

ORIGINAL



0000127798

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS

- GARY PIERCE - Chairman
- BOB STUMP
- SANDRA D. KENNEDY
- PAUL NEWMAN
- BRENDA BURNS

2011 JUL 26 A 11:10

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NO. S-20788A-11-0096

MAGLEV WIND TURBINE TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Nevada corporation,

MAGLEV RENEWABLE ENERGIES RESOURCES, INC., a Wyoming corporation,

RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT, Inc., an Arizona corporation,

EDWARD L. MAZUR and JANE DOE MAZUR, husband and wife,

RONNIE WILLIAMS and JANE DOE WILLIAMS, husband and wife,

MAG T INC., a Florida corporation,

RLGMAN CORP., a Florida corporation,

STABLE, LLC, an inactive Florida limited liability company,

RICHARD L. GREEN, and

DONALD ANDREW ROTHMAN,

Respondents.

Arizona Corporation Commission  
DOCKETED  
JUL 26 2011  
DOCKETED BY  
JDS

**FIFTH  
PROCEDURAL ORDER  
(Continues Status Conference)**

BY THE COMMISSION:

On March 1, 2011, the Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") filed a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing ("Notice") against the following entities and individuals: Maglev Wind Turbine Technologies, Inc., a Nevada corporation ("MWTT"); Maglev Renewable Energies Resources, Inc., a Wyoming corporation ("MRER"); Renewable Energy Development, Inc., an Arizona corporation ("RED"); Edward L. Mazur and Jane Doe Mazur, husband and wife; Ronnie Williams and Jane Doe Williams, husband and wife; MAG T

1 Inc., a Florida corporation (“MAGT”); RLGMAN Corp., a Florida corporation (“RLGMAN”),  
2 Stable, LLC, an inactive Florida limited liability company (“Stable”); Richard L. Green; and Donald  
3 Andrew Rothman (collectively “Respondents”), in which the Division alleged multiple violations of  
4 the Arizona Securities Act (“Act”) in connection with the offer and sale of securities in the form of  
5 investment contracts.

6 The Respondents were duly served with a copy of the Notice.

7 On March 31, 2011, requests for hearing in this matter were filed on behalf of Respondents,  
8 MAGT, RLGMAN, Richard Green and Donald Rothman.

9 Counsel for Respondents, MAGT, RLGMAN, Green and Rothman further requested that he  
10 be granted an additional three weeks to file an Answer due to his work load.

11 On April 15, 2011, by Procedural Order, a pre-hearing conference was scheduled, and leave  
12 was granted for three weeks to allow for the filing of an Answer on behalf of MAGT, RLGMAN,  
13 Green and Rothman.

14 On April 15, 2011, after the Commission had issued the above-referenced Procedural Order  
15 scheduling this matter for a pre-hearing conference, on May 23, 2011, a request for hearing was filed  
16 on behalf of the following Respondents: MWTT; MRER; RED; Edward Mazur and Jane Doe Mazur,  
17 husband and wife; and Ronnie Williams and Jane Doe Williams, husband and wife.

18 On April 19, 2011, by Procedural Order, all parties were advised of the pre-hearing  
19 conference which had been previously scheduled.

20 On May 17, 2011, counsel for Respondents, MAGT, RLGMAN, Green and Rothman to filed  
21 a request for leave to file their Answer by May 20, 2011. It was indicated that the Division had no  
22 objections to the request.

23 On May 19, 2011, leave was granted to Respondents, MAGT, RLGMAN, Green and  
24 Rothman to file their Answer by May 20, 2011.

25 On May 20, 2011, counsel for MAGT, RLGMAN, Green and Rothman filed a Request for  
26 Hearing *nunc pro tunc* on behalf of Stable which had not been included on the March 31, 2011,  
27 request which had been filed in the proceeding. Additionally, an Answer was filed on behalf of  
28 MAGT, RLGMAN, Stable, Green and Rothman.

1 On May 23, 2011, at the pre-hearing conference, the Division and Respondents appeared  
2 through counsel. Leave was granted to include Stable in the request for hearing. Counsel for the  
3 Division indicated the Division and Respondents required 45 to 60 days to discuss the issues raised  
4 by the Notice and if the proceeding was not settled, a status conference would be needed to schedule  
5 a hearing.

6 On May 25, 2011, by Procedural Order, a status conference was scheduled incorrectly on  
7 July 6, 2011.

8 On May 26, 2011, an amended Procedural Order was issued and the status conference was  
9 rescheduled to July 26, 2011.

10 On July 25, 2011, counsel for the respective Respondents jointly filed a Request for  
11 Continuance of the status conference scheduled on July 26, 2011, because one of the attorneys for the  
12 Respondents and the Division's attorney were scheduled to be out of town and unable to attend. The  
13 Respondents indicated that the Division did not oppose this request.

14 Accordingly, the status conference should be continued.

15 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED **the status conference shall be continued from July 26,**  
16 **2011, to August 15, 2011, at 10:00 a.m.,** at the Commission's offices, 1200 West Washington  
17 Street, **Room 100,** Phoenix, Arizona.

18 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if the parties reach a resolution of the issues raised in the  
19 Notice, the Division shall file a Motion to Vacate the status conference.

20 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Ex Parte Rule (A.A.C. R14-3-113-Unauthorized  
21 Communications) is in effect and shall remain in effect until the Commission's Decision in this  
22 matter is final and non-appealable.

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

26 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that withdrawal or representation must be made in compliance  
27 with A.A.C. R14-3-104(E) and Rule 1.16 of the Rules of Professional Conduct (under Rule 42 of the  
28 Rules of the Arizona Supreme Court). Representation before the Commission includes appearances

1 at all hearings and procedural conferences, as well as all Open Meetings for which the matter is  
2 scheduled for discussion, unless counsel has previously been granted permission to withdraw by the  
3 Administrative Law Judge or the Commission.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Presiding Administrative Law Judge may rescind, alter,  
5 amend or waive any portion of this Procedural Order either by subsequent Procedural Order or by  
6 ruling at hearing.

7 DATED this 26<sup>TH</sup> day of July, 2011.

8  
9  
10   
11 MARC E. STERN  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

12 Copies of the foregoing mailed/delivered  
13 this 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2011 to:

14 Douglas F. Behm  
15 DOUGLAS F. BEHM, PLLC  
14362 North Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd., Suite 1000  
16 Scottsdale, AZ 85260  
Attorney for Respondents RLGMAN Corp.,  
17 MAG T Inc., Stable, LLC, Richard L. Green, and  
Donald Andrew Rothman

18 Brian J. Schulman  
19 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
2375 East Camelback Road, Suite 700  
20 Phoenix, AZ 85016  
Attorney for Respondents Maglev Wind Turbine  
21 Technologies, Inc., Maglev Renewable Energy  
Resources, Inc., Renewable Energy Development, Inc.,  
Renewable Energy Systems, Inc., Edward L. Mazur  
and Ronnie Williams

22 Matt Neubert, Director  
23 Securities Division  
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
24 1300 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

25 ARIZONA REPORTING SERVICE, INC.  
26 2200 North Central Avenue, Suite 502  
Phoenix, AZ 85004-1481

27 By:   
28 Debra Broyles  
Secretary to Marc E. Stern