## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Before the SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20549

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RULINGS Release No. 2854/June 24, 2015

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING File No. 3-16318

In the Matter of

MICHAEL W. CROW, ALEXANDRE S. CLUG, AURUM MINING, LLC, PANAM TERRA, INC., AND THE CORSAIR GROUP, INC.

**ORDER** 

The Division submitted a letter to my office yesterday on behalf of the parties, requesting that the due date for prehearing briefs, motions in limine, and objections to exhibits and witnesses be extended from June 29 to July 1, 2015, to allow the parties additional time to review each other's hearing exhibits for potential objections or in limine motions and to prepare prehearing briefs that reflect the parties' proposed exhibits. I GRANT this extension and ORDER prehearing briefs, motions in limine, and objections to exhibits and witnesses due by July 1, 2015.

The parties have filed their respective witness lists, which were due by June 23, 2015. After reviewing these lists I have several matters I would like to raise for the parties' consideration.

- 1. Hearing timing: Based on the number of witnesses on each party's witness list, additional time may be necessary for the hearing. The parties should meet and confer to determine whether some witnesses are more likely to be called than others, for instance, by designating certain witnesses as "will call" and "may call." Based on the number of "will call" witnesses, the parties should estimate whether additional hearing time is needed and how much. If the parties agree that additional time is necessary, they should let my office know by July 1, 2015. At that time, they should also note whether they are available on July 20-21, 2015, and if not, other proposed dates to extend the hearing.
- 2. International and unavailable witnesses: The parties have listed a number of international witnesses on their witness lists and Michael Crow has offered the statement of George Charles Cody Price, who is unavailable during the week of the

hearing. After discussion amongst the parties, if these witnesses are on the parties' "will call" lists, the parties should let my office know by July 1, 2015, whether they are amenable to taking testimony by telephone rather than in person. If the courtroom does not have the facilities to proceed in this fashion, telephonic testimony could take place on other dates. The parties should keep in mind the possibility of telephonic hearing testimony when determining whether additional hearing time is necessary.

- 3. Witness subpoenas: Despite the large number of witnesses on each party's list, my office has received testimony subpoenas for only half of the proposed witnesses. If a party intends to call a witness, a subpoena should be requested by July 1, 2015. The parties should make their best estimate as to the specific date of testimony.
- 4. Division witnesses 23-28: The Division lists six Custodians of Records it intends to call to authenticate records. The parties should confer and work in good faith to reach a stipulation as to authenticity of these records. In particular, the Division should discuss with Respondents whether Respondents would be willing to accept a declaration from each document custodian as to the authenticity of records.
- 5. Expert testimony: The Division submitted the expert report of witness Allan V. Moran. To the extent that Respondents intend to submit testimony as to the viability of the mines or to rebut the Division's expert witness, by July 6, 2015, Respondents shall provide to the Division the name(s) of the witness(es), occupation(s), address(es), and a brief summary of the expected testimony, in accordance with Commission Rule of Practice 222(a)(4).<sup>2</sup>

SO ORDERED.		

Jason S. Patil Administrative Law Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> If it so chooses, the Division may also request a deposition upon oral examination pursuant to Commission Rule of Practice 233, 17 C.F.R. § 201.233, as to George Charles Cody Price.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> If any witnesses are to be offered as experts, Respondents shall also comply with Rule 222(b). 17 C.F.R. § 201.222(b).