

Regulatory and Service-Provider Takedown Evidence Report: VeoMarkets, DayHub and Connected Promotional Network

Prepared by: Gerald Daniella

Date: 6 June 2026

Purpose: Submission to financial regulators, platform trust-and-safety teams, technology providers, payment processors, and other relevant institutions for review, evidence preservation, warning-list consideration, and takedown or service-suspension assessment.

Important evidentiary note. Unless a statement is expressly identified as an independently verified public-source fact, the information in this report is presented as **complainant-reported evidence requiring institutional review**. This report does not make a final legal finding. It is intended to help competent recipients preserve records, investigate the reported conduct, assess whether services are being misused, and protect consumers where the facts meet the relevant threshold.

1. Executive Summary

This enhanced report requests urgent review and coordinated action concerning **VEO Markets Ltd / VeoMarkets, DayHub / Dayhub.io**, and a connected promotional and onboarding network allegedly targeting retail clients, including Polish consumers. The complainant's evidence indicates a recurring pattern in which potential clients are allegedly reached through social-media promotion and education-style channels, moved into private Zoom or Telegram communications, instructed on funding routes, and then directed toward offshore brokerage activity. Where clients reportedly generate profits or request withdrawals, the complainant alleges that profits are removed or withdrawals reversed under disputed explanations such as alleged "GAP Trading."

The evidence package includes a trading-history workbook for account **15777**, a screenshot of an email dispute concerning alleged removal of **USD 4,020.21** in profits, a network map identifying alleged roles and relationships, screenshots of consumer-facing concerns, and two WhatsApp videos that reportedly show Zoom-based discussions about deposits, cryptocurrency funding, Revolut, and migration to private Telegram channels. The material is supported by public-source context indicating that VeoMarkets has been described by third-party sources as **not regulated** or operating without a recognized financial authorization. Rankia Poland's public article describes VeoMarkets as a broker without licence and discusses alleged promotion to Polish users through messaging groups and withdrawal issues.¹ WikiFX lists "veo markets" as **not regulated**, identifies the website veomarkets.com, and states that no forex trading licence was found.²

The Polish Financial Supervision Authority (**KNF**) public-warning framework expressly covers suspected unauthorized business activity, and KNF states that notifications concerning entities suspected of running business without legal authorization may be submitted electronically to ostrzezenia@knf.gov.pl.³ The complainant specifically requests that VeoMarkets and DayHub be reviewed for potential inclusion on the KNF warning list. The complainant also requests escalation to **FSC Mauritius, MetaQuotes, B2BROKER**, relevant platform trust-and-safety teams, Google Safe Browsing, Trustpilot, and any identified payment processors or acquirers.

The requested action is not limited to content removal. It also includes preservation of records, KYC/AML and client-risk review, suspension or termination of services where policy breaches are confirmed, review of promotional channels for misleading or unauthorized financial promotion, and escalation to law enforcement where the facts meet the relevant threshold.

2. Recipient-Specific Action Requests

The following table translates the evidence package into practical institutional actions. It is designed to allow each recipient to identify the specific review requested of them, while avoiding overstatement of unverified claims.

