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Abstract
On January 6, 2014, JPMorgan Chase entered into the Deferred Prosecution Agreement with the Office of the US Attorney for the Southern District of New York, in which JPMorgan agreed to pay 1.7 billion dollars penalties (the "Stipulated Forfeiture Amount"). In the investigation of the scandal, JPMorgan admits its wrongdoing related to the Madoff Scandal with Ponzi scheme. The Stipulated Forfeiture Amount is to be distributed to victims of the fraud at Madoff Securities. This paper studies what is Ponzi, and why JPMorgan is responsible for its conduct in the fraud by Madoff Securities. Moreover, this paper explores the JPMorgan's compliance program in the Agreement, which describes the JPMorgan’s obligation to cooperate the process of the US regulatory authority. This paper shows the US legal standards of the banking business, which suggest implications of a legal standard and an ethical obligation of banking institutions to customers in Korea.
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I. Introduction

On December 11th, 2008, Bernard L. Madoff’s Ponzi scheme was revealed to the world and Madoff, a once influential and respected banker, was arrested. On January 6, 2014, JPMorgan Chase Bank (“JPMorgan” or the “Bank”) agreed to pay a civil forfeiture amount of 1.7 billion dollars (the “Stipulated Forfeiture Amount”) according to a Deferred Prosecution Agreement (the “Agreement”) that the bank entered into with the Office of the US Attorney for the Southern District of New York (the “Office”). The forfeiture amount is a fairly heavy penalty. But this amount was not a penalty for JPMorgan’s facilitating Madoff’s Ponzi scheme, nor profiting from the fraud, because JPMorgan did not facilitate nor make profit from Madoff’s Ponzi scheme operations. However, JPMorgan agreed to pay over 2 billion dollars penalties that related to Madoff Scandal.

II. Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities, LLC

1. Madoff’s Ponzi Scheme Scandal

In December of 2008, Bernard L. Madoff was arrested for charges of running a multibillion-dollar fraud scheme. The scheme was run through Madoff’s investment firm that he had founded in 1960 – Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities. The firm had started out as a small Wall Street investment firm but grew to a prominent presence over the years; by the early 1980s, BLMIS was one of the largest independent trading operations in the trading industry with around $300 million in assets during the Internet bubble. Madoff’s firm also forged partnerships with large brokerage businesses, such as Goldman Sachs and Merrill Lynch, and played a significant role in stock trading as well as equity and derivatives. At the time of Madoff’s arrest, federal filings showed the firm operated more than two dozen funds that managed $17 billion.¹

The scheme had all the ingredients of a classic Ponzi scheme, including a founder, Bernard L. Madoff, who had a great deal of credibility as he had been in the investment business since 1960. Madoff had also been the chairman of the board of directors of NASDAQ, an American stock exchange. The estimated losses from the Ponzi scheme are in between 34 and 50 billion U.S. dollars.²

A Ponzi scheme is an investment fraud that involves the payment of purported returns to existing investors from funds contributed by new investors. Ponzi scheme organizers often solicit new investors by promising to invest funds in opportunities claimed to generate high returns with little or no risk. In

¹ http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/12/business/12scheme.html?_r=0
² http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=aVgv00o7pWNc&refer=us
many Ponzi schemes, the fraudsters focus on attracting new money to make promised payments to earlier-stage investors to create the false appearance that investors are profiting from a legitimate business.

First, Ponzi scheme organizers convince a few investors to place money into the investment. After the specified time, the organizers return the investment money to the investors plus the specified interest rate or return. Then, pointing to the historical success of the investment, the organizers convince more investors to place their money into the system. Typically, the vast majority of the previous investors will return. These steps are repeated until the organizers decide to break the cycle and instead of returning the investment, they take the money and start a new life.

An investment scheme that lures new investors by offering unusually high payouts. Older investors get payouts from new investors, rather than from profits earned. The scheme collapses and everyone loses their money when it becomes difficult to lure new investors, a number of investors cash out of the promoter runs off with the money. Investors receive payouts and encourage other investors to invest or invest more themselves.

