I.

The Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") deems it appropriate and in the public interest that public administrative proceedings be, and hereby are, instituted pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") against David M. Tavdy ("Tavdy" or "Respondent").

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 and 5 below, which are admitted, Respondent consents to the entry of this Order Instituting Administrative Proceedings Pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 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. Tavdy, 40 years old, is a resident of Miami, Florida.

2. From March 2003 to May 2005, Tavdy was a registered representative associated with Assent LLC (“Assent”), a broker-dealer registered with the Commission.

3. On September 29, 2009, a final judgment was entered by consent against Tavdy, permanently enjoining him from future violations of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”), Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, in the civil action entitled Securities and Exchange Commission v. Guttenberg, et al., Civil Action No. 07 CV 1774, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

4. The Commission’s complaint alleged, inter alia, that from 2002 through 2006, Tavdy engaged in illegal insider trading by using material, nonpublic information concerning upcoming analyst recommendations by UBS Securities LLC (“UBS”) to purchase and sell securities in a proprietary account at Assent and in his personal accounts.

5. On February 27, 2008, Tavdy pled guilty to one count of conspiracy to commit securities fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371, and two counts of securities fraud, in violation of Title 15, United States Code, Sections 78j(b) & 78ff, Title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, Sections 240.10b-5 and 240.10b5-2, and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2, before the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, in United States v. Mitchel Guttenberg and David Tavdy, Crim. Indictment No. 1:07-CR-141.

6. The counts of the criminal indictment to which Tavdy pled guilty alleged, inter alia, Tavdy illegally conspired with others to trade on material, nonpublic information obtained from UBS concerning upcoming analyst recommendations, and that Tavdy illegally traded on material, nonpublic information obtained from UBS concerning upcoming analyst recommendations.

IV.

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

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED:

Pursuant to Section 15(b)(6) of the Exchange Act, that Respondent Tavdy be, and hereby is barred from association with any broker or dealer.

Any reapplication for association by the Respondent will be subject to the applicable laws and regulations governing the reentry process, and reentry may be conditioned upon a number of
factors, including, but not limited to, the satisfaction of any or all of the following: (a) any disgorgement ordered against the Respondent, whether or not the Commission has fully or partially waived payment of such disgorgement; (b) any arbitration award related to the conduct that served as the basis for the Commission order; (c) any self-regulatory organization arbitration award to a customer, whether or not related to the conduct that served as the basis for the Commission order; and (d) any restitution order by a self-regulatory organization, whether or not related to the conduct that served as the basis for the Commission order.

By the Commission.

Elizabeth M. Murphy
Secretary