

1-23

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
FILE NO. 3-11084

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
December 18, 2003

RECEIVED
DEC 19 2003
FIRST CLASS

In the Matter of	:	
	:	ORDER
HARRISON SECURITIES, INC.,	:	
FREDERICK C. BLUMER,	:	
and NEBRISSA SONG	:	
	:	
	:	

I held a prehearing conference yesterday, and counsel for the Division of Enforcement (Division) and for Respondents participated. This Order summarizes the matters discussed and the issues resolved at the prehearing conference.

The Division objected to Respondents' proposed exhibit lists on the grounds that they lacked specificity. I agreed with the Division that the lists, in many instances, identified only categories of documents, rather than specific documents. I also agreed that the lack of specificity prejudices the Division. After discussion, the parties agreed that the Division would promptly send letters to counsel for Respondents, identifying all the documents or categories of documents that it does not now possess. Respondents will then send the Division copies of all requested documents and categories of documents within two weeks after they receive the Division's letter.

The Division also objected to the proposed witness list of Respondents Harrison Securities, Inc. (Harrison), and Frederick C. Blumer (Blumer), on the grounds that the list failed to describe the expected testimony of certain proposed witnesses with specificity. Again, I agreed with the Division. Counsel for Harrison and Blumer filled in certain of these gaps by verbally describing the scope of the expected testimony. If there are any lingering ambiguities that may prejudice the Division's ability to prepare for the hearing, it should file an appropriate motion.


Respondents Harrison and Blumer inquired about the possibility of allowing certain witnesses testify by telephone from Los Angeles, California, rather than in person at the hearing in New York City. Two of these witnesses, Susan Leong and Lusanna Y. Gee, also appear on the Division's witness list, but the Division was not receptive to the idea of telephonic testimony. I inquired about the possibility of videoconference testimony as distinguished from telephonic testimony. If Harrison and

Blumer wish to pursue either idea, their attorney should consult with the Division about the logistics of telephonic testimony and/or videoconferencing and then file an appropriate motion. Any such motion should describe in detail the scope of the expected testimony and its relevance to the issues in the Order Instituting Proceedings.

I encouraged the parties to submit any subpoena applications to this Office as soon as possible. The parties also agreed upon the following schedule:

- Jan. 9, 2004: Respondents Harrison and Blumer to file and serve their prehearing brief in lieu of an opening argument at the hearing; if Harrison and Blumer are claiming inability to pay financial sanctions, they must provide the Division with proof in support of that claim in accordance with Rule 630 of the Securities and Exchange Commission's (Commission's) Rules of Practice;
- Jan. 14, 2004: Telephonic prehearing conference at 2 p.m. Eastern time, with the Division to initiate the call and obtain a court reporter; and
- Jan. 20, 2004: Hearing to commence at the Commission's Northeast Regional Office, Woolworth Building, 233 Broadway, Room 6115, New York, New York 10279, at 9:00 a.m. Eastern time. Once commenced, the hearing will continue to completion.

SO ORDERED.



James T. Kelly
Administrative Law Judge