ORDER INSTITUTING ADMINISTRATIVE AND CEASE-AND-DESIST PROCEEDINGS, PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 4C AND 21C OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 AND RULE 102(e) OF THE COMMISSION’S RULES OF PRACTICE, MAKING FINDINGS, AND IMPOSING REMEDIAL SANCTIONS AND A CEASE-AND-DESIST ORDER

I.

The Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) deems it appropriate that public administrative and cease-and-desist proceedings be, and hereby are, instituted against Richard Confessore (“Confessore”) pursuant to Sections 4C1 and 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) and Rule 102(e)(1)(ii) and Rule 102(e)(1)(iii) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice.2

1 Section 4C provides, in relevant part, that:

The Commission may censure any person, or deny, temporarily or permanently, to any person the privilege of appearing or practicing before the Commission in any way, if that person is found . . . (1) not to possess the requisite qualifications to represent others . . . (2) to be lacking in character or integrity, or to have engaged in unethical or improper professional conduct; or (3) to have willfully violated, or willfully aided and abetted the violation of, any provision of the securities laws or the rules and regulations thereunder.

2 Rule 102(e)(1)(ii) provides, in pertinent part, that:

The Commission may . . . deny, temporarily or permanently, the privilege of appearing or practicing before it . . . to any person who is found . . . to have engaged in unethical or improper professional conduct.
II.

In anticipation of the institution of these proceedings, Respondent has submitted an Offer of Settlement (“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 them and the subject matter of these proceedings, which are admitted, and except as provided herein in Section V, Respondent consents to the entry of this Order Instituting Administrative and Cease-and-Desist Proceedings, Pursuant to Sections 4C and 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 102(e) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice, Making Findings, and Imposing Remedial Sanctions and a Cease-and-Desist Order (“Order”), as set forth below.

III.

On the basis of this Order and Respondent’s Offer, the Commission finds³ that:

A. SUMMARY

Confessore violated the auditor independence rules for 7 audit and review engagements of three public company clients in 2012-2013 on account of employment, business, or financial relationships either he or his partners had with those three clients. In 2012, Confessore was the engagement quality review partner for DKM Certified Public Accountants, Inc.’s (“DKM’s”) audits or interim reviews of annual and quarterly financial statements of Issuer A and Issuer B. At the same time he performed this work, he worked for Issuer A’s and B’s Chief Financial Officer (“CFO”), Peter Messineo, at Messineo’s own audit firm, Messineo & Co., CPAs, LLC (“Messineo & Co.”).

Near the end of 2012, Messineo resigned as CFO of Issuer A and Issuer B and became a shareholder and partner at DKM. Despite Messineo joining DKM, Confessore continued in 2013 to conduct engagement quality reviews of financial statements of Issuer A and Issuer B for DKM even though: (1) the companies’ former CFO was now his partner at DKM and in a position to influence the audits and reviews, and (2) Messineo had been CFO during the audit periods covered by his review. In addition, in 2013 when Confessore performed the engagement quality reviews for DKM

Rule 102(e)(1)(iii) provides, in pertinent part, that:

The Commission may . . . deny, temporarily or permanently, the privilege of appearing or practicing before it . . . to any person who is found . . . to have willfully violated, or willfully aided and abetted the violation of any provision of the Federal securities laws or the rules and regulations thereunder.

³ The findings herein are made pursuant to Respondent’s Offer of Settlement and are not binding on any other person or entity in this or any other proceeding.
of Issuer A and Issuer B, he knew that Messineo -- his partner at DKM -- had a direct financial relationship with both Issuer A and Issuer B. Messineo owned stock in both companies.

Lastly, in 2013, DKM audited Issuer C’s annual financial statement covering the period from April 1, 2011 – March 31, 2012. Confessore participated in the audit despite having served as Issuer C’s CFO during the audit period.

Performing these audits and reviews for Issuer A, Issuer B, and Issuer C violated the independence rules of the Federal securities laws and the rules and regulations thereunder. Confessore also caused Issuer A, Issuer B, and Issuer C to file false or misleading reports with the Commission in violation of Section 13(a) of the Exchange Act and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13 promulgated thereunder. Confessore’s conduct was willful and constitutes improper professional conduct.