Recipient / Institution	Why the recipient is relevant	Requested action
KNF — Polish Financial Supervision Authority	Polish consumers are allegedly targeted through social-media and private-channel promotion. KNF states that notifications about suspected unauthorized business may be sent to ost.rzezenia@knf.gov.pl . ³	Review VeoMarkets and DayHub for possible unauthorized financial promotion or service provision to Polish residents; consider warning-list inclusion; preserve evidence and refer to enforcement where appropriate.
FSC Mauritius	The complainant indicates that related conduct and/or entities may have regulatory relevance for Mauritius. FSC Mauritius provides an online complaints portal and whistleblowing route, including reports about entities conducting financial services activities without a licence. ⁴	Review any Mauritius-linked persons, companies, service providers, or onboarding channels; preserve records; assess whether regulatory or whistleblowing referral is appropriate.
MetaQuotes / MetaTrader ecosystem	The disputed trading activity is alleged to involve MetaTrader / MT5 infrastructure. MetaQuotes states that it is a software development company and does not provide investment or brokerage services. ⁵	Preserve platform/server/white-label records where available; review whether the MetaTrader brand, server infrastructure, or platform access is being used in connection with misleading or abusive brokerage activity.
B2BROKER	The complainant alleges that B2BROKER is the CRM or technology provider associated with VeoMarkets. B2BROKER publishes contact channels for regulators and authorities and has a complaints policy requiring relevant supporting material. ⁶	Conduct provider compliance review, client-risk reassessment, KYC/AML review, record preservation, and service suspension or termination if policy breaches or abusive conduct are confirmed.
Platform trust-and-safety teams	The evidence describes promotion through TikTok/Instagram-style social media, Zoom, Telegram and private messaging funnels.	Review named channels, handles, videos, messages, advertisements and onboarding groups for misleading financial promotion, coordinated harm, evasion, private-channel inducement and consumer-risk disclosures.
Google Safe Browsing and browser-security reporting teams	A supplied screenshot shows a successful Google Safe Browsing submission.	Maintain URL-safety review for phishing, social-engineering, deceptive finance, or harmful-content indicators.
Trustpilot / review platforms	A supplied screenshot shows a Trustpilot review draft alleging market manipulation.	Preserve review evidence and assess whether public consumer complaints indicate a wider pattern of consumer harm or deceptive conduct.
Payment processors / acquirers	The complainant alleges Indonesian-rupee card processing and cryptocurrency/USDT funding routes.	Trace merchant identifiers, acquirers, chargeback patterns, blocked card attempts, and cryptocurrency payment instructions; suspend processing where unauthorized financial services or fraud indicators are confirmed.

3. Entities and Persons Identified for Review

The following list is an evidence-routing table. Inclusion does **not** mean that the named party has been found liable or guilty; it means the party appears in the complainant's evidence or in public-source material and should be reviewed by the appropriate institution.

Entity or person	Role described in supplied evidence	Key evidence references	Requested review
VEO Markets Ltd / VeoMarkets	Offshore brokerage platform allegedly receiving retail deposits and refusing or reversing withdrawals/profits.	Trading-history workbook; email dispute screenshot; public articles; video context; complaint narrative.	Regulatory warning-list assessment, account-record preservation, trading-log review, withdrawal-history review, payment-channel tracing.
DayHub / Dayhub.io	Allegedly linked project or network connected to promotional and onboarding activity.	Fraud network map; complainant narrative.	Review for unauthorized promotion, consumer-risk linkage, shared management or operational overlap.
Scalway / Adrian Łojek	Alleged education/onboarding funnel component.	Fraud network map and complainant narrative.	Review of referral claims, funnel mechanics, marketing disclosures, client acquisition and records.
Marcin Olinkiewicz / @fx_olin	Alleged social-media promoter and onboarding contact.	Fraud network map; complainant narrative; video summary stating the visible Zoom display name "Marcin Olinkiewicz."	Platform review of promotional content, financial inducement, private Telegram migration, deposit instructions and risk disclosures.
Marcin Makarowski	Alleged participant/promoter or linked operator in the wider network.	Fraud network map; complainant narrative; supplied group-photo captions.	Review where evidence shows solicitation, referral, leadership or operational involvement.
Dominik Pasler	Alleged DayHub / VeoMarkets-linked figure.	Fraud network map; complainant narrative; supplied group-photo captions.	Review where evidence shows solicitation, referral, leadership or operational involvement.
B2BROKER	Alleged CRM or technology provider connected to VeoMarkets.	Complainant narrative; public B2BROKER contact and complaints pages. ⁶	Provider compliance review, record preservation, KYC/AML reassessment and service-suspension assessment.
Payment processors / acquirers	Alleged Indonesian payment processor and card payments in Indonesian rupiah; USDT deposit discussion in video evidence.	Complainant narrative; video summary.	Merchant tracing, chargeback review, suspicious-transaction review and processing suspension where warranted.

4. Alleged Pattern of Conduct

The complainant describes the operation as a **multi-stage conversion funnel**. First, retail clients are allegedly exposed to promotional content through social-media channels and informal education-style branding. Second, interested consumers are moved into live calls, Zoom sessions, Telegram channels or private chats, where deposits and funding methods are discussed. Third, clients are allegedly directed into VeoMarkets brokerage accounts or related onboarding links. Fourth, trading occurs on a MetaTrader-style environment, with client complaints concerning slippage, chart inconsistencies, fake candles or abnormal execution. Fifth, once clients seek to withdraw profits, profits are allegedly removed or withdrawals reversed on the basis of internal policy explanations, including alleged "GAP Trading."

