

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

Administrative Proceedings Rulings
Release No. 5646 / March 13, 2018

Administrative Proceeding
File No. 3-16509

In the Matter of

**Edward M. Daspin, a/k/a Edward
(Ed) Michael,
Luigi Agostini, and
Lawrence R. Lux**

**Order Denying
Rule 111 Motion**

Respondent Edward M. Daspin filed a motion pursuant to Rule 111(h) to correct a manifest error of fact in an initial decision, which the Division of Enforcement has opposed. I previously stated that I would not adjudicate any further filings unless directed to by the Securities and Exchange Commission.¹

Nevertheless, to avoid uncertainty and to the extent I have the authority, the motion is DENIED. A motion filed under Rule 111(h) “is properly filed . . . only if the basis for the motion is a patent misstatement of fact *in the initial decision*.”² But the order I issued on February 20, 2018, was

¹ *Edward M. Daspin*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 5633, 2018 SEC LEXIS 627, at *3 (ALJ Feb. 28, 2018). On March 8, 2018, the Commission denied Daspin’s motion for reconsideration directed to it. *Edward M. Daspin*, Securities Act of 1933 Release No. 10468, 2018 SEC LEXIS 689 (Mar. 8, 2018). That order acknowledged my order revising and ratifying prior actions taken by administrative law judges in this proceeding, but did not discuss the posture of this proceeding or Daspin’s Rule 111 motion directed to me.

² 17 C.F.R. § 201.111(h) (emphasis added).

not an initial decision. Further, Daspin's motion does not point to any patent misstatement of fact in it.

James E. Grimes
Administrative Law Judge