

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RULINGS  
Release No. 2183 / January 6, 2015

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING  
File No. 3-16293

In the Matter of

LAURIE BEBO and  
JOHN BUONO, CPA

GENERAL PREHEARING ORDER

The Securities and Exchange Commission (Commission) commenced this proceeding on December 3, 2014, with an Order Instituting Administrative and Cease-and-Desist Proceedings pursuant to Sections 4C and 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 102(e) of Commission's Rules of Practice. The hearing is scheduled to commence on April 20, 2015, in Milwaukee, WI.

In this order, I set forth some of the general rules and guidelines I intend to follow leading up to the hearing and during the hearing. Any objection to these general rules and guidelines may be made by written motion or, if appropriate, orally during any prehearing conference.

1. Settlement. Pursuant to Commission Rule of Practice (Rule) 240(c)(2), I am available for a settlement conference. 17 C.F.R. § 201.240(c)(2). The parties must agree to hold the conference (that is, I will not hold one over objection), and must agree to waive the following rights: (1) the right to claim bias or prejudgment by me based on any views I express during the conference; (2) the right to a public proceeding (because the settlement conference will not be open to the public); (3) the right to a proceeding on the record (because the settlement conference will not be recorded stenographically); and (4) the right to an *inter partes* proceeding (because I may confer with the parties *ex parte*). I am flexible on the precise procedure and on timing. In most cases, settlement conferences have occupied the first day scheduled for the hearing, but I have also held them several weeks prior to the scheduled hearing date.
2. Personal or sensitive information. Administrative hearings are presumptively public, as are their filings. 17 C.F.R. § 201.301. Thus, unless a party moves for confidential treatment or for a protective order, any filing is considered public, as it would be in federal district court. Although the Commission currently has no rules regarding

what personal information should not appear in a filing, exercise caution. Omit personal or sensitive information if there is no real need for it.

3. Subpoenas.<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Rule 232(b), when I receive a request for a subpoena, I review it to determine if the subpoena is unreasonable, oppressive, excessive in scope, or unduly burdensome. 17 C.F.R. § 201.232(b). If I find it colorably objectionable, I generally issue an order in which I solicit the parties' views on the matter. If I do not find it objectionable, I wait two or three business days, and if no party notifies me that it objects to the subpoena, I sign the subpoena and return it to the requesting party. If a party does object, it should notify this Office immediately, and I will set a briefing schedule for any motion to quash. Because I view the briefing schedule set forth in Rule 232 as too slow, any briefing schedule on a party's motion to quash will normally require the filing of such a motion within five business days of the order setting the briefing schedule, and the filing of any opposition within three business days thereafter. No reply brief is permitted. 17 C.F.R. § 201.232(e)(1).
4. Exhibit lists. Exhibit lists shall be exchanged and filed by all parties and should include all documents that a party expects to use in the hearing for any purpose. This includes documents that are relevant only for impeachment purposes or that are presumptively inadmissible, such as investigative testimony or other prior sworn statements. Comprehensive exhibit lists prevent other parties from being surprised in the middle of the hearing, and also make it easier for me to track the various documents that the parties use during the hearing.
5. Expert reports and testimony. Expert witness disclosures must, at minimum, comply with Rule 222(b), including the provision of a "brief summary" of an expert's expected testimony. 17 C.F.R. § 201.222(a)(4), (b). I prefer to streamline the hearing by substituting the expert's report for direct testimony. Thus, expert reports should be as specific and detailed as those presented in federal district court pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26. The filing of the expert's report according to the prehearing schedule constitutes the filing, in essence, of the expert's direct testimony. During the hearing, the expert is not subject to direct examination, and is simply sworn in and proffered for cross-examination. However, I have entertained requests for brief direct examination of a party's expert.
6. Prior sworn statements. There is no general prohibition on hearsay in Commission administrative proceedings. *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.320. Prior sworn statements, however, are generally inadmissible. *See* 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.235. The prior sworn statement of a party, though, is an exception to the exception, and may be admissible. *See id.* I entertain, but do not automatically grant, motions by the Division of Enforcement (Division) to admit the investigative testimony or other sworn statement of a respondent. Admitting such a statement, and then examining the respondent only on those issues not already covered by the statement, may streamline the hearing.

---

<sup>1</sup> Forms for subpoenas to produce and to appear are available at <http://www.sec.gov/alj>.

