

**RICHARD R. BEST**  
**REGIONAL DIRECTOR**  
**Sanjay Wadhwa**  
**Thomas P. Smith Jr.**  
**Paul G. Gizzi**  
**Alix Biel**  
**Attorneys for Plaintiff**  
**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**  
**New York Regional Office**  
**Brookfield Place**  
**200 Vesey Street, Suite 400**  
**New York, New York 10281-1022**  
**212-336-0077 (Gizzi)**  
**Email: gizzip@sec.gov**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,**

**Plaintiff,**

**-against-**

**THOMAS NICHOLAS SALZANO,**

**Defendant.**

**COMPLAINT**

**21 Civ. \_\_\_\_ ( )**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”), Brookfield Place, 200 Vesey Street, Suite 400, New York, New York 10281, alleges as follows for its Complaint against Defendant Thomas Nicholas Salzano (“Salzano”), whose last known address is Osprey Court, Secaucus, New Jersey 07094.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS**

1. In January 2019, Salzano used a sham loan document with a forged signature in an unsuccessful attempt to obtain a \$150,000 investment in a purported real estate joint venture in New Jersey.

2. The sham loan document made it falsely appear as if the project had secured \$25 million in financing when, in fact, no such financing arrangement existed.

3. The joint venture was an opportunity offered by Salzano's employer, National Realty Investment Advisors, LLC ("NRIA"), a private real estate management firm. Salzano, who was a senior independent executive advisor and portfolio manager at NRIA, sent the sham loan document in an effort to obtain the \$150,000 investment from an investor who had previously invested \$150,000 of her retirement money in a fund NRIA managed.

4. Before making the additional investment, the investor contacted the lender identified on the forged loan document to verify the financing arrangement. The investor was informed that the lender had not made the loan commitment and that the document was a fake.

5. When confronted by the lender, Salzano admitted that he sent the phony loan document to the investor.

### **VIOLATIONS**

6. By virtue of the foregoing conduct and as alleged further herein, Defendant Salzano has violated Sections 17(a)(1) and (3) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act") [15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)(1) and (3)].

7. Unless Defendant is restrained and enjoined, he will engage in the acts, practices, transactions, and courses of business set forth in this Complaint or in acts, practices, transactions, and courses of business of similar type and object.

### **NATURE OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND RELIEF SOUGHT**

8. The Commission brings this action pursuant to the authority conferred upon it by Securities Act Sections 20(b) and 20(d) [15 U.S.C. §§ 77t(b) and 77t(d)].

9. The Commission seeks a final judgment: (a) permanently enjoining Defendant from violating the federal securities laws this Complaint alleges he has violated; (b) ordering Defendant to pay civil money penalties pursuant to Securities Act Section 20(d) [15 U.S.C. § 77t(d)]; and (c) permanently prohibiting Defendant from serving as an officer or director of any company that has a class of securities registered under Section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) [15 U.S.C. § 78l] or that is required to file reports under Exchange Act Section 15(d) [15 U.S.C. § 78o(d)], pursuant to Securities Act Section 20(e) [15 U.S.C. § 77t(e)].

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

10. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Securities Act Section 22(a) [15 U.S.C. § 77v(a)].

11. Defendant, directly and indirectly, has made use of the means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce or of the mails in connection with the transactions, acts, practices, and courses of business alleged herein.

12. Venue lies in this District under Securities Act Section 22(a) [15 U.S.C. § 77v(a)]. Defendant may be found in, is an inhabitant of, or transacts business in the District of New Jersey, and certain of the acts, practices, transactions, and courses of business alleged in this Complaint occurred within this District, including Salzano’s solicitation of an investor.

### **DEFENDANT**

13. **Salzano**, age 64, is believed to be a resident of Secaucus, New Jersey. Until March 2021, he was a senior independent executive advisor and portfolio manager at NRIA. In 2006, the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”) filed charges against, and simultaneously settled with, Salzano for using a telecommunications company he operated to defraud consumers with

promises of savings in phony agreements. *FTC v. Salzano*, 06-cv-2883 (D.N.J.). Without admitting the FTC's allegations, Salzano stipulated to an order barring him from engaging in deceptive conduct, requiring him to make certain disclosures in future telecommunications product pitches, and ordering him to pay \$50 million in restitution to defrauded customers, which was suspended due to his inability to pay.

