

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

**SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**  
**Release No. 85032 / February 1, 2019**

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING**  
**File No. 3-18983**

**In the Matter of**

**YOLANDA C. VELAZQUEZ,**

**Respondent.**

**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 Yolanda C. Velazquez (“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 her and the subject matter of these proceedings and the findings contained in paragraph III.1 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. On January 9, 2019, a final judgment was entered by consent against Respondent, permanently enjoining her from future violations of Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act") [15 U.S.C. §§ 77e(a) & 77e(c)], Section 15(a) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78o(a)], and Section 15(b)(6)(B)(i) of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78o(b)(6)(B)(i)], in the civil action entitled *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Peter H. Pocklington, et al.*, Civil Action Number 5:18-CV-00701-JGB-SP, in the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

2. The Commission's complaint alleged, in substance, that from between in or about April 2014 and in or about May 2017, Respondent sold unregistered securities and acted as an unregistered broker dealer, and the entire time Respondent did so an order under Section 15(b)(6)(A) of the Exchange Act was in effect with respect to Respondent that had been issued on or about March 18, 2005, permanently barring Respondent from associating with a broker or dealer. Specifically, the complaint alleged that Respondent sold investors approximately \$11 million worth of shares in The Eye Machine LLC (also known as Nova Oculus Partners, LLC) and, together with her spouse, Vanessa Puleo, received approximately \$4,733,025 in commissions. The shares of The Eye Machine Respondent sold were never registered with the Commission and no exemption from registration was available. Throughout the entire time Respondent was selling shares of The Eye Machine, she was an unregistered broker and, in fact, had been permanently barred from associating with a broker dealer on or about March 18, 2005.

### IV.

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

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED pursuant to Section 15(b)(6) of the Exchange Act that Respondent 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.

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