B. RESPONDENT

Richard Confessore, age 73, resides in Sarasota, Florida and has been a licensed Certified Public Accountant (“CPA”) in Florida since 1970. Confessore is currently a Director and “Quality Review Partner” at DKM. During 2011, Confessore was the CFO and worked at Issuer C. During 2012-2013, Confessore performed engagement quality reviews for the annual audits and interim reviews DKM performed for Issuers A and B. In addition, from June 2012 – December 2012, Confessore was an employee of Messineo & Co, then a sole proprietorship owned by Peter Messineo (who was also the CFO for both Issuer A and Issuer B).

C. OTHER RELEVANT PARTIES

Issuer A was incorporated in Delaware in 2005 and is currently headquartered in California. During 2012 and 2013, Issuer A’s common stock was registered with the Commission pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Exchange Act. In its most recent Form 10-K filed with the Commission, Issuer A states that its business “offers marketing tools and expertise to advertisers.” From February 2010 – November 2012, Messineo served as CFO of Issuer A. In 2012 and 2013, Issuer A engaged DKM to perform audit services.

Issuer B was incorporated in Nevada in 2004 and is currently headquartered in St. Petersburg, FL. During 2012 and 2013, Issuer B’s common stock was registered with the Commission pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Exchange Act. In its most recent Form 10-K filed with the Commission, Issuer B states that its business “creates a unified solution path to securely manage Advanced Metering Infrastructure and other Smart Grid optimization applications such as substation and distribution automation.” From September 2010 – October 2012, Messineo served as CFO of Issuer B. In 2012 and 2013, Issuer B engaged DKM to perform audit services.

Issuer C was incorporated in Colorado in 1981. Currently, it is a Florida corporation headquartered in Southbury, CT. During 2012 and 2013, Issuer C’s common stock was registered with the Commission pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Exchange Act. In its most recent Form 10-K filed with the Commission, Issuer C states that its business consists of “operating motor freight carriers, providing truck load service throughout the forty-eight contiguous United States.”
Confessore resigned as CFO of Issuer C on April 12, 2011. In 2012, Issuer C engaged Messineo & Co to provide audit services. Messineo & Co. did not issue an audit report before DKM was formed. In 2013, Issuer C then engaged DKM to provide audit services for the same period for which Messineo & Co. had been retained.

DKM Certified Public Accountants, Inc. (“DKM”) is registered with the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (“PCAOB”) as a public accounting firm based in Clearwater, Florida. DKM is a Florida corporation and successor to audit firms: (i) Drake Klein & Messineo CPAs PA; and (ii) Drake & Klein, CPAs PA (“Drake & Klein”). In December 2012, when Peter Messineo joined DKM, the firm changed its operational name from Drake & Klein to DKM. As of December 2012, DKM had four partners authorized to issue audit reports on behalf of the firm, including Messineo, Confessore, and Charles Klein.

Charles U. Klein, age 60, resides in Dunedin, Florida and is currently President of DKM. From approximately February 2012 through June 2013, Klein was the lead engagement partner for the services DKM performed for Issuer A, Issuer B, and Issuer C. These services included annual audits and interim reviews of the financial statements of Issuer A, Issuer B, and Issuer C. Klein has been a licensed CPA in Florida since 1985, excluding 1995 – 1998 when his license was inactive.

Peter Messineo, age 54, resides in Palm Harbor, Florida and is currently a partner at and 95% owner of Messineo & Co., which is a PCAOB-registered public accounting firm based in Clearwater, Florida. In 2012, he was the sole owner of Messineo & Co. (then named “Peter Messineo, CPA”) and CFO of Issuer A and Issuer B. From December 17, 2012 – April 16, 2013, Messineo was a partner and one-third owner of DKM and a shareholder of Issuer A and Issuer B stock. Messineo has been licensed as a CPA in New York since 1989 and in Florida since 2007.

