



IAPD Report

CAREY LEE KOELE

CRD# 2311641

<u>Section Title</u>	<u>Page(s)</u>
Report Summary	1
Qualifications	2 - 5
Registration and Employment History	6
Disclosure Information	7

i When communicating online or investing with any professional, make sure you know who you're dealing with. [Imposters](#) might link to sites like BrokerCheck from [phishing](#) or similar scam websites, or through [social media](#), trying to steal your personal information or your money.
Please contact FINRA with any concerns.



IAPD Information About Representatives

IAPD offers information on all current-and many former representatives. Investors are strongly encouraged to use IAPD to check the background of representatives before deciding to conduct, or continue to conduct, business with them.

What is included in a IAPD report?

IAPD reports for individual representatives include information such as employment history, professional qualifications, disciplinary actions, criminal convictions, civil judgments and arbitration awards.

It is important to note that the information contained in an IAPD report may include pending actions or allegations that may be contested, unresolved or unproven. In the end, these actions or allegations may be resolved in favor of the representative, or concluded through a negotiated settlement with no admission or finding of wrongdoing.

Where did this information come from?

The information contained in IAPD comes from the Investment Adviser Registration Depository (IARD) and FINRA's Central Registration Depository, or CRD, (see more on CRD below) and is a combination of:

- information the states require representatives and firms to submit as part of the registration and licensing process, and
- information that state regulators report regarding disciplinary actions or allegations against representatives.

How current is this information?

Generally, representatives are required to update their professional and disciplinary information in IARD within 30 days.

Need help interpreting this report?

For help understanding how to read this report, please consult NASAA's IAPD Tips page <http://www.nasaa.org/IAPD/IARReports.cfm>

What if I want to check the background of an Individual Broker or Brokerage Firm?

To check the background of an Individual Broker or Brokerage firm, you can search for the firm or individual in IAPD. If your search is successful, click on the link provided to view the available licensing and registration information in FINRA's BrokerCheck website.

Are there other resources I can use to check the background of investment professionals?

It is recommended that you learn as much as possible about an individual representative or Investment Adviser firm before deciding to work with them. Your state securities regulator can help you research individuals and certain firms doing business in your state. The contact information for state securities regulators can be found on the website of the North American Securities Administrators Association <http://www.nasaa.org>



Report Summary

CAREY LEE KOELE (CRD# 2311641)

The report summary provides an overview of the representative's professional background and conduct. The information contained in this report has been provided by the representative, investment adviser and/or securities firms, and/or securities regulators as part of the states' investment adviser registration and licensing process. The information contained in this report was last updated by the representative, a previous employing firm, or a securities regulator on **02/02/2026**.

CURRENT EMPLOYERS

	Firm	CRD#	Registered Since
B	LPL FINANCIAL LLC	CRD# 6413	11/26/2002
IA	LPL FINANCIAL LLC	CRD# 6413	09/28/2010

QUALIFICATIONS

This representative is currently registered in **1** SRO(s) and **37** jurisdiction(s).

Is this representative currently Inactive or Suspended with any regulator? **No**

Note: Not all jurisdictions require IAR registration or may have an exemption from registration.

Additional information including this individual's qualification examinations and professional designations is available in the Detailed Report.

REGISTRATION HISTORY

This representative was previously registered with the following firm(s):

	FIRM	CRD#	LOCATION	REGISTRATION DATES
B	EDWARD JONES	250	ST. LOUIS, MO	03/01/1993 - 11/12/2002

For additional registration and employment history details as reported by the individual, refer to the Registration and Employment History section of the Detailed Report.

DISCLOSURE INFORMATION

Disclosure events include certain criminal charges and convictions, formal investigations and disciplinary actions initiated by regulators, customer disputes and arbitrations, and financial disclosures such as bankruptcies and unpaid judgments or liens.

Are there events disclosed about this representative? **Yes**

The following types of events are disclosed about this representative:

Type	Count
Customer Dispute	9
Termination	1



Qualifications

REGISTRATIONS

This section provides the SRO, states and U.S. territories in which the representative is currently registered and licensed, the category of each registration, and the date on which the registration becomes effective. This section also provides, for each firm with which the representative is currently employed, the address of each location where the representative works. This individual is currently registered with **37** jurisdiction(s) and 1 SRO(s) through his or her employer(s).

Employment 1 of 1

Firm Name: **LPL FINANCIAL LLC**
Main Address: 1055 LPL WAY
FORT MILL, SC 29715
Firm ID#: 6413

	Regulator	Registration	Status	Date
B	FINRA	General Securities Representative	Approved	11/26/2002
B	FINRA	General Securities Principal	Approved	04/29/2003
B	FINRA	Municipal Securities Principal	Approved	06/19/2006
B	FINRA	Municipal Securities Representative	Approved	06/19/2006
B	Alabama	Agent	Approved	02/02/2017
B	Alaska	Agent	Approved	02/27/2015
B	Arizona	Agent	Approved	11/05/2013
B	Arkansas	Agent	Approved	01/06/2021
B	California	Agent	Approved	01/27/2006
B	Colorado	Agent	Approved	08/16/2005
B	Florida	Agent	Approved	08/18/2005
B	Georgia	Agent	Approved	07/26/2006
B	Idaho	Agent	Approved	04/22/2014



Qualifications

Regulator	Registration	Status	Date
B Illinois	Agent	Approved	04/29/2003
B Indiana	Agent	Approved	11/10/2004
B Iowa	Agent	Approved	11/26/2002
B Kansas	Agent	Approved	01/17/2023
B Kentucky	Agent	Approved	08/13/2020
B Louisiana	Agent	Approved	02/08/2022
B Maine	Agent	Approved	02/02/2026
B Maryland	Agent	Approved	09/09/2020
B Michigan	Agent	Approved	12/10/2002
IA Michigan	Investment Adviser Representative	Approved	09/28/2010
B Missouri	Agent	Approved	03/30/2017
B Montana	Agent	Approved	01/07/2013
B Nevada	Agent	Approved	02/28/2006
B New Jersey	Agent	Approved	01/24/2020
B New Mexico	Agent	Approved	09/05/2025
B New York	Agent	Approved	05/31/2003
B North Carolina	Agent	Approved	01/21/2009
B Ohio	Agent	Approved	11/29/2004
B Oregon	Agent	Approved	02/07/2024



Qualifications

Regulator	Registration	Status	Date
B Pennsylvania	Agent	Approved	09/09/2022
B Puerto Rico	Agent	Approved	10/30/2017
B South Carolina	Agent	Approved	11/29/2006
B South Dakota	Agent	Approved	01/07/2008
B Tennessee	Agent	Approved	04/23/2025
B Texas	Agent	Approved	09/09/2015
IA Texas	Investment Adviser Representative	Restricted Approval	09/16/2015
B Virginia	Agent	Approved	06/10/2019
B Washington	Agent	Approved	11/14/2012
B West Virginia	Agent	Approved	06/02/2003
B Wisconsin	Agent	Approved	01/31/2006

Branch Office Locations

LPL FINANCIAL LLC
123 E. MAIN AVE.
ZEELAND, MI 49464-1768





Qualifications

PASSED INDUSTRY EXAMS




This section includes all industry exams that the representative has passed. Under limited circumstances, a representative may attain registration after receiving an exam waiver based on a combination of exams the representative has passed and qualifying work experience. Likewise a new exam requirement may be grandfathered based on a representative's specific qualifying work experience. Exam waivers and grandfathering are not included below.

This individual has passed 2 principal/supervisory exams, 3 general industry/product exams, and 2 state securities law exams.




