

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**  
**Before the**  
**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

**SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**  
**Release No. 65952 / December 14, 2011**

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING**  
**File No. 3-14663**

**In the Matter of**  
  
**Steven R. Long,**  
  
**Respondent.**

**ORDER INSTITUTING ADMINISTRATIVE  
PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO  
SECTION 15(b) OF THE SECURITIES  
EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934  
AND NOTICE OF HEARING**

**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 Steven R. Long (“Respondent” or “Long”).

**II.**

After an investigation, the Division of Enforcement alleges that:

**A. RESPONDENT**

1. From at least February 2008 through August 2009, Long was the president, co-founder and 51% owner of Integrity Financial AZ, LLC, an Arizona investment company that offered unregistered securities in the form of promissory notes purportedly secured by real estate. Long, 51 years old, is a resident of Mather, California.

**B. ENTRY OF THE INJUNCTION**

1. On November 23, 2011, a final judgment was entered against Long, permanently enjoining him from future violations of Sections 5(a), 5(c), and 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933, and Sections 10(b) and 15(a) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, in the civil action entitled United States Securities and Exchange Commission v. Integrity Financial AZ, LLC, Steven R. Long, Stanley M. Paulic, Walter W. Knitter, and Robert C. Koeller, Civil Action No. 10-CV-782 (SO) in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.

2. The Commission's complaint alleged that, from at least February 2008 through August 2009, Integrity Financial AZ, LLC, through its principals, Long and Stanley M. Paulic ("Paulic"), fraudulently offered and sold unregistered securities in the form of promissory notes purportedly secured by real estate. Long and Paulic made multiple fraudulent misrepresentations and omissions regarding the company's performance, status and personnel, the use and handling of investors' funds, and the security of the investments.

### III.

In view of the allegations made by the Division of Enforcement, the Commission deems it necessary and appropriate in the public interest that public administrative proceedings be instituted to determine:

A. Whether the allegations set forth in Section II hereof are true and, in connection therewith, to afford Respondent an opportunity to establish any defenses to such allegations;

B. What, if any, remedial action is appropriate in the public interest against Respondent pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act.

### IV.

IT IS ORDERED that a public hearing for the purpose of taking evidence on the questions set forth in Section III hereof shall be convened at a time and place to be fixed, and before an Administrative Law Judge to be designated by further order as provided by Rule 110 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.110.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall file an Answer to the allegations contained in this Order within twenty (20) days after service of this Order, as provided by Rule 220 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.220.

If Respondent fails to file the directed answer, or fails to appear at a hearing after being duly notified, the Respondent may be deemed in default and the proceedings may be determined against him upon consideration of this Order, the allegations of which may be deemed to be true as provided by Rules 155(a), 220(f), 221(f) and 310 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a), 201.220(f), 201.221(f) and 201.310.

This Order shall be served forthwith upon Respondent personally or by certified mail.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Administrative Law Judge shall issue an initial decision no later than 210 days from the date of service of this Order, pursuant to Rule 360(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice.

In the absence of an appropriate waiver, no officer or employee of the Commission engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions in this or any factually related proceeding will be permitted to participate or advise in the decision of this matter, except as witness or counsel in proceedings held pursuant to notice. Since this proceeding is not "rule making" within the meaning of Section 551 of the Administrative Procedure Act, it is not deemed subject to the provisions of Section 553 delaying the effective date of any final Commission action.

For the Commission, by its Secretary, pursuant to delegated authority.

Elizabeth M. Murphy  
Secretary