

ORIGINAL



0000143203

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION

RECEIVED

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

2013 MAR -4 P 2:02

MAR 4 2013

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

DOCKETED  
*JM*

COMMISSIONERS

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NO. S-20823A-11-0407

THOMAS LAURENCE HAMPTON,  
CRD #2470192, and STEPHANIE YAGER,  
husband and wife;

TIMOTHY D. MORAN, CRD #2326078,  
and PATRICIA MORAN, husband and wife;

PATRICK MORAN, CRD #1496354, and  
KELLY MORAN, husband and wife; and

HAMPTON CAPITAL MARKETS, LLC,  
an Arizona limited liability company,

RESPONDENTS.

**TENTH**  
**PROCEDURAL ORDER**  
**(Grants Motion to Withdraw)**

BY THE COMMISSION:

On November 10, 2011, the Securities Division (“Division”) of the Arizona Corporation Commission (“Commission”) filed a Temporary Order to Cease and Desist (“T.O.”) and a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing (“Notice”) against Thomas Laurence Hampton and Jane Doe Hampton, husband and wife, and Hampton Capital Markets, L.L.C. (“HCM”), an Arizona limited liability company, (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 stock or investment contracts.

The spouse (“Respondent Spouse”) of Respondent Thomas Hampton is joined in the action pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2031(C) solely for the purpose of determining the liability of the marital community.

The Respondents were duly served with copies of the T.O and Notice.

On November 30, 2011, a request for hearing was filed on behalf of all Respondents who had been named in the November 10, 2011, T.O. and Notice.

1 On December 6, 2011, by Procedural Order, a pre-hearing conference was scheduled on  
2 January 5, 2012. Subsequently, the Division filed a Motion to File Amended T.O. and Notice in  
3 order to state the correct name of Mr. Hampton's spouse.

4 On December 12, 2011, the Division and Respondent filed a Joint Stipulation regarding the  
5 Amended T.O. and Notice. Respondents had no objections to the filing of the Amended T.O. and  
6 Notice to correct the name of Mr. Hampton's spouse (Stephanie Yager) and the parties stipulated that  
7 Respondents' initial request for hearing filed November 30, 2011, would be applicable as to the  
8 Amended T.O. and Notice. Additionally, the parties stipulated that Respondents' would have at least  
9 30 days to file an Answer from the date of an Order which authorizes the filing of the Amended T.O.  
10 and Notice.

11 On December 15, 2011, the Division was granted leave to file an Amended T.O. and Notice  
12 as stipulated by the parties.

13 On January 5, 2012, at the pre-hearing conference, the Division and Respondents, Thomas  
14 Hampton and HCM appeared through counsel. Counsel for Mr. Hampton and HCM indicated that he  
15 did not represent Mr. Hampton's spouse, Stephanie Yager, and that Mr. Hampton's spouse would be  
16 represented by separate counsel in the proceeding. The Division and Mr. Hampton and HCM were  
17 conducting settlement discussions, but the Division indicated that it intended to further amend the  
18 T.O. and Notice. In the interim, the Division requested that a status conference be scheduled in  
19 approximately 90 days.

20 On January 6, 2012, by Procedural Order, a status conference was scheduled on April 26, 2012.

21 On February 6, 2012, counsel for Respondents, Thomas Hampton and HCM, filed a Motion to  
22 Withdraw as counsel stating that he and his clients had a conflict which rendered his representation  
23 "untenable," and that to disclose the reason would violate the attorney client privilege.

24 On February 9, 2012, by Procedural Order, counsel for Respondents, Thomas Hampton and  
25 HCM, was granted leave to withdraw.

26 On April 24, 2012, the Division and Respondents filed a Joint Stipulation to Continue the  
27 status conference scheduled on April 26, 2012, for at least 60 days because Mr. Hampton was  
28 currently traveling outside of Arizona, and because the Division intended to file an Amended T.O.

1 and Notice.