Principal/Supervisory Exams

Exam	Category	Date
 Municipal Securities Principal Examination (S53)	Series 53	06/16/2006
 General Securities Principal Examination (S24)	Series 24	04/21/2003

General Industry/Product Exams

Exam	Category	Date
 Municipal Securities Representative Examination (S52TO)	Series 52TO	09/25/2025
 Securities Industry Essentials Examination (SIE)	SIE	10/01/2018
 General Securities Representative Examination (S7)	Series 7	02/24/1993

State Securities Law Exams

Exam	Category	Date
  Uniform Combined State Law Examination (S66)	Series 66	08/30/2010
 Uniform Securities Agent State Law Examination (S63)	Series 63	04/02/1993

PROFESSIONAL DESIGNATIONS

This section details that the representative has reported **0** professional designation(s).

No information reported.



Registration & Employment History

PREVIOUSLY REGISTERED WITH THE FOLLOWING FIRMS

This representative held registrations with the following firms:

	Registration Dates	Firm Name	ID#	Branch Location
B	03/01/1993 - 11/12/2002	EDWARD JONES	CRD# 250	ST. LOUIS, MO

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Below is the representative's employment history for up to the last 10 years.

Employment Dates	Employer Name	Position	Investment Related	Employer Location
11/2002 - Present	LPL FINANCIAL LLC (F/K/A) LINSKO/PRIVATE LEDGER CORP	REGISTERED REPRESENTATIVE	Y	ZEELAND, MI, United States

OTHER BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

This section includes information, if any, as provided by the representative regarding other business activities the representative is currently engaged in either as a proprietor, partner, officer, director, employee, trustee, agent, or otherwise. This section does not include non-investment related activity that is exclusively charitable, civic, religious, or fraternal and is recognized as tax exempt.

- 1/21/2003 - NON-VARIABLE INSURANCE - SELLING GE LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE. - ZEELAND, MI.
- 12/12/2005 - NON-VARIABLE INSURANCE - KOELE GODFREY INVESTMENT GROUP, INC. - KOELE GODFREY INVESTMENT GROUP INC. IS SET UP AS AN S-CORP TO CONDUCT FINANCIAL SERVICES USING LPL AS THE BROKER/DEALER. - TIME SPENT 99% - ZEELAND, MI.
- 12/10/2012 - KOELE GODFREY INVESTMENT GROUP, INC - INV REL - AT REPORTED LOCATION - DBA for LPL Business (entity for LPL business) - TIME SPENT 99% - ZEELAND, MI
- 12/24/2013 - KOELE INVESTMENT GROUP - NON-VARIABLE INSURANCE DBA - KOELE INVESTMENT GROUP - LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE - TIME SPENT 1% - ZEELAND, MI
- 08/09/2019 - Great Lake Escape Properties LLC - Investment related - At reported business location(s) - Real Estate Rental - start date:07/01/2019 - 1 hr/mo - 0 hrs during trading.
- 09/27/2022 - 123 Main Development Corporation - Investment Related - At Reported Business Location(s) - Real Estate Rental - Start Date - 06/02/2011 - 1 Hours Per Month/0 Hours During Securities Trading



Disclosure Summary

Disclosure Information

What you should know about reported disclosure events:

(1) Certain thresholds must be met before an event is reported to IARD, for example:

- A law enforcement agency must file formal charges before an Investment Adviser Representative is required to report a particular criminal event.;
- A customer dispute must involve allegations that an Investment Adviser Representative engaged in activity that violates certain rules or conduct governing the industry and that the activity resulted in damages of at least \$5,000.

(2) Disclosure events in IAPD reports come from different sources:

As mentioned in the "About IAPD" section on page 1 of this report, information contained in IAPD comes from Investment Adviser Representatives, firms and regulators. When more than one of these sources reports information for the same disclosure event, all versions of the event will appear in the IAPD report. The different versions will be separated by a solid line with the reporting source labeled.

(3) There are different statuses and dispositions for disclosure events:

- A disclosure event may have a status of *pending*, *on appeal*, or *final*.
 - A "pending" disclosure event involves allegations that have not been proven or formally adjudicated.
 - A disclosure event that is "on appeal" involves allegations that have been adjudicated but are currently being appealed.
 - A "final" disclosure event has been concluded and its resolution is not subject to change.
- A final disclosure event generally has a disposition of *adjudicated*, *settled* or *otherwise resolved*.
 - An "adjudicated" matter includes a disposition by (1) a court of law in a criminal or civil matter, or (2) an administrative panel in an action brought by a regulator that is contested by the party charged with some alleged wrongdoing.
 - A "settled" matter generally represents a disposition wherein the parties involved in a dispute reach an agreement to resolve the matter. Please note that Investment Adviser Representatives and firms may choose to settle customer disputes or regulatory matters for business or other reasons.
 - A "resolved" matter usually includes a disposition wherein no payment is made to the customer or there is no finding of wrongdoing on the part of the Investment Adviser Representative. Such matters generally involve customer disputes.

(4) You may wish to contact the Investment Adviser Representatives to obtain further information regarding any of the disclosure events contained in this IAPD report.



DISCLOSURE EVENT DETAILS

When evaluating this information, please keep in mind that some items may involve pending actions or allegations that may be contested and have not been resolved or proven. The event may, in the end, be withdrawn, dismissed, resolved in favor of the Investment Adviser Representative, or concluded through a negotiated settlement with no admission or finding of wrongdoing.

This report provides the information exactly as it was reported to the Investment Adviser Registration Depository. Some of the specific data fields contained in the report may be blank if the information was not provided.

The following types of events are disclosed about this representative:

Type	Count
Customer Dispute	9
Termination	1

Customer Dispute

This section provides information regarding a customer dispute that was reported to the Investment Adviser Registration Depository (IARD) by the Investment Adviser Representative (IAR), an investment adviser and/or securities firm, and/or a securities regulator. The event may include a consumer-initiated, investment-related complaint, arbitration proceeding or civil suit that contains allegations of sales practice violations against the individual.

The customer dispute may be pending or may have resulted in a civil judgment, arbitration award, monetary settlement, closure without action, withdrawal, dismissal, denial, or other outcome.

Disclosure 1 of 9

Reporting Source:	Individual
Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint:	LPL FINANCIAL LLC
Allegations:	CUSTOMERS SEEK RECOVERY FOR INVESTMENT LOSS IN DIRECT INVESTMENTS PURCHASED IN SEPTEMBER AND NOVEMBER 2011 AND FEBRUARY 2012, AND ALLEGE THAT INVESTMENTS WERE MISREPRESENTED AT THE TIME OF SALE. ACTIVITY DATE - 9/16/11 TO 10/19/17.
Product Type:	Direct Investment-DPP & LP Interests
Alleged Damages:	\$5,323.00
Is this an oral complaint?	No
Is this a written complaint?	Yes
Is this an arbitration/CFTC reparation or civil litigation?	No

Customer Complaint Information

Date Complaint Received:	01/26/2018
Complaint Pending?	No
Status:	Denied
Status Date:	03/15/2018
Settlement Amount:	

**Individual Contribution Amount:****Broker Statement**

THE COMPLAINT HAS BEEN DENIED. THE INVESTMENTS WERE FULLY DISCUSSED, DOCUMENTED AND AUTHORIZED. CONTRARY TO THE ALLEGATIONS THAT THERE WAS INVESTMENT LOSS, MOREOVER, CUSTOMERS ACTUALLY HAD GAINS OF \$11,968 ON THEIR \$30,000 INVESTMENT.

