

ORIGINAL



0000104363

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

2 COMMISSIONERS

3 KRISTIN K. MAYES, Chairman
4 GARY PIERCE
5 PAUL NEWMAN
6 SANDRA D. KENNEDY
7 BOB STUMP

2009 OCT 29 P 3: 12

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

OCT 29 2009

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

6 IN THE MATTER OF:

7 RICHARD BRADFORD (CRD #2706290) and
8 CINDY BRADFORD (a.k.a. Cindy White),
9 husband and wife,

DOCKET NO S-20605A-08-0377

Respondents.

PROCEDURAL ORDER

10 **BY THE COMMISSION:**

11 On July 23, 2008, the Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation
12 Commission ("Commission") filed a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing ("Notice") against Richard
13 Bradford and Cindy (Bradford) White, husband and wife (collectively "Respondents"), in which the
14 Division alleged multiple violations of the Arizona Securities Act ("Act") in connection with the
15 offer and sale of securities in the form of investment contracts

16 Respondents were duly served with copies of the Notice.

17 On August 6, 2008, Respondent Cindy (Bradford) White filed a letter in the docket indicating
18 that she was divorced from Respondent Richard Bradford on March 3, 2008. Ms. White did not
19 request a hearing in her letter.

20 On August 11, 2008, by Procedural Order, in order to determine Ms. White's intentions in the
21 matter, a status conference was scheduled on September 4, 2008.

22 Mr. Bradford did not request a hearing.

23 On September 4, 2008, a status conference was held to determine the status of the proceeding.
24 The Division appeared with counsel and Ms. White appeared on her own behalf. The proceeding was
25 recessed for further discussions between the Division and Ms. White.

26 On October 8, 2008, the Commission issued Decision Nos. 70544 and 70545, a Consent
27 Order involving Ms. White and a Default Order involving Mr. Bradford, respectively.
28

1 On March 4, 2009, Ms. White filed a letter requesting that the Commission reconsider
2 Decision No. 70544 with respect to her Consent Order. She further indicated she wished to request a
3 hearing.

4 On March 19, 2009, the Division filed a Motion to schedule a procedural conference to
5 discuss possible reconsideration of Decision No. 70544.

6 On March 20, 2009, by Procedural Order, a procedural conference was scheduled to
7 determine the status of the proceeding.

8 On April 7, 2009, a procedural conference was convened with the Division represented by
9 counsel and Respondent appeared on her own behalf. The Division and Respondent White discussed
10 the nature of the reconsideration of Decision No. 70544. Respondent further requested that a hearing
11 be scheduled if the matter is not resolved in the interim.

12 On April 8, 2009, a hearing was scheduled on July 7, 2009, with respect to the reconsideration
13 of Decision No. 70544.

14 On July 7, 2009, a full public hearing was convened before a duly authorized Administrative
15 Law Judge of the Commission at its offices in Phoenix, Arizona. The division was present with
16 counsel and Ms. White appeared on her own behalf. At the conclusion of the proceeding, the matter
17 was taken under advisement pending the submission of a Recommended Opinion and Order to the
18 Commission. The parties agreed that any closing briefs be filed by August 31, 2009.

19 On August 28, 2009, the Division filed a Motion to extend the time for filing its brief until
20 September 21, 2009.

21 On August 31, 2009, during a teleconference with the Division's attorney and Ms. White it
22 was agreed that the Division would make its filing by September 30, 2009, and Ms. White would
23 have until October 30, 2009, to file her response, if she wished to do so. By Procedural Order, the
24 Division's Motion for an extension for filing its closing brief on September 30, 2009, was granted
25 and Ms. White was afforded a similar extension until October 30, 2009, to file her response.

26 On October 28, 2009, an attorney for Ms. White filed a Motion to Extend Deadline for
27 Answering Brief until November 16, 2009, since he had been retained only recently. In the Motion
28 counsel for Ms. White indicates that the Division does not object to the brief extension.

