UNITED STAPES OF AMERICA Before the SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING File No. 3-17716

In the Matter of

ROBERT L. BAKER, JACOB B. HERRERA MICHAEL D. BOWEN, and TERRENCE A. BALLARD,

Respondents.

DIVISION OF ENFORCEMENT'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO RESPONDENT JACOB B. HERRERA'S

MOTION TO DISMISS OR ABATE

PROCEEDING

The Division of Enforcement (the "Division") files this Response in Opposition to Respondent Jacob B. Herrera's "Preliminary Answer, Motion to Dismiss, or Alternatively, Motion to Abate" (the "Motion") this administrative proceeding. The Court should reject Respondent Herrera's request that the Court either dismiss or "abate" this proceeding. Respondent Herrera argues that this Court lacks jurisdiction over the proceeding in light of the Tenth Circuit's divided decision in *Bandimere v. SEC*, No. 15-9586, 2016 WL 7439007 (10th Cir. Dec. 27, 2016), which held that Commission Administrative Law Judges ("ALJs ") are "inferior officers" who must be appointed in a manner consistent with the requirements of the Appointments Clause. But a unanimous panel of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit held that the Commission's ALJs are not constitutional "[0]fficers." *Raymond J. Lucia Cos. v. SEC*, 832 F.3d 277 (D.C. Cir. 2016) *pet. for reh'g en banc filed*, No. 15-1345 (Sept. 23, 2016). And, as the Commission has recognized in a post-*Bandimere* ruling, the D.C. Circuit's decision was correct, and the Tenth Circuit majority's contrary ruling is wrong. *See* Harding Advisory LLC & Wing F. Chau, S.E.C. Rel. No. 4600, 2017 WL 66592, at *19 n.90 (Jan. 6, 2017).

Ų

Moreover, the Tenth Circuit issued its decision in *Bandimere* on December 27, 2016, and the mandate has yet to issue in that case. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 41(b). The government is also presently considering options for further review of the Tenth Circuit's decision.

For the foregoing reasons, the Division respectfully requests that this Court deny Respondent Herrera's Motion and specifically order him to comply with: (a) Section IV of the Commission's December 8, 2016 Order Instituting Administrative and Cease-and-Desist Proceedings Pursuant to Section 8A of the Securities Act of 1933, Sections 15(b) and 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and Section 9(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 and Notice of Hearing ("OIP") [OIP, at p. 6]; and (b) Rule 220(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice. Rule 220(c) requires that "an answer shall specifically admit, deny, or state that the party does not have, and is unable to obtain, sufficient information to admit or deny each allegation in the order instituting proceedings." *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.220(c). Respondent Herrera's Motion does not comply with Rule 220(c). 14

Respectfully submitted,

a B. David Fraser, Esq.

Texas Bar No. 24012654 Scott F. Mascianica, Esq. Texas Bar No. 24072222

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission Fort Worth Regional Office Burnett Plaza, Suite 1900 801 Cherry Street, Unit 18 Fort Worth, Texas 76102 (817) 978-1409 (Fraser) (817) 978-0165 (Mascianica) (817) 978-4927 (facsimile) <u>FraserB@sec.gov</u> <u>MascianicaS@sec.gov</u>

COUNSEL FOR THE DIVISION OF ENFORCEMENT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

In accordance with Rule 150 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, I hereby certify that true and correct copy of the foregoing *Division of Enforcement's Response in Opposition to Respondent Jacob B. Herrera's Motion to Dismiss or Abate Proceeding* was sent via UPS on January 20, 2017 to the individuals listed below:

Honorable Jason S. Patil Administrative Law Judge Securities and Exchange Commission 100 F Street, N.E. Washington, DC 20549-2557 *Via e-mail to <u>alj@sec.gov</u> (courtesy copy)*

David B. Dyer Scheef & Stone, LLP 500 N. Akard St., Suite 2700 Dallas, TX 75201 <u>David.Dyer@SolidCounsel.com</u> *Counsel for Respondent Jacob B. Herrera*

Kit Addleman Haynes and Boone, LLP 2323 Victory Ave., Suite 700 Dallas, TX 75219 <u>Kit.Addleman@HaynesBoone.com</u> *Counsel for Respondents Robert L. Baker and Michael D. Bowen*

Mr. Terrence A. Ballard

Pro Se Respondent

B. David Fraser