United States of America
Before the
Securities and Exchange Commission

Securities Exchange Act of 1934
Release No. 69345 / April 8, 2013

Administrative Proceeding
File No. 3-15266

In the Matter of
Sean Nathan Healy,
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 Sean Nathan Healy ("Respondent" or "Healy").

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, Respondent consents to the Commission’s jurisdiction over him and the subject matter of these proceedings and 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. Respondent Healy, age 41, was a resident of Weston, Florida until April 2010 when he began serving a 16-year prison sentence as a result of his guilty plea in *U.S. v. Sean Nathan Healy*, CR-09-319 (MDP)(SHR) (“*United States v. Healy*”). Respondent was associated with a broker-dealer within the meaning of Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act in that he worked as a registered representative for several broker-dealers between 1997 and 2001, including Chatfield Dean & Co., Inc.; Stratton Oakmont Inc.; Barron Chase Securities, Inc.; and Guru Investment Services Limited.

2. On November 23, 2009, Healy tendered a guilty plea in *United States v. Healy* to two counts of wire fraud in violation of Title 18 United States Code Sections 1341 and 1342, and one count of unlawful monetary transactions in violation of Title 18 United States Code Section 1957. The charges in *United States v. Healy* were based on Healy’s conduct in orchestrating a Ponzi scheme between 2004 and July 2009. In his guilty plea allocution, Healy admitted that he raised approximately $17 million from investors by promising them that he would use those funds to purchase stocks and commodities on their behalf. Healy further admitted that rather than investing those funds as promised, he funded a lavish lifestyle for himself and his wife, which included the purchase of a $2.4 million waterfront mansion; $2 million of in-home improvements; $1.5 million in men’s and women’s jewelry; and numerous exotic vehicles and sport cars, including a Bentley and several Ferraris, Lamborghinis and Porsches worth over $2.3 million. Healy also admitted that he used some of the funds to make Ponzi payments to 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 Healy’s Offer.
Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED pursuant to Section 15(b)(6) of the Exchange Act that Respondent Healy be, and hereby is:

A. barred from association with any broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer, or transfer agent; 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