Title: Follow-up elaboration to DD. Why direct registration at Computershare exposes DTCC's complicity in naked shorting.
Author: zenquest
Created 2021-09-21 18:21:00 UTC
Permalink: /r/DDintoGME/comments/psonag/followup_elaboration_to_dd_why_direct/
Url: https://www.reddit.com/r/DDintoGME/comments/psonag/followup_elaboration_to_dd_why_direct/

There are two type of shares, one original shares issued by Gamestop (say GME^(GME)) and the other issued by DTCC (say GME^(DTC)). GME^(GME) is a property (partial ownership of Gamestop) and is cumbersome to sell and settle because US states have different property laws. GME^(DTC) is a DTCC issued derivative and is easy to sell and settle.

All Gamestop insiders like Ryan Cohen and Matt Furlong have GME^(GME) at Computershare. Most institutional investors also hold GME^(GME) at Computershare. The remaining GME^(GME) shares are held by DTCC at it's subsidiary Cede & Co.

Let's say for the sake of argument DTCC holds 50M GME^(GME) at Cede & Co. (***the float***). They then issues 50M GME^(DTC) to the market that is easy to trade. We buy GME^(DTC), thinking it's as good as GME^(GME), but there are differences because one is share by Gamestop and the other is a derivative share issued by DTCC. It's like a casino issuing chips for cash in their house. Both are equivalent in value and it's easy to trade chips in the casino, but can't be used outside the casino.

DTCC lets brokers and market makers, sell more GME^(DTC) than what exists for additional cash deposit (lenders love to earn interest). Let's say, market makers have created additional 200M GME^(DTC) by putting up cash collateral hoping the company goes bust and short positions never have to be closed. So now DTCC has 250M GME^(DTC) issued against 50M GME^(GME) they hold – **4x borrow leverage**.

When apes transfer 25M GME^(GME) from DTCC to Computershare, DTCC has 225M GME^(DTC) issued against 25M GME^(GME) in their depository – **8x borrow leverage**. When apes transfer additional 15M GME^(GME) from DTCC to Computershare, DTCC has 210M GME^(DTC) issued against 10M GME^(GME) they hold – **20x borrow leverage**. When apes transfer the last 10M GME^(GME) from DTCC to Computershare. DTCC now has 200M GME^(DTC) issued against **ZERO** GME^(GME) they hold – **∞ borrow leverage**.

Now, there are apes holding 200M GME^(DTC) in brokerage accounts which is backed by nothing but cash collateral and $500K SIPC insurance. Gamestop sees that all company issued GME^(GME) shares are now at Computershare, and DTCC should not be allowing any trade in GME^(DTC) because they are bogus, and it dilutes share price hurting investors. So they issue a recall, meaning, asking DTCC to close out all GME^(DTC) positions because none should exist at their end.

This is the moass situation because, market makers and hedge funds who sold GME^(DTC) shares have to buy back to close out their positions. They have limited time window to close out, but they cannot name their price, ***apes name the price***.

Apes don't know math, so they keep adding ZEROES to the price (*zeroes have no value right*). First few hedge funds throw in the towel and buy back some shares. This increases the share price. Now all other hedge funds and MMs have to post additional cash collateral with borrowers. Some cannot, marge calls and they are liquidated. When they are liquidated, the liquidators will buy back GME^(DTC) **at any asked price** quickly. This further raises the price. Cash collateral requirement goes up higher and more short hedge funds/MMs who cannot pony up money get liquidated. Apes get confused and keep adding more ZEROES to the ask price. **Houston, we have a problem**.

If DTCC were honest, they would never allow more GME^(DTC) share to trade than there are GME^(GME). If DTCC implements risk management, they will not allow ***borrow leverage*** to get out of control and force shorts to close ***some*** of their positions. But will they? Or are they waiting for apes to transfer full float to Computershare and RC to hit the ignition button. It's hard to guess.

Oh no, according to congressional testimony shorts closed their positions way back in Jan, let's see if they were honest under oath.

EDIT: fixed formatting
EDIT2: fixed borrow leverage from 21x to 20x