Disclosure 2 of 9**Reporting Source:**

Firm

Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint:

EDWARD JONES

Allegations:

CLIENT STATES HE HAS A FIVE-YEAR DISTRIBUTION IRA AND ALLEGES HE WAS INFORMED BY THE IR THAT THE INVESTMENTS WOULD BE PLACED IN SAFE INVESTMENTS. CLIENT STATES HE CONTACTED IR DURING THE FIRST YEAR WHEN THE FUND WAS GOING DOWN FASTER THAN CLIENT CLAIMS IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN AND IR INFORMED HIM NOT TO WORRY BECAUSE THEY WERE NOT THAT FAR OFF THEIR GOAL. CLIENT ALLEGES THAT IR STATED THAT FUNDS COULD BE MOVED FROM ANOTHER IRA TO MAKE UP ANY SHORTFALL. CLIENT FURTHER STATED HE QUESTIONED IR ABOUT THE PENALTIES THAT WOULD BE INVOLVED WITH SUCH A SHORTFALL. LOSSES EXCEED \$5,000.

Product Type:

Mutual Fund(s)

Alleged Damages:

\$5,000.00

Customer Complaint Information**Date Complaint Received:**

03/12/2003

Complaint Pending?

No

Status:

Denied

Status Date:

05/21/2003

Settlement Amount:**Individual Contribution Amount:****Firm Statement**

IR STATED THAT HE MET CLIENT AT A SEMINAR CONDUCTED BY THE IR ON ROLLOVERS. IR INDICATED HE MET WITH CLIENT SEVERAL TIMES TO REVIEW INVESTMENT OPTIONS FOR CLIENT'S 401K ROLLOVER AND DISCUSSED SALES CHARGES ON INVESTMENT PRODUCTS, INCLUDING CDS, BONDS, MUTUAL FUNDS, STOCKS, MONEY MARKETS AND ANNUITIES. IR STATED HE BELIEVED CLIENT WAS OVER-WEIGHTED IN PFIZER STOCK AND RECOMMENDED DIVERSIFYING THE PORTFOLIO. AFTER CLIENT'S 401K ROLLOVER, IR INDICATED IR INDICATED A SECOND RETIREMENT ACCOUNT WAS ESTABLISHED FOR THE CLIENT TO WITHDRAW INCOME. IR STATED A DIVERSIFIED PORTFOLIO WAS ESTABLISHED AND THAT AT NO TIME DID IR SAY THE INVESTMENTS WERE SAFE. IR STATED HE INFORMED CLIENT THAT BY DIVERSIFYING, THE RISKS COULD BE SPREAD OVER ALL THE INVESTMENTS. IR ALSO INDICATED HE INFORMED CLIENT THE FLUCTUATION IN PERFORMANCE WAS DUE TO THE DECLINE IN THE STOCK MARKET. IR STATED HE ALSO POINTED OUT THE INVESTMENTS HAD NOT BEEN HELD LONG-TERM AND



IR WOULD NOT RECOMMEND MAKING CHANGES AFTER HOLDING THE INVESTMENTS FOR A SHORT PERIOD. IR FURTHER STATED THAT CLIENT AGREED TO CONTINUE HOLDING THE INVESTMENTS, BUT THEN DECIDED TO MOVE A PORTION OF THE FUNDS TO MONEY MARKET. IR INDICATED THAT IR DID NOT AGREE WITH THE TRANSACTIONS, BUT MADE THEM AT THE CLIENT'S REQUEST. WHILE THE FIRM UNDERSTANDS THE CLIENT'S DISAPPOINTMENT IN THE ACCOUNT'S PERFORMANCE, MARKET FLUCTUATION IS A RISK ASSOCIATED WITH INVESTING. LITERATURE CONTAINING INFORMATION REGARDING REVENUE RULING 2002-62 WAS PROVIDED FOR CLIENT'S REVIEW. IT IS OUR OPINION CLIENT'S ACCOUNT WAS ESTABLISHED APPROPRIATELY AND IR PROVIDED THE DETAILS OF THE INVESTMENTS PURCHASED. IN ADDITION, ALL DETAILS OF THE MUTUAL FUNDS WERE INCLUDED IN THE PROSPECTUSES PROVIDED AT THE TIME OF PURCHASE. CLAIM DENIED.

Reporting Source: Individual

Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint: EDWARD JONES

Allegations: CLIENT STATES HE HAS A FIVE-YEAR DISTRIBUTION IRA AND ALLEGES HE WAS INFORMED BY THE IR THAT THE INVESTMENTS WOULD BE PLACED IN SAFE INVESTMENTS. CLIENT STATES HE CONTACTED IR DURING THE FIRST YEAR WHEN THE FUND WAS GOING DOWN FASTER THAN CLIENT CLAIMS IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN AND IR INFORMED HIM NOT TO WORRY BECAUSE THEY WERE NOT THAT FAR OFF THEIR GOAL. CLIENT ALLEGES THAT IR STATED THAT FUNDS COULD BE MOVED FROM ANOTHER IRA TO MAKE UP ANY SHORTFALL. CLIENT FURTHER STATED HE QUESTIONED IR ABOUT THE PENALTIES THAT WOULD BE INVOLVED WITH SUCH A SHORTFALL. LOSSES EXCEED \$5,000. REP DENIES ALL ALLEGATIONS AND MAINTAINS THAT HE PROVIDED COMPLETE AND ACCURATE INFO TO CLIENT ABOUT HIS INVESTMENT OPTIONS, INVESTMENT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES, AND MARKET RISKS. GIVEN CHANGING MARKET CONDITIONS.

Product Type: Mutual Fund(s)

Alleged Damages: \$5,000.00

Customer Complaint Information

Date Complaint Received: 03/12/2003

Complaint Pending? No

Status: Denied

Status Date: 05/21/2003

Settlement Amount:

Individual Contribution Amount:

Broker Statement UPON MY LEAVING MY PRIOR BROKER/DEALER (EDWARD JONES) REP WHO TOOK OVER OFFICE ENCOURAGED CLIENTS TO FILE COMPLAINTS AGAINST ME TO BETTER POSITION HIMSELF. IR STATED THAT HE MET CLIENT AT A SEMINAR CONDUCTED BY THE IR ON ROLLOVERS. IR INDICATED HE MET WITH CLIENT SEVERAL TIMES TO REVIEW INVESTMENT OPTIONS FOR CLIENT'S 401K ROLLOVER AND DISCUSSED SALES CHARGES ON INVESTMENT PRODUCTS, INCLUDING CDS, BONDS,



MUTUAL FUNDS, STOCKS, MONEY MARKETS AND ANNUITIES. IR STATED HE BELIEVED CLIENT WAS OVER-WEIGHTED IN PFIZER STOCK AND RECOMMENDED DIVERSIFYING THE PORTFOLIO. AFTER CLIENT'S 401K ROLLOVER, IR INDICATED IR INDICATED A SECOND RETIREMENT ACCOUNT WAS ESTABLISHED FOR THE CLIENT TO WITHDRAW INCOME. IR STATED A DIVERSIFIED PORTFOLIO WAS ESTABLISHED AND THAT AT NO TIME DID IR SAY THE INVESTMENTS WERE SAFE. IR STATED HE INFORMED CLIENT THAT BY DIVERSIFYING, THE RISKS COULD BE SPREAD OVER ALL THE INVESTMENTS. IR ALSO INDICATED HE INFORMED CLIENT THE FLUCTUATION IN PERFORMANCE WAS DUE TO THE DECLINE IN THE STOCK MARKET. IR STATED HE ALSO POINTED OUT THE INVESTMENTS HAD NOT BEEN HELD LONG-TERM AND IR WOULD NOT RECOMMEND MAKING CHANGES AFTER HOLDING THE INVESTMENTS FOR A SHORT PERIOD. IR FURTHER STATED THAT CLIENT AGREED TO CONTINUE HOLDING THE INVESTMENTS, BUT THEN DECIDED TO MOVE A PORTION OF THE FUNDS TO MONEY MARKET. IR INDICATED THAT IR DID NOT AGREE WITH THE TRANSACTIONS, BUT MADE THEM AT THE CLIENT'S REQUEST. WHILE THE FIRM UNDERSTANDS THE CLIENT'S DISAPPOINTMENT IN THE ACCOUNT'S PERFORMANCE, MARKET FLUCTUATION IS A RISK ASSOCIATED WITH INVESTING. LITERATURE CONTAINING INFORMATION REGARDING REVENUE RULING 2002-62 WAS PROVIDED FOR CLIENT'S REVIEW. IT IS OUR OPINION CLIENT'S ACCOUNT WAS ESTABLISHED APPROPRIATELY AND IR PROVIDED THE DETAILS OF THE INVESTMENTS PURCHASED. IN ADDITION, ALL DETAILS OF THE MUTUAL FUNDS WERE INCLUDED IN THE PROSPECTUSES PROVIDED AT THE TIME OF PURCHASE. CLAIM DENIED.

