutions 68:21 instructive 49:4 insufficient 36:20 insulating 100:3 integrity 68:20 69:7 73:24 89:24 91:20 97:22 98:19 100:10 intelligent 75:25 75:28 intend 23:27 55:13 56:19,21,25 56:28 60:2 intended 20:5 30:28 79:5 intent 46:15 intention 62:1 77:11 interact 69:11,12 interaction 75:9 interactions 13:5 interest 7:8 18:24 18:25,26 22:5 25:4 26:24 27:11 27:24 39:15 41:4 42:12,13 60:7 63:11,23 64:5 67:3,9,15 68:2,8 70:2 73:22 76:14 76:27 85:21 89:11 90:4,26 91:16,21 91:26 92:4 97:6,7	98:15,25,27 99:2 99:19 100:2,3,8 100:20 interested 43:5 51:5 interesting 85:20 95:25 interests 41:15 42:21,22,22 interfere 81:22 interfered 50:7 interim 70:16 internal 52:7 internet 71:23 interpret 60:3 interpretive 92:25 interprets 67:13 intersected 78:10 intervene 98:21 100:19 intervened 91:24 intervention 90:5 99:2 intimidation 63:7 73:26 75:7 introduce 36:14 38:1 introducing 4:24 27:18 85:14 invent 93:2 invented 92:7 97:18 investigation 9:19 investment 43:6 93:28
--	--	--	---

[investments - know]

19

investments 99:7 investor 15:19 30:3,12,12 67:7 87:26 88:6,10 89:15 94:2 95:17 97:8,14,15 investors 43:9 68:25 69:12 87:16 89:16,28 96:12,19 97:12,27 invidious 72:11 invitation 16:23 16:25 52:27 invoke 92:5 99:9 invokes 98:15 involved 15:22 19:10 29:11 68:26 86:17 93:21 94:17 94:18 96:27 99:16 99:17 involvement 11:7 involves 76:27 79:2 involving 86:26 iron 70:19 ironic 97:21 irregularity 37:5 40:2 52:23 irrelevant 13:12 irreparably 64:12 irreversible 96:16 isolated 90:2 issuance 20:6,10 20:14 issue 6:12,23 7:1,5 7:23 11:3,6 13:12	14:11,19 17:28 18:1,11,12 21:5 22:15 24:27 32:18 38:27,28 40:23 49:5,8 53:25 54:7 54:9 55:22,23,28 56:2,11 59:6,19 59:20 62:18 63:22 64:17,19 65:5 71:16 72:21 74:2 78:25,27 79:9 90:1 94:23 issuer 10:4,5,23 13:14 14:6 16:11 20:6 28:23 50:28 51:1 76:28 96:19 issuer's 20:14 issuers 13:14 19:9 41:22 63:18 68:25 issues 5:3 6:12 16:2 19:5 35:12 36:8,17 55:13 56:20,28 57:15 58:10,13 60:16,24 61:11 63:25 64:20 68:7 74:15,28 77:11 78:3 88:5 93:10 94:20 it'll 50:12 item 17:20,20 itemized 37:25 items 34:25 iv 22:6	j jack 1:5 2:8 4:6 jacob 20:11 21:14 21:20 jane 1:26 january 8:12,24 8:26 9:11,11,21 10:18 12:16,26 13:1,3,9 16:6,19 16:24 17:1,15,24 18:8,19 24:26 25:24 26:7 28:17 28:20 29:11,12,22 30:15,22,24 31:10 31:14,23 32:11,16 32:25 33:11,13,19 33:24 34:12,13 36:12 44:1 48:22 86:23 job 41:26 70:6 83:11 judge 71:19 july 24:13 jump 29:1 jurisdiction 80:1 jurisprudence 91:3,5 jury 92:11 96:2 justifiable 76:6 justification 62:11 92:7 justifications 93:12 justified 35:20 62:19	justifies 62:20 justify 62:21 70:19 71:6 74:8 75:14 76:9 93:5 99:11 juvenile 74:6 82:5 k keep 8:7 21:16,24 27:1 55:8 keeps 51:3 kept 18:10 kettle 22:3 key 17:28 kicked 28:25 kind 8:19 15:11 26:10 43:21 70:5 86:6,11 knew 94:18 96:27 know 6:21 7:16 8:13 10:7,8,12 13:19 15:10 17:3 17:9 30:14,24 33:12,19 34:27 36:4,9 37:7 40:10 47:21 52:25 53:1 57:12 58:12 59:3 59:13 60:27 64:17 64:23 65:8,11,15 66:3,9,15 67:11 67:13 68:5 69:23 70:21 74:20,23 75:11,17,27,28 76:2 78:22 79:13 79:21 83:10,19,20 83:22 85:13,15,22
---	--	---	--

[know - looking]

20

85:23 86:27 87:1 87:19 88:22,25,27 91:17 92:19 93:18 93:19,21 94:6,17 94:18 95:11 98:12 99:11 100:5 knowledge 26:15 known 9:26 53:27 knows 75:18	lawful 75:1 91:20 97:9 100:18 lawfully 95:28 98:17 lawless 100:14 laws 67:6 lawyer 89:4 layers 51:25 lead 17:8 43:10 60:25 leadership 69:1 leading 37:6 learned 12:3 20:17,18 85:12 87:1 90:2 99:13 learning 10:9 learns 23:9 leave 35:10 40:16 leaves 10:11 31:16 leaving 6:22 led 11:4 left 4:12 17:25 72:16 81:8 86:11 legality 92:25 legitimacy 42:5 43:3 92:26 legitimate 75:25 98:7 legitimize 96:9 lend 27:23 43:3 71:12 length 77:14 lengthy 63:7 letter 24:26 25:25 25:28 26:2,17 29:25 31:7 34:11	38:10,14,16 45:9 48:22 94:15 letters 46:21 level 20:5 36:17 40:1 52:4 57:18 88:19 levels 51:22 59:12 leveraging 35:28 36:5 libel 71:28 72:17 lifetime 72:17 lifting 43:15 light 64:7 likely 16:20 29:28 64:21 65:20,22 likened 74:16 likes 99:13 limit 74:17,21 limitless 91:22 limits 86:7,10,13 90:25 line 19:19,20,24 42:7 45:18 lines 19:27 24:17 link 35:11 48:28 76:6 links 25:22 26:14 26:14 list 12:13 18:5 25:9 37:25 40:27 46:3 listed 10:23 14:6 28:23 listing 9:10,27 13:15 14:21,21 16:27 17:7,11,14	17:15 20:27 21:1 23:8 32:26 33:8 33:11,21 34:6 35:1,2,20 36:2 51:7,9,11,12,25 52:7,10 54:15 57:20,26,27 58:4 74:12 88:22,22 literally 98:7 little 8:9 39:22 40:22 45:2 47:15 64:4 68:6 71:16 79:3,18 live 47:12 53:25 54:7 lockhart 2:6 4:19 38:9 43:14 80:26 81:12 lockhart's 70:6 logged 44:26 long 26:25 71:14 longer 59:1 90:23 look 24:17 27:9 34:11,12,16 35:27 41:24 42:9 45:16 52:26 53:22 59:4 62:15 87:2 90:23 looked 31:12,25 34:3 51:21 52:3 66:3 looking 4:14 5:8 17:25 19:14 26:4 29:18 45:19 49:10 49:27 65:12 67:17 68:10 76:14 78:12 101:2
I			
lack 71:9 72:3 73:22 77:10 92:7 93:9 laid 47:20 landed 48:24 language 19:2 35:10 37:12 large 16:17 54:16 56:14 81:19 largely 8:12 late 9:11 12:17 laughed 27:4 launched 74:13 launching 68:5 law 10:27 11:16 15:8,24 18:12 19:23 20:9 22:14 24:13,21 25:14 32:18 36:19 40:19 41:18 52:22 69:13 71:28 72:20 79:3 90:25 99:27,28 100:12 law's 13:26			

[looks - marks]

