


**BEFORE THE
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC**

In the Matter of the Application of

Michael Patrick Murphy

File No. 3-19573

FINRA'S MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE AND POSTPONE FURTHER BRIFING



Alan Lawhead
Vice President and
Director – Appellate Group

Megan Rauch
Associate General Counsel

Celia L. Passaro
Assistant General Counsel

FINRA
1735 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 728-8863

October 23, 2019

**BEFORE THE
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC**

In the Matter of the Application of

Michael Patrick Murphy

File No. 3-19573

FINRA'S MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE AND POSTPONE FURTHER BRIFING

On April 4, 2019, the Commission consolidated and postponed further briefing in a series of separate appeals (the "Arbitration Expungement Appeals") that all raised the same threshold issue: Does the Commission possess jurisdiction to order FINRA's Office of Dispute Resolution to allow a claimant to arbitrate a request to expunge a previous, adverse arbitration award? The Commission consolidated 12 proceedings that raised this issue and stayed briefing in 11, pending a decision on the Commission's jurisdiction based on the briefs filed in *Bart Steven Kaplow*, Administrative Proceeding No. 3-18877. *See Order Consolidating Proceedings and Postponing Further Briefing*, Exchange Act Release No. 85509, 2019 SEC LEXIS 731 (Apr. 4, 2019) (courtesy copy attached hereto as Exhibit A). Michael Patrick Murphy's application for review raises the identical jurisdictional issue. Accordingly, the Commission should consolidate this matter with the Arbitration Expungement Appeals and postpone any further briefing until the Commission issues a decision in *Kaplow*.

We briefly review the relevant facts. On August 22, 2019, Murphy filed an amended statement of claim with FINRA's Office of Dispute Resolution ("Dispute Resolution"), requesting expungement of a customer dispute from his record in FINRA's Central Registration

Depository (“CRD®”).¹ (R. at 9-23.) On September 25, 2019, FINRA notified Murphy that the matter was not appropriate for arbitration because it arose from a prior adverse arbitration award.² (R. at 25.) On October 1, 2019, Murphy filed this application for review with the Commission, seeking review of Dispute Resolution’s decision that the matter, which arose from an adverse arbitration award, is not appropriate for an expungement arbitration. (R. at 27-31.)

Commission Rule of Practice 201(a) provides that the Commission may consolidate “proceedings involving a common question of law or fact . . . for hearing of any or all matters at issue in such proceedings.” 17 C.F.R. § 201.201(a). This appeal shares the same common fact pattern and question of law in the Arbitration Expungement Appeals. Like the applicants in those cases, Murphy filed an arbitration for expungement of a customer dispute in which there had been an adverse arbitration award. After FINRA notified him that an adverse arbitration award was inappropriate for an expungement arbitration, he sought Commission review of Dispute Resolution’s decision. Like the applicants in the Arbitration Expungement Appeals, Murphy is also represented by counsel associated with the law firm HLSB Law.

Murphy’s application for review raises the same threshold question of the Commission’s jurisdiction, which was fully briefed in *Kaplow* and, accordingly, it is appropriate to consolidate Murphy’s appeal with the Expungement Arbitration Appeals for purposes of resolving the jurisdictional issue.

Commission Rule of Practice 161(a) authorizes the Commission to order postponement for “good cause shown.” 17 C.F.R. § 201.161(a). Rule of Practice 161(b) sets forth the factors

¹ “R. at ___” refers to the page number in the certified record filed on October 15, 2019.

² In the arbitration award, Murphy and his firm were found jointly and severally liable to pay the customer \$13,750. (R. at 64-67.)

the Commission must consider in determining whether to grant a postponement, including: (1) the length of the proceeding to date; (2) the number of previous postponements granted; (3) the stage of the proceedings at the time of the request for postponement; and (4) any other such matters as justice may require. 17 C.F.R. § 201.161(b). These factors favor postponement here.

