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ORDER ON MOTION FOR INTERLOCUTORY REVIEW


The motion appears to be directed to the Commission, which may grant a party’s petition for interlocutory review or order review on its own motion at any time, although “petitions for interlocutory review are ‘disfavored’ and will be granted only in ‘extraordinary circumstances.’” Gary L. McDuff, Exchange Act Release No. 78066, 2016 SEC LEXIS 2121, at *19 (June 14, 2016); 17 C.F.R. § 201.400(a).

It is unclear what relief, if any, Respondent requests from me. To the extent Respondent requests that I certify my ruling for interlocutory review under Rule of Practice 400(c), 17 C.F.R. § 201.400(c), I DENY the motion. Under Rule 400(c), I “shall not certify a ruling [for interlocutory review] unless . . . the ruling involves a controlling question of law as to which there is substantial ground for difference of opinion[,] and an immediate review of the order may materially advance the completion of the proceeding.” 17 C.F.R. § 400(c)(2)(i), (ii). That standard is not met here. The Commission has made clear that it finds no merit to the contention that its administrative law judges should have been appointed in a manner consistent with the Appointments Clause. Harding Advisory LLC, Securities Act Release No. 10277, 2017 SEC LEXIS 86, at *67-69 & n.82 (Jan. 6, 2017). Respondent has provided no reason why the Commission might rule otherwise in this proceeding, the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals’ decision in Bandimere v. SEC, No. 15-9586, --- F.3d ---, 2016 WL 7439007 (10th Cir. Dec. 27, 2016), notwithstanding.

_______________________________
Cameron Elliot
Administrative Law Judge