Disclosure 3 of 9

Reporting Source:

Firm

Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint:

EDWARD JONES

Allegations:

CLIENT INDICATES SHE PURCHASED A HARTFORD ANNUITY IN MAY 2000 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$41,509. CLIENT STATES IR INFORMED HER THE PRINCIPAL WAS NEVER AT RISK, ONLY THE INTEREST WOULD FLUCTUATE, AND THAT HER INVESTMENT WAS SAFE. CLIENT INDICATES SHE DISCUSSED THE NEGATIVE AMOUNTS ON HER STATEMENT WITH IR AND THAT SHE WAS INFORMED HER INTEREST WAS PUT INTO A HOLDING ACCOUNT. CLIENT STATES IR KNEW SHE DID NOT WANT TO INVEST IN STOCK MARKET FUNDS WHERE HER PRINCIPAL WOULD BE AT RISK. CLIENT ENCLOSED A DECEMBER 2002 STATEMENT WHICH REFLECTS A CURRENT VALUE OF \$32,357. LOSSES EXCEED \$5,000.

Product Type:

Annuity(ies) - Variable

Alleged Damages:

\$5,000.00

Customer Complaint Information**Date Complaint Received:**

03/07/2003

Complaint Pending?

No

Status:

Denied

Status Date:

05/22/2003

Settlement Amount:

**Individual Contribution Amount:****Firm Statement**

ACCORDING TO IR, CLIENT HAD BEEN PURCHASING TAX-FREE BONDS IN HER EJ ACCT AND IR EXPRESSED THE IMPORTANCE OF DIVERSIFICATION. IR INDICATED INVESTMENT OPTIONS WERE DISCUSSED, INCLUDING MUTUAL FUNDS, STOCKS, CORPORATE BONDS AND ANNUITIES. IR STATED DURING THE REVIEW OF THE INVESTMENT OPTIONS THAT HE DISCUSSED THE COSTS, FEES AND RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH INVESTMENT. IT IS UNDERSTOOD CLIENT HAD MONEY AVAILABLE IN MAY 2000, AND IR STATED HE DISCUSSED THE GOALS FOR THE MONEY BEING INVESTED. CLIENT APPARENTLY INDICATED SHE WOULD LIKE TO PASS THIS MONEY TO HER SON AND POSSIBLY REMOVE INCOME IN THE FUTURE. IR INDICATED CLIENT WAS WILLING TO PUT A PORTION OF HER TOTAL INVESTMENT INTO THE STOCK MARKET AND THE DETAILS OF THE ANNUITIES WERE DISCUSSED, INCLUDING COSTS AND RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE DIFFERENT SUB-ACCOUNTS. IR STATED HE INFORMED CLIENT THE VALUE OF THE ANNUITY WOULD FLUCTUATE AND IR BELIEVED CLIENT UNDERSTOOD THE ANNUITY AND THE RISK ASSOCIATED WITH THIS INVESTMENT. SINCE THE ANNUITY WAS PURCHASED IN MAY 2000, CLIENT HAS RECEIVED CUSTOMER ACCOUNT STATEMENTS REFLECTING THE VALUE OF THE INVESTMENT. IT IS OUR OPINION CLIENT WAS AWARE OF THE RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE ANNUITY AND THE ANNUITY WAS PURCHASED WITH CLIENT'S AUTHORIZATION. IN ADDITION, CLIENT SIGNED A DELIVERY RECEIPT WHICH WAS RECEIVED BY HARTFORD, INDICATING CLIENT UNDERSTOOD THAT ANNUITY PAYMENTS OR SURRENDER VALUES WHEN BASED UPON THE INVESTMENT EXPERIENCE OF A SEPARATE ACCOUNT, ARE VARIABLE AND ARE NOT GUARANTEED AS TO A FIXED DOLLAR AMOUNT. CLAIM DENIED.

Reporting Source:

Individual

Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint:

EDWARD JONES

Allegations:

CLIENT INDICATES SHE PURCHASED A HARTFORD ANNUITY IN MAY 2000 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$41,509. CLIENT STATES IR INFORMED HER THE PRINCIPAL WAS NEVER AT RISK, ONLY THE INTEREST WOULD FLUCTUATE, AND THAT HER INVESTMENT WAS SAFE. CLIENT INDICATES SHE DISCUSSED THE NEGATIVE AMOUNTS ON HER STATEMENT WITH IR AND THAT SHE WAS INFORMED HER INTEREST WAS PUT INTO A HOLDING ACCOUNT. CLIENT STATES IR KNEW SHE DID NOT WANT TO INVEST IN STOCK MARKET FUNDS WHERE HER PRINCIPAL WOULD BE AT RISK. CLIENT ENCLOSED A DECEMBER 2002 STATEMENT WHICH REFLECTS A CURRENT VALUE OF \$32,357. LOSSES EXCEED \$5,000. REP DENIES ALL ALLEGATIONS AND MAINTAINS THAT HE FULLY REVIEWED ALL ASPECTS OF ANNUITY INVESTMENT WITH CUSTOMER INCLUDING ASSOCIATED RISKS TO MARKET VALUE. REP MAINTAINS THAT CUSTOMER KNEW AND UNDERSTOOD WHAT SHE WAS INVESTING IN, UNDERSTOOD ALL FEATURES AND RISKS, AND THAT RECOMMENDATION WAS SUITABLE, GIVEN HER EXPRESS STATED GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND TIME HORIZON.

Product Type:

Annuity(ies) - Variable

Alleged Damages:

\$5,000.00

Customer Complaint Information



Date Complaint Received: 03/07/2003

Complaint Pending? No

Status: Denied

Status Date: 05/22/2003

Settlement Amount:

Individual Contribution Amount:

Broker Statement

UPON MY LEAVING MY PRIOR BROKER/DEALER (EDWARD JONES) REP WHO TOOK OVER OFFICE ENCOURAGED CLIENTS TO FILE COMPLAINTS AGAINST ME TO BETTER POSITION HIMSELF.

Disclosure 4 of 9

Reporting Source: Firm

Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint: EDWARD JONES

Allegations: CLIENT STATES KOELE STATED THE INVESTMENT WAS INSURED AT ALL TIMES AGAINST ANY LOSSES REGARDLESS OF STOCK MARKET FLUCTUATIONS. CLIENT STATES THE INVESTMENT WAS GUARANTEED 5% ANNUAL INTEREST AND THE FULL VALUE OF THE PRINCIPAL WOULD BE COMPLETELY LIQUID AT ALL TIMES. CLIENT ALSO STATES BREAKPOINTS WERE NOT DISCUSSED AND HE BELIEVES THE 5.5% COMMISSION IS UNACCEPTABLE. CLIENT WOULD LIKE THE FULL PRINCIPAL RETURNED PLUS INTEREST. LOSSES EXCEED \$5,000.

