

Title: Michael Burry is a witness in a formal investigation.

Author: \_Contrive\_

Created 2021-09-25 00:22:49 UTC

Permalink: /r/DDintoGME/comments/puvum6/michael\_burry\_is\_a\_witness\_in\_a\_formal/

Url: [https://www.reddit.com/r/DDintoGME/comments/puvum6/michael\\_burry\\_is\\_a\\_witness\\_in\\_a\\_formal/](https://www.reddit.com/r/DDintoGME/comments/puvum6/michael_burry_is_a_witness_in_a_formal/)

Most recent update: Edit 5: seems to have referenced this possibly?

<https://www.sec.gov/news/studies/2009/oig-509/exhibit-0292.pdf> in the re? Talks about failing to get best execution in a case from 2005. I need a cup of coffee and I can try and read through it but it seems relevant.

DD based on this tweet

<https://twitter.com/michaeljburry/status/1441484243389927428?s=21>

Backup link

<https://twitter.com/BurryArchive/status/1441485742866243585?s=20>

Rule 203.8 “service of subpoenis issued in formal investigative proceedings shall be effected in the manner prescribed by rule 232(c) or the commissions rules of practice, § 201.232(c). “

Scion is being served a subpoena from a current formal investigative proceeding.

~~That last rule reads “(a) Availability; procedure. In connection with any hearing ordered by the Commission or any deposition permitted under § 201.233, a party may request the issuance of subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses at such depositions or at the designated time and place of hearing, and subpoenas requiring the production of documentary or other tangible evidence returnable at any designated time or place. Unless made on the record at a hearing, requests for issuance of a subpoena shall be made in writing and served on each party pursuant to § 201.150. A person whose request for a subpoena has been denied or modified may not request that any other person issue the subpoena.”~~ this was not invoked sorry, c was.

“(c) Service. Service shall be made pursuant to the provisions of § 201.150(b) through (d). The provisions of this paragraph (c) shall apply to the issuance of subpoenas for purposes of investigations, as required by 17 CFR 203.8, as well as depositions and investigations”

Amongst a few things, just honestly look up the rule numbers and read em.

~~201.233 But does that mean gamestop could've subpoenaed him? Or is “party” someone else. I don't believe this anymore lol am dumb~~

Edit:

This is the overall hierarchy, this is above what I said earlier, but all of this applies because 203.8 is invoked.

“17 CFR § 203.4 Applicatiability of §§ 203.4 through 203.8

(a) Sections 203.4 through 203.8 shall be APPLICABLE to a WITNESS who is sworn in a proceeding pursuant to commission order for investigation or examination, such proceeding being hereinafter referred to as a formal investigative proceeding”

(b) Formal Investigative proceedings may be held before the commission, before one or more of it's members, or before any officer designated by it for the purpose of taking testimony of witnesses and received other evidence. The term officer conducting the investigation shall mean any of the foregoing.”

My opinion it was his large buy and sell maybe him testing the waters? Now they wanna have on record

the evidence he found.

Edit 2:

"17 CFR § 203.5 Non public formal investigative proceedings.

§ 203.5 Non-public formal investigative proceedings.

Unless otherwise ordered by the Commission, all formal investigative proceedings shall be non-public."

That last one is just mean I know it's an ongoing trial but I feel like we should see:(

\*\*Edit of post: I didn't link the tweet like an edit\*\*

Edit of post two: it is my current belief that he is either the first witness or first witness to make it known to the public, but that means that the SEC has a legitimate formal investigation into the events around gamestop short fuckus, they are actively procuring witnesses. I believe that this investigation is NON PUBLIC meaning, at least for now all we're gonna see and hear is what the good papa rc above tells us.

if they're getting scion as a witness color me and my tits jacked, are they actually listening to people with knowledge? Hopefully soon we'll find out, but I wouldn't be surprised if we find out by criminal charges being filed. This last edit is just speculation and my theory here but like, all the legos are on the floor and they paint a pretty clear picture in my head.

Edit three: According to "17 CFR § 203.2 - Information obtained in investigations and examinations" all info and documents in the course of investigation or examination unless made a matter of public record shall be deemed non public BUT the commission lets officials from some branches clue in lower level employees if I'm reading that right. \*\*I think the important wording here is "unless a made a matter of public record".\*\*

\*\*EDIT FOUR: Can someone take a look at "17 CFR § 240.24c-1 - Access to non public information" and tell me exactly how retail got fucked here? Like it looks like everyone and their dog can have access to no public info. Can any of the infamous criminal slackjawas have access to this? I think they are a (2) self regulatory organization right? Am I reading this right? According to a commentor it's up to their discretion\*\*

Scary testifying or whistle blowing if the one who are cheating can see what's goin on.

Edit 5: seems to have referenced this possibly?

<https://www.sec.gov/news/studies/2009/oig-509/exhibit-0292.pdf> in the re? Talks about failing to get best execution in a case from 2005.

Update- I'm gonna chill here, I'll still be replying but I feel like some apes out there should be looking here. I stuck my head into the blender for a lil too long and all that legalese makes my smooth brain wrinkle a lil. Kinda hurts so imma go back to watching baking videos and imma chill. I feel like it takes a fresh pair of eyes to make a new observation before I do anymore deeper research. I'm really worried about who can see the "non-public information"

Edit 6: Happy Saturday I'll keep updating when I find something relevant.