The Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") deems it appropriate and in the public interest that public administrative proceedings be, and hereby are, instituted against Robert P. Verheecke ("Respondent") pursuant to Rule 102(e)(3)(i) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice.¹

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.
II.

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 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.3 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. Respondent, age 56, is and has been a certified public accountant licensed to practice in the State of California. He served as senior vice president, chief financial officer, and secretary of Blue Coat Systems, Inc. (“Blue Coat”) from May 2001 until May 2005 and continued to work on special projects for Blue Coat until January 2006.

2. Blue Coat was, at all relevant times, a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Sunnyvale, California. Blue Coat was engaged in the business of making appliances to secure and monitor computer networks. At all relevant times, Blue Coat’s common stock was registered with the Commission pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”), and traded on the NASDAQ National Market.

3. On November 12, 2008, the Commission filed a complaint against Respondent in SEC v. Blue Coat Systems, Inc. (Civil Action No. CV 08-5127 JF). On November 21, 2008, the court entered an order permanently enjoining Respondent, by consent, from future violations of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”), Sections 10(b) and 13(b)(5) of the Exchange Act, and Rules 10b-5, 13a-14, 13b2-1, and 13b2-2 thereunder, and from aiding and abetting violations of Sections 13(a), 13(b)(2)(A), 13(b)(2)(B), and 14(a) of the Exchange Act and Rules 12b-20, 13a-1, 13a-11, 13a-13, and 14a-9 thereunder. Respondent was also ordered to pay $30,000 in disgorgement, $5,946 in prejudgment interest, and a $150,000 civil money penalty.

4. The Commission’s complaint alleged, among other things, that from at least 2001 through 2005, Blue Coat and Verheecke backdated stock options granted to company employees and executives and failed to disclose millions of dollars in expenses to Blue Coat shareholders. Verheecke used hindsight to pick dates corresponding to low stock prices for stock option grants, prepared or distributed misleading documents that made it appear as if the options had been granted on the earlier dates, and prepared or approved financial statements and Commission filings that omitted necessary expenses for backdated options and falsely described Blue Coat’s option granting practices.
IV.

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

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

A. Respondent 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 dependent 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.

Florence E. Harmon
Acting Secretary