Product Type: Annuity(ies) - Variable

Alleged Damages: \$5,000.00

Customer Complaint Information

Date Complaint Received: 12/05/2002

Complaint Pending? No

Status: Settled

Status Date: 05/29/2003

Settlement Amount: \$400.00

Individual Contribution Amount: \$0.00

Firm Statement

IR STATED HE DISCUSSED INVESTING MONEY FROM THE SALE OF THE CLIENT'S CAMPGROUND WITH CLIENTS LATE IN 2000. IR INDICATED CLIENTS STATED THE MONEY WAS NOT NEEDED FOR AT LEAST TEN YEARS AND THAT CLIENTS HAD OTHER INVESTMENTS THAT WERE PRODUCING INCOME. IR ALSO INDICATED CLIENTS WANTED TO KEEP TAXES TO A MINIMUM. IR STATED THAT WHEN THE PROCEEDS CAME IN, IR MET WITH CLIENTS TO REVIEW INVESTMENT CHOICES. IR INDICATED HE RECOMMENDED CLIENTS INVEST SOME OF THE MONEY IN AN ANNUITY, STATING IT WOULD GROW TAX DEFERRED AND THE MONEY COULD BE INVESTED IN THE MARKET OR IN SAFER INVESTMENTS, SUCH AS BONDS AND/OR FIXED INCOME. IR STATED HE TOLD CLIENTS THIS INVESTMENT WOULD MEET THE CLIENT'S GOAL OF REDUCING TAXES. IR EXPLAINED TO CLIENTS THAT THEY COULD ACCESS THE INVESTED FUNDS, BUT



RESTRICTIONS COULD APPLY TO WITHDRAWALS. IR INDICATED HE PRESENTED THE ANNUITY CONTRACT AS AN INVESTMENT THAT WOULD FLUCTUATE WITH THE MARKET AND NEVER GUARANTEED A 5% RETURN OR MENTIONED THE PRODUCT WAS A LIFE INSURANCE POLICY. ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2001, A CONTRACT VERIFICATION LETTER WAS SIGNED BY CLIENTS. UPON RECEIVING THE CONTRACT, CLIENTS HAD A TEN-DAY FREE-LOOK PERIOD IN WHICH THEY COULD HAVE CANCELLED THE CONTRACT IF IT WAS NOT WHAT THEY WANTED. IT APPEARS THE ANNUITY PURCHASE WAS APPROPRIATE FOR THE STATED OBJECTIVES LISTED ON THE ACCOUNT. WHILE THE FIRM UNDERSTANDS THE CLIENTS' DISAPPOINTMENT IN THE DECLINE IN VALUE OF THE ANNUITY, IT APPEARS THE DECLINE IS DUE TO MARKET FLUCTUATION. THEREFORE, NO ADJUSTMENTS WILL BE MADE WITH REGARDS TO THE ANNUITY PURCHASE. IN REVIEWING THE CLIENT'S CLAIM CONCERNING RIGHTS OF ACCUMULATION, IT WOULD APPEAR THAT CERTAIN BREAKPOINTS MAY NOT HAVE BEEN MET THROUGH PURCHASES IN THE CLIENT'S VARIOUS ACCOUNTS. THE FIRM OFFERED TO CREDIT CLIENT'S ACCOUNT(S) IN THE AMOUNT OF \$400 TO RESOLVE THIS MATTER.

Reporting Source: Individual

Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint: EDWARD JONES

Allegations: CLIENT STATES KOELE STATED THE INVESTMENT WAS INSURED AT ALL TIMES AGAINST ANY LOSSES REGARDLESS OF STOCK MARKET FLUCTUATIONS. CLIENT STATES THE INVESTMENT WAS GUARANTEED 5% ANNUAL INTEREST AND THE FULL VALUE OF THE PRINCIPAL WOULD BE COMPLETELY LIQUID AT ALL TIMES. CLIENT ALSO STATES BREAKPOINTS WERE NOT DISCUSSED AND HE BELIEVES THE 5.5% COMMISSION IS UNACCEPTABLE. CLIENT WOULD LIKE THE FULL PRINCIPAL RETURNED PLUS INTEREST. LOSSES EXCEED \$5,000. REP DENIES ALL ALLEGATIONS THAT HE GUARANTEED RETURN ON INVESTMENTS OR ASSURED VALUE. REP MAINTAINS THAT CUSTOMERS WERE LONG TIME INVESTORS WHO KNEW ABOUT MARKET VALUE FLUCTUATION GIVEN CHANGING MARKET CONDITIONS. REP PROVIDED COMPLETE INFO CONCERNING ANNUITY INVESTMENT (INCLUDING MARKET RISKS) AND CUSTOMERS INDICATED THEY UNDERSTOOD AND WANTED TO MAKE THAT INVESTMENT.

Product Type: Annuity(ies) - Variable

Alleged Damages: \$5,000.00

Customer Complaint Information

Date Complaint Received: 12/05/2002

Complaint Pending? No

Status: Settled

Status Date: 05/29/2003

Settlement Amount: \$400.00

Individual Contribution Amount: \$0.00

Broker Statement UPON MY LEAVING MY PRIOR BROKER/DEALER (EDWARD JONES) REP WHO TOOK OVER OFFICE ENCOURAGED CLIENTS TO FILE COMPLAINTS AGAINST ME TO BETTER POSITION HIMSELF. IR STATED HE DISCUSSED



INVESTING MONEY FROM THE SALE OF THE CLIENT'S CAMPGROUND WITH CLIENTS LATE IN 2000. IR INDICATED CLIENTS STATED THE MONEY WAS NOT NEEDED FOR AT LEAST TEN YEARS AND THAT CLIENTS HAD OTHER INVESTMENTS THAT WERE PRODUCING INCOME. IR ALSO INDICATED CLIENTS WANTED TO KEEP TAXES TO A MINIMUM. IR STATED THAT WHEN THE PROCEEDS CAME IN, IR MET WITH CLIENTS TO REVIEW INVESTMENT CHOICES. IR INDICATED HE RECOMMENDED CLIENTS INVEST SOME OF THE MONEY IN AN ANNUITY, STATING IT WOULD GROW TAX DEFERRED AND THE MONEY COULD BE INVESTED IN THE MARKET OR IN SAFER INVESTMENTS, SUCH AS BONDS AND/OR FIXED INCOME. IR STATED HE TOLD CLIENTS THIS INVESTMENT WOULD MEET THE CLIENT'S GOAL OF REDUCING TAXES. IR EXPLAINED TO CLIENTS THAT THEY COULD ACCESS THE INVESTED FUNDS, BUT RESTRICTIONS COULD APPLY TO WITHDRAWALS. IR INDICATED HE PRESENTED THE ANNUITY CONTRACT AS AN INVESTMENT THAT WOULD FLUCTUATE WITH THE MARKET AND NEVER GUARANTEED A 5% RETURN OR MENTIONED THE PRODUCT WAS A LIFE INSURANCE POLICY. ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2001, A CONTRACT VERIFICATION LETTER WAS SIGNED BY CLIENTS. UPON RECEIVING THE CONTRACT, CLIENTS HAD A TEN-DAY FREE-LOOK PERIOD IN WHICH THEY COULD HAVE CANCELLED THE CONTRACT IF IT WAS NOT WHAT THEY WANTED. IT APPEARS THE ANNUITY PURCHASE WAS APPROPRIATE FOR THE STATED OBJECTIVES LISTED ON THE ACCOUNT. WHILE THE FIRM UNDERSTANDS THE CLIENTS' DISAPPOINTMENT IN THE DECLINE IN VALUE OF THE ANNUITY, IT APPEARS THE DECLINE IS DUE TO MARKET FLUCTUATION. THEREFORE, NO ADJUSTMENTS WILL BE MADE WITH REGARDS TO THE ANNUITY PURCHASE. IN REVIEWING THE CLIENT'S CLAIM CONCERNING RIGHTS OF ACCUMULATION, IT WOULD APPEAR THAT CERTAIN BREAKPOINTS MAY NOT HAVE BEEN MET THROUGH PURCHASES IN THE CLIENT'S VARIOUS ACCOUNTS. THE FIRM OFFERED TO CREDIT CLIENT'S ACCOUNT(S) IN THE AMOUNT OF \$400 TO RESOLVE THIS MATTER.