The supplied fraud-network map summarizes the alleged funnel as follows: social-media marketing by a promoter, education-style Zoom sessions, direct Telegram solicitation, onboarding via linked platforms, and deposits into VeoMarkets. It further alleges the use of MT5-style chart manipulation, abnormal slippage, and profit removal under "GAP Trading" clauses. The map also reports use of an Indonesian payment processor for card payments, with Polish banks reportedly blocking some card transactions.

This pattern is important for takedown and regulatory review because it combines several risk indicators: offshore brokerage claims, absence or uncertainty of licensing, private-channel solicitation, cryptocurrency or alternative funding routes, consumer complaints about withdrawal refusal, and reliance on disputed internal policy clauses after profitable trading. These indicators should be reviewed together rather than as isolated complaints.

5. Account-Level Testimonial and Withdrawal Evidence

The strongest account-specific evidence concerns trading account **15777**. The uploaded workbook `ReportHistory-15777.xlsx` contains a trading-history report identifying **Camilo Cardona Martinez**,

trading account **15777 (USD, VEOMarkets-Trade, real, Hedge)**, company **VEO Markets Ltd.**, and report date **2026.05.27 16:16**. The workbook contains **4,153 rows and 14 columns**, indicating substantial trading-history data requiring preservation and technical review.

A supplied screenshot of an email titled **“Formal Dispute Regarding USD 4,020.21 Profit Removal and Withdrawal Reversal”** states that the customer formally disputes the removal of **USD 4,020.21** in profits following a withdrawal request. The customer states that the company’s justification referring to **“GAP Trading”** is unacceptable and inconsistent with the trading activity executed on the account. The email further asserts that trades were executed manually using permitted margin and leverage conditions and that the market moved in the customer’s favour during opening conditions.

Testimonial excerpt from supplied dispute screenshot. “I am formally disputing the removal of USD 4,020.21 in profits from my trading account following my withdrawal request. The justification provided by your team referring to ‘GAP Trading’ is unacceptable and inconsistent with the actual trading activity executed on the account.”

The same email alleges a sequence in which the withdrawal request was initially processed, then reversed back into the trading account, and the profit was ultimately removed. It requests a detailed explanation, the exact policy clause allegedly breached, complete trade logs and execution records, and confirmation regarding the status of withdrawn funds. For regulators, MetaQuotes, and any service providers, this is a concrete preservation trigger: the relevant account statements, order logs, server logs, dealer actions, audit trails, withdrawal records, CRM records, and correspondence should be preserved immediately.

6. Video Evidence and Testimonial Extracts

Two supplied WhatsApp videos were summarized for evidentiary use. The videos are not presented as independent proof of illegality; rather, they are presented as evidence requiring review because they appear to show private-channel onboarding and funding discussions in proximity to trading-chart material.

Video file	Observed contents	Evidentiary significance
WhatsAppVideo2026-05-30at21.12.18veo2.mp4	The video shows a Zoom meeting interface beside a candlestick trading chart. The visible participant list includes names such as “Daniel,” “Dawid Pigan,” “Marcin Glinkiewicz,” and “Anna Wasilewska.” The analysis reports translated dialogue in which a female voice says, “I can send it from Revolut, no problem,” and later asks for Telegram details on where to send it.	This supports review of whether funding instructions were being moved through private messaging and whether participants were being directed to payment routes outside a regulated onboarding process.
WhatsAppVideo2026-05-30at21.12.30veo1.mp4	The video shows a Zoom meeting with a visible participant display name “Marcin Olinkiewicz” and a candlestick trading chart. The analysis reports Polish dialogue about making a “deposit,” selecting “USDT,” moving communication to a private Telegram account, and a spoken Telegram handle described as “Oliczik 4.”	This is material for platform and regulator review because it links a named displayed participant, deposit discussion, cryptocurrency funding, and private Telegram migration.

Video testimonial excerpt — Revolut and Telegram. “I can send it from Revolut, no problem.” The participant then asks to be contacted on Telegram with details of where to send the funds.

Video testimonial excerpt — deposit, USDT and private Telegram. The summarized Polish dialogue reports a male voice instructing a female participant about making a “deposit,” selecting “USDT,” and continuing communication via a private Telegram account.

