UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 88104 / January 30, 2020

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-19684

In the Matter of

DANIEL MARKEL,
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 Daniel Markel (“Respondent”).

II.

In anticipation of the institution of these proceedings, Respondent has submitted an Offer of Settlement (“Offer”) that 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 paragraphs 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, CRD No. 4001466, acted as a registered broker-dealer from 1999 through 2016. Respondent was the owner of DT Securities Ltd. (f/k/a MarkelNewton), CRD No. 131662, which acted as a registered broker from 2004 through 2016. Markel, 55 years old, is a resident of Toluca Lake, California.

2. On January 20, 2020, a judgment was entered by consent against Respondent, permanently enjoining him from future violations of Sections 5, 17(a)(2) and 17(a)(3) of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”), in the civil action entitled Securities and Exchange Commission v. Daniel Markel, Civil Action Number 2:20-cv-00502-ODW (SSx), in the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

3. The Commission’s complaint alleges that Markel violated the antifraud provisions of the federal securities laws by omitting material facts while offering and selling the securities of Sobriety & Addiction Solutions, LLC dba MyLife Recovery Centers (“MyLife”). More specifically, the complaint alleges that Markel negligently failed to disclose to investors that MyLife, which touted itself as having an exclusive license to treat alcohol and opioid addiction with a subcutaneous implant, was in fact importing the implants from a Chinese manufacturer, in violation of Food and Drug Administration regulations. The complaint further alleges that Markel participated in an unregistered offering of MyLife’s securities for which no exemption applied.

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 Markel 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 that Respondent Markel 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; with the right to apply for reentry after five (5) years to the appropriate self-regulatory organization, or if there is none, to the Commission.

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, compliance with the Commission’s order and payment of any or all of the following: (a) any disgorgement or civil penalties ordered by a Court against the
Respondent in any action brought by the Commission, (b) any disgorgement ordered against the Respondent, whether or not the Commission has fully or partially waived payment of such disgorgement; (c) any arbitration award related to the conduct that served as the basis for the Commission order; (d) 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 (e) 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
Secretary