D. IN 2012, CONFESSORE CAUSED DKM (THEN KNOWN AS DRAKE & KLEIN) NOT TO BE INDEPENDENT BY POSSESSING A BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER OF DKM’S AUDIT CLIENTS.

1. Issuer A engaged DKM to perform interim reviews for the quarters ending June 30, 2012 (Form 10-Q filed August 14, 2012) and September 30, 2012 (Form 10-Q filed November 14, 2012). Klein was DKM’s lead engagement partner and Confessore was DKM’s engagement quality review (“EQR”) partner on these engagements.

2. During the audit and professional engagement periods for these Issuer A engagements, Messineo was Issuer A’s CFO.

3. Issuer B engaged DKM to perform audit services for the annual period ending June 30, 2012 (Form 10-K filed October 15, 2012) and the quarter ending September 30, 2012 (Form 10-Q filed November 14, 2012). Klein was DKM’s lead engagement partner and Confessore was DKM’s EQR partner on these engagements.

4. During the audit and professional engagement periods for these Issuer B engagements, Messineo was Issuer B’s CFO.
5. In June 2012, Messineo hired Confessore to work for him at Messineo & Co. Confessore worked at Messineo & Co. until mid-December 2012. Thus, Confessore worked under Messineo -- the Chief Financial Officer of both Issuer A and Issuer B -- at the same time Confessore conducted engagement quality reviews for DKM of: (i) Issuer A’s interim financial statements filed August 14, 2012 and November 14, 2012; (ii) and Issuer B’s annual financial statement filed October 15, 2012 (amended October 22, 2012). Confessore also worked for Messineo during the entire audit period of Issuer B’s interim financial statements, filed November 14, 2012, which DKM and Confessore reviewed.

6. Rule 2-01(b) of Regulation S-X (Qualifications of Accountants) states that the “Commission will not recognize an accountant as independent, with respect to an audit client, if the accountant is not…capable of exercising objective and impartial judgment on all issues encompassed within the accountant's engagement.” 17 CFR §210.2-01.

7. Rule 2-01(c) (3) states certain “business relationships” are inconsistent with independence:

   Business Relationships. An accountant is not independent if, at any point during the audit and professional engagement period, the accounting firm or any covered person in the firm has any direct or material indirect business relationship with an audit client, or with persons associated with the audit client in a decision-making capacity, such as an audit client’s officers, directors, or substantial stockholders.

   17 CFR §210.2-01(c)(3).

8. Confessore’s employment with Messineo constituted an improper business relationship and conflict of interest.


10. PCAOB standards also require auditor independence. PCAOB Rule 3520 (Auditor Independence) requires that, “[a] registered public accounting firm and its associated persons must be independent of the firm’s audit client throughout the audit and professional engagement period.”

11. PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 7 (Engagement Quality Review) requires that “an engagement quality reviewer must have competence, independence, integrity, and objectivity.” See PCAOB AS 7.4.
12. Confessore and DKM were not independent of Issuer A and Issuer B with respect to DKM’s audit and interim reviews of financial statements filed from August 2012 through November 2012 because Confessore -- the engagement quality reviewer -- had a direct business relationship with Messineo -- the CFO of clients Issuer A and Issuer B -- during DKM’s audit and professional engagement periods. See Rule 2-01(c)(3) of Regulation S-X; see also PCAOB AS 7 and PCAOB Rule 3520.

E. IN 2013, CONFESSORE FAILED TO MAINTAIN PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BY PERFORMING ENGAGEMENT QUALITY REVIEWS WHEN HE AND DKM LACKED INDEPENDENCE.


14. In mid-December 2012, Messineo joined DKM. Messineo was a one-third owner of DKM. While not a shareholder, Confessore was a partner authorized to issue audit reports on behalf of DKM.

15. Issuer A engaged DKM to perform audit services for the annual period ending December 31, 2012 (Form 10-K filed April 15, 2013). Klein was DKM’s lead engagement partner and Confessore was DKM’s engagement quality review partner on this engagement.

16. Issuer B engaged DKM to perform interim review services for the quarter ending December 31, 2012 (Form 10-Q filed February 19, 2013). Klein was DKM’s lead engagement partner and Confessore was DKM’s engagement quality review partner on this engagement.