21

looks 28:17 41:19 45:12 loss 68:22 71:21 72:3,22 76:18 losses 93:28 lost 12:23 79:18 88:6 96:13 lot 47:6 59:28 60:21 85:13,24,27 86:28 92:19 lots 8:22 low 45:7 90:28 lower 23:22 55:1 lunch 5:6 lurk 72:15 luxury 27:15	24:11 32:13,16 88:22,23 mailed 85:4 mails 15:11 19:27 88:27 main 62:27 63:6 major 27:21 87:17 89:3 94:19,27 make 6:18 9:10,26 10:9 11:13 12:5 14:13 18:22 25:6 27:15,28 33:1 37:1 38:1 42:8 50:1,14 51:3,6,19 52:25 53:13,14,26 55:2 57:12,28 60:8 65:15 70:21 71:4,8 73:6 76:22 77:9,15,23 83:11 83:27 88:17 makers 63:8,16,20 70:1 73:21 76:3 makes 7:10 11:19 41:23 42:20 43:4 51:27 52:1 56:13 58:17 75:13 80:15 88:28 making 5:13 14:4 24:23 33:8 36:21 41:27 47:10 49:4 51:9,10 58:4,5,12 60:24 61:19 67:16 70:22 72:24 74:2 76:1 78:23,24 79:17 87:12 89:7 92:27	malting 18:4,6 35:14 49:15,23 55:16 56:1,26 57:11,13,15 60:13 60:22 61:5 63:26 64:4,27 66:17 79:27 81:22 91:3 91:6 92:5 95:27 99:22 man 85:23 management 48:8 57:26 99:17 manipulation 94:1 manner 19:8 28:4 99:26 manners 99:18 map 55:12 march 44:5 mark 5:10 85:26 marked 25:3,27 34:26 46:26 47:24 92:6 market 14:22 16:20 19:4 27:16 27:24 50:4 68:12 68:22,25 69:19,21 89:15 92:3 93:6 94:1 96:21,22,25 97:16,24 98:19 markets 1:10 2:5 2:6 4:7 63:5,14,20 67:19,27,28 68:14 68:24 69:6 71:11 73:14,25 88:1 89:25 90:26 97:23 97:27 100:10	marks 1:5 2:8 3:9 4:5,6,16,17 5:16 5:19,25,26 6:19 6:23,24 7:1,20 8:1 8:16 9:7,15,18,26 10:19,21,22,27 11:1,3,21,23,25 11:28 12:2,6,8,10 12:15,24 13:4,7 13:23 14:8,13,16 14:18 15:12,16,22 16:4,7,17,19 18:9 18:17,27 19:3,7 20:11,13,24,26 21:14,20 22:14,22 23:5 24:27 25:10 25:22 26:23 27:18 28:2,22 29:23 31:23 33:17 34:3 34:24 36:18,23 37:21 38:18,27 39:21 40:3,13,24 41:15,21 42:9,13 42:19 44:7 45:11 47:12 49:16 50:3 50:23 52:24,28 53:21 58:17,23 60:24 61:24 64:16 65:11,16,28 66:24 70:5,11 71:8 72:26 73:13 75:3 75:4 77:5 79:5 81:13,16,26,28 82:3,7,9,16,24 83:1,4,9,12,18,25 84:1,3,5,8,11,13
m			
made 9:14 11:15 12:15,24 14:17 16:28 17:8 20:26 23:11 28:17 29:22 30:22 31:23 34:20 35:23 47:8,17 48:21 49:6 50:27 51:8 52:4 53:23 53:28 54:1 56:10 57:8 58:3,7 63:27 64:8 66:2 71:2,20 75:23 76:17 77:1 79:16 80:7,12,17 85:16 87:10 88:9 88:23,26 91:23 92:3 95:5,11 mail 19:19 20:20 21:27 23:20 24:4			

[marks - misguided]

22

84:16,18,22 85:1 85:8,9,10 95:3,4,7 95:10 100:21,22 100:24,27 101:1,9 marries 45:8 material 18:13 26:5 33:26,27 43:20 49:1,6 64:6 66:12 84:5,9 91:14,26 95:14 materially 20:7,12 materials 5:26 6:16 9:5 16:27,28 17:10,15,19 29:12 30:9,24 31:8,9,12 31:25 33:7,10 34:23,28 47:5,17 47:26 48:5,17,21 48:23,25 59:10 81:7 82:18 matter 1:2 4:6,8 5:28 6:4 7:9 31:11 32:26 55:22,26 56:13 57:26 58:1 60:8 64:25 65:3 66:14 70:22 83:16 85:2 90:16 96:12 mattered 94:21 matters 30:16 34:22 89:21 95:22 mccoomb 2:5 3:6 3:8 4:19,21 5:12 5:14 6:17 7:3,11 8:2,3,10,11,23,25 8:27 9:1,4,13 10:20 12:11,22	13:3,24 15:1,3,6 16:12,23,25 17:3 17:17,23,26 18:17 18:20,22 21:23 22:11 23:19,21,23 23:25,27 25:4,26 26:2,13 27:2 28:8 29:2,9,14,20 30:19,26 31:3,19 32:15 33:20,23 34:10,14,16 35:5 35:9,22 36:4 37:7 37:10,13,19,27 38:5,7,9,15,22,25 39:2,6,11,14 43:25,28 44:11,21 44:27,28 45:27 46:2,10,16,19,23 46:27 47:3,28 48:6,11 49:13 50:14,17,19,21 51:10,14,28 52:12 52:19 54:1,4,7,21 54:22,23 55:5 72:26 73:1 80:22 80:23,24 81:6 87:8 94:7 mccoomb's 5:4 mcleod 51:17 52:2 mean 6:12 29:16 31:1 35:3,17 42:28 45:25 46:7 47:11,25 48:8 49:3 50:21 51:18 57:7 60:9,15 78:17 83:5,6 87:3	98:10 meaningful 90:4 90:11 91:1 93:6 means 38:15 64:11,13 67:24,26 meant 88:8 measure 54:16 measured 74:19 meat 56:5 57:6 66:22 71:18 media 9:21 13:5 24:27 30:11 31:26 33:13,19 34:1,2 34:18 41:9 47:7 meet 52:14 meets 64:1,2,3 member 15:6,14 members 86:22 99:23 memo 17:1 44:1 94:12 memorandum 9:20 memory 10:12 mental 88:18 mention 76:2 88:9 mentioned 19:16 58:15 67:14 79:8 mere 42:5 100:1 merely 89:22 92:25 93:23 97:10 merits 1:17 4:8 6:2 76:11 80:9 message 63:18 messages 75:20	messiness 33:4 40:6 metaphor 86:3 michael 89:4 mid 6:3 7:6 midstream 6:23 7:17 might've 32:5 million 25:12,12 28:10,10 40:15,15 41:17,17 87:18 88:6 89:16 95:1 97:12 millions 76:17 87:15 90:1 96:13 96:19,20 mind 4:24 19:18 24:6,10 39:8,14 98:10 mindful 39:2 44:11 minerals 91:4,12 minor 37:7 minute 5:6,9,10 82:27 minutes 7:18 8:5 39:16 55:9 58:16 83:17 misappropriation 94:1 misconceived 91:16,26 misconduct 64:9 67:5 misguided 62:17
---	---	--	---

[mislead - number]

