

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

**SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**  
**Release No. 71969 / April 17, 2014**

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING**  
**File No. 3-15845**

**In the Matter of**

**JULIANNE CHALMERS**

**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 Julianne Chalmers (“Chalmers” or “Respondent”).

**II.**

After an investigation, the Division of Enforcement alleges that:

**A. RESPONDENT**

1. Chalmers, 65, is a resident of Desert Hot Springs, California. From no later than January 2011 until at least November 2011, Chalmers actively solicited investors for an investment in promissory notes purporting to finance gold futures on credit. Neither Chalmers, nor any company she was associated with, was registered with the Commission in any capacity. During the relevant period, Chalmers engaged in the conduct underlying the complaint described below.

2. Among other things, Chalmers acted as an unregistered broker-dealer by regularly participating at key points in the distribution of the gold future promissory notes, soliciting prospective investors through e-mail and advertisements in the USA Today, recommending to prospective investors that they purchase the promissory notes, discussing the returns and safety of the investment, and receiving commissions for her efforts.

B. ENTRY OF AN INJUNCTION AGAINST CHALMERS

3. On July 5, 2013, the Commission filed a complaint against Chalmers in Securities and Exchange Commission v. Julianne Chalmers, et al., (Civil Action Number 13-CV-1747 EAK-TGW (S.D. Fla.)). On April 9, 2014, the Court entered a default judgment against Chalmers, permanently enjoining her from violating Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act of 1933 and Section 15(a) of the Exchange Act.

4. The Commission's complaint alleged that from no later than January 2011 until at least November 2011, Defendants John Henley Fowler and Jeffrey Robert Fowler (collectively the "Fowlers") operated a Ponzi scheme disguised as a gold futures investment program. They raised approximately \$4.3 million from unsuspecting investors, misappropriated investor funds, made false representations to investors about the safety of the investment and the use of investor funds, and otherwise engaged in a variety of conduct that operated as a fraud and deceit on investors. One of the Fowlers' associates, Terry V. Koontz, reached out to Chalmers to solicit investors for the promissory notes scheme. Chalmers then solicited investors to purchase the promissory notes through e-mails and advertisements in the USA Today. The complaint also alleged that Chalmers sold unregistered securities and acted as an unregistered broker-dealer and received approximately \$90,000 in transaction-based compensation representing sale commissions for her efforts.

**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 her 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.

Jill M. Peterson  
Assistant Secretary