

July 8, 2026

Secretary U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission  
100 F Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20549  
Secretarys-Office@SEC.GOV

Subject: Petition to Amend Rule 15c6-1(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to Further Reduce Transaction Settlement Time

Dear Secretary:

The following is my Petition asking the SEC to amend Rule 15c6-1(a) to further reduce the standard settlement cycle (currently T+1) for broker-dealer securities transactions, with a target of essentially T+0.

I have been a common simple investor for a number of years, and so have welcomed the various changes to Rule 15c6-1(a) which have reduced the settling time from T+5 to the current T+1. These improvements are a benefit to the common investors. However, even T+1 appears to be a somewhat arbitrary standard, when the actual time for most transitions is nearly instantaneous. And so, as an investor, the current T+1 both removes my control of my own funds for the T+1 period, and it allows other entities to utilize my funds for their own profit (for example, earning interest payments). I fully recognize that the SEC has an obligation to oversee the various aspects of transactions to ensure compliance with fiduciary requirements and also try to prevent fraudulent and illegal activities, such as money laundering, so the revision offered in my Petition addresses those obligations as well.

Therefore, I Petition the SEC to revise the Rule 15c6-1(a) settling time to a maximum of T+1 in most cases, with limited exceptions to be defined by the SEC. This will allow the brokers/dealers to create competitive mechanisms which will likely produce settlement times of near zero. It is proposed that the SEC modify the rules as needed to allow or instruct dealers/brokers to select specific transactions which will be somewhat delayed for further scrutiny to ensure full compliance with applicable laws. This transaction selection could be random, or it would likely be better if it were "targeted" based on a set of criteria developed by the SEC which identifies suspect transactions. The parties of the transactions so selected would be informed that further review will be undertaken.

The suggested revisions offered in this Petition will further serve the interests of the investors and other utilizing securities transactions, while fully allowing the SEC to execute their important and required monitoring and oversight roles. It is envisioned that there are some entities who currently “profit” from the T+1 timing, and those entities may attempt to obfuscate this proposal by introducing self-serving reasons / excuses to counter the Petition. However, I am confident that the SEC will easily see through any such objections and find methods to address them which allow the rapid movement to implement T+0 and so serve the interests of the public at large and the common investors.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Ament