

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

**CASE NO. 20-CIV-81205-RAR**

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**COMPLETE BUSINESS SOLUTIONS  
GROUP, INC. d/b/a PAR FUNDING, et al.,**

Defendants.

---

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO ALLOW CERTAIN TRIAL  
WITNESSES TO APPEAR BY ZOOM (OR SIMILAR PLATFORM)**

**THIS CAUSE** comes before the Court on Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission’s Motion to Allow Certain Trial Witnesses to Appear by Zoom (or Similar Platform) [ECF No. 978] (“Motion”). Plaintiff submits to the Court that four of the six witnesses identified in their Motion have health conditions which render them unable to travel. Mot. at 1. Defendants do not object to these four witnesses appearing via videoconference. Mot. at 2. The remaining two witnesses—employees of two out-of-state regulatory agencies—are unable to travel due to their agencies’ limitations on employee travel. Plaintiff represents that the direct examination of these witnesses will be brief. Defendants object to their appearance via videoconference. Mot. at 1–2.

After reviewing the Motion and being otherwise duly advised, the Court finds that the SEC has shown good cause for requesting that all six witnesses be permitted to testify via videoconference. Consequently, it is hereby

**ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that the Motion is **GRANTED**.<sup>1</sup> The following witnesses may appear at trial via videoconference:

- Ronald Lipowski;
- Steven Weinkranz;
- Richard Muldawer;
- Cynthia Clark;
- Stephen A. Bouchard, Director of Examinations, New Jersey Bureau of Securities; and
- Lori Boyogueno, Sr. Securities Compliance Examiner and Enforcement Administrator.

**DONE AND ORDERED** in Fort Lauderdale, Florida this 18th day of November, 2021.



**RODOLFO A. RUIZ II**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court is cognizant that it recently denied a similar request from a non-party witness. [ECF No. 963]. However, that decision is distinguishable from the facts in the instant Motion. There, the non-party witness is alleged to have been an integral part of the case and both Plaintiff and Defendant Vagnozzi objected to his testimony via videoconference.