

IN THE MATTER of the Companies Act 1992.
AND
IN THE MATTER of an Application under the Securities Industry Act 2011. AND

IN THE MATTER of Mdollaz (trading as Arawak X), a Registered Marketplace and Clearing Facility.

## THIRD AFFIDAVIT OF CHRISTINA R. ROLLE

I, Christina R. Rolle, Executive Director of the Securities Commission of The Bahamas, (hereafter the "Commission"), New Providence, one of the islands of the Commonwealth of The Bahamas, make oath and say as follows:

1. I make this Third Affidavit on behalf of the Petitioner (also hereafter referred to as "the Applicant") in my aforesaid capacity as the Executive Director of the Commission.
2. I am the same person who, in my said capacity, swore the Affidavit filed on 18 September 2023 (the "Principal Affidavit"), and I am also duly authorized to make this Third Affidavit on the Petitioner's behalf. The facts deposed to herein are within my own knowledge or are obtained from documents in possession of the Commission or its legal advisors as the case may be, and are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.
3. In the course of carrying out its regulatory and/or investigative functions, the Commission regularly conducts meetings and interviews (both formal and informal) with persons deemed relevant to the Commission's investigations. Further, Part IV of the Act empowers the Commission to compel testimony and gather evidence from any person.
4. Per the Commission's internal processes, meetings and interviews (both formal and informal) are either attended by myself and/or by persons within the Commission who have been designated by me to attend/conduct such meetings and interviews.
5. In early October 2022, Mr. Felix Stubbs telephoned me and advised that he had been contacted by Mr. D'Arcy Rahming Sr. to serve as a director of the Respondent. Mr. Stubbs expressed his concern that he requested but was unable to receive financials from Mr . Rahming Sr. He also noted that he thought the Commission should speak with Mr. James Campbell and wanted to arrange a meeting between himself, Mr. Campbell and the Commission. The meeting was arranged for 11 October 2022. I attended this meeting along with Ms. Magan Knowles (Manager, Supervision) and Mr. Daniel Strachan (Deputy Manager, Supervision). The relevant details of this meeting are outlined at paragraphs 7-9 and 12 of the Affidavit filed on 18 September 2023 (the "Principal Affidavit").
6. On 14 October 2022, the Commission met with Mr. Darcy Rahming Sr. I attended this meeting along with Ms. Magan Knowles, Mr. Renaldo Harding (Manager, Examinations), Mrs. Vivienne Dean (Manager, Enforcement) and Mr. Daniel Strachan. The relevant details of this meeting are outlined at paragraph 13 of the Principal Affidavit.
7. On 23 March 2023, following a "for cause" examination as detailed in the Principal Affidavit, the Commission imposed conditions on the registration of the Respondent details of which are in the Principal Affidavit. On 12 April 2023, the Commission met with the principals of the Respondent who were accompanied by their attorney, Mr. Kahlil Parker KC. I attended this meeting along with Mr. Gawaine Ward (Senior Manager, Enforcement), Mrs. Vivienne Dean and Mr. Austin Smith (Deputy Manager, Examinations). The transcript of this meeting is attached to the Principal Affidavit as CRR8.
8. On 19 April 2023, the Commission met and conducted a formal interview with Mr. Michael Turnquest, former CFO of the Respondent. I did not attend this meeting and the Commission was represented by Mrs. Vivienne Dean, Mr. Daniel Strachan, Ms. Aramantha Hepburn (Deputy Manager, Enforcement) and Mr. Gladstone Brown (Legal

Officer, Enforcement). Now shown to me is a true copy of the transcript of the interview marked and exhibited as "CRR 1".
9. On 3 May 2023, the Commission met with Mr. Lambert Longley and Ms. Charlene Fox of LDL and Associates. I did not attend this meeting and the Commission was represented by Mr. Renaldo Harding, Mrs. Vivienne Dean, Mr. Austin Smith, Mr. Daniel Strachan and Ms. Aramantha Hepburn. Now shown to me is a true copy of the meeting minutes marked and exhibited as "CRR 2".
10. On 9 May 2023, the Commission met and conducted formal interviews separately with Ms. Nadia Butler, former Compliance Officer, and Mr. Kenneth Donathan, CFO. Both were accompanied by the Respondent's attorney, Mr. Kahlil Parker, KC. I did not attend this meeting and the Commission was represented by Ms. Magan Knowles, Mr. Renaldo Harding, Mrs. Vivienne Dean, Mr. Austin Smith, Mr. Daniel Strachan and Ms. Aramantha Hepburn. Now shown to me is a true copy of the meeting minutes marked and exhibited as "CRR 3".
11. On 3 July 2023, the Commission met with Mr. Samuel Wilkinson, former CFO of the Respondent. I did not attend this meeting and the Commission was represented by Mr. Austin Smith, Mr. Daniel Strachan, Ms. Aramantha Hepburn and Mr. Gladstone Brown. Now shown to me is a true copy of the meeting minutes marked and exhibited as "CRR 4".
12. On 11 July 2023, the Commission met with Investor 36 (as referred to in the Principal Affidavit). I did not attend this meeting and the Commission was represented by Mr. Daniel Strachan, Ms. Aramantha Hepburn, Ms. Yulanda Forbes-Fowler, (Assistant Manager, Examinations) and Mr. Gladstone Brown. Now shown to me is a true copy of the meeting minutes marked and exhibited as "CRR 5".
13. On 11 July 2023, the Commission held a teleconference with Investor 18 (as referred to in the Principal Affidavit). I did not attend this telephone meeting and the Commission was represented by Mr. Gawaine Ward. Now shown to me is a true copy of the meeting minutes marked and exhibited as "CRR 6".
14. On 24 August 2023, the Commission met with Investor 15 (as referred to in the Principal Affidavit) via Microsoft Teams. I did not attend this meeting and the Commission was represented by Ms. Magan Knowles, Mr. Renaldo Harding, Mr. Austin Smith, Mr. Daniel Strachan, Ms. Aramantha Hepburn and Mr. Gladstone Brown. Now shown to me is a true copy of the meeting minutes marked and exhibited as "CRR 7".
15. On 30 August 2023, the Commission met with the principals of the Respondent who were accompanied by their attorney, Mr. Kahlil Parker, KC. I did not attend this meeting and the Commission was represented by Mr. Gawaine Ward, Ms. Magan Knowles, Mr. Renaldo Harding, Mr. Daniel Strachan, Ms. Aramantha Hepburn, Mr. Yulanda Forbes Fowler, Gladstone Brown and Mr. Krisspin Sands (Legal Officer, Office of Legal Counsel).
16. On 13 September, the Commission met with the principals of the Respondent who were accompanied by their attorney, Mr. Kahlil Parker, KC. I attended this meeting along with Mr. Gawaine Ward, Ms. Magan Knowles, Mr. Renaldo Harding, Ms. Aramantha Hepburn, Mr. Yulanda Forbes Fowler and Mr. Krisspin Sands. The transcript of this meeting is attached to the Principal Affidavit as CRR 29.
17. That the contents of this Affidavit are true and correct to the best of my knowledge information and belief.

SWORN TO in the City of Nassau \} This $19^{\text {th }}$ day of October, A.D., 2023 \}

COMMONWEALTH OF THE BAHAMAS ..... 2023IN THE SUPREME COURT
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## CERTIFICATE

These are the Exhibits marked "CRR 1" through "CRR 7" referred to in the Third Affidavit of Christina R. Bole, filed herein and dated the $19^{4 n}$ day of October, 2023.
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## EXHIBIT CKRI 1

## Exhibit 1

## Re: ArawakX \& MDollaz

INTERVIEW OF MICHAEL TURNQUEST.

> Wednesday, April 19th, 2023 $10: 02 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m} .-12: 33 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$.

31A East Bay Street, 2nd Floor Nassau, New Providence

Reported By:
RoyAnne Neely-Morrison, PhD RMR, CRR, CRI, CPE Court Reporter

$$
\text { Interview - } 19 \text { April } 2023
$$

APPEARANCES:
 The Bahamas.

Mr. Michael Turnquest, Former CFO
ArawakX \& MDollaz
(Interview commenced at 10:02 a.m.)

MS. HEPBURN: Good Morning, Mr. Turnquest.
My name is Aramantha Hepburn, Deputy Manager of
Enforcement. Along with me is Mr. Daniel Strachan, Deputy Manager in the Supervision Department. Next to him is Mrs. Vivienne Dean, she is our Manager in the Enforcement Department. Next to us is Mr. Gladstone Brown, Legal Officer in the Enforcement Department.

I guess for the sake of my colleagues who were not at the meeting last week, we are hoping that you could give a brief introduction of yourself.

You have to speak up.

MR. TURNQUEST: All right. So my name is Michael Turnquest, early 50s. I have been an accountant for over 30 years, I think. I was recruited to join the ArawakX team at some point in 2021, I want to say, and eventually joined them in the middle of August, 2021. So last week, I mostly observed the conversations that were happening. Before $I$ had a chance to speak -- before I spoke, there were conversations had around the table, about possibly the conversion of the option to equity in order to have input or access information by Mr. Campbell. There was some discussion about whether or not a director could take certain administrative

```
                                    Interview - 19 April 2023
```

actions under common law. Which $I$ believe the statement on this side was it exists in the UK only under statutory or codified law. From there, the conversation was kind of still. I'm not sure how I got pulled in. I can't remember the exact details about how I got pulled into the conversation. I do remember that point that it only happened in the UK. I think $I$ was just expressing my surprise that the approach anticipated that the ArawakX management team would need time to recover from potential losses. And something about pipeline revenue. I did not understand what that was, but $I$ have had a chance to think about it since then. But the point made last week was there is only one kind of revenue, and the Securities Commission knows every penny of that revenue. Because the only revenue that can be recognized is the ten percent of whatever successful raise happened. Any other revenue has to be questioned. Any other revenue has to be questioned. And $I$ think the point $I$ made was anything you are told, if you're told to look left, look right. That, I think, was the summation of what $I$ had to say.