Disclosure 5 of 9

Reporting Source:

Firm

Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint:

EDWARD JONES

Allegations:

CLIENT STATES THEY REQUESTED AAA BONDS FROM KOELE. CLIENT INDICATED AFTER REVIEW OF THEIR IRA BONDS, WHICH WERE PURCHASED IN SEPTEMBER 2001, THEY FOUND THE INVESTMENTS TO BE DOWN AND THE BONDS ARE RATED BBB. CLIENTS STATE THEY WANT THEIR MONEY RESTORED TO THE ORIGINAL AMOUNT INVESTED. LOSSES EXCEED \$5,000.

Product Type:

Equity Listed (Common & Preferred Stock)

Alleged Damages:

\$5,000.00

Customer Complaint Information**Date Complaint Received:**

12/05/2002

Complaint Pending?

No

Status:

Denied

Status Date:

04/29/2003

Settlement Amount:

**Individual Contribution Amount:****Firm Statement**

ACCORDING TO THE IR, HE INFORMED THE CLIENTS OF THE BOND RATING AS WELL AS THE INTEREST RATE AND THE MATURITY DATE AT THE TIME OF THE SALE. THE IR ALSO STATED HE DID NOT TELL THE CLIENTS THE BOND WAS INSURED, BUT HE DID TELL THE CLIENTS THE BOND WAS A GOOD INVESTMENT WITH A GOOD COMPANY. THE IR FURTHER STATED THAT HE INDICATED TO THE CLIENTS THAT THE PRICE OF THE BONDS COULD FLUCTUATE IN RELATION TO THE BOND MARKET AND THAT THE BONDS COULD BE WORTH MORE OR LESS THAN THE ORIGINAL PURCHASE PRICE. FURTHERMORE, THE BONDS IN QUESTION WERE PURCHASED IN SEPTEMBER 2001. SINCE THAT TIME THE CLIENTS WOULD HAVE RECEIVED STATEMENTS INDICATING THE BOND RATING AS WELL AS THE VALUE OF THE INVESTMENT. CLAIM DENIED.

Reporting Source:

Individual

Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint:

EDWARD JONES

Allegations:

CLIENT STATES THEY REQUESTED AAA BONDS FROM KOELE. CLIENT INDICATED AFTER REVIEW OF THEIR IRA BONDS, WHICH WERE PURCHASED IN SEPTEMBER 2001, THEY FOUND THE INVESTMENTS TO BE DOWN AND THE BONDS ARE RATED BBB. CLIENTS STATE THEY WANT THEIR MONEY RESTORED TO THE ORIGINAL AMOUNT INVESTED. LOSSES EXCEED \$5,000. REP MAINTAINS THAT HE FULLY DISCUSSED WITH CUSTOMERS ALL ASPECTS OF THE BONDS THEY PURCHASED, AND NEVER INDICATED ANY GUARANTEE OF ASSURANCE. REP REVIEWED WITH CUSTOMER HOW PRICES COULD FLUCTUATE INTEREST PAYABLE, AND HOW BONDS COULD BE CALLED.

Product Type:

Equity Listed (Common & Preferred Stock)

Alleged Damages:

\$5,000.00

Customer Complaint Information**Date Complaint Received:**

12/05/2002

Complaint Pending?

No

Status:

Denied

Status Date:

04/29/2003

Settlement Amount:**Individual Contribution Amount:****Broker Statement**

UPON MY LEAVING MY PRIOR BROKER/DEALER (EDWARD JONES) REP WHO TOOK OVER OFFICE ENCOURAGED CLIENTS TO FILE COMPLAINTS AGAINST ME TO BETTER POSITION HIMSELF. ACCORDING TO THE IR, HE INFORMED THE CLIENTS OF THE BOND RATING AS WELL AS THE INTEREST RATE AND THE MATURITY DATE AT THE TIME OF THE SALE. THE IR ALSO STATED HE DID NOT TELL THE CLIENTS THE BOND WAS INSURED, BUT HE DID TELL THE CLIENTS THE BOND WAS A GOOD INVESTMENT WITH A GOOD COMPANY. THE IR FURTHER STATED THAT HE INDICATED TO THE CLIENTS THAT THE PRICE OF THE BONDS COULD FLUCTUATE IN RELATION TO THE BOND MARKET AND THAT THE BONDS COULD BE WORTH MORE OR LESS THAN THE ORIGINAL PURCHASE PRICE.



FURTHERMORE, THE BONDS IN QUESTION WERE PURCHASED IN SEPTEMBER 2001. SINCE THAT TIME THE CLIENTS WOULD HAVE RECEIVED STATEMENTS INDICATING THE BOND RATING AS WELL AS THE VALUE OF THE INVESTMENT. CLAIM DENIED.

Disclosure 6 of 9

Reporting Source:

Firm

Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint:

EDWARD JONES

Allegations:

CLIENT STATES THEY HAVE CONCERNS REGARDING ACTIVITY IN THEIR ACCOUNTS. THE CLIENTS INDICATE THEY BOUGHT LU AT THE RECOMMENDATION OF KOELE. CLIENTS STATE THEY SUGGESTED TO IR TO SELL THE STOCK AND IR COMMENTED THE STOCK WILL TURN AROUND. THE STOCK FELL TO LESS THAN TWO DOLLARS AND CLIENTS STATED THAT IS WHEN IR RECOMMENDED TO SELL. CLIENT ALSO PURCHASED AN ANNUITY IN WHICH THEY STATED KOELE GUARANTEED THEY WOULD NEVER LOSE ANY PRINCIPAL. LASTLY CLIENTS INDICATED THEY INFORMED IR THEY HAD SHORT TERM NEEDS FOR SOME MONEY, THEY PURCHASED EXXON STOCK AND STATED IR TOLD THEM THIS WAS A SHORT TERM INVESTMENT, A STOP LOSS ORDER WOULD BE PLACED AND THEY WOULD NOT LOSE MORE THAN \$150. CLIENTS STATE THE STOP LOSS WAS NEVER PLACED. LOSSES EXCEED \$5,000.

Product Type:

Equity Listed (Common & Preferred Stock)

Alleged Damages:

\$5,000.00

Customer Complaint Information**Date Complaint Received:**

12/02/2002

Complaint Pending?

No

Status:

Denied

Status Date:

04/29/2003

Settlement Amount:**Individual Contribution Amount:****Firm Statement**

AS TO THE CUSTS' CONCERNS REGARDING THEIR SHS OF LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES, OUR RECORDS INDICATE THAT THESE SHS WERE PURCHASED IN FEB 1999. WHEN THE SHARE PRICE BEGAN TO DROP, THE IR STATED THAT HE SUGGESTED THE CUSTS CONTINUE TO HOLD THE SECURITY INSTEAD OF SELLING. THE IR ALSO INDICATED THAT HE WENT OVER THE FIRM'S BUY AND HOLD PHILOSOPHY. AT THAT TIME, THE FIRM HAD A "HOLD" RECOMMENDATION ON LUCENT. THE IR FURTHER STATED THAT HE ADVISED THE CUSTS TO SELL THE LUCENT WHEN THE FIRM'S OPINION CHANGED TO "SELL." AS TO THE CUSTS' ANNUITY THAT WAS MATURING WITH AMERICAN SKANDIA, THE IR STATED THAT BEFORE PURCHASING THE ALLSTATE VARIABLE ANNUITY, HE REVIEWED OTHER OPTIONS WITH THE CUSTS, INCLUDING MUTUAL FUNDS, CDS AND BONDS. AFTER REVIEWING THE OPTIONS, THE IR STATED HE RECOMMENDED THE INVSTMT IN THE ALLSTATE VARIABLE ANNUITY THROUGH A 1035 EXCHANGE. THE IR STATED THAT HE INFORMED THE CUSTS THAT THE WIFE WOULD RECEIVE THE FULL AMOUNT IN THE EVENT THE HUSBAND