III. JPMorgan Chase and Madoff Investment Securities LLC

1. JP Morgan Chase’s Involvement With Madoff Investment Securities

From late 1986 until the Madoff firm’s collapse, JPMorgan served as Madoff’s primary banker for over two decades and authorities believe the company ignored signs of the fraud. Prosecutors mention in a filing in Manhattan federal court “the Madoff Ponzi scheme was conducted almost exclusively through demand deposit account and other linked cash and brokerage accounts held at JPMorgan.” Furthermore, “virtually all client investments were deposited into the primary Madoff Securities account at JPMorgan and virtually all client ‘redemptions’ were paid from a linked disbursement account.”

The Currency and Foreign Transactions Reporting Act of 1970 (commonly known as the Bank Secrecy Act, BSA) and its implementing regulations require U.S. financial institutions to report suspicious activity and to maintain certain records that would “have a high degree of usefulness in criminal, tax, or regulatory investigations or proceedings.” More specifically, the BSA requires that

---

31 U.S.C. § 5311
financial institutions “appropriate procedures to ensure compliance with [the BSA] and regulations prescribed under [the BSA] or to guard against money laundering.”

2. Deferred Prosecution Agreement

On January 6, 2014, JP Morgan Chase entered into a deferred prosecution agreement (DPA) with the Department of Justice. This agreement came after years of the bank’s denying culpability in the Ponzi scheme. Although there had been talks of criminal liability charges against the bank,[source], prosecutors and the bank have agreed to pursue the somewhat “middle ground” approach between criminal prosecution and a civil penalty. U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara explained that although certain individuals had been involved, the core problem lay with the bank’s “overall systemic failure” and that the “at this point, the appropriate charge was against the bank” rather than specific individuals.\(^5\)

Under the terms of the agreement, the bank would pay $1.7 billion to the victims of Madoff’s fraud and, in turn, after 2 years of good behavior and overhauling of its controls against money laundering, the government would dismiss all charges against the bank. During the 2-year period of deferred prosecution, JPMorgan must fully cooperate with the Office of the U.S. Attorney of the Southern District of New York (the “Office”), the FBI, and any other governmental agency designated by the Office relating to the fraud committed at Madoff Securities. Further obligations of the bank include providing quarterly reports regarding JPMorgan’s remedial changes and giving all necessary access to records to the Office.\(^6\)

Despite the bank’s settlement of $1.7 billion being the largest forfeiture for banks charged with money laundering violations, the deferred prosecution agreement represents a level of leniency that are offered to large banks and corporations. Deferred prosecution agreements allow large banks to continue operating normally and considering the amount of losses caused by Madoff’s Ponzi scheme, many critics of Wall Street are unsatisfied with the deferred prosecution and the fact that no employees of the bank were personally held liable. As Dennis M. Kelleher, head of advocacy group Better Markets, puts it, “banks do not commit crimes; bankers do.”

Still, the punishment could have been even harsher. The government reportedly considered demanding a guilty plea from JPMorgan, although such a move could have jeopardized the company’s charter as a national bank.

\(^5\) http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702304887104579306323011059460
\(^6\) JPMorgan Deferred Prosecution Agreement (Jan. 6, 2014)
The U.S. also decided not to pursue charges against individual JPMorgan execs, unlike in the London Whale trading scandal. In recent years, massive financial settlements such as deferred prosecution agreements (DPAs) or non-prosecution agreements (NPAs) with the Department of Justice have become a commonly used tool for federal white-collar criminal enforcement. At the core, DPAs and NPAs are contractual arrangements between corporations and the government where better institutional supervision and other changes are put in place in exchange for the government’s ceasing of criminal investigations and indictment against the corporation. But as DPAs become more commonplace, criticism surrounding these agreements also piles up. The increasing use of DPAs and NPAs signal a shift in prosecutorial aims from an ex-post focus on punishment to an ex-ante emphasis on compliance. Judges, elected officials and commentators consider DPAs too lenient and too frequent. Instead, many advocate for the prosecution of individuals. The DOJ also echoes this concern in a new policy memorandum issued September 9, 2015. Signed by Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates, the memorandum – “Individual Accountability for Corporate Wrongdoing” (“Yates Memorandum”) – shows the DOJ’s resolve to adopt more severe measures toward individuals in corporate fraud cases. The memorandum clearly states that “one of the most effective ways to combat corporate misconduct is by seeking accountability from the individuals who perpetrated the wrongdoing” because “it deters future illegal activity, it incentivizes changes in corporate behavior, it ensures that the proper parties are held responsible for their actions, and it promotes the public’s confidence in our justice system.” Accordingly, the memo urges prosecutors to focus on culpable individuals from the outset of the investigation of corporate wrongdoing and emphasizes that corporate resolutions will not translate into protection of individuals from criminal liability. Furthermore, the guidelines set out in the memorandum are also intended to apply to civil corporate matters.

