UNITED STATES OF AMERICA before the SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940 Release No. 5761 / June 29, 2021

Admin. Proc. File No. 3-19331

In the Matter of

JEREMY JOSEPH DRAKE

ORDER GRANTING AN EXTENSION OF TIME

On August 12, 2019, the Securities and Exchange Commission issued an order instituting administrative proceedings ("OIP") against Jeremy Joseph Drake ("Respondent") pursuant to Section 203(f) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940.¹ The OIP directed Respondent to file an answer to the OIP's allegations within 20 days of service and informed him that a failure to do so could result in him being deemed in default and the proceedings being determined against him.²

On June 22, 2021, the parties filed a joint stipulation stating that the Division served the OIP on Respondent pursuant to Rule of Practice 141 on May 27, 2021,³ and that Respondent's answer to the OIP was due pursuant to Rule of Practice 220 on June 16, 2021.⁴ The stipulation states that the parties agreed to extend the time for Respondent to file an answer to July 30, 2021.

Under Rule of Practice 161, it is the Commission that grants extensions of time.⁵ The stipulation does not include a request that the Commission grant Respondent an extension of time to file an answer to July 30, 2021, but it will be construed as containing such a request.

On March 18, 2020, the Commission issued an order providing that, pending further order of the Commission, reasonable requests for extensions of time will not be disfavored as

Jeremy Joseph Drake, Advisers Act Release No. 5318, 2019 WL 3780057 (Aug. 12, 2019).

² *Drake*, 2019 WL 3780057, at *1; Rules of Practice 151(a), 160(b), 220(b), 17 C.F.R. § 201.151(a), .160(b), .220(b).

³ See Rule of Practice 141, 17 C.F.R. § 201.141.

⁴ *See* Rule of Practice 220, 17 C.F.R. § 201.220.

⁵ See Rule of Practice 161, 17 C.F.R. § 201.161.

stated in Rule of Practice 161.⁶ It appears appropriate to grant an extension for good cause shown.⁷ Therefore, it is ORDERED that the time for filing an answer to the OIP is extended to July 30, 2021.

The parties are reminded that any agreements between them notwithstanding, the Commission may make a default finding on its own initiative. It is therefore advised that parties keep the Commission informed of any ongoing negotiations, and request deadline extensions where appropriate, so that any miscommunication may be avoided.

The parties' attention is called to the Commission's March 18, 2020 order regarding the filing and service of papers, which provides that, pending further order of the Commission, parties to the extent possible shall submit all filings electronically at apfilings@sec.gov.⁸ Also, the Commission's Rules of Practice were recently amended to include new e-filing requirements, which took effect on April 12, 2021.⁹

For the Commission, by the Office of the General Counsel, pursuant to delegated authority.

Vanessa A. Countryman Secretary

⁸ See Pending Administrative Proceedings, Exchange Act Release No. 88415, 2020 WL 1322001 (Mar. 18, 2020), https://www.sec.gov/litigation/opinions/2020/33-10767.pdf.

⁹ Amendments to the Commission's Rules of Practice, Exchange Act Release No. 90442, 2020 WL 7013370 (Nov. 17, 2020), 85 Fed. Reg. 86,464, 86,474 (Dec. 30, 2020); Instructions for Electronic Filing and Service of Documents in SEC Administrative Proceedings and Technical Specifications, https://www.sec.gov/efapdocs/instructions.pdf. The amendments also impose other obligations on parties to administrative proceedings such as a new redaction and omission of sensitive personal information requirement. Amendments to the Commission's Rules of Practice, 85 Fed. Reg. at 86,465–81.

⁶ *Pending Administrative Proceedings*, Exchange Act Release No. 88415, 2020 WL 1322001, at *1 (Mar. 18, 2020), https://www.sec.gov/litigation/opinions/2020/33-10767.pdf.

⁷ See Rule of Practice 161, 17 C.F.R. § 201.161; see also Schulman Lobel Zand Katzen Williams & Blackman, LLP, Exchange Act Release No. 87471, 2019 WL 5722077 (Nov. 5, 2019) (granting extension to file answer where Division did not object and informed Commission of agreements reached).