I said that particularly because $I$ was reflecting on this idea of the pipeline revenue; this idea of it only happens in the UK; anything like that

```
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```

reflect.

So I think I was asked if I had any evidence from ArawakX. I have a little, and I have presented what $I$ have and $I$ think that is probably as much as $I$ should present. Any other evidence, this is today, I think once $I$ have provided as much as $I$ have here, I don't know if it's appropriate even to if I have anything, to just disgorge it without some cover or some compulsion -- not that $I$ have anything. But, the reality is all of the evidence is right there in -- not necessarily in ArawakX's records, but in independent bank records. So the bank has the records of every transaction. And the bankers themselves, being aware of how ArawakX should operate, they also have evidence, which they too would not be able to divulge unless they are compelled to do so. So you are clear on that? Am I clear? I'm happy to answer any questions you have, now because this is of course the arena in which to do it. BY MS. DEAN:
Q. So let me see before $I$ move on, am $I$ to understand what you've said just now is that there have been some allegations raised. You may or may not have in your possession supporting documentation with regards to those allegations?
A. Correct.
Q. If it is that you do have that information, you're not prepared to openly provide it to the Commission save for certain --
A. If the Commission ask for it, or something specific, $I$ will definitely research and provide it if I have it. But you're probably not going to get a complete picture by asking me for the records that ArawakX should have. And you are certainly not going to get the safest record by asking me for a record that the bank definitely has. So the people to approach would be the bank, ArawakX and certainly if $I$ have anything to help jump start it, I can provide it. But $I$ cannot be relied on to have all of the records. That's simply not the case. Occasionally, I am very lucky to find an e-mail that $I$ sent.

Oh, another point that was raised last week was the likelihood that there would be an accusation that the false reporting that was submitted to the Securities Commission would be attributed to me. All I could do is raise my hands, but as luck or fate would have it, in the course of discovering the misfilings, the process involved me providing an explanation to the ArawakX executives as to why their filings were noncompliant. So there was a contrast

```
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between what they had submitted, and what $I$ had prepared. And what $I$ have provided to you is an analysis as well as confirmation from the ArawakX general manager, where he acknowledges receipt of that analysis. So the potential accusation or the potential that they would attribute these false filings to me, that's now out the window. Because we have evidence that the general manager himself was aware of what was submitted and what should have been submitted.
Q. I think you might have sent the incorrect e-mail. That's what we read, expecting to receive that from you. But the e-mail that we received actually didn't add anything or take anything away from in support of that. Because you remember in the meeting last week, you made representations that you would give them a certain thing. They would ask you to make these changes, and you wouldn't do it. And they would make their own changes and send it to us. Right? So what they submitted was not what you gave to them; correct?
A. Correct. But it's not that they would ask me to make --
Q. No, I'm just saying, they would say -- okay, we would want it to reflect a certain thing. But what

```
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you sent, the e-mail that you provided us with, it was a one-liner.
A. What you are looking at, so there should have been an attachment.
Q. We didn't get an attachment. So so we were quite lost when we received that e-mail.
A. Okay.

BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. So the whole line of questioning this morning, of course, last week, the interview or the discussion was not recorded. So if the questions sound a bit repetitive, it's because now we are actually on record.

So just for clarification, your job description at ArawakX, could you possibly give that to us, please?
A. So, I was the Chief Financial Officer, which would simply mean that all of the financial-related job functions, everything should be fed through me for approval or completion or whatever. But as it was, the company was flat in the finance area, so I basically handled everything in terms of finances, so accounts payable, there wasn't so much as receivables, but clearing exercises, but reconciliations, payment instructions, financial reporting, VAT, filings, any Interview - 19 April 2023
other filings, basically everything. So I don't know if that is a clear enough job description, or do you need to --
Q. That was your only position, CFO?
A. Yes. There was -- they eventually needed someone with the title Senior Vice President of clearing, but $I$ think even that would have fallen under CFO, depending on the organizational structure. BY MS. DEAN:
Q. So what was the staff complement at that time?
A. Of the entire organization?
Q. Yes.
A. At that time $I$ think they maintained a staff of about 25 people, at the highest point possibly. Possibly one or two more. But there was a little attrition in and out. But $I$ think they were around 20 to 25 people for most part up until they needed concessions from the employees, then that was falling off.
Q. When you say possibly more, what exactly do you mean by that?
A. One or two more. But there was always someone coming in -- it was a strange situation. Despite the struggles, you would find one or two people joining the company, and $I$ wasn't always aware of whether or

```
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not one or two had left. And you might find out a little later that this person was no longer here. So I couldn't really say what the exact number was at any particular point in time: It was a total of maybe 20 to 25 people maybe 26 , maybe 27 .
Q. How did it affect payroll?
A. Payroll was a struggle, and $I$ can't remember -- I think around December, 2021, might have been the last regular payroll. December 2021 , and that's when you had, you couldn't be certain who was on staff and who was not. December 2021, pre-Christmas would have been the last, I think regular payroll. I think prior to that, the executives may have been foregone or waived a paycheck or two just prior to Christmas. But I do remember at Christmas I think everyone got something. The regular paycheck for the junior staff, and the executives got a paycheck. After that things started falling off. Cash was in short supply.
Q. So when you entered, $I$ guess, when you joined the team at ArawakX what was the state of affairs like financially?
A. It was not the healthiest. I didn't have a sense of -- well, in my position, no history there, no experience there, $I$ could not attest or be comfortable with or have any knowledge or experience with the
likelihood that they would be able to earn what was necessary to cover what were the expenses -- the ongoing expenses at the time. It was challenging and unwise for me to -- let's leave it at that. It was an unhealthy situation. Is that sufficient? There were ongoing expenses, reducing cash balance and no revenue to speak of. No revenue appeared until -- I want to say November, at which point it would have been the equivalent of $\$ 150,000.00$, but much of that had been consumed by the expenses leading up to that point. After that $\$ 150,000.00$, which was the result of the \$1.5 million raised for Red Lobsters. We had two issues in the pipeline. Bahama Grow Labs. Something with grow in it. I think MiFi came after Lobster, and it was not performing well. I remember cash being raised of maybe 30,40 , or 50,000 , whereas they were looking for millions, or a billion. At times $I$ think they reduced the expectation. I think they made the application to reduce the thresholds and what not, but MiFi never made. Grow was a similar situation. I think they came after MiFi, very soon after MiFi, but they too didn't meet their threshold. So like around January or February, theirs would have been -- their due dates, their maturity dates would have come about. But nothing came out in terms of revenue, nothing came
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out of Grow or Mifi. All right. So you have, or at least since $I$ have been there, from August to February, March, $\$ 150,000.00$ total revenue. No pipeline revenue. There is no such thing.

BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. So when exactly did you start?
A. August.
Q. Of 2021?
A. 2012, yes.
Q. Until?
A. October of 2022 .

BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. So as CFO, what kind of documents, if any, did you sign off on?
A. Nothing really. You have communications that we would sign, but there is nothing that -- until some new controls came into place in early 2022 , there was nothing to be signed off on other than your e-mails. After that, then you have authorizations that you can make for external parties. So, in early 2022, when the alarms went off, we had some internal control changes, where $I$ became a $B$ signatory on the bank accounts. And with that, that's when $I$ was able to sign off on external documents.
Q. You say alarms went off. What do you mean by Interview - 19 April 2023
that?
A. Well, as I described, when you have $\$ 150,000$ in revenue, and you had, on average $\$ 200,000$, in expenses each month up to the early 2022, by then, all clients' fund had been consumed. There was a point when the last -- I think we were looking at the -- I don't want to characterize it too much, but there was a point where a considerable amount of what was the last cash was spent in an attempt to raise money in Boston, or Washington, or New York. And so a trip was made to Boston, Washington or New York. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. Excuse me, you say 'raise money', raise money for what?
A. Supply.
Q. Meaning investing in MDollaz?
A. Yes.
Q. You mentioned January, I think you said 2021 to December --
A. 2022 .
Q. No. I'm talking about when you mentioned the payroll. You said that the payroll was normal from January 2021?
A. It was normal, let's say since $I$ got there, August, it was normal until January 2022 or December, Interview - 19 April 2023
2021.
Q. So those initial funds that were being paid -those were on the initial investment of MDollaz?
A. Correct.
Q. So they were was nothing to do with the revenues earned from the offerings prior to that?
A. There was no revenue prior to that.
Q. Right. So you just were -- I don't want to say bleeding cash, but just spending --
A. Spending what was was invested in the company.
Q. Correct.
A. So you have Mr. Campbell quotes a number, he was given so much and every so often they would find someone new to invest in ArawakX, and you would limp along with these minor capital injections.
Q. You said every so often they would find somebody new to invest in ArawakX?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any names of those individuals or who they are?
A. I do have some names, but there again you can find -- I do have some names, subject to my poor
memory, but I have --
Q. Names and numbers?
A. I do remember the

I remembered him. I remember there was a Eellow. Of course Mr. Campbell, but his came in as a loan.
Q. So these other investors there funds were coming as capital injection?
A. As capital injections. There was a guy, $I$ think from
Q. But essentially all of this was reflected in the bank account?
A. It would be, and I might have some of these names somewhere in my records. BY MS. DEAN:
Q. And are you willing to provide us with that?
A. Yes, if $I$ can trust myself to find it. So we need the comparative analyst of the IS findings. You want my best record of investors. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. Yes, besides Mr. Campbell, and when those funds came in, would they have been accounted for?
A. And I would say new investors there was a cap table of what should be all investors. But the problems $I$ had with that table in the beginning was it just couldn't add up. This was one of the earliest problems that $I$ found. I asked for -BY MR. BROWN:

```
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Q. When you say it didn't add up, could you be a little more clear and specific?
A. Everyone was being too vague with me. I would say, Mr. Campbell would say, "it's a million three. It's a million six." And those are big differences, and he never gave me an exact number. But $I$ also could not find the number in the record that was close enough to approximate any of the numbers he gave me. So I -BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. You weren't able to reconcile with the bank account, what monies were received?
A. You could see it in the bank account. You just don't know who gave it. And that was the challenge. Because now you are thinking, if Mr. Campbell give $\$ 1.6$ million, let's just say, I'd see on the cap table, it's there as 1.3 or 1.2. What happened to the other $\$ 400,000 ?$ And then you think this over 400 individuals, did they put it through them? Or did they put something in addition to him? So I just -- the only way to resolve it was to see a subscription documents for every single person, which was not provided to me. BY MS. DEAN:
Q. I know previously when you gave your job

