UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 66626 / March 20, 2012

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-14807

In the Matter of

MICHAEL A. KIMELMAN,
Respondent.

ORDER INSTITUTING
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS
PURSUANT TO SECTION 15(b) OF THE
SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934,
MAKING FINDINGS, AND IMPOSING
REMEDIAL SANCTIONS

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 Michael A. Kimelman (“Kimelman” 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. Kimelman, age 40, resides in Larchmont, New York. During the relevant time period, Kimelman was a trader at Lighthouse Financial Group, LLC, a registered broker-dealer.

2. On March 16, 2012, a judgment was entered by consent against Kimelman, permanently enjoining him from future violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, in the civil action entitled Securities and Exchange Commission v. Arthur J. Cutillo, et al., Civil Action Number 09-CV-9208, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

3. The Commission’s complaint alleged, inter alia, that, while working as a trader at Lighthouse Financial Group in 2007, Kimelman was tipped material, nonpublic information concerning the acquisition of 3Com Corp., which had been misappropriated in violation of a duty. The complaint further alleged that Kimelman traded in these securities based on that material, nonpublic information and that he knew, or should have known, that the information was obtained in breach of a fiduciary or other duty of trust and confidence owed to the source of the information.

4. On June 13, 2011, Kimelman was found guilty of one count of conspiracy to commit securities fraud and two counts of 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. Michael Kimelman, 10-CR-56.

IV.

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

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED:

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