Murphy's appeal was filed only three weeks ago and there have been no previous postponements. Moreover, consolidating this appeal with the Arbitration Expungement Appeals to resolve the jurisdictional question would promote administrative efficiency and avoid the need for the parties to file briefs which repeat the same arguments made in *Kaplow*.³

The jurisdictional issue has been fully briefed in *Kaplow* and, accordingly, consolidation for purposes of resolving this issue and postponing further briefing serves the interests of speed and efficiency. Accordingly, the Commission should grant FINRA's motion.

Respectfully submitted,



Megan Rauch
Associate General Counsel
FINRA
1735 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 728-8863

October 23, 2019

³ The Commission allowed the other applicants in the Expungement Arbitration Appeals to file a supplemental brief (not to exceed 2,000 words) to raise legal arguments relevant to jurisdiction not already addressed in the briefs in *Kaplow* and the other consolidated appeals. See *Order Consolidating Proceedings and Postponing Further Briefing*, 2019 SEC LEXIS 731, at *9. The Commission should follow a similar procedure here.

Exhibit A

Document: 2019 SEC LEXIS 731

2019 SEC LEXIS 731

Copy Citation

In the Matter of the Applications of BART STEVEN KAPLOW, DARYL ANDREW COLE, FRANK CUENCA, THOMAS PRENTICE, KURT JACKSON, BROCK MOSELY, RONALD R. WETZEL, PETER A. RAMSAY, DONALD ANTHONY WOJNOWSKI, MARK VERNON ROTTLER, CARL G. GORDINIER, and TIMOTHY ARTHUR VANDERVER III For Review of Action Taken by FINRA

Admin. Proc. File Nos. 3-18877, 3-18879, 3-18883, 3-18894, 3-18910, 3-18919, 3-18934, 3-18988, 3-19013, 3-19016, 3-19017, and 3-19019

Securities and Exchange Commission

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 Release No. 85509

April 4, 2019

SEC Decisions, Orders & Releases

Reporter

2019 SEC LEXIS 731 *

Core Terms

consolidate, postpone, jurisdictional question, arbitration, supplemental brief

Action

[*1] ORDER CONSOLIDATING PROCEEDINGS AND POSTPONING FURTHER BRIEFING

Text

On January 31, 2019, FINRA filed a motion to stay proceedings in several applications for review of FINRA action. These applications challenge FINRA action declining to permit associated persons of member firms to use FINRA's arbitration forum to seek expungement of prior adverse arbitration awards arising from customer disputes. We

consolidate the twelve proceedings listed in the caption above for purposes of a decision on the Commission's jurisdiction based on the briefs filed in *Bart Steven Kaplow* and pursuant to this order.

Background

Each proceeding appears to involve the same common jurisdictional facts. [1](#) The applicant is an associated person of a FINRA member firm. A FINRA arbitration panel previously issued an adverse arbitration award against the applicant in a customer dispute. The applicant never moved in court to vacate the award. Instead, the applicant filed with FINRA's Office of Dispute Resolution a statement of claim seeking to have FINRA expunge the award from its publicly accessible BrokerCheck records. The Director of FINRA's Office of Dispute Resolution determined that requests to [*2](#) expunge prior adverse arbitration awards arising from customer disputes are not eligible for arbitration under FINRA's rules. [2](#) The applicant then filed an application for review of FINRA's action challenging the Director's determination.

We issued orders scheduling briefs in several of these proceedings directing the parties to brief whether the Commission has jurisdiction under Section 19(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to consider the application for review. [3](#) Briefing in *Kaplow* is complete. [4](#) Opening and response briefs have been filed in some proceedings, and the Commission has not issued orders scheduling briefs in still other proceedings. [*3](#) Several of the briefs filed so far have been materially identical to those in *Kaplow*.

FINRA moves, "[i]n light of the common issues raised" in these proceedings, for an order expediting consideration [*4](#) of the threshold jurisdictional question in *Kaplow* and staying proceedings in the other appeals. [5](#) According to FINRA, it "will present the same core argument on jurisdiction" in each case. *Kaplow* "takes no position on FINRA's" motion. The other applicants have filed materially identical oppositions to FINRA's motion. These applicants assert that staying their cases would impose "continuing harm" on the applicant's "reputation and livelihood" because it would "extend[] the time" for a decision on the merits--and thus the time the adverse arbitration award is reported on their BrokerCheck records.