7 /////
9 http://www.wlrk.com/docs/IndividualAccountabilityforCorporateWrongdoing.pdf, p.1
10 http://www.wlrk.com/docs/IndividualAccountabilityforCorporateWrongdoing.pdf, p. 4-5
11 http://www.wlrk.com/docs/IndividualAccountabilityforCorporateWrongdoing.pdf, p.2
Currently, the “case law is barren” regarding the standard for court approval of DPAs and the legislative history suggests ///

3. **JPMorgan Chase Case**

“Five years after Bernie Madoff admitted to masterminding the worst Ponzi scheme on record, JPMorgan agreed to pay more than $2 billion on Tuesday to settle criminal charges that the bank turned a blind eye to the massive fraud. The deal with U.S. authorities includes a two-year deferred prosecution agreement and represents the largest-ever bank forfeiture in the U.S. JPMorgan has additionally signed off on $543 million worth of settlements with investors hurt by the Madoff Ponzi scheme, including $325 million with Madoff Trustee Irving Picard.

The Madoff settlements bring JPMorgan’s mounting legal tab up to about $20 billion over the last 12 months, a stunning figure that has eroded shareholder value and tarnished the bank’s reputation.” JPMorgan have to pay such a high penalty for the reason which U.S authorities announced criminal charges against JPMorgan tied to its relationship with Madoff who did Ponzi Scheme before. They announced JPMorgan has two felony violations of the Bank Secrecy Act as well. JPMorgan admitted to pay $1.7 billion to victims of the Madoff fraud and agreeing to reform its anti-money laundering policies which the criminal charges will be delayed for two years in exchange under the terms of the deal with U.S authorities.

According to the Wall Street Journal, JPMorgan also agreed to pay a $350 million penalty to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency where related to Bank’s anti-money laundering compliance programs to found “Critical and widespread deficiencies.” “J.P. Morgan failed to carry out its legal obligations while Bernard L. Madoff built his massive house of cards,” FBI assistant director in charge George Venizelos said in a statement. “It took until after the arrest of Madoff, one of the worst crooks this office has ever seen, for J.P. Morgan to alert authorities to what the world already knew,” which was found in Fox news.

“Madoff’s scheme was an unprecedented and widespread fraud that deceived thousands, including us, and caused many people to suffer substantial losses,” Evangelisti said. “We believe the lessons we have learned will make us a stronger company.” Madoff pointed the finger at his former banker in the past. “There’s no question that JPMorgan is guilty; they would have to be idiots to not realize what was going on,” Madoff told FOX Business’s Adam Shapiro last May.

In Securities and Exchange Commission filing, JPMorgan said it expects the settlements announced on Tuesday to hurt fourth-quarter net income by about $850 million. The bank said it expects to add about $400 million to its litigation reserves for the fourth quarter. JPMorgan also said it has agreed to pay the Madoff trustee a total of $325 million in exchange for a release of all claims. The bank has
additionally signed off on $218 million in payments to plaintiffs in a class action lawsuit tied to the Ponzi scheme. The funds will be used to compensate victims of the fraud. Both settlements are subject to court approval, JPMorgan said. The government said the $1.7 billion payment is the largest ever bank forfeiture and the biggest Department of Justice penalty for a Bank Secrecy Act violation.

IV. The Effects of JPMorgan Chase’s Silence about Madoff’s Ponzi Scheme

There are various kinds of issues related to JPMorgan’s silence about Madoff Ponzi scheme.

1. Legal

JPMorgan was mainly accused of violating the Bank Secrecy Act (BSA), by the U.S. Government. The Bank Secrecy Act, also known as the Currency and Foreign Transactions Reporting Act, was originally passed in 1970. The BSA requires domestic banks and certain other financial institutions to establish and maintain programs designed to detect and report suspicious activity, and to maintain certain related records "where they have a high degree of usefulness in criminal, tax, or regulatory investigations or proceedings."

