Respondent Edward M. Daspin filed a motion pursuant to Rule 111(h) to correct a manifest error of fact in an initial decision, which the Division of Enforcement has opposed. I previously stated that I would not adjudicate any further filings unless directed to by the Securities and Exchange Commission.¹

Nevertheless, to avoid uncertainty and to the extent I have the authority, the motion is DENIED. A motion filed under Rule 111(h) “is properly filed . . . only if the basis for the motion is a patent misstatement of fact in the initial decision.”² But the order I issued on February 20, 2018, was


² 17 C.F.R. § 201.111(h) (emphasis added).
not an initial decision. Further, Daspin’s motion does not point to any patent misstatement of fact in it.

_______________________________
James E. Grimes
Administrative Law Judge