# STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SECURITIES DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF DETERMINING whether there has been a violation of the Securities Act of Washington by:	Order No. S-20-2957-22-CO01 CONSENT ORDER
David Snavely (CRD 2030866),	) ) )
Respondent.	) )

## INTRODUCTION

On December 7, 2021, the Securities Administrator of the Securities Division of the Department of Financial Institutions (Securities Division) issued a Statement of Charges and Notice of Intent to Enter an Order to Deny Registrations, Impose a Fine, and Recover Costs (Statement of Charges), Order Number S-20-2957-21-SC01, against David Snavely, CRD No. 2030866. Pursuant to the Securities Act of Washington, RCW 21.20, the Securities Division and David Snavely hereby enter into this Consent Order in settlement of the matters set forth in the Statement of Charges and as alleged below. Respondent David Snavely neither admits nor denies the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as stated below.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

### Respondent

1. Between April 2011 and March 2020 David Snavely was employed at Cetera Advisors, LLC (Cetera). His employment at Cetera was terminated after Cetera received allegations that he sold unsuitable annuities as part of replacement transactions. His Central Registration Depository (CRD) number is 2030866.

## Nature of the Conduct

2. Snavely's securities business was focused on retirement income planning, and the majority of his securities business was in variable annuity sales and exchanges. From February 2017 to September 2019, while employed at Cetera, Snavely recommended that 25 Washington residents purchase or exchange 36 variable annuities. Snavely's customers were seniors and ranged in age from 61 to 80. Some of Snavely's

13

16

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

variable annuity recommendations were unsuitable. Snavely received approximately \$373,862 in commissions as a result of these transactions.

# Suitability

- 3. Because of the cost and complexity associated with a variable annuity, a securities salesperson must exercise particular care to ensure that the purchase or exchange of one is suitable for a customer before recommending it. FINRA rule 2111 requires a salesperson to have a reasonable basis to believe that a transaction is suitable for a customer. To fulfill the suitability obligation, the representative must understand the potential risks and rewards associated with the recommended security or strategy and how they impact the customer. In at least two of the transactions, Snavely did not fully understand all of the restrictions of the recommended variable annuity. In one situation, Snavely recommended that the customer exchange a variable annuity for an annuity that did not allow annuitization for two years. Snavely did not realize that there was a restriction until after the annuity had been exchanged. In another situation, Snavely placed a customer's funds in a fixed account intending to switch back to the variable accounts in a relatively short amount of time. Despite knowing that the annuity contract restricted funds from being switched out of the fixed account for a 12 month period, Snavely did not believe that the insurance company would enforce this restriction.
- 4. A factor to be considered in determining the suitability of a variable annuity is whether the customer has a need for liquidity. Variable annuities are considered long-term investments with limited liquidity. They have a deferred sales charge, also known as a surrender fee, which penalizes the customer for making withdrawals or surrendering the policy during the surrender period except in limited circumstances. The surrender period usually ranges from 5 to 10 years.
- 5. In at least two instances, customers needed liquidity to pay living expenses. When the customers' liquidity needs increased to an amount greater than that allowed by the rider on their existing annuities, these customers had to surrender the variable annuities and incurred a penalty. When this happened, Snavely nonetheless recommended that they exchange their annuities for another annuity with a longer surrender period instead of a more liquid investment product.

- 6. Other suitability considerations under FINRA rule 2330(b)(1)(B)(i) are whether a customer would incur a new surrender charge, be subject to a new surrender period, lose existing benefits, or be subject to increased fees. Snavely had a pattern of recommending his customers surrender a variable annuity that he sold to the customer to purchase another variable annuity. In total, twenty-three exchanges Snavely recommended involved variable annuities that were still in the surrender period. In these 23 transactions, customers paid \$222,179 for surrendering the variable annuities prematurely. In 15 transactions, Snavely customers were subject to a surrender charge, an increased surrender period, and higher fees. Four of these customers paid a surrender fee of 5% or more. Two customers paid a surrender fee to exchange their annuities when there was only about a year left in the surrender period.
- 7. In some cases, Snavely recommended a series of transaction, which resulted in customers incurring more than one surrender fee on the same money. There were six customers who paid more than one surrender fee on the same money.