The videos should be treated as evidence of possible solicitation mechanics and should be reviewed alongside Zoom chat logs, Telegram records, CRM records, payment records, and platform referral data. The central concern is not merely that a private message application was used; it is the combination of **financial promotion, private-channel migration, deposit instructions, cryptocurrency funding, and offshore brokerage onboarding.**

7. Public-Source Context

Public sources reviewed for this report support the need for institutional scrutiny. Rankia Poland published an article titled “**VEO Markets Opinie 2026 - broker bez licencji?**”, describing VEO Markets as registered in Saint Lucia, operating without a recognized financial regulator licence, targeting Polish users through messaging groups, and being associated with blocked-withdrawal complaints.¹ WikiFX lists “veo markets” as **not regulated**, identifies the company as VEO Markets Ltd, and states that no forex trading licence was found.²

The KNF public-warning page is particularly relevant for the Polish consumer-protection component. KNF explains that its list includes notifications of suspected criminal offences and criminal proceedings where the KNF Chair exercised the rights of an aggrieved party. KNF also states that notifications concerning entities suspected of running business without legal authorization may be submitted electronically to ostrzezenia@knf.gov.pl.³

B2BROKER is relevant because the complainant alleges that it is a CRM or technology provider associated with VeoMarkets. B2BROKER publicly maintains contact routes for general inquiries, regulators, law enforcement and other authorities, and it publishes a complaints policy requiring a clear description of the concern, desired remedy and copies of relevant correspondence.⁶ MetaQuotes is relevant because the trading environment is alleged to involve MetaTrader / MT5; MetaQuotes’ public contacts page clarifies that MetaQuotes is a software-development company and does not provide investment or brokerage services, which means the request to MetaQuotes is properly framed as a technology misuse and record-preservation review rather than an adjudication of client trading claims.⁵

8. Evidence Register

The following evidence register identifies the main materials supplied for review. All original files should be preserved with their metadata and hash values by the submitting party or receiving institution where possible.

Exhibit	Source file	Description	Relevance
A1	ReportHistory-15777.xlsx	Trading-history workbook for account 15777, identifying VEO Markets Ltd and a substantial set of trading records.	Supports account-level technical and withdrawal review.
A2	WhatsAppImage2026-05-30at21.12.15.jpeg	Screenshot of formal dispute email concerning alleged USD 4,020.21 profit removal and withdrawal reversal.	Direct testimonial of disputed withdrawal and requested documents.
A3	WhatsAppVideo2026-05-30at21.12.18veo2.mp4	Zoom meeting with trading chart and reported discussion of sending funds via Revolut and receiving destination details by Telegram.	Supports review of funding instructions and private-channel migration.
A4	WhatsAppVideo2026-05-30at21.12.30veo1.mp4	Zoom meeting with visible display name “Marcin Olinkiewicz,” trading chart, deposit discussion, USDT reference and private Telegram contact.	Supports review of named promoter, cryptocurrency funding and private-channel onboarding.


Exhibit	Source file	Description	Relevance
A5	WhatsAppImage2026-05-30at21.12.07.jpeg	Trustpilot review screenshot concerning VEO Markets LTD / veomarkets.com, alleging candle manipulation.	Consumer-complaint indicator requiring platform and regulator review.
A6	39342.webp	Screenshot showing successful Google Safe Browsing submission.	Shows prior URL-security reporting effort.
A7	WhatsAppImage2026-05-30at21.12.06.jpeg	Street/location screenshot.	Contextual location or address evidence requiring verification by recipients.
A8	WhatsAppImage2026-05-30at21.12.17.jpeg and WhatsAppImage2026-05-30at21.12.17(1).jpeg	Group photographs supplied by the complainant with alleged identification of persons connected to the network.	Contextual relationship evidence; identifications should be verified independently.
A9	04_Fraud_Network_Map.md	Complainant-provided network map identifying alleged entities, individuals, funnel stages and payment conduit.	Organizes allegations and investigative leads.
A10	pasted_content.txt	Complainant narrative and requested actions, including KNF, B2BROKER and other escalation points.	Provides testimonial context and recipient-specific requests.

9. Evidence Exhibits

The following images are included as visual exhibits. They are reproduced to make the submission easier for reviewers; the original files should remain the controlling evidence.