17. PCAOB AS 7 requires that “an engagement quality reviewer must have competence, independence, integrity, and objectivity.” See PCAOB AS 7.4 (emphasis added).

18. Confessore lacked independence from Issuer A and Issuer B because Messineo, his partner at DKM, had financial and employment relationships with Issuer A and Issuer B.

19. Rule 2-01(c) (1) (Financial Relationships) states that an accountant is not independent if, at any point during the audit and professional engagement period, the accountant has a “direct financial interest” in the accountant’s audit client, including when:

   A. The accounting firm [or] any covered person in the firm…has any direct investment in an audit client, such as stocks, bonds, notes, options, or other securities.

   * * *
B. Any partner, principal, shareholder, or professional employee of the accounting firm...has filed a Schedule 13D...with the Commission indicating beneficial ownership of more than five percent of an audit client’s securities


21. Rule 2-01(c) (2) (Employment Relationships) states that an accountant is not independent if, at any point during the audit and professional engagement period, the accountant has an “employment relationship” with an audit client, including when:

A former officer, director, or employee of an audit client becomes a partner, principal, shareholder, or professional employee of the accounting firm, unless the individual does not participate in, and is not in a position to influence, the audit of the financial statements of the audit covering any period during which he or she was employed by or associated with that audit client.


22. From December 2012 to April 2013, Messineo worked at DKM’s small office in Clearwater, Florida along with Klein and approximately 6-8 staff personnel. Messineo’s office was less than 10 feet away from the offices of those providing audit services to Issuer A and Issuer B.

23. From December 2012 to April 2013, Messineo had access to all of DKM’s audit files, including those for the audit of Issuer A and the interim review of Issuer B. Messineo supervised the audit staff at DKM, including the audit manager who worked on the Issuer A audit, in some of DKM’s other engagements.

24. During a significant portion of the professional engagement period for DKM’s audit of Issuer A, Messineo possessed Issuer A’s books and records.

25. During Messineo’s tenure as a shareholder and partner at DKM, he owned stock in DKM’s clients Issuer A and Issuer B. As of April 15, 2013, when Issuer A’s Form 10-K was filed, Messineo owned approximately 6% of the outstanding shares of Issuer A’s stock.
26. Confessore knew Messineo owned stock in Issuer A and Issuer B during the audit and professional engagement periods for those clients. Despite his knowledge, he performed the EQR for DKM’s audit of Issuer A and review of Issuer B without objection and consented to the issuance of DKM’s audit report.

27. Confessore caused DKM to not be independent of Issuer A and Issuer B with respect to their public filings made in February 2013 and April 2013 because Messineo -- a partner and shareholder of DKM -- possessed a direct financial interest (stock ownership) in clients Issuer A and Issuer B during DKM’s audit and professional engagement periods. See Rule 2-01(c)(1) of Regulation S-X; see also PCAOB AS 7.4.

28. Confessore caused DKM to not be independent of Issuer A and Issuer B with respect to their public filings made in February 2013 and April 2013 because Messineo -- a partner and shareholder of DKM -- was the CFO of Issuer A and Issuer B during the audit period and in a position to influence DKM’s audit and interim review. See Rule 2-01(c)(2) of Regulation S-X; see also PCAOB AS 7.4.

F. IN 2013, CONFESSORE CAUSED DKM NOT TO BE INDEPENDENT BY PARTICIPATING IN AN AUDIT OF HIS FORMER EMPLOYER.

29. Confessore was the CFO of Issuer C until April 12, 2011. Following his resignation, Confessore made himself available to Issuer C on a part-time basis to assist with accounting matters. On June 29, 2011, Issuer C filed a “Notification of Late Filing” for its Form 10-K. The notification explained that Issuer C was unable to complete its accounting at the subsidiary level. Issuer C’s notification identified Confessore as the person to contact in regard to the notification.

30. In 2012, Issuer C engaged Messineo & Co. to perform audit services for the period from April 1, 2011 – March 31, 2012. Confessore performed work for Messineo & Co. concerning Issuer C, including the period for which he had been CFO and/or worked for Issuer C. Messineo & Co. did not complete its audit or issue an audit report before DKM was formed.

