

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 76503 / November 23, 2015

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-16967

In the Matter of

JAMES L. ERWIN and
JOINT VENTURE SOLUTIONS,
INC.,

Respondents.

ORDER INSTITUTING ADMINISTRATIVE
PROCEEDINGS AND NOTICE OF
HEARING PURSUANT TO SECTION 15(b)
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 proceedings be, and hereby are, instituted pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) against James L. Erwin and Joint Venture Solutions, Inc. (“Respondents”).

II.

After an investigation, the Division of Enforcement alleges that:

A. RESPONDENTS

1. From fall 2009 through summer 2011, James L. Erwin, resident of Las Vegas, Nevada, was the sole owner, officer, and employee of Joint Venture Solutions, Inc., a Nevada company. Erwin and Joint Venture Solutions have never been, and have never applied with the Commission to be, a registered securities broker or dealer, nor has Erwin ever been associated with any broker or dealer. During the time in which they engaged in the conduct underlying the complaint described below, neither Erwin nor Joint Venture Solutions was registered with the Commission in any capacity.

B. ENTRY OF THE INJUNCTION

2. On July 7, 2015, a final judgment was entered against Respondents, permanently enjoining them from future violations of Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act of 1933 and 15(a) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 in the civil action entitled Securities and Exchange Commission v. James Erwin, et al., Civil Action No. 2:14-CV-623, in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada.

3. The Commission's complaint alleged that, from fall 2009 to summer 2011, Respondents solicited potential investors for two fraudulent advance-fee high-yield investment programs offered by Switzerland-based Malom Group AG ("Malom"). Respondents successfully solicited at least five investors into the two programs, who collectively invested approximately \$2,575,000. These investors lost all of their invested funds. For recruiting these investors, Respondents were compensated with a percentage of each investment. The complaint alleges Respondents received a total of \$210,000 in transaction-based compensation.

4. Respondents were not registered with the Commission as brokers or dealers, and Erwin was not associated with any broker or dealer. The complaint also alleged that the Malom securities Respondents offered and sold to investors were not registered with the Commission pursuant to Section 5 of the Securities Act and did not qualify for any exemption from the registration requirements.

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 Respondents an opportunity to establish any defenses to such allegations;

B. What, if any, remedial action is appropriate in the public interest against Respondents 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 Respondents 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 Respondents fail to file the directed answer, or fails to appear at a hearing after being duly notified, the Respondents may be deemed in default and the proceedings may be determined against them 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 Respondents as provided for in the Commission's Rules of Practice.

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.

Brent J. Fields
Secretary