2 On April 25, 2012, by Procedural Order, the status conference was continued to July 10, 2012.

3 On June 27, 2012, the Division filed a Motion to Amend the caption and Notice in the  
4 proceeding, and requested that the status conference scheduled on July 10, 2012, be vacated. The  
5 Division included a copy of the Amended Notice as Exhibit "A".

6 On July 6, 2012, the Division and Respondents, Mr. Hampton and HCM, filed a Joint  
7 Stipulation to amend the caption and the Notice in this proceeding and to vacate the status  
8 conference. Respondent Stephanie Yager had not yet signed the Joint Stipulation.

9 On July 9, 2012, by Procedural Order, leave to amend the caption and the Notice was granted  
10 and the status conference was vacated.

11 On July 12, 2012, the Division filed the Amended Notice naming additional Respondents and  
12 adding more allegations to the Notice. Additionally, the respective spouses were joined in the action  
13 pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2031(C) solely for the purpose of determining the liability of the respective  
14 marital communities.

15 The additional Respondents were duly served with copies of the Amended Notice.

16 On August 6, 2012, Respondents Timothy D. Moran and Patricia Moran filed a request for  
17 hearing.

18 On August 7, 2012, Respondents Patrick Moran and Kelly Moran filed a request for hearing.

19 On August 8, 2012, by Procedural Order, a pre-hearing conference was scheduled on August  
20 21, 2012.

21 On August 20, 2012, Respondents Timothy and Patricia Moran filed a Motion to Stay  
22 Proceedings based on what was termed "a reasonable fear of criminal prosecution" and requested  
23 protection for Mr. Timothy Moran's constitutional rights under both the United States and Arizona  
24 Constitutions.

25 On August 21, 2012, at the pre-hearing conference, the Division, Respondents Timothy  
26 Moran and Patricia Moran and Respondents Patrick Moran and Kelly Moran were represented by  
27 counsel. No appearances were made by Respondents Thomas Hampton, Stephanie Yager or HCM or  
28 anyone on their behalf. Based on the August 20, 2012, motion filed by Timothy and Patricia Moran

1 to stay the proceeding, the parties who were present agreed that the pre-hearing conference should be  
2 continued for at least 60 days. Counsel for the Division further indicated that the Division had not yet  
3 had time to thoroughly review the pending Motion to Stay.

4 On August 22, 2012, by Procedural Order, another pre-hearing conference was scheduled on  
5 November 8, 2012. It was also noted that although a request for a hearing was filed pursuant to  
6 A.R.S. § 44-1972 and A.A.C. R14-4-306 for Respondent Stephanie Yager neither she nor an attorney  
7 on her behalf had entered an appearance in subsequent proceedings. Additionally, Respondents  
8 Patrick and Kelly Moran filed joinder in Respondents Timothy and Patricia Moran's Motion to Stay.

9 On August 24, 2012, Respondents Timothy and Patricia Moran filed an Answer and Motion  
10 to Dismiss the Amended Notice. A key argument in support of the motion filed by Timothy and  
11 Patricia Moran was the extremely vague nature of the allegations against Mr. Timothy Moran in the  
12 Amended Notice.

13 On September 6, 2012, the Division filed its response to the Motion to Stay filed by Timothy  
14 and Patricia Moran and the joinder of Patrick and Kelly Moran to the aforementioned motion. The  
15 Division argued that the Motion to Stay should be denied because "there is no substantial prejudice to  
16 any Respondent or their respective spouses by proceeding forward." The Division argued this point  
17 despite the fact that an adverse order against the Moran Respondents could possibly subject them to a  
18 substantial order of restitution and administrative penalties. The Division further did not take into  
19 account the credible affidavits of two well-respected Arizona attorneys who both agreed that  
20 Respondent Timothy Moran is the subject of a United States Department of Justice federal criminal  
21 investigation and that he faces a realistic threat of criminal prosecution.