7. Laying a foundation. Evidence that is irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious is inadmissible; all other evidence is presumptively admissible. 17 C.F.R. § 201.320. Thus, I do not generally require a party to lay a foundation for admission of an exhibit, nor is there a need to call a document custodian as a witness. A party may nonetheless lay a foundation if it desires, and doing so may enhance the probative value of a piece of evidence. For example, although there is no blanket prohibition on hearsay, its weight is evaluated in light of a multi-factor test, and laying a foundation with that test in mind may be appropriate. *See Joseph Abbondante*, 58 S.E.C. 1082, 1101 & n.50 (2006) (describing multi-factor hearsay test), *pet. denied*, 209 F. App'x 6 (2d Cir. 2006).
8. Start of the hearing. I generally do two things at the very beginning of the hearing. First, I rule on any pending motions, particularly motions in limine. Second, I rule on as many evidentiary objections as possible, and admit or exclude as many exhibits as I can, which greatly streamlines the hearing. The parties should therefore be prepared at the start of the hearing to orally address pending motions and evidentiary objections. In general, any prehearing objection that I do not resolve at the outset will be handled in the “traditional” way, that is, its proponent should lay a foundation and then, if an exhibit, offer it in evidence. The objecting party may then renew its objection.
9. Hearing schedule. Although the precise hearing schedule depends on the circumstances, I generally start the day at 9:00 or 9:30 a.m., and continue until at least 5:00 p.m. I generally take one break in the morning, lasting about fifteen minutes, and at least one break in afternoon, also lasting about fifteen minutes. I generally break for lunch between noon and 12:30 p.m., for about one hour and fifteen minutes. I am flexible if the parties desire a different schedule.
10. Form of objections. I discourage speaking objections, because they have a tendency to suggest answers to witnesses. On the other hand, it is helpful if an objection includes at least some articulated basis. Thus, my preferred form of objection is “objection,” followed by no more than five or six words explaining the basis. For example, “objection – vague,” “objection – asked and answered,” or “objection – assumes facts not in evidence,” are all acceptable ways of objecting.
11. Examination.
  - a. In general, the Division puts its case on first, because it has the burden of proof. The respondent then presents her case, although I am flexible about permitting the parties to proceed in some other order, and to take witnesses out of order.
  - b. The Rules do not explicitly provide for motions for judgment as a matter of law, and I do not entertain them except in extraordinary circumstances. *See Rita Villa*, 53 S.E.C. 399, 404 (1998) (permitting dismissal at the conclusion

of Division's case in "extraordinary circumstances"). As a result, I do not strictly enforce the rule that a respondent does not present any evidence until the Division rests. Instead, if the Division calls a witness that a respondent also wishes to call as a witness, the respondent should cross-examine the witness as if she were calling the witness in her own case. This means that cross-examination may exceed the scope of direct examination. Indeed, I generally do not enforce the scope rule at all, and I allow multiple redirects and recrosses, until the testimony of the witness is completely exhausted by all parties. This way, a witness need only testify once, and need not be recalled just for a respondent's case.

- c. A respondent as a witness is the exception to 11(b), *supra*. I am flexible regarding the manner of presenting respondent testimony, so long as the parties agree on it. For example, if the Division calls a respondent as its last witness, the parties may agree that respondent's counsel conducts the direct examination, followed by the Division's cross-examination, which may exceed the scope of direct. In the absence of any agreement, respondent testimony proceeds in the traditional way, that is, the respondent is called as a witness and examined potentially multiple times.
- d. In general, cross-examination may be conducted by leading questions, even as to Division witnesses that a respondent wishes to call in her own case. However, counsel may not lead their client. Thus, if a respondent is called as a witness in the Division's case, that respondent's counsel may not ask leading questions on cross-examination. Similarly, if a Commission employee is called as a witness for a respondent, the Division (or whoever represents the employee, such as the Office of General Counsel) may not ask leading questions on cross-examination.

12. Practice tips. Depositions in civil cases, and sworn testimony during investigations, are far more common than Commission administrative hearings, and I have found that certain deposition practices have unfortunately crept into hearings. I offer these practice tips as helpful suggestions to move a case along efficiently.

- a. Avoid leading questions on direct. Properly formulated non-leading questions do not always come naturally, and it is easy to fall into the habit, as in a deposition, of asking leading questions all the time. However, leading questions during direct of non-hostile witnesses are objectionable, and I sustain objections to them. Repeated leading questions, followed by meritorious objections, followed by rephrased questions, slow down the hearing needlessly, and are easily prevented.
- b. Hit the high points on cross. The purpose of discovery is to explore the case; the purpose of a hearing is to present the case. It is a waste of hearing resources to bring out on cross every jot and tittle of minutiae that is colorably

helpful to your case. Your cross will be much more memorable and powerful if you emphasize the strong points, and marginalize the tangential points.

- c. Do not comment on the evidence. You may be able to get away with sarcasm during a deposition, but sarcasm during a hearing, particularly during cross-examination, just makes you look petty and unprofessional. The post-hearing briefs provide ample opportunity to explain your skepticism in detail.

13. Be civil. Civility between counsel streamlines every proceeding, and makes my job much easier. A willingness to communicate respectfully with opposing counsel is a sign of strength, not a sign of weakness. Although there is no meet-and-confer requirement in the Rules, I encourage the parties to attempt to reach agreement on anything they reasonably can. If you cannot reach agreement, I will resolve the matter, but if you do disagree, try not to be disagreeable about it.

SO ORDERED.

---

Cameron Elliot  
Administrative Law Judge