```
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description and the list of duties that would have fallen under you as the CFO, you listed reconciliation. How would you go about reconciling monies coming in monies going out? And at what frequency did you do that?
A. That was on a daily basis. You have a live record. I have live records that have been connected to the bank. So anything that went through the bank, went through my books. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. So you use a software like Quick Books or?
A. It's easier than Excel. So basically every morning, you download the records from the bank, incorporate it into your accounting records and just complete the accounting based on the information that comes from the bank. Now, there might be -- I don't really like to count chickens before they're hatched, but in theory if you have -- there was a situation where $I$ think the guy in $\quad$ he gave us evidence that he had sent his money. He was using a combination of and earlier, he was using another bank, Commonwealth, or someone else. One or both of them were giving him trouble. The money looked like it was on its way. We might've recorded at that point and time, but you couldn't

```
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record it as cash in the bank, or record it as receivable. So that might be one of the rare occasions where $I$ would have had an approval, but otherwise everything is recorded through bank statements.
Q. So would you produce these records to Mr. Rahming and the team?
A. Yeah. He had an idea of what -- he wanted reported the way he wanted to see them. So an accounts payable register wouldn't work for him. He wanted something -- I can't remember what it was. It was nothing that was useful. Because he is always juggling money. When his cash went out, he was juggling. So it wasn't so much that he wanted to know what our cash balance was. It was how much cash do we have available to stave off whoever was banging on the door. It was prioritized or list whoever were most the important vendors, or the biggest vendors, and whenever an investor would make an injection, he would say, okay, we got $\$ 500,000$ from Mr. X. How do we spend it, and how much or payrolls so much for supplier A so much for supplier $B$ and so on.
Q. So this was money accounting for from the offerings? Was that separate and apart?
A. Yes, it's a separate set of books. But the
books do have to be combined at some point for presentation purposes. So for clients, we have a separate bank account from the company's account. Occasionally, there might be some mistaken entries, like one or two investors somehow found out or knew about the operating account, might have put their monies in the operating account. On one or two occasions, an investor's money may go in the client's account -- sometimes on purpose, sometimes accidentally. But on one, two, three occasions we had those situations. But otherwise the client's money and company's monies were in two separate bank accounts. And it is the same accounting process. Every transaction that goes in, becomes part of my record.

For clients, they did not have an electronic automated computerized system for tracking client's deposits. We had a manual system, which made it necessary for clients to inform us when they made deposits. Of course, that is open to every kind of error in the book. Some clients -- well, let's start with the last one, which $I$ don't believe was in error. The last one, when $I$ had -- at the time when $I$ had signing authority, $I$ was told that a client sent $\$ 238.00$, and they would like a refund of their
\$238.00. And my answer, we have not received $\$ 238.00$ from this client. How do you know? Because I have looked at the bank statements, and we have not received ever, between this moment in time and the advisement that they sent something, and the moment today, there is no amount of $\$ 238$ in the bank. So $I$ have that evidence. But for weeks, it was pounded on me that $I$ needed to pay someone $\$ 238$, which at that time, now that $I$ had the signing authority, $I$ said, as politely as $I$ could, $I$ don't have it. It will not be paid.
"The client has sent you evidence." "The client has sent me an image of something that they believe has made it to us. And $I$ have not received it. I can't pay it." And when I say there was about two weeks of nothing but trauma, I'm talking about phone calls in the dead of night. "You are embarrassing me." "You are insulting me." Just harassing behavior trying to force me to pay money to someone who has not sent that money to us.
Q. So it was clear that the money was received?
A. No.
Q. Not from your standpoint but from --
A. No, I don't know if it was received at all. This wasn't the first situation. Because sometimes
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1 people use their phone apps, and they try to make a transfer. Unbeknownst to them, something is wrong with their end and the bank is unable to process the transaction. So if they send me the first snapshot of the attempt to transfer, I've had to solve many problems like that, and of course at the time up there where $I$ sit. I say check back, look back to see if the bank hasn't returned the funds to your account. And sure enough one, two, thee days later, the funds have returned to their account because they have put in the wrong bank, or they didn't have enough funds in their account to make the transfer. Whatever the reasons were, I can't say what the reasons are, but it would not have been the first time that $I$ saw the situation where someone was attempting to send the payment but the payment never arrives. But in this particular case, it was some radio personality or some socially well-known person or something like that. And supposedly $I$ was told in the end that they were paid out of pocket. BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. So ArawakX has an app, or you're talking about the banking or the client's banking --
A. The client's banking app. Now, at this point ArawakX has moved on to other things and they may have Interview - 19 April 2023
a little more sophistication. They are now using the banking apps to give them accurate and correct information as opposed to what we do when $I$ went there. Where they did not have any integration with the banking systems. It was all manual.

On the topic of it being manual, the client, every so often, would not know any different or any better, they would attempt to wire funds to us. Now if you appreciate that some of the subscriptions were for $\$ 9$ or say $\$ 12$ or a smaller amounts, when you -- depending on your bank, if you ask a bank to conduct a wire transfer, if you walk to a teller and ask for a wire, they will charge you a fee. And apparently you can pay the fee yourself as a sender, or charge the receiver. So we would get $\$ 16$ transfer accounts. I don't want to make it too dramatic, but imagine $\$ 11$ in wire transfers. So a $\$ 16$ subscription with $\$ 11.50$ charge, and $I$ think we were obliged to give them their $\$ 16$ subscription.
Q. So when this information came to you -- so you may have received complaints, you say persons harassed you?
A. I need to be specific. My apologies. The general manager is the only person who harassed me, when he could not get his socialite friend granted his
\$238. It was him who would call in the dead of night with threats and claimed to be embarrassment and claimed that $I$ was undermining him or harming him in some way. All I was doing was exercising the authority $I$ had to conserve the company's assets, and not make a mistake paying someone who had not sent the money to us, or whose money we had not received. Just exercising the authority that $I$ had.
Q. As it relates to assets, what assets did ArawakX had during your time there?
A. They had a few bits of hardware. I want to say that's it. There might have been some deposits with the utility companies. Maybe the landlord. I would have to look back at the financials, but your question a great way to start on the next issue -- it is an excellent introduction to the next big issue. And the biggest issue, and it was an issue over which I got another call in the dead of night, where my career was threatened. Just about 45 minutes of unhinged ranting. And it surrounded the capitalization of software costs. On a couple of occasions, there were attempts to convince me that there were different reasons to capitalize, or there existed reasons related to ArawakX to capitalize software costs. One of them was the fact that we were Interview - 19 April 2023
a technology-based company, and so we have a privilege -- in their minds. There is some sort of privileged position because you are a technology-based company -any technology spent is considered a capital investment. There is no such carved out for -- they were all technology based institutions. There's no such thing. What determines whether or not you have a capitalized software cost, based on whether you owned it or -- yeah, you have to own it. There must be ownership. You have to have possession, control, different attributes that are pretty well laid out in IAS guidelines. Yes, you can have leases, you can lease home improvements, and as an analogy, but the business of cloud computing and ordinary commerce has become so big, that the IFRS has put significant focus on creating the guidelines as to what is capitalizable and what is not. Everybody is doing computing, so they have to have guidelines as to how those things are capitalized.

So almost none of what we spent could have been capitalized. But, you -- capitalized, in the sense of fixed assets. But there was room to capitalize it as prepays or something that could get written off. There is -- well, everything gets written off by depreciation. But prepaid would just
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be written off a bit faster. Often, it's tied to the length of a contract, if you had a contract, which for many these reasons we had none. So the longest we could ideally maintain the capital would have been one year. If there was some basis, maybe more than a year. But the most $I$ could do was record things as prepays in order to not have it affect the expense lines immediately.
Q. So the assets they were listed on the balance sheet, you said there were hardware, IT, software --
A. There was a little hardware. A few laptops here and there, and printers and what not. But other than that, there were no assets. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. So there were no fixed assets?
A. That's what $I$ am saying. So they were leasing the space that they were in physically, so they don't own that.
Q. No.
A. I don't -- they might have done something before I got there. But I don't remember much in the way of lease home improvements, because it was a lease, $I$ imagine for a,year, I'd have to check the records, where as a lease, they could record these home improvements. I don't think they did anything to
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the space that there were in much. There were some furniture. The biggest expense was the spending on software and just explaining that one. A huge body of guidance on how you deal with that. But there is, since you say fixed, I recall one thing, but it's not -- it would be -- I think you would have to call it an investment. So they had a building or a property on Joe Farrington Road that was pledged, or somehow incorporated or contributed assets. But I think it was also pledged in a loan as well. So there was a building that was contributed, and there was some mention or discussion or perhaps some history that the building was going to be used as another occasion for the business. But that's the only significantly fixed asset that $I$ could put my finger on.
Q. You had an idea to the cost of the software? You say it was a major expense?
A. Software was, there was no one software.
Q. I mean just in total. The actual cost of the software, a ballpark figure, give an estimate?
A. It is better to say let's say how much was spent on software.
Q. Sure.
A. So let's say may be about $\$ 600,000$, and $I$
don't think the spending was finished at that point. BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. So what about investments?
A. Please don't be angry if it turns out to be $\$ 300,000$. It was significant because I just remember thinking about the numbers going up and up and realizing that you don't own anything. I remember being shocked by it. So maybe my shock is making me inflate these numbers. I don't know. It was terrifying to witness. But go ahead. What about --
Q. What about investments?
A. Right so other than that land, which one could call an investment of sorts, there were no investments.
Q. None at all?
A. None at all. I hate to do this without the plans, but $I$ don't remember any other investments.
Q. I know we spoke briefly about that e-mail. You remember the contents of the e-mail? Because we kind of queried the timelines between it. I see that there is a May 2022, and a November 2022. Two different persons, $I$ think $I$ see something from Mr. James Campbell and one from D'Arcy Rahming, Sr.
A. Yes, so May, 2022 .
Q. Right.
A. So this is starting in May, Jimmy would have asked -- he I think he saw the financial statements that were presented to Securities, and he thought something's wrong. So he asked me did I prepare those financials. I looked at them. No, I did not.
Q. So who prepared them? Can you say who prepared them?
A. It would -- so Rahming $S r$. would have to have signed off on the financials or at least what was submitted to the Securities Commission. The other person who had the ability to sign off was Rahming Jr. So they would have been the ones to sign off on it. As to who prepared it, I can only speak to the facts that I witnessed among the two of them. I imagine the Senior probably dictated, and Junior did the preparations.

BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. Excuse me, Mr. Turnquest, we have some financials that were presented. Sorry. Those are financials that are submitted to the Commission as of those dates.
A. Yes, so Rahming Sr signed and I really can't remember, $I$ would have to see. I really can't remember more than that. I would have to see -- I would have to see what $I$ did to know what they did.
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BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. So do you have your own records of what you would have done against what they would have done?
A. I do. In fact, this should have given you -I was smiling so much when $I$ sent that. Because it's this reply from Rahming sr., that $I$ was only too happy to find.