23

mislead 45:25 misrepresentation 41:8 misrepresentative 41:19 missing 22:6 misunderstanding 76:23 misunderstood 37:19 mitigating 53:1 54:11 ml 9:6,19 13:16,16 13:18 16:8,14 42:10 mm 78:8 moment 10:21 15:20 24:8,9 44:25 68:27 75:17 moments 81:11 monday 21:19 monetary 95:1 month 99:8 months 21:5 24:19 25:16 27:5 36:24 66:7 75:19 93:21 96:27,27 97:2 moon 27:4 moot 9:12 12:20 13:1,12 morals 92:7 morning 4:4,5,15 4:16,17 morph 19:9 moseley 79:20	motion 1:17 48:2 motivating 18:27 move 38:13 54:27 66:21 86:20 moving 19:12 murray 101:27 mutual 87:16 n n 79:20 name 20:24 narwal 25:21 26:6 33:25,28 34:18 38:4 44:1,3,7 47:7 48:23 narwal's 46:20 natural 45:9 99:28 naturally 58:9 nature 11:11 16:13,16,18 21:16 30:2 58:25 62:21 64:7 75:15 76:23 near 90:8 necessarily 14:1 45:15 48:6 necessary 65:20 77:16 78:18 need 5:12 10:12 22:21 28:28 35:27 56:21 60:16 62:13 62:14 82:25 83:5 84:19,20 needed 14:11 needs 9:28 60:6 79:16	negative 67:20 negatively 67:18 70:9 never 19:6,7 92:9 93:17,18 94:4,5,6 94:7 96:1 new 5:17 6:12,18 8:16 10:28 11:18 14:16 15:21 19:21 20:7,11,11 21:13 21:20 22:9 25:10 26:24 27:5,7 28:3 28:10 30:23 32:10 32:26 33:16,18 36:14,16,16 38:18 38:23 40:15 42:13 47:27 54:14 55:20 56:3,8 60:4,19,20 61:6,7,8 63:28 64:1,1,3,6 65:13 65:24,27,27 66:12 76:16 78:3 82:15 85:13,14,27 88:5 89:14 98:28 news 96:22 nice 21:7 nichols 68:15 non 20:14 89:5,28 92:24 96:4,5 99:10,11 normalizing 73:26 normally 5:7 norms 69:20 73:12 notation 29:21	note 6:8 8:11 14:4 32:27 58:26 noted 69:4 83:27 notes 8:5 19:12 22:21 24:24 28:12 74:4 82:21 85:24 101:22 notice 6:13,20 7:24 13:10,26 14:16 32:18 44:8 46:15 87:22 88:3 89:26 90:10 93:7 93:9,20 94:15 notification 21:26 notified 12:26 13:7 23:8 notify 32:11 96:15 notion 42:15,16 75:27 82:20 notwithstanding 6:15 32:20 50:5 november 46:21 novo 37:4,16,28 50:1,9 52:22 56:13 59:11,19 60:20 65:5 66:15 66:25 79:10,15 nuance 78:18,21 nuanced 61:17 78:9,16 nuances 60:16 number 21:22 25:19 27:9 29:17 57:21 58:13 59:25 74:24,26 81:8,10
--	---	---	---

numbering 19:15 numbers 22:24 numco 24:18,19 nygård 82:17 90:20	occasions 70:12 occupation 41:21 occupy 63:17 69:2 69:18 occur 72:8 occurred 96:17 occurs 58:9 octagon 9:7 october 8:14 10:5 11:9 12:17 13:22 14:10 17:12,13,14 17:18 19:11 23:12 23:13,28 28:15,21 29:7,10 30:15 31:20 32:10 33:8 33:14,21 34:7,9 34:28 35:3,4,11 35:19 36:1,3,11 38:10,13 39:18 42:11 43:20,26 45:9 52:17,27 82:1 odd 13:17 odds 62:3 officer 38:19 74:24,27 86:11 officers 69:15 oh 23:26 46:22 87:2 95:7 100:23 okay 4:4,28 6:27 7:11,20,28 8:27 11:25 12:2,6,7,9 16:21 17:22,26 18:19,21 30:17 34:15 35:8 37:26 38:6 39:5,10,13	44:17,21 49:12 54:6,21 55:2 61:11 83:4 84:3 84:10,22,24 85:10 86:14 87:3,9,13 87:17 88:16 95:10 olympic 88:19 onca 71:18 once 32:5 33:5 ones 47:21,22 68:28 ongoing 81:17 online 25:17 81:26 82:1 ontario 1:10,20,22 4:7,23 5:18 6:6 71:15 85:4 91:12 91:23 100:7 onwards 33:19 open 53:25 58:2 openly 96:18 operating 68:22 95:27 operational 89:18 opinion 19:8 57:27 opportunity 5:16 12:1,18 36:15 51:2,6 52:24 53:22 54:9 57:7 58:8 62:6 87:23 96:16 99:6 opposed 36:21 52:6 83:7 opposite 91:5 93:8	optimistic 41:5 option 61:4 65:3 65:14,18 options 65:7 oral 84:2 orally 6:2 39:21 order 5:22 6:10,25 7:18,24 34:27 52:14 53:10,17,20 57:5,19 58:7,17 58:21,23,26 59:1 59:2 77:13 79:16 80:13 92:10,14 ordered 75:20 orders 94:27 ordinary 94:14 organization 93:1 orient 24:11 original 11:14 17:5,9 19:15 22:23 25:20 26:3 26:5 44:19 46:7 47:24 48:4,10 58:20 64:20 79:28 80:27 83:20,21 86:23 87:4 95:6 oro 91:4,11,23 95:22,23 97:6 98:20,23 99:23 100:16 osc 7:21 49:24 51:16 53:19 58:23 58:25 59:6 85:19 86:2,8,15 87:19 88:9,9 90:13 91:12,24 92:1,11
---	---	---	--

[osc - passage]

25

92:14 95:2,24 97:20 98:11,23 100:5,6 osc's 5:15 7:17 50:9 66:9 80:20 ought 18:25,26 51:11 53:12 outcome 63:9 73:20 outcomes 70:1 73:27 outset 8:18 42:6 58:15 outside 49:1 overall 43:16 overarching 66:9 overlapping 63:27 overlooked 18:13 91:14,26 overly 41:5,20 overpromotion 5:23 7:2 40:21 61:17 78:14 86:6 87:6,7 94:6 overpromotional 79:2 87:10,12,24 93:27 overriding 60:6 61:10,21 63:23 66:28 overrule 80:2 overruled 79:24 overseeing 68:22 oversight 91:1 overturn 89:22 100:14	overturned 91:13 91:25 overturning 98:24 overview 61:27 overwhelming 93:5 own 2:8 7:4 8:4 9:12 14:14 29:28 32:6,8 42:21,23 43:6 49:11 50:1,3 50:7 53:13 57:14 61:14 65:4,23 87:15 88:4 92:9 92:16 93:4 99:25 owning 100:15 owns 21:21 82:13	47:10,20,26 48:1 48:7,10 52:8 55:4 55:23 56:12,19 57:4,12 59:17,19 59:21,23,26 60:10 61:1,13,14,22 62:9 65:8 66:21 70:28 71:1 77:24 79:23 80:4,6,10 80:19,28 85:5 86:22,24 89:1,3 92:16,18,20 95:21 95:24 99:10,23 101:11 panel's 5:23 7:15 18:25 41:13 48:21 48:24 49:4 57:18 paragraph 29:24 30:21,27 37:9,25 38:16 40:11 41:16 45:9 50:15 68:17 72:6 77:26 paragraphs 37:23 71:25 parallel 75:4 paraphrasing 35:18 60:18 parcel 19:4 27:22 29:6 41:26 pardon 8:25 36:25 39:18 parse 31:14 part 10:25 14:9 19:4 20:20 25:28 26:3,4 27:22 28:19 29:5 33:25	35:23 41:26 46:24 47:3 48:4 49:1 52:23 56:4 59:27 69:27 73:17 77:1 77:2,4 partially 20:15 participant 16:20 19:5 50:28 51:1 93:6 95:16 participants 68:25 69:19 participate 50:4 96:19 participating 49:20 69:6 participation 20:6 20:10 87:28 93:25 participatory 51:12 particular 25:9 42:9 47:19,20 48:15 51:16 particularly 16:14 26:24 parties 5:3 6:3 36:14,15 46:13,28 47:6,17 48:4,18 48:19 49:3,6,7 51:2 62:2 66:11 79:12 95:8 partly 40:26 parts 71:25 party 37:3 party's 22:26 passage 32:8
	p		
	p.m. 4:1 44:23,24 84:26,27 101:13 page 3:3 19:14,19 21:10 22:20,23 23:18 24:15 26:20 29:17,17 30:2 31:7 34:12,16 40:12 44:2 46:14 46:14,18 81:1,2,3 81:7,8 90:20 paid 41:22 panel 1:25 4:9,11 5:20,26 6:1,1,5,7 6:14,21,24 7:21 8:13,21 10:26 12:28 17:6 34:28 38:2 39:22,25 42:6 45:25 47:2		

[past - policy]

