

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RULINGS

Release No. 3233/October 16, 2015

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING

File No. 3-16836

In the Matter of

STEVEN J. MUEHLER,  
ALTERNATIVE SECURITIES MARKETS  
GROUP CORP., AND  
BLUE COAST SECURITIES CORP., DBA  
GLOBALCROWDTV, INC., AND BLUE  
COAST BANC

ORDER POSTPONING HEARING AND  
DIRECTING FOR THE PARTIES TO HOLD  
AN INITIAL PREHEARING CONFERENCE

On September 28, 2015, the Securities and Exchange Commission issued an Order Instituting Administrative and Cease-and-Desist Proceedings (OIP) against Respondents pursuant to Sections 15(b) and 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. A hearing is currently scheduled for November 9, 2015.

On October 13, 2015, the parties filed a joint status report regarding service of the OIP and stating that the Division had notified Respondents that documents and other materials are available for inspection and copying. The parties further requested that the hearing date be postponed and that a telephonic prehearing conference be held on November 9, 2015. Lastly, the parties attached and requested entry of a protective order.

With respect to service of the OIP, the parties represent in the status report that it “was served on Respondents by U.S. Postal Service on September 29, 2015, and personally served on Respondents on October 5, 2015, in accordance with Commission Rule of Practice 141(a)(2).” U.S. Postal Service tracking information from the Office of the Secretary indicates that the OIP was mailed out to Respondents on September 29, 2015. But service by mail is not effective at the time of mailing; for an individual, service is accomplished upon confirmation of receipt, and for an entity, service is accomplished by confirmation of receipt or attempted delivery. *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(i)-(ii). The purported September 29, 2015, service-by-mail date appears inaccurate because there seems to be no confirmation of receipt and/or attempted delivery as of that date. Moreover, although the status report states that the OIP was “personally served on Respondents on October 5, 2015,” the attached proposed protective order states that the OIP was “personally served on Respondents on October 2, 2015.” As the due date for Respondents’ Answers and the deadline for an initial decision run from the date of service, it is necessary for the record to reflect an accurate service date.

I therefore ORDER that the parties submit by October 22, 2015, a declaration identifying the date that service of the OIP was actually effected on Respondents in accordance with Commission Rule of Practice 141(a)(2) and confirming when Respondents' Answer is due.<sup>1</sup>

Concerning the parties' request for a prehearing conference and postponement of the hearing, I POSTPONE the hearing, and direct the parties to hold an initial prehearing conference without the hearing officer by November 9, 2015, to discuss each numbered item in Rule 221(c), 17 C.F.R. § 201.221(c), including the date by which each item will be accomplished. By November 16, 2015, the parties shall file a joint prehearing conference statement, which addresses each numbered item in Rule 221(c), and includes proposed due dates where applicable. Specifically, the parties should propose a prehearing schedule that will result in a hearing commencing in mid- to late-February 2016.<sup>2</sup> See 17 C.F.R. § 201.360(a)(2) ("Under the 300-day timeline, the hearing officer shall issue an order providing that there shall be approximately 4 months from the order instituting the proceeding to the hearing."). Based on this prehearing conference statement, a subsequent prehearing conference with the hearing officer will be scheduled if appropriate. If the parties are unable to hold a prehearing conference by November 9, 2015, the Division shall notify this Office before that date.

The parties are also asked to email [alj@sec.gov](mailto:alj@sec.gov) courtesy copies of any filings in this proceeding in PDF text-searchable format.

---

Jason S. Patil  
Administrative Law Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Respondents may be deemed in default for failure to timely file an Answer or to otherwise defend this proceeding. OIP at 7; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a), .220(f).

<sup>2</sup> The parties may denote that an item is "not applicable" in their filing.