### **RELEVANT ENTITY**

14. **NRIA** is a real estate investment, management, and development firm that claims to have developed dozens of multi-family residential properties since 2006 in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Florida. NRIA is a New Jersey limited liability company based in Secaucus, New Jersey that advertises heavily nationwide on radio and television. As of early 2021, NRIA claimed to have \$1.25 billion under management.

### **FACTS**

#### **I. BACKGROUND OF SALZANO'S FRAUD**

15. A California investor (the "Investor") first learned of NRIA's investment opportunities when she heard a radio advertisement in the spring of 2018. After calling the company, and references NRIA provided her, the Investor was satisfied with the opportunity and decided to invest.

16. The Investor was provided with a private placement memorandum and other documents for the NRIA Partners Portfolio Fund I, LLC (the "Fund"). The Investor understood that the Fund invested in nine real estate projects in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Florida, and guaranteed a monthly rate of return of six percent for the first two years. If she remained invested in the Fund for five years, the rate of return was targeted to be sixteen to twenty percent.

17. A sales representative at NRIA assured the Investor that all nine projects were financed by investors and lenders who had conducted thorough due diligence. The Investor believed that the diversity of properties mitigated the risk that the Fund would perform poorly overall.

18. In May 2018, the Investor invested \$150,000 from her retirement account into the Fund. The next month, as promised, she began receiving monthly payments into her retirement account.

## **II. SALZANO USES A SHAM TERM SHEET IN AN EFFORT TO OBTAIN A SECOND INVESTMENT FROM THE INVESTOR**

19. In late 2018, after she had made the original \$150,000 investment, the Investor asked NRIA if there were any real estate investment opportunities near the planned new Amazon headquarters in New York. The Investor was told about “River Run,” a project in northern New Jersey. The Investor was offered an opportunity to invest in a purported joint venture with NRIA and other investors in River Run, for a minimum investment of \$300,000.

20. The joint venture interest offered to the Investor qualified as an investment contract and, therefore, was a security.

21. An employee at NRIA (“Employee A”) told the Investor that NRIA would allow her to add an additional \$150,000 to her existing \$150,000 investment in the Fund to meet the minimum required investment for the joint venture.

22. Employee A sent the Investor details showing the project would cost \$33.6 million, of which \$25 million would come from a loan that NRIA was in the process of securing.

23. The Investor then requested further details about the \$25 million loan.

24. Employee A asked the Investor to sign a non-disclosure agreement before she could receive additional details about the loan, and Salzano said he would seek the lender’s

permission to disclose the confidential loan information.

25. On January 17, 2019, after the Investor signed the non-disclosure agreement, Salzano, on behalf of NRIA, sent the Investor a term sheet dated December 17, 2018 from the purported lender (the “Lender”). Salzano described the document as “our Funding Commitment” on River Run.

26. The term sheet was purportedly signed by the Lender’s chief executive officer, and offered details of a \$25 million loan for the River Run project.

27. Regarding obtaining the Lender’s permission to disclose the loan information, Salzano wrote, “[t]his took a day to clear release from [the Lender] on but its (sic) a great project and a great loan.”

28. Salzano also wrote that “we are moving into the closing phase now.”

29. The Investor thanked Salzano and asked when the joint venture would close.

30. Salzano responded that the closing would take place during the week of February 18, 2019.

31. Still curious, the Investor called the Lender to ask about the details of the loan.

32. The Lender informed the Investor that the signed term sheet was fraudulent.

33. The Lender said the purported signature of the Lender’s chief executive officer was not authentic, the Lender’s address appeared to be stamped on the document, and the font was inconsistent throughout the document.

34. According to the Lender, the logo shown on the term sheet was an old version of the logo that was no longer in use as of the date of the term sheet.

35. Overall, according to the Lender, the document appeared to be a bad cut-and-paste job, and to be derived from sample loan structuring documents the Lender had shared with

NRIA in 2017 for projects that ultimately did not come to fruition.

36. Moreover, the Lender seldom made loans exceeding \$1 million, and had never discussed financing the River Run project.