31. In 2013, DKM agreed to audit Issuer C’s financial statements for the same period (April 1, 2011 – March 31, 2012) despite Confessore’s prior position as CFO of Issuer C during that audit period. DKM incorporated Messineo & Co.’s work into its audit of Issuer C, including Confessore’s work. On behalf of DKM, Klein signed the engagement report issued to Issuer C in June 2013.

32. Confessore caused DKM to not be independent of DKM’s client Issuer C with respect to its public filings made in June 2013 because Confessore – a partner of DKM – participated in the audit of Issuer C, which covered the period Confessore had been the CFO and/or worked for Issuer C. See Rule 2-01(c)(2) of Regulation S-X.
33. Finally, Confessore failed to comply with PCAOB Interim Auditing Standard AU 230 (Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work). AU 230.02 “requires the independent auditor to plan and perform his or her work with due professional care. Due professional care imposes a responsibility upon each professional within an independent auditor's organization to observe the standards of field work and reporting.” Confessore did not exercise due professional care when he performed EQRs while he lacked independence.

G. CONFESSORE AIDED AND ABETTED AND CAUSED DKM TO VIOLATE RULE 2-02 OF REGULATION S-X BECAUSE DKM'S AUDIT REPORTS DID NOT COMPLY WITH PCAOB STANDARDS.

34. Rule 2-02(b)(1) of Regulation S-X (Representations as to the Audit included in Accountants' Reports) requires an accountant's report to state “whether the audit was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards.” 17 CFR §210.2-02(b). These standards include the standards of the PCAOB. “[R]eferences in Commission rules and staff guidance and in the federal securities laws to [generally accepted auditing standards “GAAS”] or to specific standards under GAAS, as they related to issuers, should be understood to mean the standards of the PCAOB plus any applicable rules of the Commission.” See SEC Release No. 34-49708.

35. DKM issued audit reports for its audits of Issuer C, Issuer A, and Issuer B for fiscal years ending March 31, 2012, December 31, 2012 and June 30, 2012, respectively. Confessore was the engagement quality review partner for these audits. The audit reports incorrectly state that DKM “conducted [its] audit in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States).”

36. DKM's audits were not conducted in accordance with PCAOB auditing standards because the firm lacked independence as described above. See PCAOB Rule 3520 (requiring independence); PCAOB AS 7.4 (same).

37. Accordingly, Confessore aided and abetted and caused violations of Rule 2-02 of Regulation S-X.

H. CONFESSORE CAUSED ISSUER A, ISSUER B, AND ISSUER C TO FILE FALSE OR MISLEADING REPORTS WITH THE COMMISSION IN VIOLATION OF SECTION 13(a) OF THE EXCHANGE ACT AND RULES 13a-1 AND 13a-13 THEREUNDER.

38. Exchange Act Sections 13(a) and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13 require an issuer to file accurate annual and quarterly reports on Forms 10-K and 10-Q. Section 13(a) of the Exchange Act also requires issuers file annual reports certified by “independent public accountants,” and Rule 10-01(d) of Regulation S-X requires an “independent public accountant” review an issuer’s interim financial statements before the issuer files its Form 10-Q.
39. As a result of Confessore’s conduct, Issuer A, Issuer B, and Issuer C filed annual and quarterly reports which had not been audited or reviewed by independent accountants in violation of Section 13(a) of the Exchange Act and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13.

I. VIOLATIONS

40. As a result of the conduct described above, Confessore willfully aided and abetted and caused (i) issuers to violate Section 13(a) of the Exchange Act and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13 promulgated thereunder, and (ii) DKM to violate Rule 2-02 of Regulation S-X.

41. As a result of the conduct described above, Confessore engaged in improper professional conduct as defined in Rule 102(e)(1)(iv) in that Confessore violated applicable professional standards or committed repeated instances of unreasonable negligent conduct each resulting in a violation of applicable professional standards that indicate a lack of competence to practice before the Commission.

