The Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) deems it appropriate and in the public interest that public administrative proceedings be, and hereby are, instituted against David T. Leboe (“Respondent” or “Leboe”) pursuant to Rule 102(e)(3)(i) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice.¹

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

¹ Rule 102(e)(3)(i) provides, in relevant part, that:

The Commission, with due regard to the public interest and without preliminary hearing, may, by order, . . . suspend from appearing or practicing before it any . . . accountant . . . who has been by name . . . permanently enjoined by any court of competent jurisdiction, by reason of his or her misconduct in an action brought by the Commission, from violating or aiding and abetting the violation of any provision of the Federal securities laws or of the rules and regulations thereunder.
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 him and the subject matter of these proceedings, and the findings contained in Section III below, which are admitted, Respondent consents to the entry of this Order Instituting Administrative Proceedings Pursuant to Rule 102(e) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice, Making Findings, and Imposing Remedial Sanctions (“Order”), as set forth below.

III.

On the basis of this Order and Respondent’s Offer, the Commission finds that:

1. David T. Leboe, age 38, is and has been a certified public accountant licensed to practice in the State of Texas. He served as an accountant in Enron North America (ENA), a business unit of Enron Corp. (Enron), from 1997 until 2001.

2. Enron was, at all relevant times, an Oregon corporation with its principal place of business in Houston, Texas. Until its bankruptcy filing in December 2001, Enron was the seventh largest corporation in the United States based on reported revenue. In the previous ten years, Enron had evolved from a regional natural gas provider to a commodity trader of natural gas, electricity, and other physical commodities with retail operations in energy and other products. The Company also created and traded financial products. ENA was Enron’s largest and most profitable business unit and included Enron’s wholesale merchant business related to natural gas and power across North America, including trading, marketing and new asset development activities in that region. At all relevant times, the common stock of Enron was registered with the Commission pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) and traded on the New York Stock Exchange.

3. On March 27, 2006, the Commission filed a complaint against Leboe in Securities and Exchange Commission v. David T. Leboe and Dale G. Rasmussen, Civil Action No. H-06-1020 (S.D. Tex.). On March 28, 2006, the court entered a final judgment permanently enjoining Leboe, by consent, from future violations of Sections 10(b) and 13(b)(5) of the Exchange Act and Rules 10b-5 and 13b2-1 thereunder, and aiding and abetting violations of Sections 13(a), 13(b)(2)(A) and 13(b)(2)(B) of the Exchange Act and Rules 12b-20, 13a-1 and 13a-13 thereunder. Leboe was also ordered to pay $1 in disgorgement and a $30,000 civil money penalty.

4. The Commission’s complaint alleged, among other things, that Leboe engaged in a fraudulent scheme which resulted in Enron filing materially false and misleading financial statements in the company’s annual report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2000, and in the company’s quarterly report on Form 10-Q for the third quarter of fiscal year 2000. The Complaint alleged that Leboe engaged in a number of improper accounting practices that materially increased Enron’s annual and quarterly revenue and net income in a departure from generally accepted accounting principles. These practices included, among other things, improperly accelerating the recognition of revenue from the sale of a construction contract, and concealing undocumented side agreements from Enron’s independent
auditors. In addition, the complaint alleged that Leboe actively sought to keep others from disclosing information to Enron’s independent auditors about these side agreements.

IV.

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

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED, effective immediately, that:

A. Leboe is suspended from appearing or practicing before the Commission as an accountant.

B. After five years from the date of this order, Respondent may request that the Commission consider his reinstatement by submitting an application (attention: Office of the Chief Accountant) to resume appearing or practicing before the Commission as:

1. a preparer or reviewer, or a person responsible for the preparation or review, of any public company’s financial statements that are filed with the Commission. Such an application must satisfy the Commission that Respondent’s work in his practice before the Commission will be reviewed either by the independent audit committee of the public company for which he works or in some other acceptable manner, as long as he practices before the Commission in this capacity; and/or

2. an independent accountant. Such an application must satisfy the Commission that:

   (a) Respondent, or the public accounting firm with which he is associated, is registered with the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (“Board”) in accordance with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, and such registration continues to be effective;

   (b) Respondent, or the registered public accounting firm with which he is associated, has been inspected by the Board and that inspection did not identify any criticisms of or potential defects in the respondent’s or the firm’s quality control system that would indicate that the respondent will not receive appropriate supervision;

   (c) Respondent has resolved all disciplinary issues with the Board, and has complied with all terms and conditions of any sanctions imposed by the Board (other than reinstatement by the Commission); and

   (d) Respondent acknowledges his responsibility, as long as Respondent appears or practices before the Commission as an independent accountant, to comply with all requirements of the Commission and the Board, including, but not limited to, all requirements relating to registration, inspections, concurring partner reviews and quality control standards.
C. The Commission will consider an application by Respondent to resume appearing or practicing before the Commission provided that his state CPA license is current and he has resolved all other disciplinary issues with the applicable state boards of accountancy. However, if state licensure is dependant on reinstatement by the Commission, the Commission will consider an application on its other merits. The Commission’s review may include consideration of, in addition to the matters referenced above, any other matters relating to Respondent’s character, integrity, professional conduct, or qualifications to appear or practice before the Commission.

By the Commission.

Nancy M. Morris
Secretary