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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RULINGS Release No. 3730/March 23, 2016

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING File No. 3-17146

In the Matter of

ORDER FOLLOWING
PREHEARING CONFERENCE

JANICE D. REY

On March 1, 2016, the Securities and Exchange Commission issued an order instituting proceedings (OIP) against Respondent pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Thereafter, I postponed the hearing in this matter and scheduled a telephonic prehearing conference for March 22.

During the March 22 prehearing conference, Respondent indicated that she would likely not contest this proceeding, and the Division of Enforcement stated that it would send Respondent settlement documents for her to sign. Because Respondent indicated that she may not initially understand such documents on their face, I decided that a second telephonic prehearing conference should be held. At this second conference, the Division will explain the settlement documents to Respondent, and Respondent will be free to ask me or the Division any questions she may have.

I therefore ORDER that by March 31, 2016, the Division shall provide my office with proposed dates and times that the Division and Respondent are available for a prehearing conference. The Division shall ensure that any proposed date for the conference will allow Respondent sufficient time to receive and review any settlement documents ahead of time.

Further, although information submitted by the Division indicates that the OIP was delivered to Respondent's correctional institution on or around March 7 by U.S. Postal Service certified mail, I determined during the March 22 conference that Respondent was not served with the OIP until March 22, 2016. According to the OIP, Respondent's answer would be due twenty days after service. OIP at 3. However, given her pro se status and the possibility of settlement, Respondent's answer is due by April 22, 2016, if the proceeding is not stayed or resolved by then.

Jason S. Patil Administrative Law Judge