


SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
DENVER REGIONAL OFFICE
BYRON G. ROGERS FEDERAL BUILDING
1961 STOUT STREET, SUITE 1700
DENVER, COLORADO 80249-1961

January 5, 2018



VIA Email

Hon. Judge Carol Fox Foelak
100 F Street, N.E.
Mail Stop 2557
Washington, D.C. 20549

Re: In the Matter of Tod A. DiTommaso, Esq.; File No. 3-17550

Dear Hon. Judge Foelak,

On November 30, 2017, the Commission issued an order ratifying the prior appointment of its administrative law judges to preside over administrative proceedings. *See In re: Pending Administrative Proceedings*, Securities Act Release No. 10440 (Nov. 30, 2017). As applied to this proceeding, the order directs the administrative law judge to determine, based on a de novo reconsideration of the full administrative record, whether to ratify or revise in any respect all prior actions taken by any administrative law judge during the course of this proceeding. *Id.* at 1-2.

It is well established that subsequent ratification of an earlier decision rendered by an unconstitutionally appointed officer remedies any alleged harm or prejudice caused by the violation. *See Doolin Sec. Sav. Bank, F.S.B. v. Office of Thrift Supervision*, 139 F.3d 203, 213-14 (D.C. Cir. 1998); *FEC v. Legi-Tech, Inc.*, 75 F.3d 704, 707-09 (D.C. Cir. 1996). And that principle applies whether or not the ratifying authority is the same person who made the initial decision, so long as “the ratifier has the authority to take the action to be ratified,” and, “with full knowledge of the decision to be ratified,” makes a “detached and considered affirmation of th[at] earlier decision.” *Advanced Disposal Services East, Inc. v. NLRB*, 820 F.3d 592, 602-03 (3d Cir. 2016).

Accordingly, to implement this remedy, the administrative law judge should conduct a de novo review of the administrative record, engage in an independent evaluation of the merits through the exercise of detached and considered judgment, and then determine whether prior actions should be ratified and thereby affirmed. This process ensures “that the ratifier does not blindly affirm the earlier decision without due consideration.” *Advanced Disposal Services East*, 820 F.3d at 602-03.

The Division submits that the previous decisions issued by an administrative law judge in this proceeding, including the initial decision issued on June 13, 2017, were well-founded and

Page 2
January 5, 2018

respectfully requests that they be ratified. To that end, the Division attaches a proposed draft order to this letter.

Sincerely,



Stephen C. McKenna
Senior Trial Counsel

:nl

Enclosure:

Cc: Tod DiTommaso (via email)
Brent Fields, Secretary (via Facsimile and UPS)


UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING RULINGS

Release No. _____/

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING

File No. 3-17550



In the Matter of

TOD A. DITOMMASO, ESQ.,

Respondent.

ORDER

After a de novo review and reexamination of the record in these proceedings, I have reached the independent decision to ratify and affirm all prior actions made by an administrative law judge in these proceedings, including the initial decision issued on June 13, 2017. This decision to ratify and affirm is based on my detached and considered judgment after an independent evaluation of the merits.

IT IS SO ORDERED

Carol Fox Foelak
Administrative Law Judge