UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 73378 / October 16, 2014

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-16201

In the Matter of

JOHN W. KOSOLCHAROEN,

Respondent.

ORDER

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 John W. Kosolcharoen (“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 Section III.2. below, which is 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. Kosolcharoen, 41 years old, is a resident of Rancho Santa Margarita, California. He was the primary salesman of investment contracts offered by Global Corporate Alliance, Inc. During the relevant period, Kosolcharoen acted as an unregistered broker in violation of Section 15(a) of the Exchange Act.

2. On October 10, 2014, a final judgment was entered by consent against Kosolcharoen, permanently enjoining him from future violations of Sections 5 and 17(a)(2) and (3) of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”) and Section 15(a) of the Exchange Act, in the civil action entitled Securities and Exchange Commission v. Duncan J. MacDonald, III, et al., Civil Action Number 3:13-cv-2275, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas.

3. The Commission’s complaint alleged that, in connection with the sale of investment contracts, Kosolcharoen made material misstatements to investors to solicit their investment in the overage program offered by Global Corporate Alliance, Inc., and otherwise engaged in a variety of conduct which operated as a fraud and deceit on investors. The complaint also alleged that Kosolcharoen, while not registered as a broker or associated with a registered broker, sold unregistered securities.

IV.

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

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED pursuant to Section 15(b)(6) of the Exchange Act that Respondent Kosolcharoen be, and hereby is barred from association with any broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer, municipal advisor, transfer agent, or nationally recognized statistical rating organization; and

Pursuant to Section 15(b)(6) of the Exchange Act Respondent Kosolcharoen be, and hereby is 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.

Brent J. Fields
Secretary