```
I just want to take you to --
```

BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. So, Mr. Turnquest, just for a second. Back to the offering, to the first offering the Pinnacle Franchise Brand, you say that was 1.5 million raised, so the fees would be $10 \%$ ?
A. I think it -- well, it was a 2.5 offer, but I think they eventually got to 1.8 altogether.
Q. So less than $10 \%$ of the fees from ArawakX and MDollaz, you would have those client funds in the bank account?
A. There was a peculiarity with that particular raise. Some amounts, I think $\$ 900$, I think some funny business where the monies were held offshore or US account or something. Something that made it such that $I$ never saw it. I never saw it in the bank here in The Bahamas. They --
Q. So you never saw it in the bank here in The
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Bahamas but it was -- or held offshore?
A. Presumably held offshore or something like that.
Q. So how do they keep the client records of what they contributed? Each investor --
A. Each investor's name is associated with the amount that is submitted. So every time money comes in, I have a record the amount, the date, with confirmation from the client who sent it. So that is the clearing house's side as well. So every night, I would do an analysis going through all the e-mails that came in; any messages that were sent to me from colleagues around the office, and basically match anyone who says they sent any money with the confirmation or the evidence.
Q. So if the accounts were held offshore --
A. Not all the accounts.
Q. No, you said some of the account was held offshore?
A. Just one. In the case of Pinnacle, there was one transaction that involved some stupendously large amount. I can't remember the exact amount, whether it was $\$ 900,000.00$ or it was 1 million. Whatever it was, there was correspondence, hopefully, or at least I was told, with the Securities Commission to come to Interview - 19 April 2023
an agreement on how to deal with it.
Q. Because that would imply that these funds were being raised offshore. Not from the Bahamian not from the offering locally --

BY MS. DEAN:
Q. I want to get some clarification. Am I to understand that ArawakX MDollaz has accounts offshore as well?
A. No. That is part of the problem. So we didn't have an account offshore. We got some sort of confirmation or assurance that whoever the was sender, I can't remember the name. We can look it up, and see how much they contributed to the raise. And it was on the basis of that raise -- I think that took us over the threshold at that point. I think that might have been in early November or something like that. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. Because it sounds as if funds were being raised offshore --
A. Just one transaction.
Q. But that one transaction could be an accumulated amount of transactions offshore.
A. I don't know. But to my mind, it was one transaction. Oh, I remember how it went down. I can't swear that this is how it went. I'm just saying Interview - 19 April 2023
what was relayed to me. That transaction was attributed to the founder, Chris Mortimer. That was attributed to him. So however he got his financing, supposedly that being his money, he now makes it part of the raise. But he did not put it into a Bahamian bank account controlled by ArawakX. He put it in or left it with a US bank account that he controlled. BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. So you can't say definitively whether it was an investment or or otherwise?
A. I can't say.

BY MS. DEAN:
Q. The monies never made it into any account that was controlled by MDollaz?
A. Correct.

BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. But it was accounted for?
A. As an investment.
Q. We asked about the investment, outside of the property of Joe Farrington Road.

BY MS. DEAN:
Q. When they did the offer to Pinnacle, they gave this $\$ 900,000.00$ or 1 million would have been an investment in Pinnacle.
A. Correct.
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Q. But it never came in like the usual investment, but was marked as an investment.
A. Correct. Just to make the distinction. When you asked about investments, and $I$ think you asked about fixed assets, $I$ was trained on investment in ArawakX, in the operations in ArawakX. The investment that we are now talking about is from the offering. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. And to your knowledge Pinnacle received their funds from the raise?
A. Yes. So they presumably had this million dollars or whatever it was that was offshore, and then what was left from the cash raised in The Bahamas, they received, I think like $\$ 90,000$.
Q. Okay. So they would have received all of their investments?
A. Yeah, subject to whatever gyrations were going on at the time. I smile at that and I call it a gyration because was in that event when the payment was determined for Pinnacle, that was the first opportunity for me to exercise the dual signing authority. And on that day, $I$ call it a hostage day -- I was grabbed, pulled into a room, told that $I$ was untrustworthy, I was basically browbeaten. Leading up to that point, Mr. Campbell had -- because he was
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never convinced that things were as bad as they were. I think he was always getting two channels of communication. I would tell him we are out of cash and to hear him saying, 'hey we have lots of cash.' I would go, 'what are you talking about?' And then $I$ am thinking, oh my God! Are they cleverly ignoring the fact that that cash is not ArawakX's cash, and so truthfully saying we have lots of cash, just not meaning that it's our cash. So $I$ honestly didn't know what to make of the reports and the feedback. And so that day after it became clear that we had to have dual control of the bank accounts, he had told me to -- I guess he was thinking that $I$ exceeded my authority or something, or flaunted my authority, so behave myself. Do what I'm told. Follow directions was the admonishment from him, and then --
Q. From Mr. Campbell?
A. Mr. Campbell, yes. And then the next day, the very next day, I'm pulled in and told that I'm not trustworthy. That Mr. Campbell is only an advisor. That he -- being Rahming Sr., is the executive and whereas they are grateful that $I$ maintain these lines of communications with directors, to help the situation that they were in, cash-wise, I need to consider my career and all that stuff. So threats
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started. So in that moment, in that morning, it went from morning until afternoon, $I$ was made to sit at the table while Rahming Sr., and Rahming Jr. made decisions on what to do with the money that Mr. Campbell had just signed a loan agreement to give them. He told them what this was for and how it was to be spent.
Q. How was the money to be spent? Do you know?
A. He had a commitment letter. It's listed somewhere. I've seen it $I$ just can't remember. So much for this, so much for that. -BY MS. DEAN:
Q. Could you give a general idea of what the money was supposed to have spent on?
A. Most of the money was for Pinnacle. At that point we had no cash. We had gone through all the company's cash. We had gone through all the clients' cash. The last bit of cash before we went to near zero was a trip to New York or Boston, or whatever the hell it was.
Q. When you say for Pinnacle, you mean for Pinnacle's payout?
A. For Pinnacle's payout. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. To Pinnacle?
A. To Pinnacle.
Q. So the money that was raised from Pinnacle, some of the monies were spent?
A. Some of the monies were spent?
Q. Most of the money was spent --
A. We were in $\$ 9,000$ from 0 across the board. Maybe $\$ 25,000$.
Q. So the client's funds were spent?
A. Yes, clients' funds were spent. BY MS. DEAN:
Q. Do you have -- was there anything in writing that indicated that a certain portion of the loan and monies received from Mr. Campbell were to be paid in respect to Pinnacle? Is that in writing?
A. Yes. So when Mr. Campbell gave them the money, it's a loan, so it's like a commitment letter. So you are committed to spend the money to this purpose this purpose, this purpose, that purpose. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. So how did they spend the money?
A. I mean probably they spent it along the lines. Just not the amounts. I pointed this out, and I talk about this $\$ 90,000$ because they were doing all kind of gymnastics to reduce the figure that was going to Pinnacle. One of them was a $\$ 5,000.00$ just came out
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of nowhere. I later found out, just based on a side issue, but $I$ later found out that this was $\$ 5,000.00$ that was supposedly paid on behalf of Pinnacle by the Rahmings. Which was actually paid by Chris Mortimer himself. So it's more than likely Mortimer forgot that he paid this $\$ 5,000$ and it was presented as if the Rahmings paid the $\$ 5,000.00$, and so it was deducted from whatever was to be paid to Pinnacle. So at some point the number came down to $\$ 95,000$. The $\$ 95,000$ goes to 90,000 . So the number ended up being to 90. So that's basically what happened that first day where $I$ had counter acting signing authority. And I sat there thinking about all of those things. Do what you're told. And so all at the end of the day, I told Mr. Campbell, I said well, that's how the day went. He said no, that's not what you were supposed to do. I should have gotten up. Gotten out. Called him right away and addressed it properly. BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. You received your instructions from whom?
A. Sorry?
Q. You're saying Mr. Campbell, said you should have done things a certain way?
A. Yes. $I$ was the $B$ signatory at that point so $I$ should have vetoed all of that bull that was presented
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```
to me. But the combination of the conflict of
instructions didn't 'jive' with me having this B
signature authority at that point and time. The
person who gave it to me said do what they say. The
persons who should have not had single signing
authority were saying, we're going to fire you if you
do anything other than what we say. I'm jammed. And
frankly if they screwed each other, what can I do
about that?
BY MR. STRACHAN:
```

Q. You mentioned a trip to New York or to Boston. What was that trip for, do you have any idea what that was about? How was that paid for?
A. So all the company's cash was gone. There may have been some investors' money coming in at that point, but of course, if you are already into the clients' funds -- any monies that come in is really clients' funds. But the -- last week, I think I made a point that there was -- they had trouble understanding the difference between owning and renting. BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. Who is 'they?'
A. Sorry, the Rahmings. So the implications is if you own something, and if you spend money on that
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thing- if $I$ own a car and $I$ spend money to add a new stereo to my car, $I$ am increasing the value to my car. So that spending is an asset. I have the car as an asset. I have now added a JVC stereo, so now the value of my asset goes up a bit because I spent money on the JVC asset. But if $I$ was renting that car, and I put a JVC stereo in the car, well, $I$ have given the owner of the car a JVC stereo. That's an expense. So I would've spent it on the exact same thing, but it is a question of do you own it? Or do you have to turn it to someone else? They could not grasp that. So any spending on software which we were renting, there is is simplified explanation. This meant that these are expenses. With the exception that if the software is a part of the lease agreement, or it is somehow added value to existing assets that you have a real asset, it would have been treated it differently. But if you don't own anything, the money that you spend is all expenses. So your income statement. Which $I$ think was about three or five or six hundreds of thousands that they spent. So that was the thing I mentioned last week. This week there is another fundamental accounting economics finance problem and that's the difference between revenue and cash flow. Cash can
come from any number of sources, and you can always have positive cash flow if people keep giving cash. But if you get cash from an investor, that is not revenue. That is money that you either owe, because they want their money back, or money that they want a return on, because they want dividends in their share investment. Or they want to eventually cash it out and take it with them. That is not revenue. They didn't grasp that. But $I$ believe as a result, they never really focused on the revenue aspect of the business. They never, never, until very late in the game, attempted to find new clients to feed -- to realize revenue out of their pipeline. They always had a pipeline. The pipeline was there, but something has to pop out of that pipeline and become a real client. I believe the country can use a service like the ArawakX. I'm not sure that they believed that ArawakX is that type of service. But what they do believe that it is an attractive enough idea so that they can pull money in. So the constant chasing of clients.

BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. So that was what the trip was about?

BY MS. DEAN:
Q. I was about to say you went all around the Interview - 19 April 2023
bush and we still don't know what this New York trip was about.
A. Did I take you on too long a trip? They went to a conference or some gathering of investors, hoping to attract capital investment.

BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. So we got your second e-mail, Mr. Turnquest. I think this one you wanted some clarification on certain things as it relates to that particular $I$ you labeled it as a report. Is it possible we can start from paragraph 1 , but of course in paragraph 1, you establish your time of employment, that being August 2021 to October 7, 2022. Before that, you stated that you were wrongfully terminated.
A. Yes.
Q. Is this something you sought legal action to in relation to you just coined the term?
A. I just coined the term, because they had in there, incompetence this, that and the other, but it can't be substantiated, and I end this letter explaining when that termination happened and the events connected with it.
Q. Paragraph 2, if you may. Look at the first line. "The said termination --"
A. "Adherence to new internal controls which were Interview - 19 April 2023
instituted in January of 2022 --"
Q. Right. So my question is in relation to the new internal controls. What internal controls were implemented.
A. So the new internal control was the dual signatory.

BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. So prior to that it was just either one or the other?
A. Sorry?
Q. Prior to that, it was just either Mr. Rahming Sr. or Jr. to sign?
A. Rahming Sr. or Jr.
Q. Can sign?
A. Either one. One signature was sufficient. BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. This external director --
A. I was just taken aback that it has taken as long as it has taken. It's scary.
Q. This external director, who exactly are you referring to?
A. Jimmy Campbell.
Q. Abuse of client funds. You mean the accusation there in paragraph 2 again. Substantiated by what? Line 2 of paragraph 2 , sentence 1 .
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A. Abuse of clients -- use of client funds.
Q. You want to elaborate on that?
A. The client funds only had one purpose. That is to effectively go to the issuer. If you use it for anything else, it's an abuse.
Q. So what else was it used for?
A. Operating expenses. Business expenses.
Q. Okay. The allegation of 'to pay founders perks and company expenses.'
A. So Junior lived in an apartment that they said was a studio in sandy Port. It came to a point when we were running out of cash, and there was less that could go towards that, but that would be the biggest perk followed by travel. BY MS. DEAN:
Q. So when you say the biggest perk, you are saying that his rent, mortgage whatever, his living was covered -- his living expenses that were attached to the apartment in Sandy Port were covered by?
A. The company's fund. And as the company's funds were used, it actually got into the clients' fund.
Q. Do you have any documents in your possession that would speak to that, or confirm that to show payments being paid from the company's fund or from
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the fiduciary account?
A. In this document, it shows all the transfers
Q. That looks like a snap shot. It looks like your reconciliation. It doesn't look like a snapshot from the bank statement itself.
A. These are, each one of these is a transfer of client funds to the company's operating account. Every single one. There are some that aren't here. MS. HEPBURN: I think what she is saying is that this is excerpt. This is not the actual physical --

BY MS. DEAN:
Q. Can you provide us with the --
A. If $I$ gave you the -- after this would be the entire transaction history of the account.
Q. That's fine. If you have it in your possession, we'll take it.
A. That's what $I$ was worried you would get to. Because I shouldn't have it. Don't you think?
Q. I don't know what your contract of employment would have said.
A. It's a company record. I probably may have it, in all honesty, because it's done in excel, but $I$ really shouldn't have it. Would you like me to
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present it?
Q. That's why $I$ was saying, $I$ do not know what his contract says. If hé has a contract of employment that specifically says that that should not happen, fine. But if there is no contract of employment and it does not give that prohibition --
A. I think we are probably getting in the area general of should an employee have any company's, records after they were -- like I said, I probably could find more than enough, but it would be. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. Do you know if the apartment or studio for Rahming Jr., was this in his name or the company's name?
A. That was in his name, but the payment records obviously would come out.
Q. Okay.

BY MS. DEAN:
Q. And were those made directly to the landlord?
A. To the landlord, trying to remember her name now.

BY MR. BROWN:
Q. And did you sign off on that payment, or how did you become aware?
A. Bills were presented to me for payment -- I Interview - 19 April 2023
don't know -- it'was not necessarily bills, $I$ think it was e-mails or any time the landlord wanted her rent, she would send an angry e-mail. So the e-mails came to me. And I would prepare a cheque. I would like to say Treco, but $I$ can't.

BY MS. DEAN:
Q. So you are saying these payments were made by cheque?
A. Yeah. Almost all payments were made by cheques. We are just getting into wire instructions later in the game.
Q. And can you, do you remember like the period?
A. I would say he's probably -- it probably goes up when we were drying up. I met him in the apartment. When $I$ got there, he was in there, and then maybe three or four, maybe five months of payments after that.
Q. Okay. So when you got there, it would have been August, 2021. So you started -- these cheques were being paid from you got there?
A. Yes.
Q. So from August to let's say December of 2021 , the cheques would have been done every month?
A. Yes. I'm not sure it went to December it may have been.
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BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. When you got there, there were no previous records being kept?
A. Yes. I would have gotten all of that. So if he was there for let's say January 2021 , I definitely have a record of the payment. But $I$ saw, and participated in the preparation of things after $I$ got there. So $I$ have the records actually going back from inception. Like $I$ said, we have this situation where monies are in for investors, but $I$ don't know if that's the Campbells $\$ 30$ or somebody else's $\$ 30$. BY MS. DEAN:
Q. Were there any other perks?
A. That was the biggest one. That one and the travel.

BY MR. BROWN:
Q. There were only two perks?
A. Yes. Two big repetitive, expensive perks.

BY MS. DEAN:
Q. In our previous meeting, you had indicated monies being sent to Poland and --
A. Yes. It relates to -- some relates to software development. Some relates to supposedly a director's fees.
Q. Director's fee in Poland?

Interview - 19 April 2023
A. There was a gentleman. He was Irish but he lives in Poland or maybe he does his banking in Poland Mr. Rahming made a lot out of that he had friend all around the world. I'm not sure if this was a continued, but this was a person who they trusted, who had some sort of financial background and -BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. Could it be consulting fees?
A. Yes, $I$ guess you can say consultant fees, but I think he was director, consulting fee, software fees, everything.

BY MS. DEAN:
Q. But there was no agreement between them and the company that would substantiate --
A. There were lots of agreements. The agreements were there. I think $I$ may even have that, but again, I probably shouldn't have that. It's a question of -anyway, the agreements were there. It's a question of whether we ended up with an asset that was useful. BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. How many agreements. You are saying the agreements were there?
A. Yeah. So this individual in his package, he wanted to be paid for depository, centralized security, depository. He wanted to be entrusted with
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that function. He wanted his wife -- his wife was pretty well established. She is a director, I think. She had a business somewhere in Europe. So the things she did would fit well with what ArawakX should have been doing. And I think he was proposing that she assist in some way. They were proposing that they come down to The Bahamas. This was all in one package that $I$ saw, but $I$ think that package constituted the agreement, but part of the agreement that was enabled I' think it was just the securities depository agreement, perhaps the directorship or something but that's separated.
Q. We turn the attention back to the report.
"The Rahming subsequently submitted material
noncompliant...." This is separate from what you have put together? Because you are saying they submitted something?
A. Yes. Like what you have there is definitely what they submitted. But if I was to show you what I have done for that same period of time, you would see the differences. Or perhaps who is right or what is wrong. You may not not the difference, but what $I$ tend to send in this thing is the analysis of the two. And Mr. Campbell, again, believing that instructions obviously and so on, just show them what it should be, Interview - 19 April 2023
and maybe they would constrain themselves.
Q. So the paragraph that follows, that starts, 'amongst several matters of noncompliance', do you have that information in the list of the records as well? Because you said you have done a comparative analysis --
A. So, I'm going to send it to you as well. But when you see it, $I$ put boxes around each number and that is wrong or each wording that is wrong -- when $I$ say wrong, meaning not clear, not misleading. The computing between investments, for instance. Both right regular investments and ArawakX investments, and potential investments in red. This is for the company and this is for the client. And so what you are looking for in the descriptions is clarity. Said differently, you don't want to be misleading. So that's what you are after when you are talking about qualitative presentation of financials. And sometimes you are constrained with numbers that have to come together. So all of those things $I$ explained in this document, with God's help, I find --
Q. So there was discussion with the company's auditors and yourself; right?
A. Right.
Q. You say some of which touched on these same Interview - 19 April 2023
matters?
A. Yes.

So the auditors were appointed I got in contact with them since $I$ got there. Some of the reasons for the contact was for some of the issues that $I$ discovered when $I$ went through this journey. But we have a deadline for reporting, and so $I$ began discussions with the auditors. And they have preplanning questions. And in the course of that preplanning exercise, we touched on some of these matters. The preplanning is done because they have to establish a materiality level. So, perhaps we have $\$ 30,000$ error somewhere. Does that make a difference to the auditors or to the presentation of financial statements? Perhaps it does. Perhaps it doesn't. It depends on how big if it an issue. So those are the sort of things we had to do, and then we have to make assessments in management. Whether or not the company is a public interest company. I think is the description $I$ gave them. And whether there are regulatory filings that have to be done. They have to consider all of these things. The auditors have to consider all of these things in advance of starting their work.

BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. So was there was an engagement letter or an agreement? Did you reach that far or --
A. I don't think. You don't get an engagement - so you have to be accepted as a client. They have to know about you before they become engaged. But if you do appoint them, if you want to go with these auditors, so now it's interview time, and then they make a decision, do $I$ even want this company as a client? So no engagement letter, but there was a preplanning exercise. They have to make an assessment.

BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. And that's what you were a part of, the preplanning?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So I see, prior to your --
(Whereupon a five minute recess was taken at 11:36 a.m.)
(Interview reconvened at 11:46 a.m.)
A. So it was myself and TSHOMB Godet. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. From Deloitte?
A. The spelling begins $T-S-H$, even though it doesn't sound that way. BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. So we wanted to turn your attention to your termination, and the events immediately that preceded your termination. Anything spectacular? Anything that stood out?
A. Yes. So long way around, there was a -- no granted it might be unrelated -- but there was a time I was sitting at my desk, and there was an e-mail from D'Arcy Rahming, Sr., and it says, Mike please transfer 40 something thousand to somewhere or pay 40 something thousand dollars to something somewhere. So $I$ can't remember if we were in funds or out of funds, but it didn't seem like a practical thing to do. And -- or maybe it was mathematically impossible to do unless, he was again confused, and looking at clients' accounts or something. So $I$ went to send, I think $I$ -- no, actually $I$ did respond. I sent the response, and I asked the question: I'm sorry, sir. Where would these funds come from? And after I sent the e-mail, I noticed that the sender, the domain for the sender was at Hughes.net. Not at ArawakX.com. It was at Hughes dot something. And I poked some more. And I couldn't be satisfied that this wasn't Mr. Rahming, because he has his own personal e-mail address. And so $I$ called him up and $I$ said I'm sorry, did you send an e-mail asking me to transfer 40 something thousand?

1 I either called him or sent him an e-mail to his ArawakX box, and $I$ got a response saying no, he didn't. And I said, you didn't? That's funny because I've got this e-mail from somebody at Hughes.net or somewhere -- I think I might have done a little further investigations. Maybe I figured it originated out of Taiwan. I don't know if $I$ am confabulating, or if $I$ really did figure out that this e-mail originated out of Taiwan or somewhere. I told him I said, it's funny. I think I've just been spoofed. Someone is trying to get me to start something. And so I reported that to the $N R O$ person. So after speaking with or e-mailing or getting a response from Mr. Rahming about whether or not he had asked me to send 41 -- something in the $40 s . \quad$ Some thousands of dollars. He came back saying, no, he didn't. I think we have been spoofed or I've been spoofed. Someone now knows about ArawakX or something knows we have so much money and so on. Or may be they are just guessing. And he sent back a response saying, 'good catch.' I figured out that it was unreal. And then I reported it to Nadia maybe a day later. I think $I$ kept looking at it too. Because I didn't appreciate someone knew that much to come to me to ask to initiate a transaction. I didn't appreciate that, so Interview - 19 April 2023

I think I continued looking. And that's when I figured out the address puts them somewhere in the far east.

I think they were also somehow suggesting, something in the e-mail suggesting -- I think they wanted-it transferred to the account at Credit Swiss or something like that, or UBS. And they give me an account number. I think they gave me sufficient details where if $I$ made a mistake, it would have been gone to that account. So it's probably a general account, and I think I alerted Credit Swiss or whoever it was, and $I$ was like let Nadia take care of this.