PASSED AWAY. THE IR ALSO INDICATED HE DID NOT TELL THE CUSTS THAT THE ANNUITY WOULD NEVER LOSE PRINCIPAL. THE IR STATED THAT HE DISCUSSED THE PURCHASE OF EXXON MOBIL STK WITH THE CUSTS AFTER THE CUSTS HAD RECEIVED A PHONE CALL FROM OUR CUSTOMER RETENTION DEPARTMENT. THE IR STATED THAT HE DISCUSSED THE CUST'S GOALS FOR THE MONEY TO BE INVESTED, AND FURTHER INDICATED THAT THE CUSTS HAD NO SPECIFIC TIME HORIZON AND THIS MONEY WAS NOT GOING TO BE NEEDED WITHIN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS. THE IR ALSO STATED THAT HE INDICATED TO THE CUST THAT THE SECURITY COULD BE SOLD ANY DAY THE MARKET WAS OPEN. ACCORDING TO THE IR, HE DID DISCUSS PLACING A STOP LOSS ORDER ON THE INVESTMENT WITH THE CUSTS; HOWEVER, THE STOP LOSS ORDER WAS NOT PLACED BECAUSE THERE WAS NO CONFIRMATION FROM THE CUSTS. THE IR FURTHER STATED THAT HE DISCLOSED COMMISSIONS TO THE CUSTS. ALSO, AT THE TIME OF THE PURCHASE THE CUSTS WOULD HAVE RECEIVED A TRADE CONFIRMATION INDICATING THE AMOUNT OF COMMISSION THAT WAS CHRGD FOR THE TRD. CLAIM DENIED.

Reporting Source: Individual

Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint: EDWARD JONES

Allegations: CLIENT STATES THEY HAVE CONCERNS REGARDING ACTIVITY IN THEIR ACCOUNTS. THE CLIENTS INDICATE THEY BOUGHT LU AT THE RECOMMENDATION OF KOELE. CLIENTS STATE THEY SUGGESTED TO IR TO SELL THE STOCK AND IR COMMENTED THE STOCK WILL TURN AROUND. THE STOCK FELL TO LESS THAN TWO DOLLARS AND CLIENTS STATED THAT IS WHEN IR RECOMMENDED TO SELL. CLIENT ALSO PURCHASED AN ANNUITY IN WHICH THEY STATED KOELE GUARANTEED THEY WOULD NEVER LOSE ANY PRINCIPAL. LASTLY CLIENTS INDICATED THEY INFORMED IR THEY HAD SHORT TERM NEEDS FOR SOME MONEY, THEY PURCHASED EXXON STOCK AND STATED IR TOLD THEM THIS WAS A SHORT TERM INVESTMENT, A STOP LOSS ORDER WOULD BE PLACED AND THEY WOULD NOT LOSE MORE THAN \$150. CLIENTS STATE THE STOP LOSS WAS NEVER PLACED. LOSSES EXCEED \$5,000. REP DENIES ALL ALLEGATIONS, AND MAINTAINS THAT HE PROVIDED COMPLETE AND ACCURATE INFO TO CUSTOMERS CONCERNING ALL INVESTMENTS. REP ALSO MAINTAINS THAT CUSTOMERS KNEW ABOUT MARKET RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH THEIR INVESTMENTS AND WERE COMFORTABLE WITH THOSE INVESTMENTS.

Product Type: Equity Listed (Common & Preferred Stock)

Alleged Damages: \$5,000.00

Customer Complaint Information

Date Complaint Received: 12/02/2002

Complaint Pending? No

Status: Denied

Status Date: 04/29/2003

Settlement Amount:

Individual Contribution Amount:

**Broker Statement**

UPON MY LEAVING MY PRIOR B/D REP WHO TOOK OVER OFFICE ENCOURAGED CLIENTS TO FILE COMPLAINTS AGAINST ME TO BETTER POSITION HIMSELF. AS TO THE CUSTS' CONCERNS REGARDING THEIR SHS OF LUCENT TECH, OUR RECORDS INDICATE THAT THESE SHS WERE PURCHASED IN 2/99. WHEN THE SHARE PRICE BEGAN TO DROP, THE IR STATED THAT HE SUGGESTED THE CUSTS CONTINUE TO HOLD THE SECURITY INSTEAD OF SELLING. THE IR INDICATED THAT HE WENT OVER THE FIRM'S BUY & HOLD PHILOSOPHY. AT THAT TIME, THE FIRM HAD A "HOLD" RECOMMENDATION ON LUCENT. THE IR FURTHER STATED THAT HE ADVISED THE CUSTS TO SELL THE LUCENT WHEN THE FIRM'S OPINION CHANGED TO "SELL." AS TO THE CUSTS' ANNUITY THAT WAS MATURING WITH AMERICAN SKANDIA, THE IR STATED THAT BEFORE PURCHASING THE ALLSTATE VAR ANN, HE REVIEWED OTHER OPTIONS WITH THE CUSTS, INCLUDING MUTUAL FUNDS, CDS & BONDS. AFTER REVIEWING THE OPTIONS, THE IR STATED HE RECOMMENDED THE INVSTMT IN THE ALLSTATE VAR ANN THROUGH A 1035 EXCHANGE. THE IR STATED THAT HE INFORMED THE CUSTS THAT THE WIFE WOULD RECEIVE THE FULL AMOUNT IN THE EVENT THE HUSBAND PASSED AWAY. THE IR INDICATED HE DID NOT TELL THE CUSTS THAT THE ANNUITY WOULD NEVER LOSE PRINCIPAL. THE IR STATED THAT HE DISCUSSED THE PURCHASE OF EXXON MOBIL STK WITH THE CUSTS AFTER THE CUSTS HAD RECEIVED A PHONE CALL FROM OUR CUSTOMER RETENTION DEPT. THE IR STATED THAT HE DISCUSSED THE CUST'S GOALS FOR THE MONEY TO BE INVESTED, & FURTHER INDICATED THAT THE CUSTS HAD NO SPECIFIC TIME HORIZON & THIS MONEY WAS NOT GOING TO BE NEEDED WITHIN THE NEXT 5 YEARS. THE IR STATED THAT HE INDICATED TO THE CUST THAT THE SECURITY COULD BE SOLD ANY DAY THE MARKET WAS OPEN. ACCORDING TO THE IR, HE DID DISCUSS PLACING A STOP LOSS ORDER ON THE INVESTMENT WITH THE CUSTS; HOWEVER, THE STOP LOSS ORDER WAS NOT PLACED BECAUSE THERE WAS NO CONFIRM FROM THE CUSTS. THE IR STATED THAT HE DISCLOSED COMMISSIONS TO THE CUSTS. AT THE TIME OF THE PURCHASE THE CUSTS WOULD HAVE RECEIVED A TRADE CONFIRMATION INDICATING THE AMOUNT OF COMMISSION THAT WAS CHRGD FOR THE TRD. CLAIM DENIED.

