1	CHARLES E. CANTER (Cal. Bar No. 263197)							
2	Email: canterc@sec.gov SARAH S. NILSON (Cal. Bar No. 254574)							
3	Email: nilsons@sec.gov YOLANDA OCHOA (Cal. Bar No. 267993)							
4	Email: ochoay@sec.gov							
	Attorneys for Plaintiff							
5	Katharine Zoladz, Co-Regional Director							
6	Securities and Exchange Commission Katharine Zoladz, Co-Regional Director Gary Y. Leung, Regional Trial Counsel 444 S. Flower Street, Suite 900 Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (323) 965-3998 Facsimile: (213) 443-1904							
7	Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (323) 965-3998							
8	Facsimile: (213) 443-1904							
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT							
10	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA							
11								
12								
13	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE	Case No.						
14	COMMISSION,							
15	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT						
16	VS.							
17	SHELDON RICHARD BENTLEY,							
18	a/k/a RICK BENTLEY,							
19	Defendant.							
20		l.						
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								

Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") files this complaint against Defendant Sheldon Richard Bentley ("Bentley") and alleges:

JURISDICTION

- 1. The Court has jurisdiction over this action under Sections 20(b), 20(d)(1), and 22(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(b), 77t(d)(1) & 77v(a), and Sections 21(d)(1), 21(d)(3)(A), 21(e), and 27(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 78u(d)(1), 78u(d)(3)(A), 78u(e) & 78aa(a).
- 2. Defendant has, directly or indirectly, made use of the means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, of the mails, or of the facilities of a national securities exchange in connection with the transactions, acts, practices, and courses of business alleged in this complaint.
- 3. Venue is proper in this district under Section 22(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77v(a) and Section 27(a) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78aa(a), because Bentley resides in this district.

SUMMARY

- 4. This securities fraud enforcement action involves a scheme to conceal paid promotion of a securities offering from September 2020 through mid-2021.
- 5. Specifically, Bentley, on behalf of his company, Cloudastructure, Inc., entered into a sham agreement with a Canadian entity ("Entity 1"), which failed to disclose that investor funds would be used to pay William Mikula ("Mikula") to tout Cloudastructure's securities offering under Regulation A ("Reg A"). Shortly after Bentley executed the agreement, Mikula authored articles promoting the Cloudastructure offering. These articles falsely stated that they were based on independent research and represented to would-be investors that neither the newsletter publishing the articles nor the authors received any compensation for the recommendation. In fact, Bentley provided at least \$350,000 in lavish entertainment and travel for Mikula and his associates, among others, and caused Cloudastructure to

pay Entity 1 at least \$650,000 in cash, a portion of which was distributed to Mikula in exchange for his promotional articles.

- 6. Through his conduct, Bentley violated the antifraud provisions of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b) and 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5, and the antifraud provisions of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77q(a).
- 7. The SEC seeks permanent injunctions against future violations of Exchange Act Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 thereunder and Securities Act Section 17(a), a civil penalty against Bentley, and an order barring Bentley from serving as an officer or director of a public company.

THE DEFENDANT

8. **Sheldon Richard Bentley (a/k/a Rick Bentley),** age 55, is a resident of Truckee, California. Bentley founded Cloudastructure in 2003 and has served as Cloudastructure's chief executive officer and as a director of the company's board since that time.

RELATED ENTITIES AND INDIVIDUALS

- 9. Cloudastructure, Inc. ("Cloudastructure") is a cloud-controlled video surveillance company incorporated in Delaware with its principal place of business in Miami, Florida. During the relevant period, Cloudastructure was headquartered in San Mateo, California. Cloudastructure's offering statement for an offering of securities under Reg A was qualified in July 2020. Cloudastructure filed post-qualification amendments that were qualified in May 2021 and May 2022. Mikula promoted Cloudastructure between September 2020 and mid-2021.
- 10. **Jonathan William Mikula, a/k/a/ William Mikula,** is a resident of Georgia, who, from at least 2019 through late 2021, was chief analyst and author of Palm Beach Venture, a newsletter published by Palm Beach Research Group. Mikula has been twice enjoined by federal courts from violating the federal securities laws: *SEC v. Phoenixsurf.com, et al.*, Case No. 2:07-cv-04765-JSL, ECF No. 6 (C.D. Cal.

