Woska & Hayes, LLP
OKLAHOMA CITY • HOUSTON

2618 First National Center 120 N. Robinson Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Phone: 405-235-1401 Fax: 405-235-1052 Toll Free: 1-800-935-1401

www.aboutbrokerfraud.com

June 15, 2005

Catherine McGuire
Associate Director and Chief Counsel
Division of Market Regulation
Securities and Exchange Commission
450 Fifth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20549

RE: NASD De Facto Rule Concerning Motions to Dismiss

Dear Ms. McGuire:

Our firm represents public customers in arbitration claims against NASD members. It is our belief that the practice of allowing motions to dismiss in arbitration is a violation of NASD Rule10303 which mandates a hearing unless waived by the parties. The reason for the rule is that contractually mandated arbitration must take place as required by contract. There are no arbitration clauses in customer agreements which mention Motions to Dismiss or Motions for Summary Judgment.

The NASD-DR has advised the SEC that arbitrators may entertain motions to dismiss as a function of the arbitrators' inherent power to control the arbitration proceedings, codified in Rule 10324. The NASD also suggests that this NASD rule interpretation allowing motions to dismiss is supported by federal case law which holds that a "hearing" may consist of simply an opportunity for each side to argue, citing Warren v. Tacher, 114 F. Supp. 2d, 600 (W.D. Ky. 2000).

First, let me re-emphasize that the question of motions to dismiss presents a fundamental issue of contracted disclosures and investor protection. Motions to Dismiss are an important tool which is used by the brokerage industry to attempt to defeat investor claims without allowing investors the evidentiary hearing required by Rule 10303. The NASD, while advertising itself as supporting investor protection, has simply ignored Rule 10303 and instead supported the industry on this issue. If the NASD is interested in allowing public customers real protection, Motions to Dismiss and Motions for Summary Judgment sought by NASD members should be referred to a court of law where real discovery could take place.

As an SRO, the NASD is subject to conflicts of interest and must balance investor protection with the interests of its broker-dealer members. Even so, it is surprising that the NASD would contend that Rule 10324, which allows arbitrators to interpret the Code, authorizes an arbitration panel to absolutely ignore the explicit hearing requirements guaranteed investors under Rule 10303. Arbitrations should never be led to believe that their power to "interpret" the Code allows them to ignore its explicit provisions.

It is also troubling to our law firm that the SEC should support the NASD in this anti-investor position. A government agency charged with investor protection and responsible for overseeing the NASD should not endorse subversion of arbitration rules designed to protect investors and allow them to experience the small amount of due process of law which is occasionally available in a full hearing on their claims.

Your citation of Warren v. Tacher as authority that the "hearing" required under Rule 10303 can merely consist of a proceeding in which each side has an opportunity to present argument is equally disturbing. A cursory review of the Code of Arbitration Procedure confirms that the Code distinguishes between the hearing requirement provided in Rule 10303 and the opportunity to present argument without testimony as provided in Rules 10315 and 10321(d).

Adopting a strained, anti-investor interpretation by ignoring the explicit language of the Code of Arbitration Procedure and instead relying on an isolated district court decision is inappropriate for a federal agency charged with SRO oversight and responsible for investor protection. I would hope the SEC would conduct an independent, objective review of the issues involved rather than parrot the self-serving arguments of the agency it regulates.

Interestingly, the NASD included language in proposed Rule 12504 that motions to dismiss (other than those relating to time frames) are discouraged by the NASD and may only be granted in extraordinary circumstances. The proposed rewrite was made public in 2004, and yet the NASD has failed to alert arbitrators to this important policy position.

In the meantime, the NASD continues to encourage arbitrators to ignore Rule 10303 and grant industry motions to dismiss. Even more recently, the current arbitrator expungement examination, which is required to be taken by all arbitrators, encourages arbitrators to believe that they have an unfettered right to grant motions to dismiss in violation of Rule 10303.

In the interest of investor protection, I ask that you reconsider your position and instruct the NASD that Rule 10303 should be enforced in accordance with its terms. At the very least, the NASD should promptly advise arbitrators of its position as set forth in the Code rewrite that motions to dismiss are discouraged and should only be granted in extraordinary circumstances.

Very truly yours,

A. Daniel Woska
For the Firm

ADW/ljv

cc: NASD
Debra B. Hayes, Esquire
Rob Shaff