Analysis [*5](#)

We construe FINRA's request to resolve the "common issue" in these cases by issuing a decision in the *Kaplow* appeal as a request to consolidate these cases for purposes of the jurisdictional question. We have determined to consolidate the proceedings identified in the caption above limited to the question of the Commission's appellate jurisdiction. [6](#) Commission Rule of Practice 201(a) provides that we may consolidate "proceedings involving a common question of law or fact . . . for hearing of any or all the matters at issue in such proceedings." [7](#) These proceedings all involve a common question of law: whether Exchange Act Section 19(d) authorizes the Commission to review the FINRA Dispute Resolution Director's determination that an expungement claim is not eligible for arbitration under FINRA's rules. These proceedings also share a common fact pattern relevant to the FINRA action at issue. We conclude it is appropriate to consolidate these proceedings limited to the jurisdictional question.

[*6](#)

We further construe FINRA's request that we stay the appeals other than *Kaplow* as a request to postpone further briefing in those cases pursuant to Commission Rule of Practice 161, which authorizes us to order postponements for "good cause shown." [8](#) Under Rule 161(b), the factors the Commission must consider in determining whether to grant a postponement as relevant here are: (i) the length of the proceeding to date, (ii) the number of postponements, adjournments, or extensions already granted, (iii) the stage of the proceedings at the time of the request, and (iv) any other such matters as justice may require. [9](#) Each factor favors FINRA here.

The Commission received FINRA's motion [*7](#) on January 31, 2019, before briefing orders issued in several of the appeals at issue. No previous extensions or postponements have been granted. Consolidating the cases to resolve the jurisdictional question and postponing further briefing would promote administrative efficiency. Postponing further briefing would obviate the need for the parties to file briefs repeating the same arguments on the jurisdictional question.

We disagree with the Applicants that by consolidating the appeals for purposes of briefing and deciding the jurisdictional issue a decision on the merits will be delayed. FINRA is not requesting that we postpone a decision on the merits. Instead, FINRA requests that we postpone jurisdictional briefing in the cases other than *Kaplow* to save the parties the time and expense of filing parallel, materially identical jurisdictional briefs in each case. Applicants do not explain how requiring jurisdictional briefs to be filed individually in each of the cases would expedite a decision on jurisdiction, let alone decisions on the merits. [10](#)

[*8](#)

In any case, no applicant has argued that the *Kaplow* briefs inadequately address the jurisdictional question or that the applicant would be prejudiced if he could not supplement those briefs. Although several applicants have noted that their counsel do not represent other applicants, we note that all counsel are directly or indirectly affiliated with the same law firm, [11](#) and the briefs that have been filed so far by counsel in the cases being consolidated have been materially identical. Based on our review of these briefs, it does not appear that jurisdictional briefing in each case would aid the Commission's decisional processes. Accordingly, we find it in the interests of justice to order consolidated briefing.

If after reviewing the *Kaplow* briefs, [12](#) and the other briefs filed thus far in the appeals being consolidated, [13](#) any applicant wishes to file a supplemental brief, such applicant may move no later than April 25, 2019, under Rule of Practice 154 for leave to do [*9] so. Applicants shall attach the proposed supplemental brief to the motion. Supplemental briefs shall not exceed 2,000 words, and shall be limited to legal arguments relevant to jurisdiction not otherwise addressed in the applicants' briefs filed in *Kaplow* and the other appeals being consolidated. [14](#) Applicants may assume the Commission is familiar with all briefs filed in *Kaplow* and in the other appeals being consolidated, including the supplemental briefs. It is not necessary to file a protective supplemental brief to join or preserve legal arguments addressed in those briefs or to be deemed to have exhausted administrative remedies before the Commission. The parties' obligations to file briefs addressing the jurisdictional issue will be satisfied by either relying on the other briefs filed in these consolidated appeals or by submitting any supplemental brief.

[*10]

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the proceedings identified in the caption above be consolidated for hearing of the jurisdictional question; and it is further

ORDERED that briefing on the jurisdictional question in these consolidated proceedings proceed as set forth above.