Disclosure 7 of 9**Reporting Source:**

Firm

Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint:

EDWARD JONES

Allegations:

CLIENT STATES SHE IS TRANSFERRING HER ACCOUNT. CLIENT CLAIMS SHE IS VERY DISAPPOINTED THAT THE IR, CAREY KOELE, DID NOT ADVISE HER OF THE POSSIBILITY OF TRANSFERRING HER ASSETS WITHIN HER ANNUITY TO THE MONEY MARKET ACCOUNT AROUND MAY AND JUNE OF 2000. CLIENT CLAIMS SHE WAS ADVISED IF SHE LOCKED IN HER ASSETS SHE WOULD NEVER BE ABLE TO MOVE IT BACK INTO THE ACTIVE ACCOUNTS. CLIENT STATED SHE PERSONALLY CALLED HARTFORD AND WAS INFORMED THE FUNDS COULD BE MOVED INTO THE MONEY MARKET ACCOUNT; AS A RESULT, CLIENT CLAIMS BY THIS TIME SHE HAD ALREADY LOST ALMOST \$100,000.
(PENDING COMPLAINT FILED ON U-4)

Product Type:

Annuity(ies) - Variable

Alleged Damages:

\$100,000.00

Customer Complaint Information



Date Complaint Received: 10/18/2001

Complaint Pending? No

Status: Denied

Status Date: 12/18/2001

Settlement Amount:

Individual Contribution Amount:

Firm Statement

IR STATED HE HAS DISCUSSED THE MATTER WITH THE CLIENT AND. ALTHOUGH THE CLIENT STILL WISHES TO TRANSFER HER ACCOUNTS, SHE IS LEAVING ON GOOD TERMS AND HER CONCERNS APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO HER SATISFACTION. INFORMED CLIENT TO CONTACT ME IF THIS IS NOT A CORRECT UNDERSTANDING.

Reporting Source: Individual

Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint: EDWARD JONES

Allegations: CLIENT STATES SHE IS TRANSFERRING HER ACCOUNT. CLIENT CLAIMS SHE IS VERY DISAPPOINTED THAT THE IR, CAREY KOELE, DID NOT ADVISE HER OF THE POSSIBILITY OF TRANSFERRING HER ASSETS WITHIN HER ANNUITY TO THE MONEY MARKET ACCOUNT AROUND MAY AND JUNE OF 2000. CLIENT CLAIMS SHE WAS ADVISED IF SHE LOCKED IN HER ASSETS SHE WOULD NEVER BE ABLE TO MOVE IT BACK INTO THE ACTIVE ACCOUNTS. CLIENT STATED SHE PERSONALLY CALLED HARTFORD AND WAS INFORMED THE FUNDS COULD BE MOVED INTO THE MONEY MARKET ACCOUNT; AS A RESULT, CLIENT CLAIMS BY THIS TIME SHE HAD ALREADY LOST ALMOST \$100,000.

Product Type: Annuity(ies) - Variable

Alleged Damages: \$100,000.00

Customer Complaint Information

Date Complaint Received: 10/18/2001

Complaint Pending? No

Status: Denied

Status Date: 12/18/2001

Settlement Amount:

Individual Contribution Amount:

Broker Statement

IR STATED HE HAS DISCUSSED THE MATTER WITH THE CLIENT AND ALTHROUGH THE CLIENT STILL WISHES TO TRANSFER HER ACCOUNTS, SHE IS LEAVING ON GOOD TERMS AND HER CONCERNS APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED TO HER SATISFACTION. INFORMED CLIENT TO CONTACT ME IF THIS IS NOT A CORRECT UNDERSTANDING.

**Disclosure 8 of 9**

Reporting Source: Individual

Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint: EDWARD JONES

Allegations: THE CLIENT STATES THAT THE IR SPOKE TO HER ABOUT ANNUITIES AND STATED THAT HE WOULD NEVER LOSE HIS PRINCIPAL. CLIENT STATES THE IR TOLD HIM HE MAKES NO MORE PROFIT SELLING AN ANNUITY TO THE CLIENT THAN ANY OTHER FUNDS. CLIENT ALSO ALLEGES THE IR PROVIDED HER WITH INACCURATE INFORMATION CONCERNING HER ACCOUNT PERFORMANCE DURING AN ACCOUNT REVIEW. CLIENT DOES NOT MAKE A SPECIFIC REQUEST FOR DAMAGES.

Product Type: Insurance

Alleged Damages: \$5,000.00

Customer Complaint Information

Date Complaint Received: 09/28/1999

Complaint Pending? No

Status: Denied

Status Date: 11/02/1999

Settlement Amount:

Individual Contribution Amount:

Broker Statement THE IR STATES HE DISCUSSED SEVERAL ANNUITIES WITH THE CLIENT IN DETAIL AND PROVIDED HER WITH PROSPECTUSES. THE COMMISSIONS EARNED ON THE ANNUITY PURCHASE AND THE MUTUAL FUND PURCHASES WERE COMPARABLE. WE BELIEVE IRS SUGGESTIONS WERE MADE BASED ON THE CLIENTS INVESTMENT OBJECTIVES AND WERE PLACED WITH THE CLIENTS AUTHORIZATION.

Disclosure 9 of 9

Reporting Source: Individual

Employing firm when activities occurred which led to the complaint: EDWARD JONES

Allegations: THE CLIENT STATES DURING A MEETING WITH MR. KOELE ON 10/27/99, THEY INSTRUCTED HIM TO MOVE \$10,000 FROM THEIR VAN KAMPEN FUND TO GNTX, BASED ON MR. KOELE'S RECOMMENDATION. THE CLIENTS STATE THAT THE PURCHASE OF GNTX DID NOT OCCUR UNTIL 02/03/00 WHEN THE PRICE HAD INCREASED FROM \$17 TO \$30 1/4.

Product Type: Equity - OTC

Alleged Damages: \$5,000.00

Customer Complaint Information

Date Complaint Received: 02/23/2000

Complaint Pending? No



Status: Denied

Status Date: 03/17/2000

Settlement Amount:

Individual Contribution Amount:

Broker Statement

THE CUSTOMERS WERE ADVISED THAT THE IR ACKNOWLEDGES PURCHASES IN GNTX STOCK WERE DISCUSSED DURING THE MEETING ON 10/27/99 BUT CLAIMS THE CUSTOMERS DID NOT INSTRUCT HIM TO MAKE THE CHANGES IN THE ACCOUNT AT THAT TIME. THE IR INDICATES IF HE HAD RECEIVED THOSE INSTRUCTIONS THE ORDERS WOULD HAVE IMMEDIATELY BEEN ENTERED. THE CUSTOMERS ARE ALSO REMINDED THAT THEY HAVE RECEIVED MONTHLY STATEMENTS SINCE OCTOBER THAT CLEARLY INDICATED THE ORDERS HAD NOT BEEN ENTERED IN THE ACCOUNT. OUR POSITION IS THE CUSTOMERS DID NOT INSTRUCT THE IR TO PLACE THE TRADES AND THE CLAIM IS DENIED.



Termination

This disclosure event involves a situation where the Investment Adviser Representative voluntarily resigned, was discharged or was permitted to resign after allegations were made that accused the Investment Adviser Representative of violating investment-related statutes, regulations, rules or industry standards of conduct; fraud or the wrongful taking of property; or failure to supervise in connection with investment-related statutes, regulations, rules or industry standards of conduct.

Disclosure 1 of 1

Reporting Source:	Individual
Firm Name:	EDWARD JONES
Termination Type:	Discharged
Termination Date:	10/30/2002
Allegations:	SUBMITTING A DOCUMENT TO A LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS OFFICE WHICH CONTAINED IMPROPER SIGNATURES. NO CUSTOMERS WERE HARMED AS A RESULT OF THE SUBMISSION OF THE DOCUMENT.
Product Type:	No Product
Other Product Types:	
Broker Statement	SUBMITTING A DOCUMENT TO A LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS OFFICE WHICH CONTAINED IMPROPER SIGNATURES. NO CUSTOMERS WERE HARMED AS A RESULT OF THE SUBMISSION OF THE DOCUMENT.



End of Report

This page is intentionally left blank.