

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RULINGS  
Release No. 2246/January 22, 2015

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING  
File No. 3-16217

In the Matter of

THRASOS TOMMY PETROU

ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR  
EXTENSION WITHOUT  
PREJUDICE

On October 27, 2014, the Securities and Exchange Commission (Commission) issued an Order Instituting Administrative and Cease-and-Desist Proceedings (OIP) against Respondent Thrasos Tommy Petrou (Respondent), pursuant to Section 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Section 203(f) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. A briefing schedule for motions for summary disposition was agreed to by the Division of Enforcement (Division) and Respondent's counsel during a telephonic prehearing conference held on December 1, 2014. *Thrasos Tommy Petrou*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 2070, 2014 SEC LEXIS 4523 (Dec. 1, 2014).

On January 21, 2015, this Office received a letter from Respondent's counsel (Letter) requesting that the approaching deadline for filing motions for summary disposition be moved from February 6, 2015, to February 27, 2015, and that the deadlines for filing oppositions and replies be similarly extended by three weeks.

The Letter is addressed to me, and although Respondent may well have filed the Letter with the Commission's Office of the Secretary (OS), the Letter does not so state. *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.151 (motions must be filed with OS). I accept motions, including this one, that are formatted as letters, a practice which is common in New York City. However, in Commission administrative proceedings, relief is more properly requested by filing a motion with OS (with an electronic courtesy copy directed to the administrative law judge at [alj@sec.gov](mailto:alj@sec.gov)) rather than sending a letter addressed to the administrative law judge. *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.152 (specifying the form of motions). I note that the Commission's Rules of Practice do not require that motions be bound, only that they be stapled in the upper left corner. 17 C.F.R. § 201.152(a)(6). Also, I consider the requirement that a motion be "accompanied by a written brief of the points and authorities relied upon" satisfied where the motion and the written brief are combined in one document. *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.154(a).

Requests for an extension of time are governed by Rule 161 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, which mandates that I adhere to a policy strongly disfavoring such requests, except

in circumstances where the requesting party makes a strong showing that the denial of the request would substantially prejudice that party's case. 17 C.F.R. § 201.161(b)(1). The Letter fails to provide any reason for the requested three-week extension. The OIP was filed nearly three months ago and, after discussion during the December 1, 2014, prehearing conference, Respondent's counsel agreed that the briefing deadlines were acceptable. In addition, the Letter conveys that the Division has declined to take a position on the matter, rather than agreeing to an extension.

Accordingly, I find that Respondent has failed to make a showing that he will be substantially prejudiced by my adherence to the original briefing deadlines, and his request that these deadlines be extended is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

SO ORDERED.

---

Cameron Elliot  
Administrative Law Judge