

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 85330 / March 15, 2019

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-19106

In the Matter of

JARED JEFFREY DAVIS,

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 Jared Jeffrey Davis (“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 paragraph III.2. below, which are 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. Respondent, age 41, and a resident of Sandusky, Ohio, co-owned, operated, and controlled various entities and websites related to a binary options enterprise. During the period relevant to this action, Respondent was neither registered with the Commission as either a broker or a dealer nor was he associated with a broker or dealer registered with the Commission.

2. On February 22, 2019, a judgment was entered by consent against Respondent, permanently enjoining him from future violations of Sections 5 and 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act"); Sections 10(b) and 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act; and Exchange Act Rule 10b-5, in the civil action entitled Securities and Exchange Commission v. Jared Jeffrey Davis, et al., Civil Action Number 3:18-cv-02829, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio–Western Division.

3. The Commission's complaint alleged that, in connection with the offer and sale of binary options securities, Respondent, among other things and acting through his various business entities, engaged in misrepresentations and omissions concerning the trading of binary options securities and also sold unregistered binary options securities. Respondent also, acting through his various business entities and using the mails or other means or instrumentalities of interstate commerce, effected transactions in, or induced or attempted to induce the purchase and sale of, securities while he was neither registered with the Commission as a broker or dealer nor while he was associated with an entity registered with the Commission as a broker or dealer.

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; and

Pursuant to Section 15(b)(6) of the Exchange Act, Respondent 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 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 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.

Vanessa A. Countryman
Acting Secretary