22 On September 17, 2012, the Division filed its response to the Motion to Dismiss filed by  
23 Respondents Timothy and Patricia Moran. In its response the Division argued that the Amended  
24 Notice is sufficient to put Respondent Timothy Moran on notice of his alleged violations of the Act  
25 and that the requirements of the Arizona Administrative Code ("A.A.C.") and the rules of the  
26 Commission had been met. As a result, the Division argued that the Motion to Dismiss should be  
27 denied. However, in concluding its response, the Division acknowledged that the Administrative  
28 Law Judge ("ALJ") could order the Division to further amend the Amended Notice to add additional

1 allegations, if he determined the current allegations should be amended or supplemented.

2 On September 18, 2012, Respondents Timothy and Patricia Moran filed their reply in support  
3 of their Motion to Stay in which it was argued that the test was whether there is a realistic threat of  
4 criminal prosecution and not whether there is a pending criminal prosecution or whether a substantial  
5 prejudice will result from the proceeding going forward.

6 On September 28, 2012, Respondents Timothy and Patricia Moran filed their reply in support  
7 of their Motion to Dismiss in which it was argued that the Commission's rule A.A.C. R14-3-106(L)  
8 and also A.R.S. § 41-1061(B)(4) both required the Division to state more succinctly in its Amended  
9 Notice allegations which stated in greater detail the charges against Mr. Moran to enable him to  
10 present a defense.

11 On November 2, 2012, by Procedural Order, Respondents Timothy and Patricia Moran's  
12 Motion to Stay, which was joined by Respondents Patrick and Kelly Moran, was granted and the pre-  
13 hearing conference scheduled on November 8, 2012, was vacated. The Motion to Dismiss was taken  
14 under advisement.

15 On February 22, 2013, a Motion to Withdraw was filed by counsel for Respondents Timothy  
16 D. Moran and Patricia Moran stating that his clients had failed to fulfill their financial obligations  
17 which were owed for legal services despite warnings that counsel would withdraw "if his bills were  
18 not made current." In support of his Motion to Withdraw, counsel cited Rule 1.16 of the Arizona  
19 Rules of Professional Conduct where the rule is set forth. Counsel served a copy of his Motion to  
20 Withdraw upon his clients and certified that his clients had been notified in writing of the status of the  
21 case including pending matters related to the proceeding.

22 No objections have been filed to the Motion to Withdraw filed by counsel for Respondents  
23 Timothy D. Moran and Patricia Moran.

24 Accordingly, the Motion to Withdraw should be granted.

25 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Motion to Withdraw filed by counsel for  
26 Respondents Timothy D. Moran and Patricia Moran is hereby granted.

27 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this proceeding shall be stayed until further Order, as  
28 previously ordered.

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Division shall file a motion for a status conference to be  
2 scheduled upon a change in the circumstances which caused the stay to be instituted herein.

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

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

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

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent's request for discovery shall be taken under  
15 advisement.

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

18 DATED this 4<sup>TH</sup> day of March, 2013.

19  
20  
21   
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
MARC E. STERN  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

23 Copies of the foregoing mailed/delivered  
24 this 4<sup>TH</sup> day of March, 2013 to:

25 Thomas Hampton  
26 HAMPTON CAPITAL MARKETS, LLC  
9026 East Calle De Las Brisas  
Scottsdale, AZ 85255

27 Stephanie Yager  
28 9026 East Calle De Las Brisas  
Scottsdale, AZ 85255

1 Paul J. Roshka, Jr.  
2 Timothy J. Sabo  
3 ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC  
4 One Arizona Center  
5 400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800  
6 Phoenix, AZ 85004  
7 Attorneys for Respondents  
8 Timothy D. and Patricia Moran

9 Michael D. Curran  
10 MAYNARD CRONIN ERICKSON  
11 CURRAN & REITER, P.L.C.  
12 3200 North Central Avenue, Suite 1800  
13 Phoenix, AZ 85012  
14 Attorneys for Respondents  
15 Patrick and Kelly Moran

16 Timothy and Patricia Moran  
17 4545 E. Joshua Tree Lane  
18 Scottsdale, AZ 85253

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

24 By:   
25 Debbi Person  
26 Assistant to Marc E. Stern  
27  
28