Exhibit A2 — Formal dispute concerning USD 4,020.21 profit removal

Formal Dispute Regarding USD 4,020.21 Profit Removal and Withdrawal Reversal 🔍 📄

 **Camilo Cardona** <camilocardonamarec@gmail.com> 1:16 (hace 0 minutos) ☆ 😊 ↶ ⋮
para contact ▾

Dear VeoMarkets Compliance Team,

I am formally disputing the removal of USD 4,020.21 in profits from my trading account following my withdrawal request.

The justification provided by your team referring to "GAP Trading" is unacceptable and inconsistent with the actual trading activity executed on the account.

I did not engage in arbitrage, latency exploitation, system abuse, or any prohibited trading practice. The trades were executed manually using the margin and leverage conditions explicitly permitted under the Limitless account type offered by your company. The market simply moved in my favor during the opening conditions, which is a normal and legitimate market outcome.

Your company initially processed the withdrawal request and later reversed the funds back into the trading account before ultimately removing the profit entirely. This sequence of actions raises serious concerns regarding the integrity of your withdrawal procedures and the retroactive application of trading policies after profitable activity has occurred.

Additionally, my team and I have been documenting multiple irregularities involving execution quality, price discrepancies, abnormal slippage, and graphical inconsistencies observed across several accounts during an ongoing investigation.

At this moment, my legal team is already preparing formal communications and regulatory inquiries directed toward the relevant authorities and entities connected to your Saint Lucia registration.

I am requesting the immediate review and resolution of this case, including the full restoration and payment of the removed USD 4,020.21 profit.

Please provide:


- A detailed explanation of the alleged violation.
- The exact policy clause supposedly breached.
- Complete trade logs and execution records supporting your decision.
- Confirmation regarding the status of my withdrawn funds.

I expect a formal response within the shortest possible timeframe.

Sincerely,
Camilo Cardona
15777


Caption. Supplied screenshot of a customer email disputing alleged removal of USD 4,020.21 in profits and withdrawal reversal. The screenshot should be used with the original image file and the underlying email headers, if available.

Exhibit A3 – Video still: Zoom meeting, trading chart and funding discussion



Caption. Representative still extracted from `WhatsAppVideo2026-05-30at21.12.18veo2.mp4`. The analysis reports a Zoom meeting next to a candlestick chart and translated dialogue concerning Revolut and Telegram payment destination details.

Exhibit A4 – Video still: Zoom meeting with named displayed participant and USDT discussion



Caption. Representative still extracted from `WhatsAppVideo2026-05-30at21.12.30veo1.mp4`. The analysis reports a visible display name “Marcin Olinkiewicz,” a trading chart, discussion of deposit, USDT and movement to a private Telegram account.

Exhibit A5 — Trustpilot review screenshot



Caption. Supplied Trustpilot screenshot concerning VEO Markets LTD / veomarkets.com. The Spanish text alleges that the broker manipulated a candle on M1 timeframe during Sydney open and states that the broker is not trustworthy.


Exhibit A6 — Google Safe Browsing submission screenshot

The screenshot shows a mobile browser interface at the URL `google.com/safebrowsi`. The page content includes:

- Header information: 5:25, signal strength, 1 tab, 36.4 KB/S, 45G, and 74% battery.
- Text explaining that the site's status may be updated in the Transparency Report and shared with third parties. It includes links to [here](#), [Google's Privacy Policy](#), and [Terms of Service](#).
- Text stating that Safe Browsing aims to protect users from malware, unwanted software, or social engineering (for example, phishing content). It includes a link to [here](#).
- A form with three input fields: "Report Type*", "URL to report*", and "Additional details". The "Additional details" field has a character count of `/ 800`.
- A "Submit" button.
- A "Status of submission" section showing a green checkmark and the text "Submission was successful." with a refresh icon.

Caption. Supplied screenshot showing a successful Google Safe Browsing submission. This supports the record that a URL-safety report was already made.

Exhibit A7 — Location or address screenshot requiring verification



Caption. Supplied street/location screenshot. This should be treated as a verification lead only unless the address, corporate registration record and location metadata are independently confirmed.

Exhibit A8 — Supplied group photographs requiring independent identification





Caption. Supplied group photographs. The complainant alleges that certain individuals connected to the network are present. Because facial identification requires independent verification, recipients should treat these photographs as contextual evidence and compare them against verified identities, travel records, event records, social-media posts and metadata where lawful.

