

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RULINGS  
Release No. 1558/June 26, 2014

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING  
File No. 3-15900

---

In the Matter of

JOHN J. BRAVATA,	:	
RICHARD J. TRABULSY, and	:	POSTPONEMENT ORDER
ANTONIO M. BRAVATA	:	

---

The Securities and Exchange Commission instituted this proceeding with an Order Instituting Proceedings (OIP) on June 2, 2014, pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and 203(f) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, and the hearing was scheduled to commence on June 30, 2014. The proceeding is a follow-on proceeding based on United States v. Bravata, No. 2:11-cr-20314 (E.D. Mich.), in which Respondents John J. Bravata (John Bravata), Richard J. Trabulsy (Trabulsy), and Antonio M. Bravata (Antonio Bravata) were convicted of wire fraud and other offenses on December 11, 2013, April 15, 2014, and December 11, 2013, respectively.

The Division of Enforcement (Division) has requested that the hearing date be postponed and a prehearing conference be scheduled during the week of July 14, 2014. To allow time for service of the OIP on all Respondents in accordance with 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(i) and their Answers,<sup>1</sup> consistent with 17 C.F.R. § 201.161, the hearing will be postponed sine die, and a prehearing conference will be scheduled to be held by telephone on July 18, 2014, at 11:00 a.m. EDT. The undersigned notes logistical difficulties associated with the fact that each of the three Respondents is incarcerated in a different facility; if all three are not available on that day and time, the Division will request that the prehearing conference be postponed to a day and time when all parties are available.

---

<sup>1</sup> John Bravata and Antonio Bravata were served with the OIP on June 5, 2014, and John Bravata has filed an Answer. Trabulsy has not yet been served with the OIP. Each Respondent's Answer is due within twenty days of service on him. See OIP at 3; 17 C.F.R. § 201.220(b). A Respondent who fails to file an Answer within the time provided will be deemed to be in default, and the undersigned will enter an order barring him from the securities industry. See OIP at 4; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a), .220(f).

The Division anticipates requesting permission to move for summary disposition. The Division is reminded that preconditions for such a request are that the respective Respondent has filed an Answer and that the Division has made available the investigative file, as required by 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.230, .250(a). See Byron S. Rainer, Exchange Act Release No. 59040 (Dec. 2, 2008), 94 SEC Docket 12093; José P. Zollino, Exchange Act Release No. 51632 (Apr. 29, 2005), 85 SEC Docket 1292.

In his Answer, John Bravata requests a stay of this proceeding. While his articulation of the grounds for a stay is not altogether clear, even the pendency of an appeal does not preclude “follow-on” action based on the conviction. Joseph P. Galluzzi, 55 S.E.C. 1110, 1116 n.21 (2002); John Francis D’Acquisto, 53 S.E.C. 440, 444 n.9 (1998).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/S/ Carol Fox Foelak  
Carol Fox Foelak  
Administrative Law Judge