37. In fact, a year earlier the Lender had decided not to do any business with NRIA after a falling-out between the two parties, when the Lender decided against making a loan to NRIA for a different project.

### **III. SALZANO TRIES TO COVER HIS TRACKS AFTER BEING CAUGHT IN HIS ATTEMPT TO DEFRAUD**

38. Upon receiving the fake document from the Investor, the Lender's chief legal officer wrote to NRIA on February 15, 2019, demanding that NRIA "immediately cease and desist" misappropriating Lender's trademarks and "defrauding potential investors using fraudulent documents that falsely reflect a financial relationship or commitment between [the Lender] and NRIA when no such relationships or commitments exist."

39. Regarding the term sheet, the Lender's chief legal officer wrote that, "[i]n fact, this letter of intent is a fraud and the CEO's signature was forged."

40. Having been caught in his attempt to defraud the Investor, Salzano tried to cover his tracks, including by altering an email he had previously sent to the Investor.

41. First, Salzano sent an email to the Investor, *in all caps*, in which he claimed he had erroneously neglected to stamp the term sheet as "EXAMPLE ONLY."

42. Forwarding his January 17, 2019 email to the Investor, Salzano wrote, one month later on February 19, 2019, that the Investor should "IGNORE THIS PRIOR EMAIL IT WAS SENT IN ERROR WITH ERRANT DOCUMENTS ATTACHED NOT STAMPED AS 'EXAMPLES ONLY' OF WHAT AN LOI LOOKS LIKE AND DICTATE NOT READ."

43. Salzano also claimed that the River Run project had been canceled: "THIS

POTENTIAL DEAL IS CANCELED.”

44. Salzano then went a step further in trying to cover his tracks.

45. In forwarding his January 17, 2019 email to the Investor on February 19, 2019, Salzano altered the text of his original email in the email chain, in an effort to make it appear as if he had originally stated the term sheet was only an example.

46. Salzano added text in all caps to his original email: “[t]his took a day to clear release OF A SAMPLE DRAFT OF WHAT IT COULD LOOK LIKE FOR A LENDER LIKE [the Lender] on but its (sic) a great project and a great loan.”

47. Second, in an undated letter to the Lender, with metadata suggesting it was prepared on February 20, 2019, Salzano admitted that he provided the fake term sheet to the Investor.

48. Salzano claimed that the document “emanated in error and by mistake from my office.”

49. Salzano asserted that he had mistakenly sent the document without a “hypothetical example overlay” placed on the document, which would have shown it was not an actual loan.

50. He also claimed that the Investor was the only person to receive the phony term sheet, and acknowledged that he was “wholly responsible for this ridiculous and unprofessional single error in dealing with one small investor.”

51. He further stated that he had been in a “terrible rush” and “somehow attached the version without my overlay example.”

52. Finally, Salzano said he was attaching the corrected example term sheet to the letter.



53. As he had done in his cover-up email to the Investor, however, Salzano altered the example term sheet he showed the Lender by omitting the signature page with the forged signature of the Lender's chief executive officer.

54. Salzano added, "I am heartfully sorry for this error" and "I have been completely honest in this testimony and response to you."

55. In sum, and contrary to his statement to the Lender that he was completely honest, Salzano's explanations, both to the Investor and to the Lender, were replete with lies.

**CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
**Violation of Securities Act Sections 17(a)(1) and (3)**

56. The Commission re-alleges and incorporates by reference here the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 55.

57. Defendant, directly or indirectly, in the offer or sale of securities and by the use of the means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or the mails, knowingly or recklessly has employed one or more devices, schemes or artifices to defraud, and/or knowingly, recklessly, or negligently has engaged in one or more transactions, practices, or courses of business which operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the purchaser.

58. By reason of the foregoing, Defendant, directly or indirectly, has violated and, unless enjoined, will again violate Securities Act Sections 17(a)(1) and (3) [15 U.S.C. §§ 77q(a)(1) and (3)].

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court enter a Final Judgment:

**I.**

Permanently enjoining Salzano and his agents, servants, employees and attorneys and all persons in active concert or participation with any of them from violating, directly or indirectly, Securities Act Sections 17(a)(1) and (3) [15 U.S.C. §§ 77q(a)(1) and (3)].

