United States Securities and Exchange Commission

Securities Act of 1933 Release No. 8798 / May 2, 2007

Securities Exchange Act of 1934 Release No. 55695 / May 2, 2007

Investment Company Act of 1940 Release No. 27817 / May 2, 2007

Administrative Proceeding File No. 3-12626

In the Matter of Thomas C. Bridge, James D. Edge, and Jeffrey K. Robles

On May 2, 2007, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (Commission) issued an Order Instituting Administrative and Cease-and-Desist Proceedings Pursuant to Section 8A of the Securities Act of 1933, Sections 15(b) and 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Section 9(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (Order) against Thomas C. Bridge (Bridge), James D. Edge (Edge) and Jeffrey K. Robles (Robles) (collectively, the Respondents).

In the Order, the Division of Enforcement (Division) alleges that Bridge, a registered representative at the Boca Raton, Florida branch office of A.G. Edwards & Sons, Inc. (AG Edwards), violated certain provisions of the federal securities laws by using deceptive means to place market timing trades on behalf of a customer. The Division also alleges that Edge, the branch manager at AG Edwards' Boca Raton and Lake Worth, Florida branch offices, failed reasonably to supervise Bridge. The Division further alleges that Robles, the branch manager at AG Edwards' Boston Back Bay, Massachusetts branch office, failed reasonably to supervise Charles Sacco (Sacco), a former registered representative in that office who the Division alleges violated certain provisions of the federal securities laws by using deceptive means to place market timing trades on behalf of two customers.

The Division alleges that Bridge willfully violated Section 17(a) of the Securities Act, Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder. The Division also alleges that Edge and Robles failed reasonably to supervise Bridge and Sacco, respectively, with a view to preventing their violations of the federal securities laws.

A hearing will be scheduled before an Administrative Law Judge to determine whether the allegations contained in the Order are true, to provide the Respondents an opportunity to dispute the allegations and to determine what sanctions, if any, are appropriate and in the public interest. The Commission directed that an Administrative Law Judge shall issue an initial decision no later than 300 days from the date of service of the Order, pursuant to Rule 360(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice.