

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
June 2, 2005

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-11938

In the Matter of

**Thomas Steinbach, Ashley
Sosner, Tim Rice, Howard
Kerbel, Barry Berman, Vincent
Barone, and Bruce Biddick,**

Respondents.

**ORDER INSTITUTING ADMINISTRATIVE
PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO SECTION
15(b) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE
ACT OF 1934 AND NOTICE OF HEARING**

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 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”), against Thomas Steinbach (“Steinbach”), Ashley Sosner (“Sosner”), Tim Rice (“Rice”), Howard Kerbel (“Kerbel”), Barry Berman (“Berman”), Vincent Barone (“Barone”), and Bruce Biddick (“Biddick”) (collectively the “Respondents”).

II.

After an investigation, the Division of Enforcement alleges that the Respondents have each been convicted of a felony as set forth below:

A. Steinbach

1. Steinbach was the director and vice president of Integrated Homes, Inc., (“INHI”) from on or about February 9, 2001 through on or about April 16, 2001. Steinbach, 46 years old, is a resident of Mountain Lakes, New Jersey.

2. Steinbach participated in an offering of INHI, which is a penny stock.

3. On April 30, 2003, Steinbach pled guilty to one count of conspiracy to commit wire fraud, mail fraud and securities fraud in violation of Title 18 United States Code, Section 371 before the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, in United States v. Thomas Steinbach, Criminal Indictment No. 02-20452-CR-GRAHAM. On September 12, 2003, a judgment in the criminal case was entered against Steinbach. Steinbach was sentenced to a prison term of 21 months followed by three years of supervised release.

4. The count of the criminal indictment to which Steinbach pled guilty alleged, inter alia, that Steinbach and his co-defendants conspired to unjustly enrich themselves by defrauding a fictitious foreign mutual fund (the “mutual fund”), by artificially affecting the supply and demand for INHI stock and by inflating the price of INHI stock through illegal means. The count of the criminal indictment also alleged that the purpose and object of the conspiracy was for Steinbach and his co-defendants to unjustly enrich themselves by defrauding the public shareholders of INHI.

B. Sosner and Rice

1. Sosner was a registered representative affiliated with several securities broker-dealers registered with the Commission from, in or about August 1999, to in or about August 2002. Sosner, 36 years old, is a resident of Boca Raton, Florida.

2. Rice owned large amounts of Equity Technologies & Resources, Inc. (“ETCR”) stock from, in or about August 1999 to in or about August 2002. Rice, 41 years old, is a resident of League City, Texas.

3. Sosner and Rice participated in an offering of ETCR, a penny stock.

4. On November 15, 2002, Sosner pled guilty to one count of conspiracy to commit securities fraud in violation of Title 18 United States Code, Section 371 before the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, in United States v. Ashley Sosner, et al., Criminal Indictment No. 02-60165-CR-DIMITROULEAS. On January 5, 2004, a judgment in the criminal case was entered against Sosner. Sosner was sentenced to probation for a term of five years, 250 hours of community service and special conditions of supervision.

5. On January 3, 2003, Rice pled guilty to one count of conspiracy to commit securities fraud in violation of Title 18 United States Code, Section 371 before the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, in United States v. Tim Rice, et al., Criminal Indictment No. 02-60165-CR-DIMITROLEAS. On September 12, 2003, a judgment in the criminal case was entered against Rice. Rice was sentenced to probation for a term of five years.

6. The count of the criminal indictment to which Sosner and Rice pled guilty alleged, inter alia, that Sosner, Rice, and their co-defendants conspired to unjustly enrich themselves by defrauding the mutual fund through paying undisclosed kickbacks to certain persons affiliated with the mutual fund in exchange for causing the mutual fund to purchase large amounts of overpriced ETCR stock and Movie-O-Network, Inc. (“MVEO”) stock from Sosner, Rice, and

their co-defendants. The count of the criminal indictment also alleged that the purpose and objective of the conspiracy was for Sosner, Rice and their co-defendants to unjustly enrich themselves by defrauding the shareholders of ETCR and MVEO by artificially affecting the supply and demand for ETCR and MVEO stock in order to inflate the market price of these stocks through illegal means.

C. Kerbel, Berman, and Barone

1. Kerbel was the founder of ThermoElastic Technologies, Inc. (“TMRO”) and controlled a significant amount of TMRO stock. Kerbel, a resident of Toronto, Ontario Canada, is 61 years old.

