

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**  
**Before the**  
**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

**SECURITIES ACT OF 1933**  
**Release No. 9845 / June 18, 2015**

**SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**  
**Release No. 75239 / June 18, 2015**

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING**  
**File No. 3-16638**

**In the Matter of**

**Stifel, Nicolaus & Company, Inc.**

**Respondent.**

**ORDER INSTITUTING ADMINISTRATIVE  
AND CEASE-AND-DESIST PROCEEDINGS  
PURSUANT TO SECTION 8A OF THE  
SECURITIES ACT OF 1933 AND SECTION  
15(b) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE  
ACT OF 1934, MAKING FINDINGS, AND  
IMPOSING REMEDIAL SANCTIONS AND  
A CEASE-AND-DESIST ORDER**

**I.**

The Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) deems it appropriate and in the public interest that public administrative and cease-and-desist proceedings be, and hereby are, instituted pursuant to Section 8A of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”) and Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) against Stifel, Nicolaus & Company, Inc. (“Respondent”).

**II.**

In anticipation of the institution of these proceedings, Respondent has submitted an Offer of Settlement (the “Offer”) which the Commission has determined to accept. Solely for the purpose of these proceedings and any other proceedings brought by or on behalf of the Commission, or to which the Commission is a party, and without admitting or denying the findings herein, except as to the Commission’s jurisdiction over it and the subject matter of these proceedings, which are admitted, Respondent consents to the entry of this Order Instituting Administrative and Cease-and-Desist Proceedings Pursuant to Section 8A of the Securities Act of 1933 and Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Making Findings, and Imposing Remedial Sanctions and a Cease-and-Desist Order (“Order”), as set forth below.

### III.

On the basis of this Order and Respondent's Offer, the Commission finds<sup>1</sup> that

#### **Summary**

1. This matter involves violations of an antifraud provision of the federal securities laws in connection with Respondent's underwriting of certain municipal securities offerings. Respondent, a registered broker-dealer, conducted inadequate due diligence in certain offerings and as a result, failed to form a reasonable basis for believing the truthfulness of certain material representations in official statements issued in connection with those offerings. This resulted in Respondent offering and selling municipal securities on the basis of materially misleading disclosure documents. As a result of the conduct described herein, Respondent willfully violated Section 17(a)(2) of the Securities Act.<sup>2</sup>

2. The violations discussed in this Order were self-reported by Respondent to the Commission pursuant to the Division of Enforcement's (the "Division") Municipalities Continuing Disclosure Cooperation Initiative.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, this Order and Respondent's Offer are based on the information self-reported by Respondent.

#### **Respondent**

3. Respondent, incorporated in Missouri and headquartered in St. Louis, Missouri, is registered with the Commission as a broker-dealer, investment adviser, and municipal advisor.

#### **Due Diligence Failures**

4. Pursuant to Rule 15c2-12 of the Exchange Act, before purchasing or selling municipal securities in connection with an offering, underwriters are required to obtain executed continuing disclosure agreements from the issuers and/or obligated persons with respect to such municipal securities. In order to comply with the requirements of Rule 15c2-12, the continuing disclosure agreement must include an undertaking by the municipal issuer and/or obligated person, for the benefit of investors, to provide an annual report containing certain financial information and operating data to the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board's ("MSRB") Electronic Municipal Market Access system,<sup>4</sup> as well as timely notice of certain specified events

---

<sup>1</sup> The findings herein are made pursuant to Respondent's Offer of Settlement and are not binding on any other person or entity in this or any other proceeding.

<sup>2</sup> A willful violation of the securities laws means merely "that the person charged with the duty knows what he is doing." Wonsover v. SEC, 205 F.3d 408, 414 (D.C. Cir. 2000) (quoting Hughes v. SEC, 174 F.2d 969, 977 (D.C. Cir. 1949)).

<sup>3</sup> See Div. of Enforcement, U.S. Sec. & Exch. Comm'n, Municipalities Continuing Disclosure Cooperation Initiative, <http://www.sec.gov/divisions/enforce/municipalities-continuing-disclosure-cooperation-initiative.shtml> (last modified Nov. 13, 2014).

<sup>4</sup> Previously, Rule 15c2-12 required such information to be provided to the appropriate nationally recognized municipal securities information repositories. In December 2008, Rule 15c2-12 was amended to designate the

pertaining to the municipal securities being offered and timely notice of any failure to submit an annual report on or before the date specified in the continuing disclosure agreement.

5. Rule 15c2-12(f)(3) requires that a final official statement set forth any instances in the previous five years in which an issuer of municipal securities, or obligated person, failed to comply in all material respects with any previous continuing disclosure undertakings.

