

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RULINGS  
Release No. 3533/January 22, 2016

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING  
File No. 3-16836

In the Matter of

STEVEN J. MUEHLER,  
ALTERNATIVE SECURITIES MARKETS  
GROUP CORP., AND  
BLUE COAST SECURITIES CORP., DBA  
GLOBALCROWDTV, INC., AND BLUE  
COAST BANC

ORDER DENYING RESPONDENTS'  
MOTION TO QUASH

On January 18, 2016, Respondents moved to quash or limit a subpoena I issued at the request of the Division of Enforcement pursuant to Rule of Practice 232, 17 C.F.R. § 201.232. The subpoena ordered the production of various categories of “documents pertaining to conduct that occurred since the filing of the [order instituting proceedings (OIP)] in this matter,” based on matters that Respondents identified in their amended answer. Div. Request for Subpoena at 1.

With regard to the nine categories of requested documents that Respondents do not object to—categories 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, and 14—I order that Respondents produce those documents to the Division no later than January 29, 2016.

With regard to the eight categories of requested documents that Respondents contend are subject to “confidentiality agreements and non-disclosure agreements,” could “provide a competitor . . . an unfair business advantage,” or otherwise implicate “sensitive or confidential information” —categories 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 17—I order that the Division, no later than January 27, 2016, confer with Respondents and file a proposed protective order sufficient to ensure that such documents will be produced solely for this proceeding and shall not be included as part of the public record. Such an order shall adequately protect the stated concerns of confidentiality or sensitive information. Upon receipt of this order, Respondents must expeditiously convey it to the unnamed parties of the “confidentiality agreements and non-disclosure agreements,” who are permitted to file any objections to this proposed course of action no later than January 28, 2016. Assuming that the proposed protective order is appropriate, subject to my consideration of any meritorious objections by non-parties, Respondents must produce all responsive documents to these eight categories, subject to the

prospective protective order and any applicable privilege claims, to the Division on January 29, 2016.

Respondents also contend that the preceding eight categories are “vague and ambiguous,” have “no relevance to the matter at hand,” or are sought “only for annoyance, embarrassment, oppression and undue burden or expense.” I am unpersuaded by these assertions. By their plain language, the requests are straightforward and relate to facts put squarely at issue by Respondents’ amended answer and the allegations in the OIP. At the prehearing conference of January 4, 2016, Respondents declined my offer to help clarify the scope of the subpoena, if any such clarification was necessary. Tr. at 32-38. Respondents also apparently rejected my recommendation for a meet and confer with the Division regarding any objections. Tr. at 37-38. Respondents’ asserted explanations, which are unsubstantiated, do not justify limiting the subpoena.

As such, I DENY Respondents’ motion to quash or limit the subpoena except that certain documents shall be produced subject to a protective order as previously described.

---

Jason S. Patil  
Administrative Law Judge