So not too long after that event, I was called into the office again. Challenged about my loyalty. Do I enjoy working here? Are you part of the team? All these questions posed to me. I understand at that time, there was some consideration of firing me. I understood that subsequently. I only made the point that to me ArawakX was breaking new ground. We were introducing something new to the market. The country was going to benefit from it, and we all stand to make good money if we carry it through with it. I don't see the problem, or $I$ don't have a problem. And somewhere to the end of towards the end of that conversation, Mr. Rahming says to me. Oh, I

Interview - 19 April 2023
forgot to tell you, I moved $\$ 42,000$ out of Sun Cash into the operating account last night.
Q. Sun Cash was used to do what again?
A. I think I have explain this in here. Is that context useful? Because when $I$ put those two events together, $I$ really can't help but wonder, that e-mail address, that domain out of Singapore, was it really a pirate?

BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. To try to get you to transfer funds.
A. Right. Was it a pirate? Someone I knew nothing about, or was it someone who knows me only too well, and knows me well enough to say, okay, let's see if we can fool Michael into doing something stupid. BY MS. DEAN:
Q. How long after you received the e-mail --
A. Immediately. The records were there. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. So did Mr. Rahming provide anything more clarity behind the transfer to the operating account, or the reason for it?
A. He gave a reason. Hacking or something. BY MS. DEAN:
Q. Why would he have -- even if that was the reason, maybe there was a hacking incident at Sun Cash
-- even if that were purpose, even if that was the case, everything on Sun Cash is fiduciary.
A. Yes, right.
Q. And at that point, MDollaz had already established a fiduciary account at BOB, so there was no reason for monies to be sent from fun cash to an operating account. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. So you are saying that's an error on the bank part, or it's an error on --
A. It wasn't an error. He transferred the money from the client's account to the operating account.
Q. You said he gave the reason as hacking?
A. He was concerned that Sun Cash would get hacked.

BY MS. DEAN:
Q. Do you know the date, do you have the exact date?
A. September 2022. I don't have the exact date.
Q. You are sure the amount is 42 K ?
A. I'll look again. Because the thing with Sun Cash, they have money in every bank more or less. And they usually take two or three days. They may have to consolidate money to one place, and transfer that to your bank. They have most of the money at RBC. Most

```
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of their clients are RBC, transfer to their bank. Sometimes it takes two, three, four days. So I can't remember if -- I think he probably initiated it on this day, but it didn't hit the account until a few days later.

BY MS. DEAN:
Q. And were you ever a signatory on the Sun Cash account?
A. The Sun Cash account, as $I$ explain in here, has a problem. The Sun Cash account has a problem in that they don't have that kind of flexibility. It's online only. It's a push button. They don't have a mechanism where two signing authorities are necessary to transfer. So this is a situation where a single person could do it. Once $I$ gave him the password -initially before time, I was the only one with the password, but $I$ think as they were making preparations to do their thing, they started taking on more financial CFO responsibilities. BY MS. DEAN:
Q. So at the time who were the individuals that had access to the couldn't cash passport?
A. Just him, me and his son.
Q. okay.

BY MS. HEPBURN:

```
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Q. So those were the only two incidents that preceded your termination. You said the first one was an e-mail where he asked you to transfer --
A. Well, I don't know if it's a pirate or a friend.

BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. Or coincidental.
A. Or a coincidence.

BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. And then the challenge in the office where he spoke about you being loyal?
A. Yeah. Any time they need to brainwash they do this collective brain programming thing.
Q. So those were the only two incidents that occurred before you received the termination letter -if you did actually receive one.
A. Correct. I did receive one.
Q. The context --
A. Sorry, the other two things. Two other things happened since this moment. The money, I think if $I$ were to look at Sun Cash and Bank of The Bahamas on that day. Maybe $I$ saw Sun Cash move and Ban of The Bahamas not move, or maybe I did not see any movement from either one. I had to wait a couple days before it shows up to bank of The Bahamas. But at that time,

I made two requests to have the money put to fiduciary. It doesn't matter if it's Bank of The Bahamas, or Sun Cash's fiduciary account, but it must not be the operating account. If it's an interim thing, bounces here and then you move it, no problem in my mind. Mistake. But certainly we don't want to invite the temptation of the money sitting in the wrong account for any undue length of time. But $I$ would expect, and it was transferred to this account more than likely to settle more of these expenses that I would not have approved at that point and time. So me being the $B$ signatory; Campbell being the $B$ signatory or $A$ signatory, $I$ think they were up against the wall at this point. The $\$ 42,000$ that was needed, they took it out. They needed to convince the bank that the signing authorities implemented in January were no longer in effect. Michael was no longer here. A new person takes my place and Mr. Campbell doesn't know he is none-the-wiser. That's what I suspect happened. BY MS. DEAN:
Q. So for a point of clarification. Mr. Campbell was officially appointed as a $B$ signatory on the $B O B$ bank account?
(No response)
Interview - 19 April 2023

BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. And also, did you receive all of your compensation in respect of your termination?
A. No, not at all. That's their way of saying -for having cause -- you did something wrong. That's the reason $I$ am here. BY MS. DEAN:
Q. Back to the appointment do you remember when he was added as a signatory?
A. Should have been in January.
Q. January of 2022?
A. Give or take he may have started in December, might have finished in February. I don't know. BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. You say you received a termination letter with reasons for your termination?
A. Yes. Generic reasons. I can't remember, pull them straight out the handbook on employment laws. They can't point to any particular thing. Not to say that they won't, but they certainly didn't take it in the letter. It was a generic letter. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. Up until the time you left, you could say with certainly that the company was not profitable?
A. Yes.
Q. Excluding --
A. I could say with certainly that the company was not profitable. The reason why $I$ can say that is because they -- image was important. So as things were getting tough, they insisted of maintaining the four offices. They insisted on maintaining the full complement of staff. Staff left. There may have been a few dismissals. There were a few dismissals. But staff were frustrated there was just tale after another. One excuse after another. I remember feeling very naive, perhaps this is the time to tell the staff that we are actually running on investor capital. But the reaction was that would spook the staff, reduce confidence. Undoubtedly, it would, but you would have to, $I$ would say, give them a choice now early before their debts start hounding them, and give them an option to move on. So that was me. So for a few pay check, but if you keep track of these expenses as you are obliged to do, until they waited, those expenses were against no income. So yes, the company was not profitable. We had demand letters from the landlords. You had the staff no one wanted to touch, and they felt they could not move forward unless they kept some of the software programmers ameliorated in that fold. So every so often, there would be -- it

```
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died off towards the end.

BY MS. DEAN:
Q. What's the position as regards to the software, the platform that ArawakX runs on and the company?
A. So they never got a comprehensive platform together. Sorry, this is not a long story. So I was invited initially to look at a software -- not that $I$ understood how things would come together, but $I$ ultimately realized that we don't have the money for any kind of luxury at my behest. So $I$ undertook to making things as affordable and as simple as possible, hence Excel. No problem for me. No cost for the company. No deficiency in reporting. I make a point out of this because they believe that QuickBooks does your accounting. I tried to make the point that's like a pen writing your sermon. It's not the same thing. You write the sermon using a pen. QuickBooks does not do your accounting more to the meat. They became attached to this programme called -- I forget the name of the software. This thing out of France. They became attached to it, and they were convinced that they could do any number of things. The very first thing they wanted to do with it was to multiply it. It's important because you can't do that. That's
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a crime. You cannot take someone's software and use it in multiple businesses without compensating the person who gave it to you. Now it's not software that was multipliable in any event. So I didn't worry about it. But that approach, when that crashed then they decided that they would use it -- that it could be used for general lender account which it could, if was a strict pay service provider programme.

Fantastic for what was designed for. For it could not work for a general lender account. Every observations of its use, you saw it being paired with other bits of software to make it happen. To make it useful in any organization.

So what we ended up with was -- or what I found out was they were never really open to too many other bits of software. They got rid of one -- I will call it software in a general sense, these are all licenses. They're not things that we owned; and they were all cloud based. So they were not things that we controlled. So the first platform that they use was crowd engine. Perfect for -- it's perfect for its purpose. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. That's a bespoke software?
A. It's not bespoke. It's perfect for crowd
funding. Which it was meant to do. For stocks, equities. But the one they were after was -- I can't remember the name. Maybe it will come to me. They eventually dumped crowd engine because that carried a cost of $3,4,5,000$. I can't remember the number.

By that time, they realized that with excel, because the way customers' information was coming in, and it wasn't integrated with crowd engine, I was with excel and my daily reconciliations or daily clearing exercises, $I$ had all the information that crowd engine had. So crowd engine was nothing more than a pretty face. All the records were in excel I had. So they chopped crowd engine. They will never admit it, but they were heavily reliant on my records. And they were trying to move into the French software. The French software is the one that they got the mortgage for. So that's the platform that they want to say is carrying the business, but did didn't. It didn't carry it initially. It barely could carry it now in my opinion. It's not unlike Sun Cash, what Sun Cash is to its customers. So if you think about Sun Cash, you will recognize that $S$ un Cash does not have a place to keep track of stock or bonds. But that is the programme that they are or that $I$ left them nursing, and $I$ say nursing because up to that point,
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Interview - 19 April 2023
```

they had used associates in California to first attempt this duplication of the French software. At some point, they realized this is illegal -- that's in California. That got abandoned. Then they were trying to replicate it or add to it, but at some point, there was supposedly no more money to go to them, so that stopped. And then $I$ think they moved into something more affordable, which from the looks of it that $I$ saw last, was a word press. Word press has a lot of good. I am only guessing, but it looks like a word press template. Looks very good. Probably works but $I$ think you are probably on the point of developing it the way it could have been developed had they -- but I'm not sure what they are using it for.

BY MS. DEAN:
Q. So there is no bespoke platform that ArawakX is using?
A. At the time I left it, there was one.
Q. Everything would have been licensed?
A. Yes.

BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. So your records, you said everything you kept was probably even better than what they are offering. Was this was on company laptop or something like that?
A. No, it was kept in the cloud. I didn't say it was better. All I'm saying is I had all the of the information necessary to keep track the customers' holdings; whether it was cash, whether it was security I had it.
Q. And everything was in the cloud you never had an actual personal laptop issued to you?
A. I never did -- well sorry, I did have a laptop issued.
Q. And you returned it when you were terminated?
A. I used my own laptop coincidently or accidentally, $I$ might have a copy or records of things. I don't know that it would help to -- if you tell me it helps, I will do some research. I don't know that it well.

BY MS. DEAN:
Q. You don't know if what helps?
A. The customers records you need because you should be able to demand that from ArawakX.
Q. I mean, yes that is the case they are customers records, but what happened we are looking more toward we are certain allegations, specific when it comes to commingling and misuse of clients' funds.
A. Those are bank records.
Q. And if you have information in your possession Interview - 19 April 2023
that substantiates those allegations --
A. Okay, so each of these transactions you will find that's quoted in this letter, you will find in the bank statements. You will look at the bank account -- the statement for the client's bank account, and you will see the number. You look at the statement for operating account, and you will see the corresponding credit. So the bank statements are the assets of the company. They're available from bank itself, you can compel the bank to give it to you. If I gave it to you it's frankly the least trustworthy. I would say $I$ would be in between the two. Ideally it should come from the bank. If you'd like it, none the less, $I$ could give it to you, but it won't amount to anything more than this. It's just another record from me.

BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. I think those records would be helpful. For all intents and purposes, all records we could possibly get our hands on would be helpful.
A. If $I$ can find what $I$ had, what $I$ would have is possibly the downloads from the bank. BY MS. DEAN:
Q. The downloads from the bank?
A. So the banks can give you information in the
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#### Abstract

couple of ways. I don't use those. I got the raw data downloads.


Q. It still has the identifying information about the bank, the bank account numbers, the period. All of that is on there.

BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. This report that you forwarded to us, this is the only report you prepared this way. This seems to be an assessment of specifically of false quarterly reports. Do you have any other reports you would have prepared?
A. Done like that?
Q. Yes.
A. I don't think so.
Q. Other e-mail threads, attachments?
A. It's a synopsis that $I$ had been asked to prepare to explain the condition of the company, that but it is no different from what $I$ told you here today.
Q. That would have been helpful I guess you addressed it to someone?
A. Right.
Q. That would be helpful. Report of the position of the company, you say, at a specific time?
A. This is all subsequent to my termination.

Interview - 19 April 2023
Q. So you didn't prepare anything, even though you were in constant review of the what the financial position of company was, you reported to the board, reporting to the CEO.
A. There were reports to the boards, but that might have been all by mouth.
Q. So there no written reports to the board?
A. I will check. I think these are the best. This e-mail here is the best. BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. Just one last question, Mr. Turnquest, regarding the audit. In your professional opinion, a personal opinion, do you think they will able to get an unqualified audit?
A. No.
Q. No, you don't see them being able to get a qualified audit?
A. If they got an unqualified audit, the presumption here is the auditors are given all the facts. Do they have all the facts, you may get no report -- in my opinion, $I$ doubt that they could get an unqualified audit. And that is on the assumption that they provide all the of the facts. But if all of the facts are known, there is no way they could get an unqualified audit report. In fact, the auditors I
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don't know how new it is, but qualified and unqualified, and then there is uniformed, no report, as in we decline to say give you -- to anything about the situation. And that is supposed to be a signal to the people who are expecting the report to say okay we have to do something different. So for liability purposes, they may not comment, because any comments could be seen positively or negatively favour or out of favour and then they are caught in some compromising position, so the thinking, I suppose is no report. They do all that work and they say, no report. But a lot was put into this pipeline revenue, that's just a projection. There is no such thing as pipeline revenue. There is potential revenue in the pipeline. That's how it is. BY MS. DEAN:
Q. What are the deliverables, Mr. Turnquest?
A. Now, I am going to see if I have the investors' list. Bank statements?
Q. Yes.
A. Anything else? Oh, e-mails, discussions with directors.

BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. Was there any reporting to the Commission during your time at ArawakX? Did you ever apprise the Interview - 19 April 2023

Commission of what was going on internally? Because you seem to have had some issues. You made the Commission aware of what was happening?
A. Let me just go to the reporting. So we have the quarterly reports; then we have the investor filings, maybe. And all of these are tied together. And then we have the fees that have to be paid, and $I$ think the investor filings -- I think the filings only related to the successful raises or was that to every raise.

BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. So we received filings from the successful raise.
A. So it's unsuccessful.
Q. So we would need some kind of declaration that it was unsuccessful, communication.
A. So there would need to be some declaration, communication. There would also be -- I assumed there was some communication about that with the securities Commission about the million or the 1.2 million that was related to the Pinnacle subscription. I have not submitted it, but $I$ assumed that happened. It didn't happen?