The JPMorgan’s violation against the Bank Secrecy Act can be divided into two parts: (a) failure to maintain an effective anti-money laundering program, (b) failure to file a Suspicious Activity Report.

As mentioned above, the BSA requires that financial institutions "maintain appropriate procedures to ensure compliance with [the BSA] and regulations prescribed under [the BSA] or to guard against money laundering." Therefore, JPMorgan was needed to establish and maintain an anti-money laundering ("AML") compliance program. As Madoff conducted the Ponzi scheme using accounts held at JPMorgan, the bank could have doubts in Madoff’s huge returns before the Madoff’s arrest on December 11, 2008. Since 2006, JPMorgan had issued some structured products linked to the returns of "feeder" funds that were invested in Madoff Securities. However, an analyst at the bank's London-based Equity Exotics Desk wrote a memo to the head of the desk about Madoff Securities on October 16, 2008. The memo says that JPMorgan "seem[ed] to be relying on Madoff’s integrity", although such reliance seemed quite dangerous. The October 16 Memo ended with the conclusion that "here are various elements in the story that could make us nervous," and there should be "apparent fear of Madoff, where no one dares to ask any serious questions as long as the performance is good." Despite the careful observation by the analyst, the memo was never communicated to anti-money laundering compliance personnel in the United States and there was no meaningful effort by the bank to examine or investigate the Madoff Securities.
In addition, the BSA asks financial institutions to "report any suspicious transaction relevant to a possible violation of law or regulation." That is, a financial institution is supposed to file a Suspicious Activity Report, or "SAR" when it "knows, suspects, or has reason to suspect" that a transaction involves illegal activities, no apparent business or lawful purpose. Responding to the October 16 Memo, JPMorgan in London filed a report with the United Kingdom Serious Organised Crime Agency, or "SOCA". According to the report, JPMorgan pointed out that "the investment performance achieved by [the Madoff Securities] funds ... is so consistently and significantly ahead of its peers year-on-year, even in the prevailing market conditions, as to appear too good to be true." However, JPMorgan failed to file a SAR in the United States.

At the statutory allegation, U.S. Southern District Court of New York said that “JPMorgan did willfully fail to establish an adequate anti-money laundering program, including, at a minimum, (a) the development of internal policies, procedures, and controls designed to guard against money laundering; (b) the designation of a compliance officer to coordinate and monitor day-to-day compliance with the Bank Secrecy Act and anti-money laundering requirements; (c) the establishment of an ongoing employee training program; and (d) the implementation of independent testing for compliance conducted by bank personnel or an outside party, to wit, JPMorgan, failed to enact adequate policies, procedures, and controls to ensure that information about the bank’s clients obtained through activities in and concerning JPMorgan's other lines of business was shared with compliance and anti-money laundering personnel, and to ensure that information about the bank's clients obtained outside the United States was shared with United States compliance and anti-money laundering personnel.” The statutory allegations also says that “JPMorgan did willfully fail to report suspicious transactions relevant to a possible violation of law or regulations, as required by the Secretary of the Treasury, to wit, JPMorgan, failed to file a Suspicious Activity Report in the United States with respect to transactions in bank accounts maintained by Madoff Securities.”

Recently, however, U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara agreed not to prosecute JPMorgan on two violations of the federal Bank Secrecy Act, in exchange for the fines and promised reforms. The case will be dropped altogether in two years if the bank is fulfilling its part of the bargain. Bharara said that “The bank has accepted responsibility and agreed to continue reforming its anti-money-laundering practices.” Under the arrangement, JPMorgan will submit quarterly progress reports to prosecutors beginning in April. But according to a little noticed provision, both sides said they had agreed to keep the contents of those reports a secret. Furthermore, unlike some similar agreements, this deal includes no outside monitoring, giving the U.S. Attorney's office “sole discretion” in determining whether the bank is living up to the deal, according to the agreement. JPMorgan is also under orders by federal regulators to improve its systems.