26

past 33:26 58:26 73:9,10,15 path 11:4 pattern 43:16 93:14 patterns 86:28 pause 24:23 57:17 77:24 pay 92:19 pdf 81:1 pecuniary 71:21 72:4 pedophile 90:20 pedophiles 36:25 76:2 pending 11:21 53:25 penny 27:12 82:14 pensions 99:20 people 8:19 41:27 42:3 43:5 62:23 64:9 69:18 75:19 87:14 94:26 95:5 percent 26:26 perception 18:24 18:25,26 perfect 33:5 perfectly 9:2 46:6 perform 64:23 performer 24:18 performing 90:17 92:1 performs 90:7 period 25:1 30:5 30:15 34:4 62:19	permission 6:1 permit 99:6 permitting 56:12 permutation 60:2 permutations 60:1 persist 73:26 person 10:15 14:5 14:26 15:23,27 16:5 17:24 20:7 20:12 21:13,21,28 22:2,8,23,27 23:3 31:28 32:27 42:17 45:6,22 51:12 74:26 80:3 89:6 92:22 94:20,21,23 96:5 97:27 personal 69:9 89:14 personally 73:20 personnel 56:10 76:1 persons 45:1,7,8 69:1,10 perspective 5:2 9:25 38:28 43:7 49:28 84:7 persuasive 70:25 peter 82:16 90:20 pettypiece 2:3 3:7 4:23,26 5:13 7:12 7:13 54:24,25 55:1,7,11,12 57:22,24 59:8,13 59:15,22,25 60:14 60:21 61:19 72:25 72:27 73:4,7	77:27 78:1,5,8,20 80:21 81:11,15,19 82:4,22 85:3,6 86:2,8 88:8,25 pettypiece's 87:19 phone 22:19 pick 50:23 picture 90:19,22 piece 26:2 30:7 41:12 78:14 81:8 pieces 17:28 25:21 34:18,20 35:10 40:2 41:9,14 44:8 pif 10:3 20:23 22:10,27,28 23:4 23:4 38:19,24 45:5,11,22 97:1 pig 76:2 piquing 22:4 place 33:23 43:23 43:27 places 43:28 plainly 62:19 plaintiff 71:20 72:2 plan 5:1 56:18 65:8 planet 70:14 90:17 platforms 30:11 played 47:11 please 4:3 19:14 26:8 38:14 44:25 84:28 plus 27:11 point 5:8 7:18 14:24 15:28 16:26	17:19 18:5 24:5 25:6 27:27 28:1 33:17 36:24 37:7 38:11 43:23 47:11 48:11 53:2 56:5 57:20 58:3,17 67:11,24 72:7,22 73:8 74:16,18 75:22,23 79:13 81:1 92:18,27 95:5 100:1 pointed 23:5 26:27 31:27 40:24 pointing 87:2 points 25:8 28:13 38:9 58:24,24 77:23 83:7 94:8 police 74:23 policies 6:10 43:7 55:18 56:6,22 62:25,28 64:5 69:10 92:8,23 policy 6:25 22:6,7 37:12,28 38:3 40:25 42:16 43:8 43:22 44:13 45:5 45:12 53:12 56:6 57:20 63:3,11 64:13 66:23,24,27 67:1,2,4 68:3 69:24,27 71:4 73:22 76:25,25 77:20,22 78:28 79:3,15,17 82:10 92:12
---	---	--	--

[ponder - process]

27

ponder 1:27 4:12 poorly 74:27 position 17:6 30:8 53:6,27 57:14 60:5 63:14 79:13 80:6 91:2 positions 7:20 63:17 68:28 69:2 69:11 positive 36:21 37:2,4 possesses 90:8 possibility 10:1 possible 19:13 40:10 55:8 84:23 post 20:14 43:19 56:9 62:19 postdate 34:9,20 posted 74:17 posterity 18:10 posting 42:27 90:19 postings 33:16 posts 9:21 48:23 potential 10:21 22:23 37:5 41:25 54:17 57:14 60:16 77:6 potentially 25:12 27:7 53:16 55:3 58:10 97:19 power 57:28 90:25 91:21 99:27 100:17 powerful 83:27	powers 97:17 98:17 practical 9:2 practically 48:16 53:21 preamble 81:7,21 precedent 92:28 98:25 precise 47:15 precisely 95:21,22 96:11 predate 34:9 35:4 predecessor 58:27 preparation 8:14 prepare 47:1 prepared 5:6 6:20 7:17 8:17 17:11 19:7 42:20 46:13 61:12 85:10 86:1 86:20 present 36:15,16 63:25 64:15 78:18 presentation 83:21 85:12 presented 61:5 64:1 98:11 press 11:17 16:1 20:19 21:11 22:22 presume 12:13 17:23 presumed 72:1 presuming 46:3 presuppose 50:22 pretend 40:6 pretty 36:7	preventing 73:16 previous 92:27 previously 8:8 15:2,5 34:17 price 19:24,25 20:3 27:14 41:6,6 42:2,24 prices 68:22 principal 41:21 91:24 principle 18:12 72:5 92:4 98:2 100:16 principled 95:19 principles 91:14 98:18 99:27 100:19 prior 11:6,27 23:6 40:5 43:14 probably 21:18 32:23 44:15 68:11 probity 78:4 problem 10:4 11:5 19:6,6 25:18 41:8 41:28 54:2,17 82:13 problematic 7:4 14:5 25:13 31:28 40:23 41:1 42:3 42:14 71:24 problems 40:5 60:16 89:3,18 procedural 6:22 14:8,11 29:3,5 32:21 37:1,5 40:2 52:23 53:8 54:18	57:1,10,18 60:23 62:8 65:9,16 74:15 77:8,10 87:20 90:27 91:20 92:6 93:8 97:17 98:18 99:12,21 100:9 procedurally 7:16 49:16 89:19 100:14 procedure 92:13 procedures 58:18 58:19,19,22,24,28 59:4 90:10 92:9 96:1 proceed 64:19 80:10 96:18 99:7 proceeded 22:13 22:17 91:14 proceeding 17:5,9 18:11 19:15 22:24 25:20 26:5 34:23 35:15 44:20 46:8 47:25 48:5,10 62:4,17 76:24 79:24 80:27 81:17 proceedings 58:20 101:13 proceeds 96:26 process 9:14 11:2 14:10 21:4 28:24 28:25 34:21 35:13 36:5,13 37:3,16 38:11 48:3 50:6 50:19,20,26 52:13 52:15 53:13,14,19
---	--	---	--

[process - question]

28

56:2,28 57:14 58:11,13 61:17 62:11,21 63:13 64:22 66:12 73:23 73:24 75:26 76:7 77:17 80:14 83:11 89:10,20 92:6,16 92:26 95:19 97:9 97:19 98:6,6,8,10 processes 36:28 62:6 77:12 96:14 professional 96:17 professionalism 68:20 69:7 profile 14:21 profoundly 98:2,2 projected 25:10 projection 27:7 projections 28:3,6 28:7,9 40:19 prolong 66:14 prolonged 75:19 prominently 57:1 promise 84:10 promises 41:6 promising 41:26 promoter 9:26 25:16 27:12,25 38:20 40:26 41:22 82:13 promotion 7:2,4 13:6 25:13 40:17 40:20,23 41:8 promotional 30:9 30:10 40:28 61:20 64:21 78:10 79:2	79:4 89:7 94:13 95:17 promotions 25:18 proper 90:9 91:10 properly 6:24 10:27 11:1 14:15 16:3 49:1 91:27 96:2 proportion 87:9,9 proportionality 90:11,27,28,28 97:9 100:9 proportionally 95:28 98:17 proportionately 96:25 propose 17:27 18:4 proposed 10:4 19:21 20:6,10 24:14,21 proposing 23:3 45:6 proposition 16:18 54:16 90:7 prospective 27:10 protect 89:24 96:25 99:20 protecting 43:9 protection 19:24 20:3 30:3,13 67:7 97:8,15 prove 72:2,22 proven 73:15 95:17 96:4	provide 26:23,27 52:28 57:4,14 59:7 61:27 79:6 96:15 99:5 provided 37:21 58:8,14 provides 24:28 29:26 51:4 62:28 79:22 providing 58:11 61:9 provision 50:25 58:4 prudent 88:26 public 1:14 18:24 18:25,26 60:6 63:11,17,23 64:5 64:11 66:28 67:3 67:9,15 68:2,8,17 69:1,11 70:2 73:22 76:1,14,27 85:21 86:18 88:27 89:11 90:4,16,26 91:16,21,26 92:3 93:22 94:17 96:18 96:19 97:6,7,15 98:15,22,25,27 99:2,7,19 100:2,3 100:8,19 publication 72:1 72:10 publicly 19:1 published 30:10 pull 37:13 46:9 50:18	pulled 11:15 74:17 74:20 86:7,10,12 punished 97:28 puppy 87:3 purely 66:26 71:5 purpose 1:17 68:14 purposes 8:5 10:7 34:22 39:6 pursuant 21:27 53:8 put 6:18 10:15,27 16:9 23:6 32:17 33:20 34:10,28 39:21 41:10 42:21 42:21 48:17,19 60:11 62:6 66:11 81:1 82:2 putting 25:22 27:23 28:3 30:6 42:3 44:3 54:17 puzzle 44:8
q			
q&a 24:16 quantification 71:13 quasi 93:2 queen 1:21 question 5:20,23 6:15,20,22,26 7:3 7:4 8:14,18,20 12:13 13:28 14:14 15:26 16:21 23:16 27:13 28:26 34:1 35:23 37:15,19			