For the Commission, by the Office of the General Counsel and its Secretary, pursuant to delegated authority.

Load Date: 2019-04-04

SEC Decisions, Orders & Releases

Footnotes

[1](#)

All applicants are represented by counsel affiliated with the law firm HLBS Law.

[2](#)

Under FINRA's rules, the Director "may decline to permit the use of the FINRA arbitration forum if the Director determines that, given the purposes of FINRA and the intent of the Code, the subject matter of the dispute is inappropriate." FINRA Rules 12203(a), 13203(a).

[3](#)

See *Thomas Christopher Prentice*, Exchange Act Release No. 84886, 2018 WL 6696597 (Dec. 20, 2018) (order scheduling briefs); *Frank Augustine Cuenca*, Exchange Act Release No. 84792, 2018 WL 6499913 (Dec. 11, 2018) (order scheduling briefs); *Daryl Andrew Cole*, Exchange Act Release No. 84722, 2018 WL 6333612 (Dec. 4, 2018) (order scheduling briefs). Pending before the Commission are FINRA's motions to dismiss for untimeliness in *William Rosenthal*, Admin. Proc. File No. 3-18617, and *Tim Sullivan*, Admin. Proc. File No. 3-18616.

[4](#)

See <https://www.sec.gov/litigation/apdocuments/ap-3-18877.xml>.

5 On March 14, 2019, FINRA filed a second motion requesting the same relief as to applications filed after its first motion. In one of those cases, FINRA withdrew the motion and we later granted the applicant's request to dismiss the appeal as moot. *See Stephen M. Seewer*, Exchange Act Release No. 85471, 2019 WL 1424368 (March 29, 2019).

6 FINRA has not moved to consolidate and stay briefing in *Kevin Clayton Cox*, Admin. Proc. File No. 3-18980, or in a second review proceeding brought by one of the applicants listed in the caption above, *Donald Anthony Wojnowski*, Admin. Proc. File No. 3-19014. We therefore decline to consolidate those cases at this time and will issue separate briefing orders.

We do not decide FINRA's motion with respect to *Rosenthal* and *Sullivan* at this time since FINRA's motions to dismiss those appeals on timeliness grounds are pending before the Commission.

7 Rule of Practice 201(a), 17 C.F.R. § 201.201(a).

8 Rule of Practice 161(a), 17 C.F.R. § 201.161(a).

9 Rule of Practice 161(b), 17 C.F.R. § 201.161(b).

10 FINRA requests "expedited consideration" of the jurisdictional question. The Rules of Practice do not provide for expedited consideration of a specific question in an appeal from SRO action. *See, e.g.*, Rule of Practice 400(b), 17 C.F.R. § 201.400(b) (petition for "interlocutory review of a hearing officer's ruling"); Rule of Practice 401(d)(3) 17 C.F.R. § 201.401(d)(3) (motion to stay SRO actions that have "already taken effect" or "will, by [their] terms, take effect within five days"); Rule of Practice 401(e)(3) (motions to lift stay of Public Company Accounting Oversight Board action); Rule of Practice 411(e), 17 C.F.R. § 201.411(e) (request for Commission to determine whether to order on its own initiative review of hearing officer's decision); Rule of Practice 500, 17 C.F.R. § 201.500 (temporary orders and suspensions).

11 *See supra* note 1.

12 *See* <https://www.sec.gov/litigation/apdocuments/ap-3-18877.xml>.

13 *See* <https://www.sec.gov/litigation/apdocuments/ap-open-fileno-asc.xml>

14 Rule of Practice 154, 17 C.F.R. § 201.154.

Content Type: Administrative Materials

Terms: 2019 SEC LEXIS 731

Narrow By: Sources: SEC Decisions, Orders & Releases Content Type: Administrative Materials

Date and Time: Oct 21, 2019 05:05:54 p.m. EDT



[About
LexisNexis®](#)

[Privacy
Policy](#)

[Terms &
Conditions](#)

[Sign
Out](#)

Copyright
© 2019
LexisNexis.
All rights
reserved.

RELX Group™

[Print](#)