BY MR. STRACHAN:
Q. We will have to check.

```
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BY MS. HEPBURN:
Q. So what about the communication about the MLRO compliance officer. All of this was happening internally. You were apprised of certain things. Certain things have to be reported. What is your interaction with her? She has an obligation as well. She is actually registered with the Commission. So I am trying to figure out, all of this is happening, did you have the opportunity to speak to her?
A. Opportunity was there, but $I$ wasn't prepared to initiate the conversation, and she was very cautious, I think, about asking, to be honest. At the same time, I can sympathize with her to a degree, because she was much more closely, and I think they drew her in much more closely to their circle of influence, to keep her on the team or onboard. So I imagine much the same way they sat me down, and browbeated (sic) me, twisted my arms and tried to force compliance. That's probably a practice for them. They probably would have done the same thing to her, perhaps some different kind of touch. I don't know. But $I$ think ultimately, however they viewed things, she shared their view. So $I$ think for the last meeting, the point was made that they just needed time to recover, she might have brought on, okay. So Interview - 19 April 2023
no one's has been paid for one, two, three, four, five, months, perhaps we just need time to recover. MS. HEPBURN: Mr. Turnquest, I think that concludes our session with you today.
(Interview ended at 12:33 p.m.)
$\qquad$
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## SCB MINUTES



| Meeting Agenda | No agenda. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Meeting Documents | None |
|  |  |

Meeting Action Items, Notes and Other Comments

1. Charlene indicated that she say $\$ 200,000$ of fiduciary funds from the fiduciary/client account transferred into the operating account and used to fund the company's operations.
2. Lambert indicated that they were awaiting many deliverables from D'Arcy and Arawak X from their meeting and request on April 14 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ that Arawak X promised to provide by April $21^{\text {st }}$ but still not yet provided.
3. From SCB's standpoint the July 31,2022 financial statements are still not received. Deadline was November 2022 and extended to March 2023. Not looking like they will submit by May 31, 2023 based on discussion with Lambert/Charlene.
4. Matters highlighted by Lambert:
a. Investors have purchased shares in Arawak X, have exchanged the cash but no share certificates issued and corporate documents not legally updated to reflect the same.
b. Memo and arts not seen as increasing share capital from 5,000 to $10,000,000$.
c. Receivables recorded subsequent to audit period but no evidence of rights to such receivables.
d. Solvency and going concern is a major concern for the audit.
e. Lambert indicated that he expects to issue and unqualified (i.e. "clean") audit opinion with emphasis of a matter concerning going concern.
f. Concerns exist of legal issues arising from James Campbell on loan repayment, shares, etc.
g. Concerns exist on going concern from the perspective of the SCB's conditions on the license that prohibits Arawak X from:
i. On boarding new clients.
ii. Obtaining additional investments from existing clients.
iii. Ceasing its crowdfunding activities on the Arawak $X$ platform.
h. If not removed, Lambert indicates going concern disclosure will say that the company may not be operational within 12 months of the signing/issuance of the audit report.

| Action/ <br> Notes No. | Meeting Action and Notes | Person/Organization Responsible | Deadine |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | i. RH asked if there were unpaid audit fees, which Lambert indicated that yes he was owed fees and would not issue the report if these fees remained unsettled. |  |  |
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## Exhibit 3

| ArawakX/Mpollaz: Meeting with Nadia Butier and Kenneth Donathan |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weanesday 9thay 2023 | Meeting Start Time 12:00 noon End Time 1:30 $\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. | ScB Yellow Hder Boardioom. . < Wind |
| Meeting Type | Meeting Called by the SCB |  |
| Meeting Called By | SCB | Nadia Butler, Compliance Officer and Kenneth Donathan; Acting CF0 |
| SCB Facilitator | RH and MK |  |
| Minute Taker | AS |  |
| SCB Attendees | Daniel Strachan (DS) Aramantha Hepburn (AH) Vivienne Dean (VD) Renaldo Harding (RH) Austin Smith (AS) Gladstone Brown |  |
| Non-SCB Attendees | Nadia Butler, Compliance Officer, Kenneth Donathan, Acting CFO (c/o ArawakX) and Khalil Parker, KC and Leslie Brown (Cedric, Parker \& Co.) |  |


| Purpose of Meeting | To gather further information on the company's operations, etc. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Background/Special Notes | None |



1. That she has been with ArawakX since Inception of Operations (February, 2021)
2. That she created a KYC program for regulation reporting
3. That she tried the KYC banking model and the manual route and moved to a hybrid of the automated/manual route.
4. That she tried to make the company's system work for the Bahamas as it was tailored for the US.
5. That there were two (2) persons in the compliance role/function.
6. There were share changes but no updated memo and arts to reflect the same.
7. That in many instances she was not involved in corporate governance and compliance matters and that she often learned of things "after the fact."
8. That initially there were 2 persons dedicated and then 3 but back to 2 .
9. That Kentico Forbes was a Compliance Analyst in the dept, and he can approve low and medium risk clients in his role (or within his powers).
10. That there was no legal in-house rep
11. That they were moving to an AML tool that is plugged into the system.
12. That receiving payments were the hardest part of the business.
13. That there were challenges identifying customers through bank transfers.
14. That the risk ratings were based on the rules applied for accredited Investors and that all information was not received on additional investors.
15. That Darcy Rahming Sr. was completing the company Capitalization Table.
16. That she was not involved in process other than advising what is required for Form 4 for the SCB.
17. That there was a side project underway that was given to individuals within ArawakX to receive the aforementioned information.
18. That draft subscription documents were reviewed in late 2022 for subscribers into the company's shares.
19. That HR is responsible for the tracking the Employee Stock Benefit for employees, specifically Ms. Curry was responsible.

Kenneth Donathan indicated the following during the interview:

1. That he started in the role of acting CFO in October 2022.
2. That the company does not have sufficient liquidity to repay investors should investors decide to request withdrawal from the company as far as he was aware.
3. That the audit was in the final stages and that all documents requested from the auditors have been provided to them approx. 2 weeks ago, inclusive of the draft financial statements of July 31, 2022.
4. That he was a shareholder as from April 2021 but not listed in the shareholder register of the company.
5. That ArawakX may be a public company given the amount of shareholders.
6. That the company always had a challenge in the cash position.

## SCB MINUTES

| Action/ Notes No. | Meeting Action and Notes | Person/Organization Responsible | Deadine |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6. That client fund's were separate and there were no comingling issues. <br> 7. Fees entitled to the company were transferred to the operating accounts, however operational accounting was an issue. |  |  |

## Exhibit 4

## SCB MINUTES

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Meeting Type | Interview of Samuel Wilkinson (former CFO of Mdollaz) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meeting Called By | SCB |  |  |  |  |  |
| SCB Facilitator | Aramantha J. Hepburn |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minute Taker | Aramantha J. Hepburn |  |  |  |  |  |
| SCB Attendees | Aramantha J. Hepburn, Daniel Strachan, Austin Smith, Gladstone Brown |  |  |  |  |  |
| Absentees |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Purpose of Meeting | Investigation into MDollaz |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Opening Notes/Background | The SCB met with Samuel Wilkinson who was the first CFO of MDollaz |



Meeting Action Items, Notes and Other Comments


| 2. | SW was approached by D'Arcy Rahming Sr. to serve as CFO. His tenure lasted <br> $3-4$ months. |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3. | SW observed that the Company had issues i.e. insufficient controls, no <br> financial statements, no formal records but he had sight of bank transactions. <br> He also noted that he had no knowledge of how the company was capitalized. |  |  |
| 4. | SW indicated that it was difficult to get information from the Rahmings <br> hence one of the reason for his resignation. |  |  |
| 5. | SW observed the purchase of vehicles, expensive lunches were being <br> bought and excessive traveling. | It was unclear as to whether the Company was in financial constraints at <br> that time. |  |
| 6. |  |  |  |

## Meeting End Time - 12:30 pm



| Purpose of Meeting | To find out what was told to persuade him to purchase shares in MDollaz／Arawak $X$ ，how much he purchased，when and who he communicated with when doing so． |
| :---: | :---: |
| Opening Notes／Background | The meeting commenced at 5pm as I called $\quad$ via WhatsApp having been unable to reach him otherwise via landline to his shop． |


| Meeting Agenda | $\mathrm{Yes/NO}$ | Where these minutes can be located i．e．appropriate END folder and Legal Files． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Meeting Documents | Yes／No | Electronic version obtained from MDollaz，of subscription agreement for \＄100k signed by |

## Meeting Action Items，Notes and Other Comments

| 4奇細列 <br>  |  <br>  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1．GW spoke with $\square$ via WhatsApp as he could not be reached at his food store in $\square$ ．He indicated that he＇s going on vacation tomorrow so will be unavailable for some time． GW explained the reason for trying to reach him，indicating that we need to find out from him what were the circumstances under which he signed the subscription agreement for shares of MDollaz．GW sent him a copy of his signed agreement so he could see what was being referred to． $\square$ then said that he | N／A | N／A |


|  | Mesidux xut | 8 Respoiditic | Draduay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | actually signed two (2) documents - one for $\$ 100 \mathrm{k}$ and another for $\$ 50 \mathrm{k}$ - the latter he signed afterwards/last. He did not recall the details of it at the time. <br> GW asked him for a copy of the other document he said he signed for $\$ 50 \mathrm{k}$ for 10k shares. He said that around that time he met with Mr. Rahming on the matter but didn't recall much about the meeting. He did not recall anything being said about valuation of the company but he recalled that the shares were about the $\$ 5$ per share, which he thought was good. Ultimately, he just decided to support a Bahamian company. He wanted to invest and decided to do so because of $\square$ , whom he knew prior. <br> introduced him to the Rahmings ( Sr and Jr). $\square$ didn't receive anything from them such as documents or material outlining the investment in their company. They told him the company was going public in 2025 and so he decided to get in early and thought $\$ 5$ per share was a good price. <br> In considering his purchase, he said he also bought shares in the Port so thought this was going to be a good investment into a starting Bahamian co. $\square$ said they mentioned Gov't Bonds and he thought they would get them, though he didn't go into detail on what they said about this. Overall, he did not seem to recall the details surrounding the subscriptions and what, if anything, he was told at that time. He also recalled they spoke at some length about the investment at the time, as he took almost the whole day dealing with this when he flew into $\square$ back then. said he would send me a copy of the second signed agreement for $\$ 50 k$, which GW did not find/locate amongst what MDollaz had prior sent to SCB. <br> Call ended - 5:20pm |  | $\cdots$ |

## SCB MINUTES



| Circulation to SCB Staff who <br> did not attend meeting | Yes |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Purpose of Meeting | To gain an understanding of how Mdollaz. | became an investor into the various crowdfunding platforms presented by |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Background/Special Notes | NIL |  |



Meeting Action Items, Notes and Other Comments


## SCB MINUTES

| Action/ Notes No. | Meeting Action and Notes , \%vov, \% |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | payouts and the timing of the returns. responded that the documents did not include such details. Further, AH questioned whether made inquiries about receiving investor returns, and replied that D'arcy Rahming Sr. noted that investor returns depends on the various companies (i.e. crowdfunding platforms) decision to issue dividends and whether annual audits were conducted. <br> YFF also inquired whether all investments made into the various crowdfunding platforms were based on personal decisions or marketed by Mdollaz. noted that his first investment (i.e. Red Lobster) was a personal decision and all other investments he was contacted by D'arcy Rahming Sr. and Jr. He noted that he was contacted on four (4) separate occasions (a few times in 2022 and once in 2023) and in most cases, the meetings were more of a social event where he was apprised of new crowdfunding offerings/investment opportunities. During the meetings, they all smoked cigars and had drinks which were compensated for by $\square$. He further added, that the last time he met with both D'arcy Rahming Sr. and Jr. would've been by Spritz Bar \& Grill a few weeks ago (i.e. sometime in May or June 2023), where he was apprised of Mdollaz plans to open an investment firm which would allow the company to manage and pay-out investor funds. Based on the plans presented, felt that D'Arcy Rahming Sr. and Jr. was indirectly asking for additional funding, however it was noted that he did not receive any returns on his previous investments therefore he "did not fall for the bait". also noted that D'arcy Sr . and Jr. asked him to mention investment opportunities to other $\square$ however, he declined recommending their services. <br> YFF also made inquiries as to whether $\square$ made any investments into Bahamas Myfi, and noted that he initially invested $\$ 15,000$ into the aforementioned platform. However, the platform was unsuccessful. YFF then inquired as to whether $\square$ was refunded and $\square$ noted that he was refunded in the sense of being notified of the failed platform. Therefore, he advised Mdollaz to invest the $\$ 15,000$ refund into Tropical Gyro where he added an extra $\$ 5,000$, so overall $\$ 20,000$ were invested into Tropical Gyro. YFF also questioned whether $\square$ requested for part of the refund to be injected into MDollaz and replied no. <br> In wrapping up the meeting, AH asked to provide all crowdfunding documents relative to the investments made into the various platforms; and all cheque stubs evidencing payments made to Mdollaz. agreed to provide all documentation. |
| Closure | The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 am. |


$\Gamma$
SCB MINUTES


| Meeting Agenda | No agenda. |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Meeting Documents | None |  |  |

Meeting Action Items, Notes and Other Comments

Meeling Action and Notes

1. MK: How did you come to know about ArawakX?
a. Response: Approached in-person by D’Arcy Rahming Sr. and Jr. who he has known for a long-time.
2. MK: How much was invested?
a. Response: Approximately $\$ 75,000$.
3. MK: Did you sign a term sheet? What did you understand by it (i.e. what did it represent?)
a. Response: Evidence of my investment in the company
4. MK: What did it mean to you in terms of your standing in the company?:
a. Response: I am an ordinary shareholder.
5. MK: Did you receive a share certificate from Mdollaz Ltd?
a. Response: No, but I was not concerned about that since I had the term sheet, which was sufficient for me. I have 12 other companies also with no share certificate.
6. MK: How was the $\$ 25,000$ investment paid? Around July 2020.
a. Response: Cheque or bank transfer was done.
7. MK: Can you provide evidence of this to us?
a. Response: I decline to do this.
8. Did you know that Mdollaz Ltd. was regulated by the Commission?
a. Response: I was excited by the project by the Rahmings and did not necessarily know that they had a license.
9. Was there particular class of shares?
a. Response: I do not recall. I think I was just an ordinary shareholder. It was 25,000 Class B cumulative redeemable preference shares initially and then converted to ordinary shares on July $31^{\text {st }} 2021$.
10. How was the conversion effected? What process?
a. Response: There as a conversion schedule with conversion dates listed. Maybe they called and I confirmed to convert, but I did exercise the conversion right on July $31^{\text {st }} 2021$.
11. Were you provided with a valuation of the company? What did you understand to be the value?
a. Response: I do not know. I purchased the shares based on their assessment of value.
12. MK: Did you know how they did their assessment?
a. Response: No I do not.
13. MK: The certificate of registration with the Commission - what's the date on that?
a. Response: January $18^{\text {th }} 2021$
14. RH: How did you come to decide to invest in ArawakX? Did you review the financials? Or was it purely on the basis of your friendship/relationship?
a. Response: I have another investment that I need to complain to you on. That's Omni and Mango. They refuse to communicate with me after many requests and they do not have any financials for $10 y r s$.
15. MK: Your e-mail of September 3, 2021 regarding the valuation? What was your understanding of that? The $\$ 200 \mathrm{M}$ valuation, was anything provided to substantiate that?
a. Response: I did not receive any support for that.
16. MK: What led you to invest an additional $\$ 50 \mathrm{k}$ ?
a. Response: On the belief that this was a much needed service that would blossom into something that could be worth $\$ 200 \mathrm{M}$. I did not believe it was worth $\$ 200 \mathrm{M}$ but I did believe that it could grow to that, especially if it was taken on the international stage.
17. MK: How did the $\$ 50 \mathrm{~K}$ change hands for the $2^{\text {nd }}$ tranche?
a. Response: All of my payments are bank transfer. It would have been that way. They provided the wire instructions.
18. MK: Can you provide that to us, i.e. the payment instructions:
a. Response: Possibly, yes. I have an acknowledgement of receipt also from them via email. I can also request from my bank the details on that.
19. MK: What was the price per share for the $1^{\text {st }}$ tranche and $2^{\text {nd }}$ tranche?
a. Response: The $1^{\text {st }}$ tranche was $\$ 5$ per share for $\$ 25,000$ investment ( 5,000 shares). The total holding is now 20,000 shares at $\$ 5(\$ 100,000)$
total whereby I paid \$75,000 (\$25k appreciation in value).
20. MK: Just the 2020 and 2021 investments?
a. Response: Yes.
21. MK: Did you ever invest in any of the issuers?:
a. Response: No, but I was a part of the mailing list for investment opportunities in the issuers.
22. MK: Did you receive a recent update as to the value of the shares?:
a. Response: No, not other than the notification that I hold 20,000 @ \$5/share.
23. MK: Were any attorneys involved in these transactions?
a. Response: No.
24. MK: We would be grateful to receive and see from you the below items:
a. The subscription agreement for the $2^{\text {nd }}$ tranche, the evidence of transfer for both investments and the business plan for the $1^{\text {st }}$ investment.
25. : Who am I helping by giving you these requests? Myself, the general public, ArawakX?
a. Response: MK/RH - you are helping yourself, the general public and ArawakX. We can't comment on the ongoing work we are doing but under the legislation
26. 

: I asked D'Arcy Rahming Sr. why does the Commission want to speak to me? He said that this is normal, routine and part of the acceptance process.

## COMMONWEALTH OF THE BAHAMAS

IN THE SUPREME COURT
Commercial Division

IN THE MATTER of the Companies Act, 1992 AND

IN THE MATTER of an Application under the Securities Industry Act 2011,

AND
IN THE MATTER of Mdollaz Ltd. (trading as Arawak X), a Registered Marketplace and Clearing Facility.

THIRD AFFIDAVIT OF CHRISTINA R. ROLLE

COM/com 00053 of 2023

Securities Commission of The Bahamas
Poinciana House
North Building, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Floor
31A East Bay Street
Nassau, The Bahamas

Petitioner/Applicant

