

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 54814 / November 22, 2006

Administrative Proceeding
File No. 3-12485

IN THE MATTER OF SCOTT W. BROCKOP

The United States Securities and Exchange Commission (Commission) announced the issuance of an Order Instituting Administrative Proceedings Pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Exchange Act) and Notice of Hearing (Order) against Scott W. Brockop of Edison, New Jersey.

The Division of Enforcement (Division) alleges in the Order that on October 26, 2006, in the civil action entitled Securities and Exchange Commission v. iShopNoMarkup.com, Inc., et al., Civil Action Number 04-CV-4057, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York entered a final judgment by default against Brockop permanently enjoining him from violating Sections 5 and 17(a) of the Securities Act of 1933, Sections 10(b) and 15(a) of the Exchange Act, and Rule 10b-5 thereunder. The complaint in the civil action alleged that from approximately December 1999 through June 2000, Brockop acted as an unregistered broker. Specifically, Brockop served as Vice President of Sales and Marketing for iShopNoMarkup.com, Inc. (iShop), a start-up Nevada corporation. Brockop's primary responsibility was to direct iShop's efforts to solicit investors to purchase stock in iShop's private placements. Specifically, iShop ran a "boiler room" operation, where permanent and temporary employees cold-called potential investors. Brockop directed the daily operations of this "boiler room." iShop's salespeople, including Brockop, actively solicited investors to purchase iShop stock. Brockop and the salespeople he supervised made material misrepresentations to investors to induce them to purchase iShop stock. Through the offerings, iShop sold approximately 6,748,600 shares of stock to over 350 investors, and obtained proceeds of approximately \$2.3 million.

A hearing will be scheduled before an administrative law judge to determine whether the allegations contained in the Order are true, to provide Respondent Brockop an opportunity to dispute the allegations, and to determine what, if any, remedial action is appropriate and in the public interest pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act. The Order requires the Administrative Law Judge to issue an initial decision no later than 210 days from the date of service of the Order, pursuant to Rule 360(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice.