

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

**SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934  
Release No. 66329 / February 6, 2012**

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING  
File No. 3-14662**

**In the Matter of**

**STANLEY M. PAULIC,**

**Respondent.**

**ORDER MAKING FINDINGS AND  
IMPOSING REMEDIAL SANCTIONS**

**I.**

On December 14, 2011, the Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) instituted public administrative proceedings pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) against Stanley M. Paulic (“Respondent”).

**II.**

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.2 below, which are admitted, Respondent consents to the entry of this Order 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. Paulic was the chief executive officer, co-founder and 49% owner of Integrity Financial AZ LLC ("IFAZ"), a limited liability corporation registered in the state of Arizona. Paulic and IFAZ sold unregistered securities and acted as unregistered brokers. Paulic, 38 years old, is a resident of Aurora, Ohio and Lakeland, Florida.

2. On November 23, 2011, a final judgment was entered against Stanley M. Paulic, permanently enjoining him from future violations of Sections 5(a), 5(c), and 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act"), Sections 10(b) and 15(a) of the Exchange Act and Exchange Act Rule 10b-5, 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 Number 10-CV-782 (SO), in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.

3. The Commission's Complaint alleged that in connection with the sale of promissory notes purportedly secured by real estate in Tonopah, Arizona, Paulic fraudulently offered and sold unregistered securities in the form of promissory notes purportedly secured by real estate. The Commission's Complaint further alleged that 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, engaging in a variety of conduct that operated as a fraud and deceit on investors.

### **IV.**

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

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED pursuant to Section 15(b)(6) of the Exchange Act that Respondent Paulic be, and hereby is:

- (a) barred from association with any broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer, municipal advisor, transfer agent, or nationally recognized statistical rating organization; and
- (b) 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