[question - records]

29

38:14 39:3,7,8 40:14,17,20,25 44:13,17 45:1,10 45:21 46:2 48:7 48:15 50:12,13,22 50:24 51:11 52:16 52:23 56:12,14,28 57:18 58:2 61:13 67:12 73:11,15,16 77:3,25 82:17 87:4 questions 5:21 8:22 10:27 12:13 15:11 17:24 19:28 21:15 40:8 44:14 44:15 50:5 55:9 56:19 57:10 64:27 66:21 77:24 79:7 80:19 100:6 101:3 quickly 5:1 58:16 73:19 75:9 quite 11:13,18 26:25 29:14 81:15 81:27 87:8 quo 65:12 quote 40:13 93:26 99:9 quotes 26:19 quoting 72:18	101:6,8 raised 6:13,19 7:24 15:26 16:2,3 49:16 54:11 74:15 81:15 85:11 97:1 100:6 raises 40:20 raising 22:16 40:3 random 50:13 range 15:13 rapid 26:10 rapist 90:20 rapists 36:25 76:1 rare 21:8 55:5 rate 40:14 rather 7:9 37:1 53:11 55:25 64:24 rating 9:28 10:1 23:7 32:28 rational 91:21 rationale 29:26 76:6 85:18 95:26 rationales 86:26 92:6 93:9 reach 19:24 25:12 43:13 65:27,27 reached 13:4 reaching 21:1 reaction 35:26 66:2 75:17 96:22 reactionary 82:6 read 31:1,10 33:15 41:24 51:18 55:19 68:4 71:25 reader 31:4	reading 30:21 ready 27:16 44:27 72:15 reaffirm 100:16 real 76:21 reality 22:12 71:12 realize 95:11 really 10:25 14:4 40:3 43:1 46:10 55:13 56:1,4 58:14 61:28 62:2 62:5,27 63:27 64:10 65:14,18 66:22 73:11 79:11 81:10 83:15 84:4 85:25 86:12 95:9 rearguing 83:7 reason 9:13 13:13 14:15 24:28 36:23 63:6 69:21 70:27 78:22 85:17,19 88:12,26 reasons 14:9 17:1 29:10,11 33:10 51:3 55:19 57:8 58:8 60:25 62:27 71:24 80:6 88:20 reassess 61:13 reassessment 64:6 recall 24:25 52:27 recapitulating 49:26 received 6:28 94:15	recent 66:27 recess 44:23 84:24 84:26 recognition 5:22 6:9,25 7:18,24 52:14 53:10,16,20 57:5,19 58:6,17 58:23,26 59:2 65:22 77:13 92:10 92:14 recognize 18:18 39:17 51:20 61:6 recognized 89:25 91:7,28 92:1 recognizing 56:22 recommending 22:26 reconsidering 59:19 record 4:25 9:6,20 17:4,9 18:10 19:15 21:10 22:16 22:24 23:1,5 25:20 26:3,5 29:17,19 32:13 33:20 34:5,8,17 34:22 43:12 44:2 44:9,19 46:4,6,8 46:12,13,18,25 47:13,18,24 48:9 49:1,3 51:3 58:20 64:16 66:8 70:5 80:27 90:16 recording 16:10 records 10:7 34:2
r			
r.s.o. 1:3 rabinowitz 71:17 raise 5:3 6:11 14:20,20 19:5,7 25:17 30:3 43:10			

[recourse - resolved]

30

recourse 47:21 red 10:3 redetermination 65:3 refer 59:10 60:16 reference 15:14,15 17:7 22:5 24:18 27:5 29:27 32:25 33:18 40:9 41:16 46:7 47:8 51:16 81:13 referenced 46:19 79:19 references 26:20 27:3 28:17 34:2 71:26 76:17 referred 16:28 33:9 48:25 81:12 referring 28:8 30:21 refers 31:8,9 32:16 78:9 99:13 reflect 73:14 regard 44:9 regarding 93:26 regardless 39:6 43:19 registrar 85:4 regulation 68:13 95:20 99:22 regulator 97:26 regulators 63:19 68:21 69:12 75:24 94:12,13 regulatory 56:21 61:3 63:8,12,13	63:16 67:5 68:12 70:1 73:20,21,24 73:27 88:3 89:11 89:19 91:8 93:1 94:14,28 96:1 97:16 98:19 99:27 reiterate 67:4 reject 100:15 related 45:1,6,8 45:22 47:7 69:10 relationship 13:17 13:19,20 16:8,11 16:16 69:16 release 11:17 16:1 20:19 21:11 22:22 relevant 13:1 15:23 17:10 25:7 31:24 40:13 51:22 52:15 reliance 92:8 reliant 39:19 relies 68:20 97:24 relitigate 86:19 rely 44:16 89:26 relying 34:1 92:5 96:3 remain 88:16 95:18 96:26 97:8 remainder 81:4,4 81:6 remained 88:15 remains 100:12 remarks 85:10 86:1,5,20 remedies 89:23	remedy 56:12 77:23 79:8,9 remembering 35:14 remit 65:2 remitting 55:26 64:25 removed 26:16 repeat 57:21 70:4 70:6 79:12 95:12 repeated 33:25 76:17 repeatedly 76:4 repeating 66:26 95:9 repetition 64:21 replaces 10:11 reply 3:8 5:16 12:1,5 14:14 55:3 73:6 80:23,25 81:11,18 82:25 83:1,6,15,19 95:9 reporter 101:27 represent 35:6 81:14 representation 47:10 representations 35:22 51:3,6 52:25 represented 21:28 63:1 73:2 representing 24:21 25:14,14 reputation 63:2,4 67:2,19,25 68:7	68:19 69:26 70:10 70:11,26 71:5,10 72:22 73:18 90:21 reputational 63:3 64:14 67:15 70:3 71:22 72:4,7,23 96:16 request 20:4 45:18 57:25 58:3 93:24 requested 45:14 45:14,16 require 22:10 38:18 45:5 57:8 64:5 67:5,6,6 68:28 required 57:19 58:22 59:5 79:14 89:24 98:25 requirement 45:10 53:8 57:6 58:6,28 59:1 requirement's 59:1 requirements 53:19 57:5 69:14 69:16,17 78:11 93:3 requires 38:23 64:14 99:2 requiring 22:7 69:8 90:4 resemble 95:19,20 reserving 101:7 resolved 11:5 64:18
--	--	--	--