2. Berman was the founder of TMRO and controlled a significant amount of TMRO stock. Berman, a resident of Toronto, Ontario, Canada, is 70 years old

3. Barone was a stock promoter.

4. Kerbel, Berman, and Barone participated in an offering of TMRO, which is a penny stock.

5. On March 14, 2003, Kerbel and Berman pled guilty to one count of conspiracy to commit wire fraud, mail fraud and securities fraud in violation of Title 18 United States Code, Section 371 before the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, in United States v. Howard E. Kerbel, Barry Berman, and Vincent Barone, et al., Criminal Indictment No. 02-20547-CR-HUCK. On March 21, 2003, Barone pled guilty to the same count. On June 25, 2003, judgments in the criminal case were entered against Kerbel, Berman and Barone. Kerbel, Berman and Barone were each sentenced to a prison term of 18 months followed by three years of supervised release including community service.

6. The count of the criminal indictment to which Kerbel, Berman and Barone pled guilty alleged, inter alia, that Kerbel, Berman, Barone and their co-defendants conspired to unjustly enrich themselves by defrauding the mutual fund, by artificially affecting the supply and demand for TMRO stock and by inflating the price of TMRO stock through illegal means. It was also alleged that the purpose and object of the conspiracy for Kerbel, Berman, Barone and their co-defendants was to unjustly enrich themselves by defrauding the public shareholders of TMRO.

D. Biddick

1. Biddick was an owner, registered principal and a securities broker at Centex Securities, Inc., a securities broker-dealer registered with the Commission. Biddick, 47 years old, is a resident of San Diego, California.

2. Biddick participated in an offering of Digital Concepts International, Inc. (“DCII”), which is a penny stock.

3. On April 7, 2003, Biddick pled guilty to one count of conspiracy to commit wire fraud, mail fraud and securities fraud in violation of Title 18 United States Code, Section 371 before the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, in United States v. Bruce Biddick, Criminal Indictment No. 03-CR-534-ALL. On August 22, 2003, a judgment in the criminal case was entered against Biddick. Biddick was sentenced to a prison term of four months followed by three years of supervised release. Biddick was also ordered to pay a fine in the amount of \$4,000.

4. The count of the criminal indictment to which Biddick pled guilty alleged, inter alia, that Biddick and his co-defendant conspired to unjustly enrich themselves by defrauding the mutual fund, through paying undisclosed kickbacks to an undercover agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigations and certain persons affiliated with the Fund, in exchange for their causing the Fund to purchase a large amount of overpriced DCII stock.

III.

In view of the allegations made by the Division of Enforcement, the Commission deems it necessary and appropriate in the public interest that public administrative proceedings be instituted to determine:

A. Whether the allegations set forth in Section II are true and, in connection therewith, to afford the Respondents an opportunity to establish any defenses to such allegations;

B. Whether, pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act, it is appropriate and in the public interest to bar Respondents from participating in any offering of penny stock, including: acting as a promoter, finder, consultant, agent or other person who engages in activities with a broker, dealer or issuer for purposes of the issuance or trading in any penny stock; or inducing or attempting to induce the purchase or sale of any penny stock; and

C. What, if any, additional remedial action is necessary and appropriate in the public interest against Sosner and Biddick, pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act.

IV.

IT IS ORDERED that a public hearing for the purpose of taking evidence on the questions set forth in Section III hereof shall be convened at a time and place to be fixed, and before an Administrative Law Judge to be designated by further order as provided by Rule 110 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.110.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that each Respondent shall file an Answer to the allegations contained in this Order within twenty (20) days after service of this Order, as provided by Rule 220 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.220.

If any Respondent fails to file the directed answer, or fails to appear at a hearing after being duly notified, that Respondent may be deemed in default and the proceedings may be determined

against him upon consideration of this Order, the allegations of which may be deemed to be true as provided by Rules 155(a), 220(f), 221(f) and 310 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a), 201.220(f), 201.221(f) and 201.310.

This Order shall be served forthwith upon each Respondent personally or by certified mail.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Administrative Law Judge shall issue an initial decision no later than 210 days from the date of service of this Order, pursuant to Rule 360(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice.

In the absence of an appropriate waiver, no officer or employee of the Commission engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions in this or any factually related proceeding will be permitted to participate or advise in the decision of this matter, except as witness or counsel in proceedings held pursuant to notice. Since this proceeding is not "rule making" within the meaning of Section 551 of the Administrative Procedure Act, it is not deemed subject to the provisions of Section 553 delaying the effective date of any final Commission action.

By the Commission.

Jonathan G. Katz
Secretary