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 Craig Drimal (“Drimal” 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 Sections III.2 and III.4 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. Drimal, age 55, resides in Weston, Connecticut. During the relevant time period, Drimal was a proprietary trader associated with RBC Professional Trader Group LLC, a registered broker-dealer based in New York, New York. Immediately prior to his arrest, Drimal was a proprietary trader associated with Echotrade LLC, a registered broker-dealer based in Phoenix, Arizona. Drimal held Series 7, 22 and 63 securities licenses.


3. The Commission’s complaint alleged, inter alia, that in 2007 Drimal was tipped material, nonpublic information concerning Axcan Pharma Inc., 3Com Corp. and Avaya, Inc., which information had been conveyed in violation of a duty. The complaint further alleges that Drimal traded based on the material, nonpublic information and tipped the information to others.

4. On April 26, 2011, Drimal pled guilty to five counts of securities fraud and one count of conspiracy to commit securities fraud in violation of Title 18 United States Code, Sections 2 and 371, and Title 15 United States Code, Sections 78j(b) and 78ff, in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, in United States v. Craig Drimal, 10-CR-0056.

5. The counts of the criminal indictment to which Drimal was found guilty alleged, inter alia, that Drimal, and others, participated in a scheme to defraud by executing securities trades based on material, nonpublic information regarding certain inside information concerning public companies that had been misappropriated in violation of duties of trust and confidence, and that he unlawfully, willfully and knowingly did so, directly and indirectly, by use of the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce, and of the mails, and of the facilities of national securities exchanges, in connection with the purchase and sale of securities.
IV.

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

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED:

Pursuant to Section 15(b)(6) of the Exchange Act, that Respondent Drimal be, and hereby is barred from association with any broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer or transfer agent, and barred from participating in any offering of a penny stock, including: acting as a promoter, finder, consultant, agent or other person who engages in activities with a broker, dealer or issuer for purposes of the issuance or trading in any penny stock, or inducing or attempting to induce the purchase or sale of any penny stock.

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