resources 40:25 resourcing 45:21 respect 16:11 20:3 49:17 52:20 67:4 73:22 respectful 93:27 97:14 respectfully 87:21 89:21 99:23 100:13 respond 5:14 87:23 96:16 99:6 responded 71:23 respondent 79:25 respondent's 79:24 respondents 1:11 responding 75:7 response 12:27,28 15:10 39:23 54:11 64:8,26 69:28 73:27 74:9 79:11 79:26 82:1,6 84:8 responsibility 69:3 rest 21:25 95:13 restoring 100:8,9 100:9,10 result 20:7,11 23:10 55:17 64:21 71:22 74:13 80:4 82:18 88:7 97:13 resulted 77:3 88:2 resume 5:4 resuming 44:24 84:27	retaliating 73:19 retaliation 81:27 82:3,5,20 retaliatory 63:10 69:28 73:18 81:28 retread 83:19,20 retroactive 89:10 93:11 96:23 retroactively 93:5 97:4 99:8 return 65:12 returned 80:17 revenue 24:19 25:12,15,17 27:27 28:3,6,8,10,11 40:14,16 41:17 revenues 25:10 reverse 82:10,11 review 4:9 7:26,26 14:26 20:23 26:11 26:13 29:11,11 30:23 35:15 36:11 39:26 45:23 52:5 52:8 56:25 75:26 77:3 79:23,26 82:26 91:23 reviewable 92:3 reviewed 20:25 56:23 93:8 reviews 28:16 51:4 revision 45:23 revisit 17:27 rich 27:15 right 4:12 5:6 8:18 9:13,16,22 14:7	17:19,25 23:21 25:4 26:4 27:20 28:1 29:17 32:22 33:2 34:15 35:24 38:5,7,25 43:2 44:7 47:2,3 48:6 52:5,12 53:12 54:5,10,15,27 56:20 59:18 60:13 60:19,21 65:9 80:16 81:7,24 82:24,25 83:9,15 84:7,12 rights 14:11 21:21 23:14 29:5 37:4 37:28 39:28 51:12 ripping 87:15 rise 30:12 41:1 67:7 86:23 risk 9:28 32:28 risks 73:26 road 18:5 55:12 74:25 86:6,9,13 roadmap 79:22 roads 59:26 60:25 roadside 75:5,6,17 86:3,4 robbers 36:25 rocket 25:11 26:21 27:4 role 10:11 11:1 13:15 41:15,23,28 42:4,13 90:8 91:8 92:1 98:14 roles 42:17,17 69:1,11	room 4:14 rope 76:4 route 62:9 rubber 98:12,13 98:14 rule 5:22 89:2,5,8 89:10 90:25 92:17 92:22,24 93:4 99:27 100:12 rules 58:22 59:5 86:5 89:28 92:23 96:4,4 97:18 99:10,11 ruling 80:1 run 32:12,19 40:14 48:26 66:11 runs 46:14 rutman 71:17 72:4
			s
			safeguards 96:9 96:12 sailed 36:22 sake 13:17 sanction 93:16 94:11 95:16 99:12 sanctions 88:1 89:26,27 93:3,12 95:1 96:5 97:18 sandy 2:6 19:13 19:18 24:6,10 27:1,3 45:4 sandy's 20:1 savings 88:6 96:13 97:12

[saying - shortly]

32

saying 8:17 19:1 21:1,26 27:19 30:27 31:5,10,14 31:19 32:8,23 34:11 36:1 40:19 42:11 53:12 62:13 64:12 66:25 71:19 71:24 74:11,20 76:19,19 78:22 83:26 86:9 87:2 100:25 says 29:14,23 30:2 31:3,3,4 32:16 33:16 35:19 49:27 57:24 scam 70:12 scenario 47:25 schedule 22:19 sclerotic 99:18 scope 7:25 62:22 screen 25:19 28:19 script 95:13 scroll 20:1 21:7,9 24:11,15 26:3 scrolling 19:18 21:17,24 scrutiny 90:11,12 100:4,7 seated 4:3 44:25 84:28 sec 29:27 30:3,6 32:4 second 5:10 6:28 11:15 39:27 41:5 50:18 55:10,28	63:6 64:22 69:27 73:18,28 98:1 secretly 89:25 section 29:26 30:18 68:15 92:14 sections 1:12 securities 1:2,10 1:20 4:7,23 5:18 6:6 51:24 52:5 67:6 68:13,14 69:13 91:9,12,23 98:19 100:7 security 22:2,7 see 4:19 5:2,10 6:12 9:17,19,20 15:6,9,11 19:19 19:20 21:24,25 22:15,25 24:17 26:4,9,16 27:2 29:13,16 32:4,7 33:9 34:18 41:9 42:12 43:10 46:22 54:28 63:22 70:14 74:25 77:24 82:15 83:13 97:20,21 101:2 seeing 101:7 seeking 22:26 seem 39:23 seems 38:21 69:4 seen 19:9 26:18 87:6 seep 72:14 sees 78:26 segue 36:7	selectively 95:15 self 73:2 93:1 send 22:27 72:27 73:2 94:15 sends 63:18 senior 94:27 sense 7:10 10:9 sent 26:6 47:6 81:12 82:27 94:12 sentence 28:28 30:20 separate 76:25,26 76:27 september 10:25 10:26 12:17 13:27 21:10,17 23:9,18 25:2,23 28:21 32:17 34:26,26 sequence 26:10 serious 56:27 90:4 94:28 95:18 100:2 100:6 seriously 89:23 served 100:3,8 session 16:24 set 6:28 36:8 37:8 38:10 50:10 53:19 59:27,28 60:7 65:1,2,4,9,14,17 69:20 73:12 92:28 98:26 99:18 sets 23:13 37:27 setting 52:15 53:10 55:21,27 73:11,16	settlement 29:27 30:6 32:5 several 71:24 severance 13:12 severe 70:16 95:15 severity 87:27 share 27:15 41:6 shared 72:25 80:28 82:22 shareholder 14:28 15:13,21,23 22:14 27:21 38:20,28 42:1 45:11 88:15 89:17 94:19 shareholders 42:22 76:17,18,21 87:17 88:5 98:28 98:28 shares 20:14 43:5 96:20 sharing 42:27 43:1,2 shifting 86:25 89:27 92:6 93:9 96:23 ship 25:11 36:22 shithole 70:13 shocked 88:9 100:4 shocking 90:22 shoes 42:1 short 25:1 27:28 58:18,21 shorthand 101:22 shortly 9:17
---	---	---	---

[should've - statement]

33

should've 15:20 15:24 show 17:21 25:8 29:10 85:23,23 88:21 showed 87:21 93:28 94:26 showing 28:19 shown 37:2 47:13 89:8 99:15 shows 73:22 side 30:7 61:20 83:7 significant 15:13 30:5,9 43:16 66:11 significantly 94:28 signs 74:25 silent 96:26 silently 99:3,5 similar 58:25 79:22 81:14 simple 72:22 87:4 simply 32:26 34:8 50:8 55:27 63:28 80:8 91:28 98:14 simultaneously 92:5 96:9 single 60:1 singularly 63:22 sit 55:3 situate 57:10 situation 9:24 10:10 32:24 33:2 80:16,18	six 39:15 skill 101:22 skipped 12:3 skirt 60:15 slightly 82:2,19,20 small 44:4 87:18 smiling 70:14 84:12,14 social 9:21 13:5 24:27 30:11 31:26 33:13,18 34:1,2 34:18 41:9 47:7 solely 30:5 77:5 solutions 19:21 40:15 88:6 89:15 98:28 somebody 42:8 87:28 99:5 somebody's 55:5 soon 25:8 sorry 12:22,24 23:15,26 29:17 37:19,24 43:25 46:16 55:1 57:21 57:22 77:27 79:6 95:7,7,10,11 100:23 sort 8:13 10:12 15:19 18:4 35:26 40:17 48:18 59:3 64:18,19,26 69:23 75:24,25 76:13 88:23 94:15,24 sorts 88:20 sought 6:1 79:25	sound 84:13 sounds 14:13 91:15 source 38:3 space 13:6 spanning 75:19 speak 54:9 67:15 speaking 23:15 53:21 98:13 speaks 78:6 special 69:16,18 specializing 91:8 specific 15:25 16:14 17:19 39:3 39:9 72:7,23 specifically 28:8 38:19 55:15 68:5 71:9 82:15,17 specifics 81:25 spectrum 68:25 speech 75:23 speed 74:17,21 86:6,9 speeders 74:26 speeding 74:17,24 86:9,13 spend 23:27 spent 36:24 spin 82:19 spread 72:16 spring 72:15 squarely 77:19 stage 51:7,9,11 58:9,11 stake 98:23	stakeholders 42:22 stalinist 85:15 stamp 98:14 stamped 34:26 98:12 stamps 34:18 98:13 stand 50:7 standard 49:23 56:25 64:2,2,3 67:11,13,14,17,20 68:1 70:17 71:3,3 71:7 73:11 74:19 standards 7:1 53:15 61:15 63:19 69:7,20 73:12,16 77:14 92:7 93:2,7 94:25 97:17 standing 48:23 standpoint 29:3 49:9,10 stands 33:3 start 19:13 45:1 54:5 55:12 66:25 68:11 83:16 86:10 started 32:2 46:16 starting 42:10,10 70:3 starts 32:21,22 46:18 state 16:18 26:23 37:4 64:15 stated 7:20 statement 6:10 35:27 37:8 68:12
--	--	--	---