This agreement is in sharp contrast to a deal approved last year between another bank, HSBC, and Loretta Lynch, the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York. HSBC was also accused of two
violations of the Bank Secrecy Act, as well as of violating U.S. sanctions against Iran, Libya, Sudan and Burma. Like JPMorgan, HSBC accepted responsibility for its conduct, and agreed to pay nearly $2 billion in penalties and improve its internal controls. The similarities end there. HSBC’s deferred prosecution agreement lasts five years instead of two, and its compliance is monitored independently by former Manhattan prosecutor and Marsh & McLennan CEO Michael Cherkasky. Like JPMorgan, HSBC is required to submit quarterly reports to the U.S. Attorney’s office, and the reports themselves are confidential. But prosecutors in the HSBC case must file quarterly status reports with the court, which are public.  

Another significant consequence of the Madoff case is that all banks will have to scrutinize their clients. According to the government’s statements, the case against JPMorgan has two major points: one is that JPMorgan’s London office invested through Madoff’s “feeder” funds, which ultimately raised concerns and led to alerting the British authorities. The other point is the fact that Madoff held two large checking accounts with JPMorgan in the U.S.  

The outcome of this case, that is, the settlement that JPMorgan made to avoid criminal indictment, suggests that JPMorgan had an obligation to alert authorities by the fact that a client held checking accounts with the bank. The Bank Secrecy Act requires “///” which, could be expansive in its meaning, if the government desires to interpret it so. When investment “appears too good to be true”, banks should be alerting authorities. But the financial impact of that logic would mean that when certain investors or clients that are well-managing their funds to well in an otherwise repressed market,  

2. Economic  

The Justice Department accepted only a payment of $13 billion from the bank to avoid criminal charges of ‘turning a blind eye' to the Ponzi scheme. In fact, this deal is actually quite a gift to Chase. It sounds like a lot of money, but there are myriad deceptions behind the sensational amount of the fine.  

First of all, the settlement may wipe out between $100 billion and $200 billion in potential liability – meaning that the bank might just have settled “for ten cents or so on the dollar.” The Federal Housing Finance Agency alone was suing Chase and its affiliates for $33 billion. The trustee in the ongoing Bernie Madoff Ponzi scandal was suing Chase for upwards of $19 billion. Obviously, those plaintiffs may never have gotten that kind of money out of Chase. But just settling the mere potential of so much liability has huge value for the bank. It is part of the reason the company's share price had not exactly cratered since the settlement was announced. Moreover, the settlement is only $9 billion in cash, with

$4 billion earmarked for “mortgage relief.” But overall, the key to this whole thing is that the punishment is just money, and not a crippling amount, and not from any individual's pocket, either. In fact, the deal that has just been completed between Chase and the state represents the end, or near the end, of a long process by which people who committed essentially the same crimes as Bernie Madoff will walk away without paying any individual penalty.

In 2014, from the earnings perspective, JPMorgan’s quarterly profit fell 7.3 percent on $2.6 billion of settlements tied to Bernard Madoff’s Ponzi scheme as rising legal costs ended the firm’s three-year streak of record annual earnings. Fourth-quarter net income declined to $5.28 billion, or $1.30 a share, from $5.69 billion, or $1.39, a year earlier, according to a statement today from New York-based JPMorgan, the biggest U.S. bank. Results excluding the Madoff settlement and other one-time items were $1.40 a share. Twenty-two analysts surveyed by Bloomberg estimated $1.37 on average. Chief Executive Officer Jamie Dimon is whittling down the firm’s list of legal woes that include allegations it misled buyers of mortgage bonds, rigged markets and turned a blind eye to suspicious activity by customers. The Madoff agreement, which the bank said reduced fourth-quarter profit by about $850 million, capped a year in which JPMorgan spent more than $23 billion on legal settlements.

Revenue dropped 1.1 percent to $24.1 billion while expenses declined 3.1 percent to $15.6 billion. Full-year net income fell 16 percent to $17.9 billion. The company lost its title as the most-profitable U.S. bank after San Francisco-based Wells Fargo & Co. posted $21.9 billion in annual earnings on January 2014. JPMorgan’s litigation costs sapped $1.1 billion from fourth-quarter profit. The firm booked a $7.2 billion charge in the third quarter amid provisions to cover legal expenses, including part of a record $13 billion settlement of mortgage-bond probes.

