

ORIGINAL



0000123988

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

COMMISSIONERS

KRISTIN K. MAYES - Chairman
GARY PIERCE
PAUL NEWMAN
SANDRA D. KENNEDY
BOB STUMP

2011 MAR 24 A 10: 51
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

IN THE MATTER OF:

JOSEPH COSENZA and ANDREA BENSON,
husband and wife;

U.S. MEDIA TEAM, LLC, an Arizona limited
liability company;

THOMAS BRANDON and DIANE M.
BRANDON, husband and wife;

CELL WIRELESS CORPORATION, a Nevada
corporation, formerly known as U.S. SOCIAL
SCENE, a Nevada corporation;

DAVID SHOREY and MARY JANE SHOREY,
husband and wife;

RESPONDENTS.

DOCKET NO. S-20763A-10-0430

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

MAR 24 2011

DOCKETED BY

**THIRD
PROCEDURAL ORDER
(Continues Hearing)**

BY THE COMMISSION:

On October 21, 2010, the Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") filed a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing ("Notice") against the following individuals and entities: Joseph Cosenza and Andrea Benson, husband and wife; U.S. Media Team, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company ("USMT"); Thomas Brandon and Diane M. Brandon, husband and wife; Cell Wireless Corporation, a Nevada corporation ("CWC"), formerly known as U.S. Social Scene, a Nevada corporation ("U.S.S.S."); and David Shorey and Mary Jane Shorey, husband and wife (collectively "Respondents") in which the Division alleged multiple violations of the Arizona Securities Act ("Act") in connection with the offer and sale of securities in the form of notes and stock. The spouses ("Respondent Spouses") of Respondents Cosenza, Brandon and Shorey were joined in the action pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2031(C) solely for the purpose of determining the liability of their respective marital communities.

1 The Respondents were duly served with copies of the Notice.

2 On November 5, 2010, requests for hearing were filed by David and Mary Jane Shorey and by
3 David Shorey as CEO of CWC. Mr. Shorey indicated the he and his wife and CWC would be
4 retaining an attorney to represent them.

5 On November 15, 2010, Thomas Brandon filed a request for hearing on behalf of himself and
6 his wife Diane Brandon. Mr. Brandon indicated that he and his wife were in the process of retaining
7 an attorney to represent them in the proceeding.

8 On November 18, 2010, by Procedural Order, a pre-hearing conference was scheduled on
9 December 16, 2010.

10 On December 13, 2010, the Shoreys, Brandons and CWC filed requests for a continuance
11 stating they needed more time to secure counsel.

12 On December 15, 2010, the Division filed response in which it objected to the requests for a
13 continuance pointing out that Respondents had ample time to secure counsel.

14 On December 16, 2010, at the outset of the pre-hearing conference the requests for a
15 continuance were denied. The Division appeared with counsel and Mr. Shorey and Mr. Brandon
16 appeared on their own behalf. The Division was attempting to resolve the issues raised in the Notice
17 with the Respondents. In the interim, the Division requested that a status conference be scheduled
18 and the parties agreed to one being scheduled in February, 2011. Subsequently, by Procedural Order,
19 a status conference was scheduled on February 16, 2011.

20 On February 16, 2011, the Division appeared with counsel and Mr. Shorey and Mr. Brandon
21 appeared on their own behalf. The Division and Respondents who were present indicated that they
22 were continuing to attempt to settle the proceeding, but the Division requested that in the interim a
23 hearing be scheduled after April to avoid scheduling conflicts. Subsequently, by Procedural Order, a
24 hearing was scheduled to commence on May 10, 2011.

25 On March 22, 2011, counsel for Respondents CWC and Mr. and Mrs. Shorey filed a Motion
26 to Continue the hearing and proposed an alternate set of dates in July for the hearing. The
27 Respondents' Motion indicates that the Division has no objection to the Motion or its suggested dates
28 for the continuance.

1 Accordingly, the hearing should be continued.

2 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that a **hearing shall be continued from May 10, 2011 to**
3 **July 19, 2011, at 10:00 a.m.**, at the Commission's offices, 1200 West Washington Street, **Hearing**
4 **Room 1**, Phoenix, Arizona.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall also set aside **July 20 and 21, 2011**, for
6 **additional days of hearing**, if necessary.

7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the **Division and Respondents shall exchange copies of**
8 **their Witness Lists and copies of their Exhibits by June 17, 2011**, with courtesy copies provided
9 to the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

10 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **if the case is resolved by a proposed Consent Order prior**
11 **to the hearing, the Division shall file a Motion to Vacate the proceeding.**

12 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Ex Parte Rule (A.A.C. R14-3-113-Unauthorized
13 Communications) applies to this proceeding as the matter is now set for public hearing.

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that withdrawal or representation must be made in compliance
15 with A.A.C. R14-3-104(E) and Rule 1.16 of the Rules of Professional Conduct (under Rule 42 of the
16 Rules of the Arizona Supreme Court). Representation before the Commission includes appearances
17 at all hearings and procedural conferences, as well as all Open Meetings for which the matter is
18 scheduled for discussion, unless counsel has previously been granted permission to withdraw by the
19 Administrative Law Judge or the Commission.

20 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all parties must comply with Rules 31 and 38 of the Rules
21 of the Arizona Supreme Court and A.R.S. § 40-243 with respect to practice of law and admission
22 *pro hac vice*.

23 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Presiding Officer may rescind, alter, amend, or waive
24 any portion of this Procedural Order either by subsequent Procedural Order or by ruling at hearing.

25 DATED this 24th day of March, 2011.

26
27 
28 MARC E. STERN
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

1 Copies of the foregoing mailed/delivered
2 this 24th day of March, 2011 to:

3 Bruce R. Heurlin
4 Kevin M. Sherlock
5 HEURLIN SHERLOCK PANAHI
6 1636 North Swan road, Suite 200
7 Tucson, AZ 85712-4096
8 Attorneys for Respondents David Shorey,
9 Mary Jan Shorey and Cell Wireless Corp.


7 David and Mary Jane Shorey
8 6959 East Wild Canyon Place
9 Tucson, AZ 85750

9 David L. Shorey, CEO
10 CELLWIRELESS CORP.
11 6959 East Wild Canyon Place
12 Tucson, AZ 85750

11 Thomas L. Brandon
12 Diane M. Brandon
13 10206 East Desert Flower Place
14 Tucson, AZ 85749

14 Matt Neubert, Director, Securities Division
15 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
16 1300 West Washington Street
17 Phoenix, AZ 85007

16 ARIZONA REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
17 2200 North Central Avenue, Suite 502
18 Phoenix, AZ 85004

18 By: 
19 Debra Broyles
20 Secretary to Marc E. Stern

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28