72:2,10,14 85:22 95:11 statements 66:2 70:4,7,15,26 74:2 74:8 76:9 87:11 87:13 89:7 94:5 states 23:13 static 32:4 54:10 status 65:12 step 16:12 49:26 49:27 57:13,13 68:6 88:14 98:24 stepped 88:14 steps 37:6 65:1,18 75:3 stern 37:20 stock 9:26 25:16 27:4,12,12,14,15 27:16,25 28:7 40:25 41:6,8,22 42:2,5,24 70:13 82:12,13,14 88:12 88:13,15,17 96:20 stocks 27:24 stop 75:5,6,17,21 86:3,4 stopped 74:23 stopping 20:28 storm 33:5 street 1:21 strength 78:24 strengthened 97:16 strikes 92:25 stronger 89:23	structure 15:21 96:1 stuff 24:24 83:22 subconscious 72:15 subject 8:11 19:20 22:2 44:15 66:21 69:13 80:19 97:28 100:12 submission 6:3,9 8:18 11:26 12:5 12:15,20,24 18:22 34:25 35:13 36:10 37:13 39:17 40:5 40:12,12 44:6,7 48:14 49:25 50:6 50:9 60:27 64:19 64:22 66:22 69:4 73:17 82:3,7 93:27 97:14 submissions 3:6,7 3:8,9 5:4,13,15,17 5:18,20,28 6:2,5,8 6:22,23,25,27,28 7:4,6,15,17,22 8:10 9:12 15:16 18:3 32:2 35:23 37:8 38:1 39:20 40:24 42:6 44:5 44:15 47:23 49:6 49:14 50:14,16,23 51:16,19 55:3,8 55:11,14,19,28 56:4,15,17,24 57:3,10 59:9 60:2 60:3,9,15,19 61:9	61:18,19,24,24 62:5 63:27 66:19 69:5,25 71:8 74:1 74:4,8,16 76:10 76:12 77:14,20,26 79:9,11,18 80:20 80:23 83:28,28 84:2 85:9 95:6 100:26 101:4,11 submit 18:24 40:22 42:25 55:24 68:22 87:21 99:23 submitted 5:20 55:20 subsequent 20:17 28:18,18,20 34:24 43:18 60:5 61:21 66:5 77:18 78:26 subsequently 25:27 31:7 35:4 53:18 subset 17:19 55:13 substance 6:20 7:9 57:4 58:6 81:19 substantial 89:15 95:1 substantively 49:16 subsumed 17:18 suffer 71:21,21 89:28 suffered 62:8,15 66:3 sufficient 45:17 62:24,28 91:11	suggest 25:13 27:22 30:15 suggested 15:18 76:12 suggesting 27:6 suggestions 41:20 suggests 38:26 76:4 suicide 76:5 suitability 9:15 10:1 11:2,6,14 18:28 20:23,25 22:16 36:21,22 45:23 51:19 53:3 55:18,25 56:5,13 56:22 59:16 60:26 60:28 61:14,15 62:18 64:6,8,24 65:5 67:13 68:8 68:10,28 69:9,22 69:25 76:26 77:4 78:11,15 79:15 90:24 92:20 93:6 suitable 18:9 suite 69:13 sum 49:18 summarily 87:11 87:12 summarizing 67:9 78:6 summary 25:1,22 26:9 superior 65:25 76:8 supplemental 5:20 79:9
---	---	--	---

[supplemented - third]

35

supplemented 33:13 support 50:10 65:16 66:9 67:22 75:13 91:2 supportable 49:23 supporting 6:19 55:21 suppose 69:23 supposed 65:10 supposedly 78:12 supreme 72:18 91:7 sure 7:7 9:4 12:8 14:2,13 25:6 27:28 48:23 50:14 51:26 52:1 59:6 83:11 90:12 surmise 36:22 surprised 97:19 surrounding 62:8 suspend 76:24 suspension 77:1,4 switch 69:24 system 98:19 systems 91:3,8 97:6 100:17	tactical 82:4 take 7:5,27 8:8 10:10 13:6 16:12 17:27 22:21 24:3 24:25 27:28 29:7 36:28 39:3,8 44:13,18 45:2 48:11,26 49:18,25 49:27 50:24 52:25 57:13 62:5,10 65:1,17 68:6,27 82:27 83:5,16,17 83:18 84:10,15,20 84:24 taken 12:12 25:7 44:23 60:17 61:15 84:26 takes 22:20 42:9 55:23 talk 19:11 25:13 36:7,8 67:26 86:3 talking 20:21 24:14 26:20 27:21 28:9 40:14 41:25 42:2,27 64:7 71:4 83:25 86:4 87:16 97:1 talks 78:2 tangent 12:12 tat 82:6 tell 8:12 13:18 17:5,6,16,17 19:3 22:12 41:18 46:12 47:13,19 52:21 telling 31:4 38:22	tend 67:27 tendering 56:3 terminated 9:6 13:16,19 termination 13:7 terms 14:25 35:11 49:14 75:22 78:4 territory 83:14 text 20:9 thank 7:11,13 8:1 8:3 20:1 21:23 38:8 44:10,22,28 45:4 46:1 54:20 54:22,23,25 55:7 80:21 82:23 84:11 84:23,28 85:7 100:21,28 101:4 101:10,12 thanks 4:18 57:23 theft 89:17 theme 76:11 85:14 themes 61:28 theoretical 97:10 theories 85:15,28 86:26 theory 20:28 99:3 99:4 thing 6:8 21:8 24:4 40:17 52:21 59:9 81:25 86:2 things 19:1 30:17 30:25 34:9 49:18 54:12 76:19 84:6 85:11 think 5:8,22 6:10 6:14 7:14,15 8:6	9:1,7 10:20,26 12:3 13:6 14:1 16:13,18 22:6 23:1,17,21,24 25:3,4,7 26:16 29:14 30:26,26 31:16 33:3,15 34:11 35:9,18 37:8 38:21 39:6 40:18,27,27 41:8 42:8,15 44:14,18 45:15 46:16,20 48:16 49:2,14,19 50:12 51:8 52:9 52:12,12 53:6,21 54:8,16,18 55:2 56:27 57:3 58:2,3 58:6,9 60:3 61:28 62:2 63:27 65:14 65:18 66:5,17,22 67:11,23 68:11 70:5,6,8,20,26 71:1,7 73:1 74:18 74:22 75:2,15,26 76:2,22 78:13,21 78:22,26 79:21 81:22 82:19 84:6 84:9 85:18 86:3,4 86:8 87:1,7,8 88:12 90:2,13,28 92:11,18,19 94:7 95:8 97:21 101:5 third 11:19 41:7 41:20 56:4 65:3 70:12 77:20,21
t			
t 27:3 36:26 tab 46:18,20,26 47:5,20,23 58:20 80:27 81:7 table 3:1 46:10 81:2			

[thought - true]

36

thought 10:8 23:16 thoughts 82:26 thousands 89:16 89:28 96:12 97:11 threatening 73:21 76:3 82:17 threats 63:8 75:7 three 11:12,22 24:17 33:4 40:27 40:28 65:7 96:27 96:28 97:1 threshold 45:8 61:6 throat 54:4 throw 10:9,14 thugs 36:25,26 ticket 86:13,14 tidier 32:25 33:2 tie 32:23 51:15 tied 27:12 32:24 tiktok 26:15,24 27:17 30:11 42:27 47:12 tiktoks 28:19 time 4:16,16 8:6,6 8:7 9:2,8,22 10:8 12:17 13:8,10,13 15:28 18:17,20 19:19 20:23 23:27 24:12 25:1,5,6 28:20 29:12 30:5 32:5,8,12 33:17 34:25 36:24 38:11 39:3 43:24,25,26 44:11 47:11 48:26	53:2,4,27 56:11 73:9 82:25 83:1 87:3 90:9 timed 55:8 timekeeping 8:4 timeline 12:2,3,4 14:12 timelines 42:3 timely 90:10 times 81:27 timing 5:2 9:16 32:21 tip 28:26 tipping 14:25 38:27 69:17 tit 82:6 today 4:27 5:5 48:24 55:10 56:18 57:2 60:2 61:12 62:1 66:13,20 72:21 77:9 83:2 86:21,27 87:7 94:8 95:24 101:1 101:11 together 23:6 32:23,24 33:20 48:17 93:8 told 8:12 11:5,9,10 17:14 18:3 32:2 33:5,10 42:6 52:13 53:5 54:2 81:21 95:12 tongue 28:27 took 36:18 65:11 75:4,20 98:23	tools 80:15 top 18:3 24:11 30:2 topic 55:16 77:21 topics 55:15 toronto 1:22 total 49:18 totally 85:20,26 touch 56:18 63:24 79:7 touched 9:3 61:28 towards 39:16 56:10 63:8,16 64:9 76:15 77:18 track 51:8 92:7 trade 82:12 traded 96:20 trading 69:17 76:24 transacting 25:14 transaction 10:5 10:28,28 11:10,14 11:17,18 13:11 14:15,19 15:22,25 15:26 19:21,25 20:18 21:13,16 22:1,8,13,17,22 23:4 24:14,20,22 88:17 91:25 96:18 96:21,26,28 98:24 99:7 transaction's 11:11 transcription 101:22,28	transition 63:24 transparent 46:5 treading 83:13 treated 49:3 74:27 75:12 treating 31:14 treatment 97:28 trial 62:6 70:19 71:19,20 tribunal 48:4 55:25 56:6 59:26 62:7,13 64:23,28 66:6,13,18,23 70:24 74:14 75:13 76:12 77:15,16 79:10,27 80:3,15 86:25 89:22 90:5 90:6 93:15 94:26 98:20 100:13,19 tribunal's 65:24 73:13 98:14,16 tribunals 95:21 tried 87:2,7,8 88:12 94:7 trigger 57:15 triggered 14:26 45:10 triggers 43:21 55:20 56:1,2 trite 71:28 troubled 7:6 troubling 88:28 94:24 true 11:11 15:20 42:28 96:24 101:21
--	--	---	--