**II.**

Ordering Defendant to pay civil monetary penalties under Securities Act Section 20(d) [15 U.S.C. § 77t(d)];

**III.**

Permanently prohibiting Defendant from serving as an officer or director of any company that has a class of securities registered under Exchange Act Section 12 [15 U.S.C. § 78l] or that is required to file reports under Exchange Act Section 15(d) [15 U.S.C. § 78o(d)], pursuant to Securities Act Section 20(e) [15 U.S.C. § 77t(e)]; and

**IV.**

Granting any other and further relief this Court may deem just and proper.

**JURY DEMAND**

Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff demands that this case be tried to a jury.

Dated: New York, New York  
June 7, 2021

*/s/ Richard R. Best*

---

RICHARD R. BEST\*  
REGIONAL DIRECTOR  
Sanjay Wadhwa\*  
Thomas P. Smith\*  
Paul G. Gizzi  
Alix Biel\*  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
New York Regional Office  
Brookfield Place  
200 Vesey Street, Suite 400  
New York, New York 10281-1022  
212-336-0077 (Gizzi)  
Email: gizzip@sec.gov

\* Not admitted in District of New Jersey

### LOCAL RULE 11.2 CERTIFICATION

Pursuant to Local Rule 11.2, I certify that the matter in controversy alleged against the Defendant in the foregoing Complaint is related to *United States v. Thomas Nicholas Salzano*, 21-mj-13062 (LDW) (D.N.J.), pending in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey.

*/s/ Richard R. Best*

---

RICHARD R. BEST  
REGIONAL DIRECTOR  
New York Regional Office  
Brookfield Place  
200 Vesey Street, Suite 400  
New York, New York 10281-1022  
212-336-0077 (Gizzi)  
Email: gizzip@sec.gov

Of Counsel:  
Sanjay Wadhwa  
Thomas P. Smith Jr.  
Paul G. Gizzi  
Alix Biel

**DESIGNATION OF AGENT FOR SERVICE**

Pursuant to Local Rule 101.1(f), the undersigned hereby designates the United States Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey to receive service of all notices or papers in this action at the following address:

David E. Dauenheimer  
Deputy Chief, Government Fraud Unit  
United States Attorney's Office  
District of New Jersey  
970 Broad Street, Suite 700  
Newark, NJ 07102  
(973) 645-2925  
Email: david.dauenheimer2@usdoj.gov

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

*/s/ Richard R. Best*

---

RICHARD R. BEST  
REGIONAL DIRECTOR  
New York Regional Office  
Brookfield Place  
200 Vesey Street, Suite 400  
New York, New York 10281-1022  
212-336-0077 (Gizzi)  
Email: gizzip@sec.gov

Of Counsel:  
Sanjay Wadhwa  
Thomas P. Smith Jr.  
Paul G. Gizzi  
Alix Biel

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) RICHARD R. BEST, SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, 200 VESEY STREET, SUITE 400, NEW YORK, NY 10281. (212)-336-0077 (G1771)

DEFENDANTS

THOMAS NICHOLAS SALZANO

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Hudson (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff, 2 U.S. Government Defendant, 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party), 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, PTF DEF, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

Table with columns: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES. Includes codes like 110 Insurance, 210 Land Condemnation, 310 Airplane, 440 Other Civil Rights, 625 Drug Related Seizure, 710 Fair Labor Standards Act, 820 Copyrights, 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant).

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding, 2 Removed from State Court, 3 Remanded from Appellate Court, 4 Reinstated or Reopened, 5 Transferred from Another District (specify), 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer, 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION: Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)(1) and (3). Brief description of cause: This is a civil enforcement action by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: [X] Yes [ ] No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE US v. Salzano (pending assignment) DOCKET NUMBER 21-mj-13062

DATE: Jun 7, 2021 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD: Richard R. Best (Digitally signed by Richard R. Best Date: 2021.06.04 17:36:49 -0400)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

### Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
- United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
- Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
- Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions](#).
- V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
- Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
- Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441.
- Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
- Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
- Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
- Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.
- Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.
- PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- VI. Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service.
- VII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.
- Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.
- Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

**Date and Attorney Signature.** Date and sign the civil cover sheet.