6. Respondent acted as either a senior or sole underwriter in a number of municipal securities offerings in which the official statements essentially represented that the issuer or obligated person had not failed to comply in all material respects with any previous continuing disclosure undertakings. In fact, certain of these statements were materially false and/or misleading because the issuer or obligated person had not complied in all material respects with its previous continuing disclosure undertakings. Among the offerings in which the official statements contained false or misleading statements about prior compliance were the following:

- A 2012 negotiated securities offering in which an issuer failed to disclose that it had filed two years' worth of certain required financial information between 67 and 153 days late, and failed to file required notices of late filings for each of those;
- A 2012 negotiated securities offering in which an issuer failed to disclose that it had filed its audited financial statements for three years between 14 and 94 days late, failed to file its audited financial statement for one year, and failed to file required notices of late filings for each of those; and
- A 2012 negotiated securities offering in which an issuer failed to disclose that since 2009 it had not made any filings it had previously undertaken to make in connection with prior securities offerings, and had not filed notices of late filings for each of those.

7. Respondent failed to form a reasonable basis through adequate due diligence for believing the truthfulness of the assertions by these issuers and/or obligors regarding their compliance with previous continuing disclosure undertakings pursuant to Rule 15c2-12.

### **Legal Discussion**

8. Section 17(a)(2) of the Securities Act makes it unlawful “in the offer or sale of any securities . . . directly or indirectly . . . to obtain money or property by means of any untrue statement of a material fact or any omission to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.” 15 U.S.C. § 77q(a)(2) (2012). Negligence is sufficient to establish a violation of Section 17(a)(2). See *Aaron v. SEC*, 446 U.S. 680, 696-97 (1980). A misrepresentation or omission is material if there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable investor would consider it important in making an investment decision. See *Basic Inc. v. Levinson*, 485 U.S. 224, 231-32 (1988).

---

MSRB's Electronic Municipal Market Access system as the central repository for ongoing disclosures by municipal issuers, effective July 1, 2009.

9. An underwriter may violate the antifraud provisions of the federal securities laws if it does not have a reasonable basis for believing the truthfulness of material statements in offering documents in connection with a securities offering, as a result of inadequate due diligence. “By participating in an offering, an underwriter makes an implied recommendation about the securities [that it] . . . has a reasonable basis for belief in the truthfulness and *completeness* of the key representations made in any disclosure documents used in the offerings.” Dolphin & Bradbury, Inc. v. SEC, 512 F.3d 634, 641 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (emphasis added) (quoting Municipal Securities Disclosure, Exchange Act Release No. 26100, 53 Fed. Reg. 37778, 37787 (Sept. 28, 1988) (“1988 Proposing Release”)); see also City Securities Corp., Exchange Act Release No. 70056, 2013 WL 3874855, at \*1-2 (July 29, 2013) (finding underwriter violated anti-fraud provisions by failing to conduct due diligence related to issuer’s statements regarding its compliance with previous continuing disclosure undertakings).

10. An underwriter “occupies a vital position” in a securities offering because investors rely on its reputation, integrity, independence, and expertise. See Dolphin & Bradbury, 512 F.3d at 641 (quoting 1988 Proposing Release, 53 Fed. Reg. at 37787). While broker-dealers must have a reasonable basis for recommending securities to customers, underwriters have a “heightened obligation” to take steps to ensure adequate disclosure. Id. (quoting 1988 Proposing Release, 53 Fed. Reg. at 37787 n.74).

11. Rule 15c2-12 was adopted in an effort to improve the quality and timeliness of disclosures to investors in municipal securities. In recognition of the fact that the disclosure of sound financial information is critical to the integrity of not just the primary market, but also the secondary markets for municipal securities, Rule 15c2-12 requires an underwriter to obtain a written agreement, for the benefit of the holders of the securities, in which the issuer undertakes (among other things) to annually submit certain financial information. See 17 C.F.R. § 240.15c2-12(b)(5)(i) (2015); see also Municipal Securities Disclosure, Exchange Act Release No. 34961, 59 Fed. Reg. 59590, 59592 (Nov. 17, 1994). Critical to any evaluation of an undertaking to make disclosures is the likelihood that the issuer or obligated person will abide by the undertaking. See id. at 59594. The disclosure requirements of Rule 15c2-12 provide an incentive for issuers and obligated persons to comply with their undertakings, allowing underwriters, investors, and others to assess the reliability of the disclosure representations. See Municipal Securities Disclosure, 59 Fed. Reg. at 59595.

12. As a result of the conduct described herein, Respondent willfully violated Section 17(a)(2) of the Securities Act.

### **Cooperation**

13. In determining to accept Respondent’s offer, the Commission considered the cooperation of Respondent in self-reporting the violations.