[truncating - videoconference]

37

truncating 24:24 trust 68:20,23 try 41:22 48:26 55:7 57:4,10,11 84:22 trying 11:27 27:23 39:15 42:23,24 75:24 88:27 tsx 91:13,25,28 tuesday 4:1 79:8 tured 33:28 turn 73:28 85:1 turned 100:5 turning 30:1 tweets 25:9,22 26:14 28:19 34:3 40:13 twice 83:26 97:28 twitter 25:1 26:15 27:11 28:3 two 5:20 7:18 14:9 21:5 23:6,6 27:6 30:25 43:28 51:22 51:24 55:23 58:16 62:27 69:25 76:19 81:10 96:27 tying 27:7 type 63:10,15 types 71:12	unaddressed 40:16 unapproved 97:19 unclear 47:15 uncommon 26:25 undefined 99:9 under 8:20 11:14 15:23 20:6 23:3 35:15 39:26 54:18 55:18 56:6 57:19 58:23 62:25,28 63:11 64:3,13 65:22 66:24 69:10 70:23 71:4 73:22 76:25 77:22 78:28 79:15,17 92:9,14 95:26 underline 43:15 undermine 18:14 92:2 undermines 63:4 63:13 67:18 71:5 73:24 undermining 67:21,28 underpin 98:19 understand 9:13 16:10 17:10 22:11 31:1 43:21 45:19 49:25,26 55:2 92:13 understanding 9:5 33:23,27 45:20 46:27 48:3 59:11 74:10	undisclosed 41:4 unfair 62:20 63:10 89:19 92:16 97:28 98:5 unfairly 75:13 99:25 unfairness 62:8,10 62:15 65:17 66:3 74:18 75:6,22 92:6 97:18 unfavourable 63:9 70:1 unfolded 97:25 unfortunate 72:16 unfortunately 47:14 unique 11:12,19 11:22 unlawful 75:5 unlimited 90:8 unmistakably 91:24 unquestionably 74:5 unquote 93:26 99:9 unsuitability 8:16 14:17,26 23:7,10 24:1 32:18 35:12 41:2 42:15 43:11 78:14 79:1 88:4 94:22 unsuitable 13:21 18:18 28:22 30:1 31:6,11,13,23 42:8 49:20 50:3	62:26 65:13 66:1 66:24 77:22 78:23 82:11 86:16 90:9 92:15 93:16,24 96:14 97:5 99:5 untidy 49:21 unusual 5:27 6:4 unwanted 73:27 unwind 88:16 unwise 75:6 upheld 89:5,9 92:17,24 uphold 89:27 upholding 89:1 use 36:4 39:15 40:10 78:21 85:17 93:5 used 8:5 81:26,27 82:4 86:3 99:10 99:10 useful 24:28 using 25:5
u			v
ultimately 66:13 79:14 80:3 89:9 89:27 unacceptable 56:8			v 4:6 71:17 91:12 vacuum 16:16 value 43:5 89:17 variation 21:16 various 24:2 31:8 41:9 42:17 vector 18:3 verse 31:8 version 29:18 video 4:15 27:17 videoconference 80:11

[videos - wrongs]

38

videos 26:15,25 28:20 42:27 47:12 view 14:24 36:28 55:6 58:14 59:4 61:21 62:1,7,16 63:18,21 64:10,14 66:9,14,27 67:23 69:8 80:14 82:10 82:18 viewed 63:10 views 62:10 vindicate 62:7 vingoe 95:23 virtual 79:25 80:5 voice 19:5,8 volume 1:18 voted 96:21 voting 21:21 vu 91:17	67:4 68:6,27 71:8 73:28 76:22 77:9 79:12 83:16,18,20 84:13,15 85:11 86:1 88:16 90:12 90:12,18 100:7 101:10 wanted 8:12 14:20 18:3 34:6 39:20 40:9 50:15 58:15 59:7 88:14 wants 5:14 6:21 19:5 20:26 64:17 101:6 warn 96:15 warning 87:22 94:15 99:6 warnings 93:20 warrant 70:16,27 warrants 60:13 washes 37:5 40:1 waste 25:6 watch 27:15 way 6:19 7:23 13:18 35:6 40:6 42:11,24 46:11 48:19 61:27 62:13 62:17 63:12 66:17 66:17 70:24 75:5 79:1 82:2 ways 60:21 61:7 75:1,6 we've 19:9 22:27 23:2 25:19 31:12 31:12 32:26 36:9 36:12 37:2 39:19	39:25 40:7 47:24 50:6,25 51:24,25 51:25 52:13,16,21 57:3 64:7,26 65:28 83:7,27 86:27 89:8 weaker 78:22 wealth 31:26 wearing 27:25 website 41:24 wednesday 65:7 week 43:14,14 56:16 86:5 weeks 86:18,18 93:21 94:16,22,22 94:22,23 96:28 99:8 weight 7:22 weighting 77:6 went 11:20 24:26 25:21 31:25 52:5 96:20 west 1:21 whichever 70:24 white 78:27 wide 68:24 wildly 96:6 willing 41:18 winner 26:21 wiped 89:17 wonder 76:8 wondering 32:19 word 77:8 78:21 81:27 82:5 words 36:5 43:8 70:18 76:5,5 89:9	98:15 work 14:23 37:21 87:8 working 46:10 world 8:16 10:28 11:18 14:16 19:21 25:10 26:24 27:5 27:7 28:3,11 33:18 38:18 40:15 42:13 56:8 70:12 76:16 88:5,18 89:14 98:28 worried 90:21 worse 75:16 worst 70:13 90:17 worth 76:18 would've 6:17 11:2,5,8,9,9 14:16 14:18,19 16:2 23:4,7,8 35:1 46:27 47:21 53:9 88:2 writing 31:15,16 51:19 written 5:27 7:5 7:14,21 37:8 38:1 40:12,12,24 50:15 51:15 55:14 56:15 56:23 57:3,9 60:2 69:5 74:8 77:26 79:9 83:28 wrong 21:19 43:2 75:8,18 86:11 94:9 wrongs 74:11
w			
waechter 1:26 4:13 70:20 walk 5:1 14:12 15:8 44:19 46:4 walking 45:2 walks 49:14 wallstreetreport... 30:11 want 5:3,25 10:2 11:26 13:11 14:5 19:11 24:3,4,28 28:1 29:1 30:27 39:7 40:16 42:4 45:20 50:22 59:9 61:12 63:6 65:9			

[x - ziaian]

x
x 25:23 30:12
y
y 27:9
yeah 4:26 5:19 7:5
7:19 12:10 23:26
33:22 34:10 37:18
37:24 46:22 49:11
51:13 59:25 60:14
73:4,7 77:28 78:5
84:8,16,18 95:10
year 66:7
years 90:18,21,22
youtube 28:20
yule 5:16
z
z 79:20
zero 87:26,27
88:17
ziaian 79:20 80:10