

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 67492A / July 24, 2012

INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940
Release No. 30152 / July 24, 2012

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-14961

In the Matter of

**WILFRED R. BLUM AND
ALEXANDER LINDALE,
LLC,**

Respondents.

**CORRECTED ORDER INSTITUTING
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS
PURSUANT TO SECTION 15(b) OF THE
SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
AND SECTION 9(b) OF THE INVESTMENT
COMPANY ACT OF 1940 AND NOTICE OF
HEARING**

I.

The Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) deems it appropriate and in the public interest that public administrative proceedings be, and hereby are, instituted pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) and Section 9(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (“Investment Company Act”) against Wilfred R. Blum (“Blum”) and Alexander Lindale, LLC (“Alexander Lindale”) (Blum and Alexander Lindale, collectively “Respondents”).

II.

After an investigation, the Division of Enforcement alleges that:

A. RESPONDENTS

1. Blum is the general manager of Alexander Lindale. Blum was not registered with the Commission in accordance with Section 15(b) nor was he associated with a broker or dealer. Beginning in January 2008 and continuing through January 2010, Blum conducted numerous unregistered offerings and distributions of Copper King Mining Corp (“Copper King”) stock. Blum, 58 years old, is a resident of Salt Lake City, Utah.

2. Alexander Lindale is a Minnesota limited liability company with its principal place of business in Midvale, Utah. Alexander Lindale provides public relations and financing for small start-up companies.

B. ENTRY OF THE INJUNCTION

1. On June 28, 2012, a judgment was entered against Blum and Alexander Lindale permanently enjoining each of them from future violations of Sections 5(a), and 5(c) of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”) and Section 15(a) of the Exchange Act in the civil action entitled Securities and Exchange Commission v. Copper King, et al., Civil Action Number 2:11-CV-00526, in the United States District Court for the District of Utah, Central Division. Respondents were jointly and severely ordered to pay disgorgement of \$3,291,352, representing profits gained as a result of the conduct alleged in the Complaint, together with prejudgment interest thereon in the amount of \$557,218.33, and each of them were barred from participating in an offering of a penny stock under Section 20(g) of the Securities Act and Section 21(d)(6) of the Exchange Act.

2. The Commission’s complaint alleged that in January 2008, Alexander Lindale and Blum were retained by Copper King to obtain financing for Copper King and to conduct public relations services for Copper King, including the issuance of press releases designed to create a demand for investors to buy Copper King stock. In an effort to obtain financing for Copper King, Blum decided to offer and sell Copper King stock pursuant to Rule 504 of Regulation D. However, Blum did not comply with the requirements and limitations imposed by Rule 504 of Regulation D. Beginning in January 2008 and continuing through January 2010, Blum, on behalf of himself and acting through Alexander Lindale, conducted numerous unregistered offerings and distributions of Copper King stock, including selling stock in excess of the \$1 million per 12 month limitation imposed by Rule 504. In addition, in subscription agreements distributed to investors, Blum represented that Alexander Lindale was buying Copper King stock with investment intent and not with a view to distribute the stock to the public, as required under Rule 504. However, these claims were false. Within hours of having Copper King stock issued to Alexander Lindale, Blum immediately began to distribute or resell Copper King stock to individual investors and entities.

III.

In view of the allegations made by the Division of Enforcement, the Commission deems it necessary and appropriate in the public interest that public administrative proceedings be instituted to determine:

A. Whether the allegations set forth in Section II hereof are true and, in connection therewith, to afford Respondents an opportunity to establish any defenses to such allegations;

B. What, if any, remedial action is appropriate in the public interest against Respondents pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act;

C. What, if any, remedial action is appropriate in the public interest against Respondents pursuant to Section 9(b) of the Investment Company Act.

IV.

IT IS ORDERED that a public hearing for the purpose of taking evidence on the questions set forth in Section III hereof shall be convened at a time and place to be fixed, and before an Administrative Law Judge to be designated by further order as provided by Rule 110 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.110.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondents shall file an Answer to the allegations contained in this Order within twenty (20) days after service of this Order, as provided by Rule 220 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.220.

If Respondents fail to file the directed answer, or fail to appear at a hearing after being duly notified, the Respondents may be deemed in default and the proceedings may be determined against them upon consideration of this Order, the allegations of which may be deemed to be true as provided by Rules 155(a), 220(f), 221(f) and 310 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a), 201.220(f), 201.221(f) and 201.310.

This Order shall be served forthwith upon Respondents personally or by certified mail.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Administrative Law Judge shall issue an initial decision no later than 210 days from the date of service of this Order, pursuant to Rule 360(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice.

In the absence of an appropriate waiver, no officer or employee of the Commission engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions in this or any factually related proceeding will be permitted to participate or advise in the decision of this matter, except as witness or counsel in proceedings held pursuant to notice. Since this proceeding is not "rule making" within the meaning of Section 551 of the Administrative Procedure Act, it is not deemed subject to the provisions of Section 553 delaying the effective date of any final Commission action.

For the Commission, by its Secretary, pursuant to delegated authority.

Elizabeth M. Murphy
Secretary