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22 23
- 24
- 25
- 26 27
- 28

- Aug. 14, 2007); SEC v. Mikula, Case No. 1:08-cv-03097-BBM, ECF No. 95 (N.D. Ga. Sept. 24, 2009). In connection with false statements he made to the SEC in the
- 2007 case, Mikula pled guilty to providing false information to a federal agency, in
- violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001. United States v. Mikula, Case No. 2:10-cr-00649-DSF,
- ECF No. 18 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 19, 2011). In 2022, the SEC filed another enforcement
- action against Mikula and others arising out of the some of the same conduct at issue
- in this case. SEC v. Mikula, 2:22-cv-07096-SB-E (C.D. Cal.).
- 11. Christian Fernandez a/k/a Christian Crockwell is a Mexican citizen residing in Georgia. Fernandez funneled a portion of the payments to Mikula in exchange for Mikula's Cloudastructure promotion. Fernandez is a defendant in the SEC's action against Mikula.
- Amit Raj Beri a/k/a Raj Beri is an Australian national residing in 12. Florida. Beri is a defendant in the SEC's action against Mikula. Beri attempted to act as a middleman between Cloudastructure and Mikula with respect to the promotion.
- Palm Beach Research Group is operated by Common Sense 13. Publishing, LLC, a subsidiary of Market Wise, Inc., a U.S. public company. Palm Beach Research Group publishes Palm Beach Venture, a subscription-based newsletter that focuses on opportunities for investors to invest in securities offered under Reg A. Mikula was one of two attributed authors of the Palm Beach Venture newsletter.

THE ALLEGATIONS

- Cloudastructure was qualified to conduct a securities offering under Reg 14. A in July 2020.
- 15. Bentley first learned about Palm Beach in late 2019 when, as part as his fundraising efforts, he was searching for an investor newsletter that would feature Cloudastructure and recommend it to its subscribers.
- By early 2020, Bentley was pitching Cloudastructure to Mikula in hopes 16. of getting Palm Beach to promote the company.

- 17. Mikula connected Bentley with Beri so that Beri could help Cloudastructure with "ironing out the logistics of making a Palm Beach feature happen." In early February 2020, Bentley flew to Miami to meet with Mikula and Beri to discuss such a promotion.
- 18. Soon after the Miami meeting, Beri began negotiating a consulting agreement with Bentley, representing that Palm Beach would promote the company if Cloudastructure paid Beri 5% of investor funds raised, which Beri intended to share with Mikula.
- 19. Beri's negotiations were not successful because Bentley thought Beri's proposed percentage was too high, so by March 2020, Bentley resumed dealing directly with Mikula in his efforts to get Palm Beach to promote Cloudastructure.
- 20. In July 2020 and August 2020, Bentley flew to Las Vegas and Atlanta to meet in person with Mikula and Fernandez to discuss the promotion. During the August 2020 meeting, Mikula recorded interviews with Bentley discussing Cloudastructure.
- 21. In early September 2020, Fernandez, at Mikula's instruction, contacted Bentley and reopened discussions about a "consulting agreement." Fernandez proposed that Cloudastructure would pay Fernandez less than what Beri had previously demanded.
- 22. Bentley knew Fernandez was Mikula's friend and associate when he negotiated the agreement.
- 23. On September 4, 2020, Bentley, on behalf of Cloudastructure, executed the "consulting agreement" with Fernandez, who was acting on behalf of Entity 1, a Canadian company.
- 24. Four days later, on September 8, 2020, Bentley received an email with a Palm Beach article by Mikula promoting Cloudastructure's Reg A offering.
- 25. The email and article included the false disclaimer that neither Palm Beach nor its affiliates were compensated for the endorsement. Bentley forwarded the

article to others.

- 26. On the same day he received the email and article, Bentley emailed Cloudastructure's accounting group asking that the Entity 1 be paid promptly.
- 27. Pursuant to the agreement, Cloudastructure issued eight payments totaling \$650,000 to Entity 1 from September 2020 through August 2021.
- 28. The "consulting agreement" between Entity 1 and Cloudastructure was a sham. Neither Fernandez nor Entity 1 provided any meaningful consulting services to Cloudastructure.
- 29. Instead, the agreement was a means of concealing Mikula's compensation for his promotion of Cloudastructure.
- 30. In addition to negotiating the agreement, Bentley (1) advised Entity 1 on how to prepare consulting invoices so that they would "sail through" without raising questions from Cloudastructure's Chief Financial Officer; (2) approved all the invoices from Entity 1; and (3) instructed that the company pay all the Entity 1 invoices.
- 31. Entity 1 paid about 20% of the \$650,000 from Cloudastructure to Mikula in two tranches: On or about July 26, 2021, Entity 1 disbursed about \$100,000 as a "dividend" to a Mexican entity, Goldentown Consulting SA DE CV ("Goldentown"), on or about July 26, 2021, and disbursed about \$28,500 to Goldentown on or about September 8, 2022. Goldentown then "loaned" the funds to Mikula, with no expectation of repayment.
- 32. Entity 1 also used funds from Cloudastructure to pay monthly American Express bills for an account nominally in the name of Mikula's personal assistant (whose salary was also paid by Entity 1) but which was in fact used to cover travel and other charges incurred by Mikula.
- 33. In addition to compensating Mikula with cash paid to Entity 1, Bentley lavishly entertained Mikula and Fernandez during the Cloudastructure promotion.
 - 34. From September 2020 through mid-2021, Cloudastructure, at Bentley's