Excluding the impact of accounting charges, profit at the unit was down 11 percent to $2.1 billion, while revenue declined 2 percent to $8 billion. Within the markets and investor services unit, fixed-income revenue was $3.2 billion, little changed from the previous year, and equity revenue fell 2.5 percent to $873 million. Net income from consumer and community banking climbed 19 percent to $2.37 billion as provisions for credit losses fell and expenses declined. The consumer division benefited from a $1.2 billion reduction in the allowance for loan losses. Revenue was $11.3 billion, down 8 percent from a year earlier.

Mortgage fees and related income dropped 46 percent to $1.09 billion in the quarter, from $2.04 billion a year earlier. Home-loan originations were $23.3 billion, down 54 percent. That was echoed at Wells Fargo, the largest U.S. home lender, which saw fourth-quarter mortgage-banking income drop by almost half from year-earlier levels to $1.57 billion. The company posted a 10 percent advance in profit to $5.61 billion. JPMorgan said asset-management profit rose 18 percent to $568 million as client holdings climbed 12 percent to $2.3 trillion amid greater inflows and rising equity markets. Commercial banking profit was little changed at $693 million, compared with $692 million a year earlier.

Pri de Silva, senior banking analyst at CreditSights Inc. in New York, commented that “All things
considered, it wasn’t a bad quarter. JPMorgan had something close to a kitchen-sink quarter getting some legal issues done.”

3. Political

In the political view, the Obama administration was criticized because Department of Justice declined to push JPMorgan to trial on criminal charges and just forced the bank to pay the fine. Being fined only will not be a good lesson to those without social responsibilities.

In addition, the Inspector General's Office asked the Justice Department to help enforce the subpoena, but the department, by then far along in its own investigation, declined. The Justice Department, The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (“OCC”), and JPMorgan have all declined to comment on the settlement talks, which sources say could be wrapped up by year's end. A JPMorgan spokesman did not immediately respond to a request for a comment on whether the bank tried to impede regulators. In its annual report earlier this year, the bank said it is "responding to various governmental inquiries concerning the Madoff matter.”

4. Social

There were so many negative views and opinions about JPMorgan in the American society, after the bank was found out to keep silence about Madoff’s scam. The London Whale episode left the public in the dark about just what JPMorgan was doing with stock trading in its Chief Investment Office in London. Moreover, JPMorgan was suspected to impede U.S. authorities' investigation of the Bernard Madoff Ponzi scheme. The OCC, which regulates and supervises JPMorgan, tried to oversee the bank, but only to fail, specifically with respect to the bank's provision of banking services to Madoff. This kind of action worsened the public and media opinion about the country’s largest bank by assets.

After the government's decision about the fines on JPMorgan in just the past 13 months, the public was numbing itself to the endless stream of financial malfeasance. JPMorgan will welcome the fines and settlements without any criminal charges. Jack Blum, a former consultant to the IRS and money laundering expert, said that "The Justice Department seems unwilling to use its power to prosecute. This is, I think, a pretty disgraceful record of tackling an individual problem of criminality." Also, the general consensus about the fines from most observers in the finance sector is that this superficially high-dollar settlement — worth about half a year's profits for Chase — should be called a "robbery" and more "shakedown," because the fines and settlements are just trivial when taking other things into consideration. Recently, the news that JPMorgan’s post-Madoff reforms will be hidden from public made another issue, since it is a weak response, totally different from the actions posed to HSBC, as mentioned above.
V. Conclusion

Until now, we have seen the silence of the America’s biggest bank about Madoff’s Ponzi scheme. Though the bank knew there was something wrong, it did not take any action to correct it. This case could be an example of moral hazard, as JPMorgan cared about its benefits from the scheme only. The bank tried to turn a blind eye on the expected damage that Madoff will cause. The cost of Madoff’s Ponzi scheme devastated not only victims, but the public in the United States and across the world.

JPMorgan should reflect itself about its conduct and try to fix the problems. In addition, U.S. government needs to keep an eye on the bank and prevent another victim through thorough scrutiny and monitoring. The government should focus on forcing financial intermediaries to observe the rules, not on JPMorgan itself.
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