


**HARD COPY**

**COPY**



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
Before the  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

**Administrative Proceeding  
File No. 3-17228**

**In the Matter of**

**Michelle L. Helterbran Cochran,  
CPA**

**Respondent.**

**DIVISION OF ENFORCEMENT'S  
LETTER IN SUPPORT OF  
RATIFICATION OF ALL PRIOR  
ACTIONS**

On November 30, 2017, the Commission issued an order ratifying the prior appointment of its administrative law judges to preside over administrative proceedings. *See In re: Pending Administrative Proceedings*, Securities Act Release No. 10440 (Nov. 30, 2017). As applied to this proceeding, the order directs the administrative law judge to determine, based on a de novo reconsideration of the full administrative record, whether to ratify or revise in any respect all prior actions taken by any administrative law judge during the course of this proceeding. *Id.* at 1-2.


It is well established that subsequent ratification of an earlier decision rendered by an unconstitutionally appointed officer remedies any alleged harm or prejudice caused by the violation. *See Doolin Sec. Sav. Bank, F.S.B. v. Office of Thrift Supervision*, 139 F.3d 203, 213-14 (D.C. Cir. 1998); *FEC v. Legi-Tech, Inc.*, 75 F.3d 704, 707-09 (D.C. Cir. 1996). And that principle applies whether or not the ratifying authority is the same person who made the initial decision, so long as “the ratifier has the authority to take the action to be ratified,” and, “with full knowledge of the decision to be ratified,” makes a “detached and considered affirmation of th[at] earlier decision.” *Advanced Disposal Services East, Inc. v. NLRB*, 820 F.3d 592, 602-03 (3d Cir. 2016).

Accordingly, to implement this remedy, the administrative law judge should conduct a de novo review of the administrative record, engage in an independent evaluation of the merits through the exercise of detached and considered judgment, and then determine whether prior actions should be ratified and thereby affirmed. This process ensures “that the ratifier does not blindly affirm the earlier decision without due consideration.” *Advanced Disposal Services East*, 820 F.3d at 602-03.

The Division submits that the previous decisions issued by an administrative law judge in this proceeding, including the initial decision issued on March 7, 2017, were well-founded and respectfully requests that they be ratified. To that end, the Division attaches a proposed draft order to this letter.

Dated: January 5, 2018

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy L. Evans  
Texas Bar No. 24065211

David D. Whipple  
D.C. Bar No. 999495  
New York Registration No.4902565

United States Securities and  
Exchange Commission  
Fort Worth Regional Office  
Burnett Plaza, Suite 1900  
801 Cherry Street, Unit 18  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102  
(817) 978-5036  
(817) 978-4927 (facsimile)  
EvansTim@sec.gov  
COUNSEL FOR  
DIVISION OF ENFORCEMENT


**SERVICE LIST**

Pursuant to Rule 150 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served on the following on January 5, 2018 via United Parcel Service, Overnight Mail and/or Email:

Honorable Cameron Elliot  
Administrative Law Judge  
Securities and Exchange Commission  
100 F Street, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20549-2557

Michelle L. Helterbran Cochran, CPA

██████████  
██████████ TX ██████████

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy L. Evans

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

**Administrative Proceeding**  
**File No. 3-17228**

**In the Matter of**

**Michelle L. Helterbran Cochran,**  
**CPA,**

**Respondent.**

**ORDER RATIFYING AND AFFIRMING**  
**PRIOR ACTIONS**

After a de novo review and reexamination of the record in these proceedings, I have reached the independent decision to ratify and affirm all prior actions made by an administrative law judge in these proceedings, including the initial decision issued on March 7, 2017. This decision to ratify and affirm is based on my detached and considered judgment after an independent evaluation of the merits.

---

Cameron Elliot  
Administrative Law Judge