10. Recommended Preservation Requests

Recipients should be asked to preserve the following categories of records pending investigation. The purpose of preservation is to prevent loss of evidence and to allow a fair review of the allegations.

Evidence category	Records to preserve
Trading and platform records	MT5 server logs, order execution records, quote feeds, dealer actions, audit trails, account 15777 history, withdrawal logs, IP logs and timestamps.
CRM and onboarding records	Client profiles, lead-source data, referral codes, call notes, KYC records, correspondence, consent forms, risk warnings and assigned account managers.
Communications	Zoom recordings, chat logs, Telegram group/channel records, private Telegram handles, WhatsApp communications, email headers and message metadata.
Payment records	Card merchant identifiers, acquirer records, Indonesian-rupiah transactions, chargebacks, blocked payment attempts, Revolut transfer details, USDT wallet addresses and transaction hashes.
Promotional records	Social-media posts, advertisements, livestreams, funnel pages, landing pages, claims about licensing, profit expectations, risk disclosures and deletion history.
Corporate and provider records	Contracts, white-label agreements, CRM agreements, server licences, support tickets, compliance reviews and termination or escalation records.

11. Recommended Submission Language

The following language can be adapted for each recipient. It is intentionally neutral and evidence-focused.

We request urgent preservation and review of records concerning VEO Markets Ltd / VeoMarkets, DayHub / Dayhub.io, and associated promotional or onboarding channels. The attached evidence package includes account-level trading history, a customer dispute concerning alleged removal of USD 4,020.21 in profits, screenshots, video summaries showing deposit and private-channel funding discussions, and public-source material indicating regulatory-risk concerns. We do not ask the recipient to accept the allegations without review. We ask that the relevant records be preserved, that the matter be assessed under the recipient's regulatory, compliance, platform or service-provider policies, and that services or content be suspended where the evidence confirms unauthorized financial services, misleading promotion, fraud indicators, or misuse of technology infrastructure.

For KNF specifically, the submission should emphasize Polish consumer targeting, alleged lack of Polish authorization, private Telegram onboarding, and the request for warning-list review. For B2BROKER, the submission should emphasize technology-provider risk, KYC/AML and client-risk review, record preservation, and service suspension where policy breaches are confirmed. For MetaQuotes, the submission should focus on platform misuse, white-label/server records, and preservation of logs rather than asking MetaQuotes to adjudicate client trading claims. For platforms and payment processors, the submission should focus on deceptive financial promotion, private-channel inducement, cryptocurrency or alternative funding instructions, blocked withdrawals and consumer-harm indicators.

12. Conclusion

The materials supplied present a coherent set of investigative leads: a named offshore brokerage, alleged connected projects and promoters, account-level withdrawal and profit-removal complaint, trading-history data, public-source warnings or negative regulatory-risk context, and video evidence suggesting private-channel deposit discussions. The combination of these elements warrants immediate preservation of records and formal review by regulators, service providers, platforms and payment processors.

The most urgent steps are: first, notify **KNF** for possible warning-list consideration; second, notify **B2BROKER** with a provider-compliance and service-suspension request; third, notify **MetaQuotes** for record preservation and potential platform-misuse review; fourth, notify **FSC Mauritius** through the appropriate complaint or whistleblowing channels; fifth, preserve and submit all original files, including the videos, workbook and screenshots; and sixth, escalate platform and payment-channel evidence to the relevant trust-and-safety and acquiring institutions.

References

No.	Source	URL
1	Rankia Poland — VEO Markets Opinie 2026 - broker bez licencji?	https://rankia.pl/veo-markets-opinie-broker-bez-licencji/
2	WikiFX — veo markets profile	https://www.wikifx.com/en/dealer/4175865849.html
3	KNF — Public Warnings	https://www.knf.gov.pl/en/CONSUMERS/Information_for_the_financial_market_consumers/Public_warnings?warningName=foris&warningTypeld=all
4	FSC Mauritius — Online Complaints Portal	https://complaints.fscmauritius.org
5	MetaQuotes — Contacts	https://www.metaquotes.net/en/company/contacts

No.	Source	URL
6	B2BROKER — Contacts	https://b2broker.com/contacts/
7	B2BROKER — Complaints Policy	https://b2broker.com/complaints/