## **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

- 1. The offer and sale of variable annuities constitutes the offer and sale of a security as defined in RCW 21.20.005(10) and (12).
- 2. The offer and sale of said securities failed to comply with FINRA Rules 2111 and 2330(b)(1)(B)(i). Pursuant to RCW 21.20.110(1)(b), such conduct is grounds for denying registration as a securities salesperson and an investment adviser representative, imposing a fine, and charging costs.
- 3. The offer and sale of said securities were made in violation of RCW 21.20.702. Pursuant to RCW 21.20.110(1)(b), such conduct is grounds for denying registration as a securities salesperson and an investment adviser representative, imposing a fine, and charging costs.

11

9

13

19

23

21

25

Based upon the foregoing and finding it in the public interest:

### **CONSENT ORDER**

IT IS AGREED AND ORDERED that Respondent David Snavely, and their agents and employees, shall cease and desist from violating RCW 21.20.702, the suitability section of the Securities Act of Washington.

IT IS AGREED AND ORDERED that Respondent David Snavely shall not make application for, nor be granted, any investment adviser, investment adviser representative, broker-dealer, or securities salesperson registration for a period of two years, such period having been completed on April 28, 2022 and prior to the entry of this Consent Order.

IT IS AGREED AND ORDERED that before any application by Respondent David Snavely for registration as an investment adviser representative or securities salesperson will be approved, Respondent's sponsoring firm must provide the Securities Division with an acceptable plan of supervision that is specific to Snavely's securities business. Such plan must be in place for at least two years, and Securities Division must be notified before the plan is modified or terminated.

IT IS AGREED AND ORDERED that Respondent David Snavely shall be liable for and pay a fine in the amount of \$15,000 on or before entry of this Consent Order.

IT IS AGREED AND ORDERED that Respondent David Snavely shall be liable for and pay costs in the amount of \$1,000 on or before entry of this Consent Order.

IT IS AGREED AND ORDERED that this order is not a final order based on violations of any laws or regulations that prohibit fraudulent, manipulative or deceptive conduct.

IT IS AGREED that this order may not be presented as evidence in any legal proceeding in civil courts or arbitration, except by the Securities Division in actions arising from or relating to a violation of this order.

IT IS AGREED that Respondent David Snavely enters into this Consent Order freely and voluntarily and with a full understanding of its terms and significance.

IT IS AGREED that the Securities Division has jurisdiction to enter this order.

1	IT IS AGREED that in consideration of	of the foregoing, the Respondent waives the	ir right to a hearing
2	and to judicial review of this matter pursuant to Chapter 34.05 RCW.		
3	WILLFUL VIOLATION OF THIS ORDER IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE.		
4			
5	Signed this <u>12<sup>th</sup></u> day of <u>Sep</u>	otember 2022	
	Signed this <u>12</u> day of <u>Sep</u>	2022.	
6 7	Signed by:	Approved as to form by:	
8			
9	/s/ David Snavely, Individually	John A. Bender, Attorney for Re	espondent
10			
11	SIGNED and ENTERED this <u>28<sup>th</sup></u>	day of <u>September</u>	2022.
12			
13		/s/	
14		William M. Beatty	
15			
16			
17	- 1000 SAIA-	Securities Administrator	
18			
19	Approved by:	Presented by:	
20			
21	/s/		
	Brian Guerard	/s/ Holly Mack-Kretzler	
22	Chief of Enforcement	Financial Legal Examiner Super	rvisor
23			
24			
25			
	CONCENT ODDED	E DEDARMANT OF TH	NAME THOUTSTON