

1 LYNN M. DEAN (Cal. Bar No. 205562)  
 Email: deanl@sec.gov  
 2 ROBERTO A. TERCERO (Cal. Bar No. 143760)  
 Email: terceror@sec.gov

3 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
 4 Securities and Exchange Commission  
 Michele Wein Layne, Regional Director  
 5 Alka N. Patel, Associate Regional Director  
 Amy Jane Longo Regional Trial Counsel  
 6 444 S. Flower Street, Suite 900  
 Los Angeles, California 90071  
 7 Telephone: (323) 965-3998  
 Facsimile: (213) 443-1904

8  
 9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 10 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
 11 **Western Division**

12 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
 13 COMMISSION,  
 14 Applicant,  
 15 vs.  
 16 ANDREW T.E. COLDICUTT and  
 17 LAW OFFICE OF ANDREW  
 COLDICUTT,  
 18 Respondents.

Case No. 2:17-cv-03888-CAS (AFMx)

**[PROPOSED] ORDER TO SHOW  
 CAUSE WHY AN ORDER  
 COMPELLING COMPLIANCE  
 WITH INVESTIGATIVE  
 SUBPOENAS SHOULD NOT BE  
 ISSUED**

1           The Applicant, the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”), having filed  
2 an Application for an Order to Show Cause and an Application for Order Compelling  
3 Compliance with Investigative Subpoenas against Respondents Andrew T.E.  
4 Coldicutt and the Law Office of Andrew Coldicutt (collectively, “Respondents”), the  
5 Court having considered the Application and documents filed in support thereof, and  
6 good cause having been shown, the Court being fully briefed in the matter, and there  
7 being no just cause for delay:

8           IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the SEC’s Application for an Order to Show  
9 Cause Why an Order Compelling Compliance with Investigative Subpoenas should  
10 not be issued is GRANTED.

11           IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that on July 31, 2017, at 10:00 a.m., or as soon  
12 thereafter as the parties can be heard, the Respondents shall appear before the  
13 Honorable Christina A. Snyder, United States District Court, in Courtroom 8D, 8th  
14 Floor, located at United States Courthouse, 350 West First Street, Los Angeles,  
15 California 90012-4565, to show cause, if there be any, why this Court should not  
16 issue an Order (“Order Compelling Compliance”) that:

17           a)       finds that (1) Respondents have failed to comply with the Court’s  
18 June 8, 2017 Order [Dkt. 15]; (2) Respondents have failed to meet their burden to  
19 establish that the documents responsive to the SEC’s May 2016 investigative  
20 subpoenas that were withheld on the grounds that they are privileged were in fact  
21 privileged, and (3) that Respondents have therefore waived any such privilege; and

22           b)       directs the Respondents to produce without any further delay all  
23 documents responsive to the SEC’s May 2016 investigative subpoenas that were  
24 withheld on the grounds that they are privileged.

25           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any papers in opposition to the issuance of  
26 said Order Compelling Compliance shall be filed by the Respondents with this Court  
27 and served on the SEC’s Los Angeles Regional Office at 444 S. Flower Street, 9th  
28

1 Floor, Los Angeles, California 90071, such that they arrive no later than 5:00  
2 p.m. (PT), on July 17, 2017.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any reply papers in support of the issuance  
4 of said Order Compelling Compliance shall be filed by the Respondents with this  
5 Court and served on the Respondents' counsel, Estevan R. Lucero, Lucero Law Firm  
6 APC, 3517 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 200, San Diego, CA 92108, such that they  
7 arrive no later than 5:00 p.m. (PT), on July 24, 2017.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that service of this Order to Show Cause, and  
9 any papers in opposition to the issuance of said Order, or any reply papers, may be  
10 accomplished by electronic mail, facsimile, United Parcel Service or personal service.

11  
12 Dated: July 7, 2017



13  
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15 HON. CHRISTINA A. SNYDER  
16 U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28