

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**  
**Before the**  
**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**  
**August 23, 2004**

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING**  
**File No. 3-11594**

---

<b>In the Matter of</b>	:	
	:	
<b>PLATINUM INVESTMENT</b>	:	<b>ORDER INSTITUTING</b>
<b>CORPORATION,</b>	:	<b>ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS</b>
<b>ANDREW ANTONUCCI and</b>	:	<b>PURSUANT TO SECTION 15(b) OF THE</b>
<b>MATHEW BEAULIEU,</b>	:	<b>SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934</b>
	:	
<b>Respondents.</b>	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	

---

**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 Platinum Investment Corporation (“Platinum”), Andrew Antonucci (“Antonucci”) and Mathew Beaulieu (collectively the “Respondents”).

**II.**

The Division of Enforcement alleges that:

A. Platinum has been a registered broker-dealer pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act since April 2001. Platinum was incorporated under the laws of the State of Nevada on August 30, 2000 and had its principal place of business in Rochester, New York. Platinum maintained offices in Rochester, New York, Fort Lauderdale, Florida and New York, New York.

B. From approximately July 2001 through July 2002, Antonucci was a registered representative associated with Platinum. Antonucci holds Series 4, 7, 24, and 63 securities licenses.

C. From approximately July 2001 through July 2002, Beaulieu was a registered representative associated with Platinum. Beaulieu holds Series 7, 24, and 63 securities licenses.

D. On July 31, 2002 the Commission filed a complaint (“Complaint”) against Platinum, Antonucci, Beaulieu, and others (SEC v. Platinum Investment Corporation, et al., 02 Civ. 6093 S.D.N.Y. (JSR)) alleging, among other things, that from approximately August 2001 through July 2002 Platinum, Antonucci, Beaulieu, and others raised over \$1.5 million through fraudulent unregistered stock offerings conducted through Platinum. The complaint also alleges that Platinum, Antonucci, Beaulieu and others defrauded investors by making material misrepresentations with respect to the securities involved in the offerings. The complaint further alleges that Platinum has been a registered broker-dealer pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act since April 2001, and that Antonucci holds Series 4, 7, 24, and 63 securities and Beaulieu holds Series 7, 24, and 63 securities licenses.

E. On August 12, 2002 the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York filed a Partial Final Consent Judgment as to Platinum, and on October 15, 2002 filed Partial Final Consent Judgments as to Antonucci and Beaulieu (“Partial Judgments”). The Partial Judgments entered against the Respondents, among other things, permanently enjoined them from violating Sections 5(a), 5(c), and 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 and Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder. Platinum, Antonucci, and Beaulieu consented to the entry of the Partial Judgments without admitting or denying the allegations in the Complaint, except as to jurisdiction.

### 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 are true and, in connection therewith, to afford the Respondents an opportunity to establish any defenses to such allegations; and

B. What, if any, remedial action is appropriate in the public interest against the 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 200 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.200.

**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 fails to file the directed answer, or fail 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 the Respondents personally or by certified mail.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Administrative Law Judge shall issue an initial decision no later than 300 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.

Jonathan G. Katz  
Secretary