

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 73171 / September 22, 2014

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-16151

In the Matter of

STEPHEN STUART,

Respondent.

ORDER INSTITUTING
ADMINISTRATIVE AND CEASE-AND-
DESIST PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT
TO SECTIONS 15(b) AND 21C OF THE
SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF
1934

I.

The Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) deems it appropriate and in the public interest that public administrative and cease-and-desist proceedings be, and hereby are, instituted pursuant to Sections 15(b) and 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) against Stephen Stuart (“Respondent” or “Stuart”).

II.

After an investigation, the Division of Enforcement alleges that:

A. RESPONDENT

1. Respondent, age 50, is a resident of Monrovia, Maryland. During the period June 29, 2011 through July 8, 2011, Respondent was a consultant to and shareholder of ComCam International, Inc. (“ComCam”). During that period, Respondent participated in an offering of ComCam stock, which is a penny stock. On October 24, 2013, Respondent pleaded guilty to one count of wire fraud and one count of mail fraud in *U.S. v. Stuart, et al.*, 11-CR-10416-DJC (D. Mass.). He was sentenced on February 12, 2014 to 16 months’ probation, the first two months to be served in community confinement followed by home detention for a period of six months. He was also ordered to pay a fine of \$2,000, and, on February 14, 2014, was ordered to forfeit \$17,000.20.

B. OTHER RELEVANT ENTITIES AND INDIVIDUALS

1. ComCam International, Inc., a Delaware company with its principal place of business in West Chester, Pennsylvania, designs, manufactures, and sells video surveillance systems. ComCam's common stock is currently quoted on the OTCQB under the symbol "CMCJ." Its common stock was registered with the Commission under Section 12(g) of the Exchange Act, but the company filed a notice of termination of its registration on March 19, 2012. On December 1, 2011, the Commission, pursuant to Section 12(k) of the Exchange Act, suspended trading in the securities of ComCam for a period of ten business days.

2. Donald Gilbreath, age 57, is a resident of West Chester, Pennsylvania. During the period June 29, 2011 through July 8, 2011, Gilbreath was the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of ComCam. On June 13, 2012, Gilbreath was charged by criminal information with one count of conspiracy to commit securities fraud and pleaded guilty to that charge on June 29, 2012 in *U.S. v. Donald Gilbreath*, 12-CR-10186 (D. Mass.). Gilbreath was sentenced on December 19, 2013 to 18 months' probation and was ordered to pay a fine of \$2,000 and to forfeit \$17,000.

C. KICKBACK SCHEME

1. These proceedings arise out of a fraudulent scheme in which insiders of publicly-traded penny stock companies paid secret kickbacks to a purported corrupt hedge fund manager, who was in fact an undercover agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation ("Fund Manager"), in exchange for the Fund Manager's purchase of restricted stock of the penny stock companies on behalf of his purported hedge fund ("the Fund"), which did not actually exist.

2. On or about June 29, 2011, Stuart and Gilbreath met with the Fund Manager (the "June 29 Meeting"). The Fund Manager explained to Stuart and Gilbreath that he was prepared to invest Fund monies of up to \$5 million in ComCam stock, in exchange for a secret fifty percent kickback, thereby enabling the Fund Manager to keep half of the money he was supposedly investing on behalf of the Fund.

3. At the June 29 Meeting, the Fund Manager also explained the mechanics of the funding, informing Stuart and Gilbreath that, while the Fund Manager could commit to an investment of \$5 million of the Fund's money, with \$2.5 million being kicked back to the Fund Manager, the Fund Manager did not want to invest the entire amount at once. Therefore, the Fund Manager told Stuart and Gilbreath that he would invest the money over time in tranches, or installments, of increasing amounts.

4. At the June 29 Meeting, the Fund Manager further discussed with Stuart and Gilbreath the mechanics of how monies would be kicked back to the Fund Manager. The Fund Manager arranged with Stuart and Gilbreath that ComCam would execute a consulting agreement with a nominee consulting company that the Fund Manager purportedly controlled, but that the Fund Manager would not actually provide any consulting

services. Stuart and Gilbreath were told that invoices would be issued by the Fund Manager's nominee company to ComCam in order to disguise the kickbacks.

5. At the June 29 Meeting, Stuart and Gilbreath agreed to the funding/kickback arrangement.

6. On various dates between June 30, 2011 and July 8, 2011, Gilbreath sent the Fund Manager documents related to the kickback transaction, including a consulting agreement between ComCam and the Fund Manager's nominee consulting company, stock purchase agreements between ComCam and the Fund, and a phony invoice for non-existent consulting services purportedly rendered by the Fund Manager's nominee company.

7. On or about July 5, 2011, in accordance with wiring instructions provided by Gilbreath, \$34,000.20 was sent by wire transfer from a bank account maintained in Massachusetts, purportedly belonging to the Fund, to a ComCam corporate bank account outside of Massachusetts. This wire transfer represented the first tranche of funding to ComCam.

8. On or about July 6, 2011, Stuart and Gilbreath caused a total of \$17,000 to be sent by wire transfer from a ComCam corporate bank account outside of Massachusetts to a Citizens Bank account held in the name of the Fund Manager's nominee company in Massachusetts. This wire transfer represented Gilbreath's and Stuart's kickback to the Fund Manager from the first tranche of funding to ComCam.

9. On or about July 8, 2011, Stuart and Gilbreath caused a stock certificate representing the purchase by the Fund of 65,385 ComCam shares to be sent to the Fund Manager.

D. VIOLATIONS

1. As a result of the conduct described above, Stuart willfully violated Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5(a) thereunder, which prohibit fraudulent conduct in connection with the purchase or sale of securities.

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 and cease-and-desist 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 including, but not limited to, disgorgement, and civil penalties pursuant to Section 21B of the Exchange Act; and

C. Whether, pursuant to Section 21C of the Exchange Act, Respondent should be ordered to cease and desist from committing or causing violations of and any future violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, whether Respondent should be ordered to pay a civil penalty pursuant to Section 21B(a) of the Exchange Act, and whether Respondent should be ordered to pay disgorgement pursuant to Sections 21B(e) and 21C(e) 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 not earlier than 30 days and not later than 60 days from service of this Order 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 him 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 300 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.

By the Commission.

Jill M. Peterson
Assistant Secretary