direction, spent over \$350,000 in connection with entertaining Mikula and his associates, among others. These lavish entertainment expenses included hotel accommodations, meals and bottle service at clubs, yacht rentals, the engagement of entertainers, and other such expenses.

- 35. Bentley understood that entertaining Mikula extravagantly was a condition to getting Palm Beach to feature Cloudastructure. His advice to another company's CEO who was working on getting Mikula to agree to promote his company was "wine and dine [Mikula] lavishly" and "never, ever, let them pick up the check."
- 36. Throughout 2020 and 2021, Cloudastructure filed Reg A offering circulars with the Commission, which outlined how investor funds would be used and disclosed that operating expenses include consulting costs.
- 37. Bentley reviewed, approved, and held ultimate authority for the content of these offering circulars used to raise investor funds.
- 38. The offering circulars did not disclose that some of the consulting costs were, in fact, payments for Mikula's promotion, and this omission made the offering circulars false and misleading.
- 39. The misleading omissions were material because investors would have wanted to know that the articles recommending Cloudastructure's offering were bought and paid for with investor funds.
- 40. Cloudastructure raised approximately \$30 million in investor funds through Mikula's promotion.
- 41. Bentley knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that Cloudastructure's payments to Entity 1 were to compensate Mikula for his promotional articles.
- 42. Bentley's conduct regarding the sham agreement and the payments to Entity 1 was also unreasonable and therefore negligent.
- 43. Bentley knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that the offering circulars were misleading by omitting that investor funds were used to pay for Mikula's

2 3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

14

13

16

17

15

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

26

25

27 28 promotion.

44. Bentley's conduct in omitting to disclose in the offering circulars that investor funds were used to pay Mikula was also unreasonable and therefore negligent.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Fraud in Connection with the Purchase or Sale of Securities Violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5

- 45. The SEC realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 44 above.
- Bentley—with Mikula and Fernandez—carried out a scheme to defraud 46. through the combination of their deceptive statements and actions concerning the Cloudastructure offering. Throughout the promotional campaign, Bentley knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that Cloudastructure was paying for Mikula's promotion through the consulting agreement with Entity 1 and by lavishly entertaining Mikula.
- In addition, Bentley knowingly or recklessly misled and deceived 47. investors by omitting to disclose in the offering circulars that investor funds were used to pay Mikula.
- 48. By engaging in the conduct described above, Bentley, directly or indirectly, in connection with the purchase or sale of securities, by the use of means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or the mails, (a) employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud; (b) made untrue statements of material facts or omitted to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; and (c) engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon other persons, including purchasers and sellers of securities.
- Bentley, with scienter, employed devices, schemes, or artifices to 49. defraud; made untrue statements of material facts or omitted to state material facts necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances

under which they were made, not misleading; and engaged in acts, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon other persons, including purchasers and sellers of securities by the conduct described in detail above.

50. By engaging in the conduct described above, Bentley violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b), and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Fraud in the Offer or Sale of Securities Violations of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act

- 51. The SEC realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 44 above.
- 52. In the offer or sale of the Cloudastructure securities, Bentley—with Mikula and Fernandez—carried out a scheme to defraud, through the combination of their deceptive statements and actions concerning the Cloudastructure offering. Throughout the promotional campaign, Bentley knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that Cloudastructure was paying for Mikula's promotion through the consulting agreement with Entity 1 and by lavishly entertaining Mikula.
- 53. In addition, Bentley knowingly or recklessly misled and deceived investors by omitting to disclose in the offering circulars that investor funds were used to pay Mikula.
- 54. By engaging in the conduct described above, Bentley, directly or indirectly, in the offer or sale of securities, by use of the means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by use of the mails (a) employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud; (b) obtained money or property by means of untrue statements of a material fact or by omitting to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; and (c) engaged in transactions, practices, or

courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser.