## Undertakings

14. Respondent has undertaken to:

a. Retain an independent consultant (the “Independent Consultant”), not unacceptable to the Commission staff, to conduct a review of Respondent’s policies and procedures as they relate to municipal securities underwriting due diligence. The Independent Consultant shall not have provided consulting, legal, auditing or other professional services to, or had any affiliation with, Respondent during the two years prior to the institution of these proceedings. Respondent shall cooperate fully with the Independent Consultant and the Independent Consultant’s compensation and expenses shall be borne by Respondent.

b. Require the Independent Consultant to enter into an agreement that provides that for the period of engagement and for a period of two years from completion of the engagement, the Independent Consultant shall not enter into any employment, consultant, attorney-client, auditing or other professional relationship with Respondent, or any of its present or former affiliates, directors, officers, employees, or agents acting in their capacity. The agreement will also provide that the Independent Consultant will require that any firm with which he/she is affiliated or of which he/she is a member, and any person engaged to assist the Independent Consultant in performance of his/her duties under this Order shall not, without prior written consent of the Division enter into any employment, consultant, attorney-client, auditing or other professional relationship with Respondent, or any of its present or former affiliates, directors, officers, employees, or agents acting in their capacity as such for the period of the engagement and for a period of two years after the engagement. The agreement will also provide that, within 180 days of the institution of these proceedings, the Independent Consultant shall submit a written report of its findings to Respondent, which shall include the Independent Consultant’s recommendations for changes in or improvements to Respondent’s policies and procedures.

c. Adopt all recommendations contained in the Independent Consultant’s report within 90 days of the date of that report, provided, however, that within 30 days of the report, Respondent shall advise in writing the Independent Consultant and the Commission staff of any recommendations that Respondent considers to be unduly burdensome, impractical or inappropriate. With respect to any such recommendation, Respondent need not adopt that recommendation at that time but shall propose in writing an alternative policy, procedures or system designed to achieve the same objective or purpose. As to any recommendation on which Respondent and the Independent Consultant do not agree, Respondent and the Independent Consultant shall attempt in good faith to reach an agreement within 60 days after the date of the Report. Within 15 days after the conclusion of the discussion and evaluation by Respondent and the Independent Consultant, Respondent shall require that the Independent Consultant inform Respondent and the Commission staff in writing of the Independent Consultant’s final determination concerning any recommendation that Respondent considers to be unduly burdensome, impractical, or inappropriate. Within 10 days of this written communication

from the Independent Consultant, Respondent may seek approval from the Commission staff to not adopt recommendations that the Respondent can demonstrate to be unduly burdensome, impractical, or inappropriate. Should the Commission staff agree that any proposed recommendations are unduly burdensome, impractical, or inappropriate, Respondent shall not be required to abide by, adopt, or implement those recommendations.

d. Certify, in writing, compliance with the undertakings set forth above in paragraphs 14(a)-(c). The certification shall identify the undertakings, provide written evidence of compliance in the form of a narrative, and be supported by exhibits sufficient to demonstrate compliance. The Commission staff may make reasonable requests for further evidence of compliance, and Respondent agrees to provide such evidence. The certification and supporting material shall be submitted to LeeAnn Ghazil Gaunt, Chief, Municipal Securities and Public Pensions Unit, with a copy to the Office of Chief Counsel of the Division, no later than the one-year anniversary of the institution of these proceedings.

e. Respondent shall cooperate with any subsequent investigation by the Division regarding the subject matter of this Order, including the roles of other parties.

f. For good cause shown, the Commission staff may extend any of the procedural dates relating to these undertakings. Deadlines for procedural dates shall be counted in calendar days, except that if the last day falls on a weekend or federal holiday, the next business day shall be considered the last day.

#### IV.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission deems it appropriate and in the public interest to impose the sanctions agreed to in Respondent's Offer.

Accordingly, pursuant to Section 8A of the Securities Act and Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act, it is hereby ORDERED that:

A. Respondent cease and desist from committing or causing any violations and any future violations of Section 17(a)(2) of the Securities Act.

B. Respondent shall, within ten (10) days of the entry of this Order, pay a civil money penalty in the amount of \$500,000.00 to the Securities and Exchange Commission. If timely payment is not made, additional interest shall accrue pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 3717. Payment must be made in one of the following ways:

- (1) Respondent may transmit payment electronically to the Commission, which will provide detailed ACH transfer/Fedwire instructions upon request;

- (2) Respondent may make direct payment from a bank account via Pay.gov through the SEC website at <http://www.sec.gov/about/offices/ofm.htm>; or
- (3) Respondent may pay by certified check, bank cashier's check, or United States postal money order, made payable to the Securities and Exchange Commission and hand-delivered or mailed to:

Enterprise Services Center  
Accounts Receivable Branch  
HQ Bldg., Room 181, AMZ-341  
6500 South MacArthur Boulevard  
Oklahoma City, OK 73169

Payments by check or money order must be accompanied by a cover letter identifying Stifel, Nicolaus & Company, Inc. as a Respondent in these proceedings, and the file number of these proceedings; a copy of the cover letter and check or money order must be sent to LeeAnn Ghazil Gaunt, Chief, Municipal Securities and Public Pensions Unit, Securities and Exchange Commission, 33 Arch Street, 23rd Floor, Boston, MA 02110-1424.

C. Respondent shall comply with the undertakings enumerated in Paragraphs 14(a)-(d), above.

By the Commission.

Brent J. Fields  
Secretary