UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Before the SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940 Release No. 4394 / May 26, 2016

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING File No. 3-17261

In the Matter of

JACQUELINE J. STANFILL

Respondent.

ORDER INSTITUTING ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO SECTION 203(f) OF THE INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940, MAKING FINDINGS, AND IMPOSING REMEDIAL SANCTIONS

I.

The Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") deems it appropriate and in the public interest that public administrative proceedings be, and hereby are, instituted pursuant to Section 203(f) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 ("Advisers Act") against Jacqueline Stanfill ("Respondent" or "Stanfill").

II.

In anticipation of the institution of these proceedings, Respondent has submitted an Offer of Settlement (the "Offer") which the Commission has determined to accept. Solely for the purpose of these proceedings and any other proceedings brought by or on behalf of the Commission, or to which the Commission is a party, Respondent admits the Commission's jurisdiction over her and the subject matter of these proceedings, and the findings contained in Sections III.1., III.2., and III.3. below, and consents to the entry of this Order Instituting Administrative Proceedings Pursuant to Section 203(f) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, Making Findings, and Imposing Remedial Sanctions ("Order"), as set forth below.

On the basis of this Order and Respondent's Offer, the Commission finds that

1. Stanfill was the owner and operator of Stanfill Wealth Management, LLC, a currently inactive Tennessee limited liability company formed in 2004. Stanfill Wealth Management, LLC, which provided investment advisory services, was not registered with the Commission. From approximately 1997 to 2005 Stanfill was a registered representative associated with broker-dealers registered with the Commission. Stanfill, 58 years old, is a former resident of Knoxville, Tennessee.

2. On January 11, 2016, Stanfill pled guilty to one count of wire fraud, one count of mail fraud, and one count of money laundering in violation of Title 18 United States Code, Sections 1343, 1341, and 1957 respectively, before the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee, in <u>United States v. Jacqueline Stanfill</u>, Criminal Docket No. 3:15-CR-108 (2015). On April 4, 2016, Stanfill was sentenced to serve 108 months in federal prison and ordered to pay over \$8 million in restitution.

3. The counts of criminal information to which Stanfill pled guilty alleged, <u>inter alia</u> that between 2008 and January 20, 2015, through Stanfill Wealth Management, LLC, Stanfill purported to invest money on behalf of clients with legitimate investment companies. Instead of investing the money however, Stanfill converted the clients' funds to her own personal use. In order to maintain the confidence of her clients, Stanfill created phony documents that had the appearance of account statements and correspondence from a nationally-known registered broker-dealer. Stanfill further attempted to maintain the confidence of her clients by making payments, either to clients under the guise of returning invested funds and accumulated earnings, and/or by sending funds to the Internal Revenue Service to maintain the illusion that the clients' fictitious investments were tax-deferred.

IV.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission deems it appropriate and in the public interest to impose the sanctions agreed to in Respondent Stanfill's Offer.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED pursuant to Section 203(f) of the Advisers Act, that Respondent Stanfill be, and hereby is barred from association with any broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer, municipal advisor, transfer agent, or nationally recognized statistical rating organization. Any reapplication for association by the Respondent will be subject to the applicable laws and regulations governing the reentry process, and reentry may be conditioned upon a number of factors, including, but not limited to, the satisfaction of any or all of the following: (a) any disgorgement ordered against the Respondent, whether or not the Commission has fully or partially waived payment of such disgorgement; (b) any arbitration award related to the conduct that served as the basis for the Commission order; (c) any self-regulatory organization arbitration award to a customer, whether or not related to the conduct that served as the basis for the Commission order; and (d) any restitution order by a self-regulatory organization, whether or not related to the conduct that served as the basis for the Commission order.

By the Commission.

Brent J. Fields Secretary