- 55. Bentley, with scienter, employed devices, schemes, or artifices to defraud; with scienter and/or negligence, obtained money or property by means of untrue statements of a material fact or by omitting to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading; and with scienter and/or negligence, engaged in transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser.
- 56. By reason of the foregoing, Bentley violated, and unless restrained and enjoined will continue to violate, Sections 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the SEC respectfully requests that the Court:

I

Issue findings of fact and conclusions of law that Bentley committed the alleged violations.

II.

Issue judgment, in forms consistent with Rule 65(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, permanently enjoining Bentley and his officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with him, who receive actual notice of the judgment by personal service or otherwise, and each of them, from violating Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b) and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5.

III.

Issue judgments, in forms consistent with Rule 65(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, permanently enjoining Bentley and his officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and those persons in active concert or participation with

Case 2:23-cv-02119-JDP Document 1 Filed 09/27/23 Page 11 of 11

1	him, who receive actual notice of the judgment by personal service or otherwise, and					
2	each of them, from violating Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §77q(a).					
3	IV.					
4	Order Bentley to pay civil penalties under Section 20(d) of the Securities Act,					
5	15 U.S.C. § 77t(d), and Section 21(d)(3) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(3).					
6	V.					
7	Enter an order against Bentley, pursuant to Section 20(e) of the Securities Act,					
8	15 U.S.C. § 77t(e), and Sections 2l(d)(2) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)(2),					
9	prohibiting him from acting as an officer or director of any issuer that has a class of					
10	securities registered pursuant to Section 12 of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78 ℓ or					
11	that is required to file reports pursuant to Section 15(d) of the Exchange Act,					
12	15 U.S.C. § 78o(d).					
13	VI.					
14	Retain jurisdiction of this action in accordance with the principles of equity and					
15	the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in order to implement and carry out the terms of					
16	all orders and decrees that may be entered, or to entertain any suitable application or					
17	motion for additional relief within the jurisdiction of this Court.					
18	VII.					
19	Grant such other and further relief as this Court may determine to be just and					
20	necessary.					
21	Dated: September 27, 2023					
22	/s/ Charles E. Canter					
23	Charles E. Canter					
24	Sarah S. Nilson Yolanda Ochoa					
25	Attorneys for Plaintiff					
26	Securities and Exchange Commission					
27						

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the first an

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS	DEFENDANTS			
Securities & Exc	change Commission		Sheldon Richar	Sheldon Richard Bentley, a/k/a Rick Bentley			
(b) County of Residence of (E.	of First Listed Plaintiff XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CAS	SES)	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Nevada (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.				
Charles Canter, SEC, 444 S. Flo	Address, and Telephone Number, Sarah Nilson, & Yola wer Street, Suite 900 (323) 965-3998	anda Ochoa	Attorneys (If Known) Emily Berry Ehrlich Craig LL 510-548-3605	Emily Berry Ehrlich Craig LLP, 803 Hearst Ave, Berkeley, CA 94710,			
II. BASIS OF JURISD		One Box Only)	II. CITIZENSHIP OF PI	RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff		
U.S. Government Plaintiff	S. Government 3 Federal Question		(For Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF Citizen of This State 1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State				
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship	o of Parties in Item III)	_	2 Incorporated and P of Business In A	Another State		
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 Foreign Nation	66		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT				Click here for: Nature of S			
CONTRACT	TOF	PERSONAL INJURY	FORFEITURE/PENALTY 625 Drug Related Seizure	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES		
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgmen 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	of Property 21 USC 881 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Management Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application 840 Trademark 880 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016 SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit (15 USC 1681 or 1692) 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act 490 Cable/Sat TV X 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
	moved from 3 R	Remanded from	4 Reinstated or 5 Transfe Anothe (specify	r District Litigation			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(b), 77t	(d)(1) & 77v(a); 15 U.S.C.	filing (Do not cite jurisdictional stat §§ 78u(d)(1), 78u(d)(3)(A), 78u(e				
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complete COMPLAINT: UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. JURY DEMAND: Yes X							
VIII. RELATED CASI	(See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER			
DATE Sep 27, 2023		SIGNATURE OF ATTO /s/ Charles E. Canter	RNEY OF RECORD				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AI	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	DGE		

Case 2:23-cy-02119-JDP Document 1-1 Filed 09/27/23 Page 2 of 2 INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box. Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
 - Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.

Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service.
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.

 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.