

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
June 26, 2007

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-12670

In the Matter of

GARY J. SPIRK,

Respondent.

**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 Gary J. Spirk (“Respondent” or “Spirk”).

II.

After an investigation, the Division of Enforcement alleges that:

A. RESPONDENT

1. Respondent was involved in both the nine-month promissory note offerings of Security Asset Capital Corporation and Apacor Financial, Inc.; he was the sole principal of Secure Investments, which sold the unregistered notes from each offering through a network of independent insurance agents in Pennsylvania whom he had recruited. Respondent had been involved with such unregistered promissory note offerings in the past. Respondent is 53 years old and resides in Washington Borough, Pennsylvania. He has never been registered with the Commission in any capacity.

B. ENTRY OF THE INJUNCTION

2. On June 12, 2007, a final judgment was entered against Spirk, on his default, permanently enjoining him from future violations of Sections 5(a), 5(c), and 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”), Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, and Section 15(a)(1) of the Exchange Act, in the civil action entitled Securities and Exchange Commission v. Security Asset Capital Corporation, et al., Civil Action Number 04-CV-0683, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

3. The complaint alleges that defendants, including Respondent, made material misrepresentations and omissions in the offering of nine-month promissory notes, whereby investors were promised secure investments with 12% (or more) annual returns, but instead lost their money. The alleged misrepresentations and omissions related to, among other things, the use of the offering proceeds and the risks associated with the investment. Specifically, the complaint alleges that, contrary to representations, at the time of the offerings each of these issuers was in dire financial circumstances, and that offering proceeds were used, not for the purchase of productive assets as promised, but, largely, to pay commissions, officers’ salaries and personal expenses, and to pay interest to prior investors. The complaint further alleges that, from these offerings of promissory notes, Security Asset raised approximately \$7 million and Apacor raised approximately \$1.5 million. Finally, the complaint alleges that no registration statement was in effect as to these promissory notes; nor were they exempt from registration, and that Respondent, in connection with the charged conduct, acted as an unregistered broker-dealer.

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 Respondent an opportunity to establish any defenses to such allegations; and

B. What, if any, remedial action is appropriate in the public interest against Respondent 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 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 Respondent fails to file the directed answer, or fails to appear at a hearing after being duly notified, the 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 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.

For the Commission, by its Secretary, pursuant to delegated authority.

Nancy M. Morris
Secretary