J. FINDINGS

42. Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that Confessore engaged in improper professional conduct pursuant to Section 4C(a)(2) of the Exchange Act and Rule 102(e)(1)(ii) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice.

43. Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that Confessore willfully violated, or willfully aided and abetted the violation of, a provision(s) of the Federal securities laws or the rules and regulations thereunder pursuant to Section 4C(a)(2) of the Exchange Act and Rule 102(e)(1)(iii) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice.

44. Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that Confessor: willfully aided and abetted and caused issuers to violate Section 13(a) of the Exchange Act and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13 promulgated thereunder and DKM to violate Rule 2-02 of Regulation S-X.

IV.

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

Accordingly, pursuant to Sections 4C and 21C of the Exchange Act, it is hereby ORDERED, effective immediately, that:

A. Confessore shall cease and desist from committing or causing any violations and any future violations of Section 13(a) of the Exchange Act and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13 promulgated thereunder, and Rule 2-02 of Regulation S-X.

B. Confessore is denied the privilege of appearing or practicing before the Commission as an accountant.
C. After 2 years from the date of this order, Confessore may request that the Commission consider his reinstatement by submitting an application (attention: Office of the Chief Accountant) to resume appearing or practicing before the Commission as:

1. a preparer or reviewer, or a person responsible for the preparation or review, of any public company’s financial statements that are filed with the Commission. Such an application must satisfy the Commission that Confessore’s work in his practice before the Commission will be reviewed either by the independent audit committee of the public company for which he works or in some other acceptable manner, as long as he practices before the Commission in this capacity; and/or

2. an independent accountant. Such an application must satisfy the Commission that:

   (a) Confessore, or the public accounting firm with which he is associated, is registered with the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (“Board”) in accordance with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, and such registration continues to be effective;

   (b) Confessore, or the registered public accounting firm with which he is associated, has been inspected by the Board and that inspection did not identify any criticisms of or potential defects in Confessore’s or the firm’s quality control system that would indicate that the Confessore’s will not receive appropriate supervision;

   (c) Confessore has resolved all disciplinary issues with the Board, and has complied with all terms and conditions of any sanctions imposed by the Board (other than reinstatement by the Commission); and

   (d) Confessore acknowledges his responsibility, as long as Confessore appears or practices before the Commission as an independent accountant, to comply with all requirements of the Commission and the Board, including, but not limited to, all requirements relating to registration, inspections, concurring partner reviews and quality control standards.

3. The Commission will consider an application by Respondent to resume appearing or practicing before the Commission provided that his CPA license is current and he has resolved all other disciplinary issues with the applicable boards of accountancy. However, if CPA licensure is dependent on reinstatement by the Commission, the Commission will consider an application on its own merits. The Commission’s review may include consideration of, in addition to the matters referenced above, any other matters relating to Respondent’s character, integrity, professional conduct, or qualifications to appear or practice before the Commission.

D. Confessore shall within 14 days of the entry of this Order, pay a civil money penalty in the amount of $15,000 to the Securities and Exchange Commission. If timely payment is not
made, additional interest shall accrue pursuant to SEC Rule of Practice 600 and 31 U.S.C. § 3717. Payment must be made in one of the following ways:

(1) Respondent may transmit payment electronically to the Commission, which will provide detailed ACH transfer/Fedwire instructions upon request;

(2) Respondent may make direct payment from a bank account via Pay.gov through the SEC website at http://www.sec.gov/about/offices/ofm.htm; or

(3) Respondent may pay by certified check, bank cashier’s check, or United States postal money order, made payable to the Securities and Exchange Commission and hand-delivered or mailed to:

Enterprise Services Center
Accounts Receivable Branch
HQ Bldg., Room 181, AMZ-341
6500 South MacArthur Boulevard
Oklahoma City, OK 73169

Payments by check or money order must be accompanied by a cover letter identifying Confessore as a Respondent in these proceedings, and the file number of these proceedings; a copy of the cover letter and check or money order must be sent to John T. Dugan, Associate Regional Director, Boston regional Office, Securities and Exchange Commission, 33 Arch Street, Boston, MA 02110.

By the Commission.

Brent J. Fields
Secretary