

and revisions, the Directorate ensures that only useful, non-redundant information is collected. These efforts will reduce excessive reporting burdens.

**Burden on the Public:** The Directorate estimates that an average of five minutes is expended for each proposal submitted. An estimated 6,000 responses are expected during the course of one year for a total of 500 public burden hours annually.

**Expected Respondents:** Individuals.

**Estimated Number of Responses:** 6,000.

**Estimated Number of Respondents:** 6,000.

**Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:** 500 hours.

**Frequency of Responses:** On occasion.

Dated: June 14, 2006.

**Catherine J. Hines,**

*Acting Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.*

[FR Doc. 06-5524 Filed 6-16-06; 8:45am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-M**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[File No. 500-1]

### In the Matter of America's Sports Voice, Inc. (n/k/a Milagro Holdings, Inc.), Dawcin International Corp., and Trans Continental Entertainment Group, Inc.; Order of Suspension of Trading

June 15, 2006.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of America's Sports Voice, Inc. (n/k/a Milagro Holdings, Inc.) because it has not filed a periodic report since the period ended June 30, 2001.

It also appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Dawcin International Corp. because it has not filed a periodic report since the period ended March 31, 1997.

It also appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Trans Continental Entertainment Group, Inc. because it has not filed a periodic report since the period ended January 31, 2003.

The Commission is of the opinion that the public interest and the protection of investors require a suspension of trading in the securities of the above-listed companies.

Therefore, *it is ordered that*, pursuant to Section 12(k) of the Securities

Exchange Act of 1934, trading in the above-listed companies is suspended for the period from 9:30 a.m. e.d.t. on June 15, 2006, through 11:59 p.m. e.d.t. on June 28, 2006.

By the Commission.

**Nancy M. Morris,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 06-5531 Filed 6-15-06; 11:24 am]

**BILLING CODE 8010-01-P**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-53973; File No. SR-Amex-2006-34]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; American Stock Exchange LLC; Order Approving Proposed Rule Change Relating to Minor Rule Violations and the Bunching of Odd-Lot Orders

June 12, 2006.

On April 12, 2006, the American Stock Exchange LLC ("Amex" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission"), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act")<sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> a proposed rule change to include violations of its rule governing the bunching of odd-lot orders (Amex Rule 208) in Amex Rule 590, its Minor Rule Violation Plan ("Plan"). The proposed rule change was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on May 10, 2006.<sup>3</sup> The Commission received no comments regarding the proposal.

The Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities exchange.<sup>4</sup> In particular, the Commission believes that the proposal is consistent with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act,<sup>5</sup> because handling violations of Amex Rule 208 pursuant to the Plan would enable prompt resolution of such violations in the interest of protecting investors and the public interest. The Commission also believes that the proposal is consistent with Sections 6(b)(1) and 6(b)(6) of the Act,<sup>6</sup> which require that the rules of an exchange enforce compliance with, and provide

appropriate discipline for, violations of Commission and Exchange rules. In addition, because existing Amex Rule 590 provides procedural rights to a person fined under the Plan to contest the fine and permits a hearing on the matter, the Commission believes the Plan, as amended by this proposal, provides a fair procedure for the disciplining of members and persons associated with members, consistent with Sections 6(b)(7) and 6(d)(1) of the Act.<sup>7</sup>

Finally, the Commission finds that the proposal is consistent with the public interest, the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act, as required by Rule 19d-1(c)(2) under the Act<sup>8</sup> which governs minor rule violation plans. The Commission believes that the change to the Plan will strengthen the Exchange's ability to carry out its oversight and enforcement responsibilities as a self-regulatory organization in cases where full disciplinary proceedings are unsuitable in view of the minor nature of the particular violation.

In approving this proposed rule change, the Commission in no way minimizes the importance of compliance with Amex rules and all other rules subject to the imposition of fines under the Plan. The Commission believes that the violation of any self-regulatory organization's rules, as well as Commission rules, is a serious matter. However, the Plan provides a reasonable means of addressing rule violations that do not rise to the level of requiring formal disciplinary proceedings, while providing greater flexibility in handling certain violations. The Commission expects that Amex will continue to conduct surveillance with due diligence and make determinations based on its findings, on a case-by-case basis, as to whether a fine of more or less than the recommended amount is appropriate for a violation of Amex Rule 208 under the Plan or whether such a violation requires formal disciplinary action.

*It is therefore ordered*, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act<sup>9</sup> and Rule 19d-1(c)(2) under the Act,<sup>10</sup> that the proposed rule change (SR-Amex-2006-34) be, and hereby is, approved and declared effective.

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

<sup>3</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 53749 (May 2, 2006), 71 FR 27298.

<sup>4</sup> In approving this proposed rule change, the Commission notes that it has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. See 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

<sup>5</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

<sup>6</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(1) and 78f(b)(6).

<sup>7</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(7) and 78f(d)(1).

<sup>8</sup> 17 CFR 240.19d-1(c)(2).

<sup>9</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

<sup>10</sup> 17 CFR 240.19d-1(c)(2).

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.<sup>11</sup>

Nancy M. Morris,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E6-9579 Filed 6-16-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-53976; File No. SR-CBOE-2006-39]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated; Order Approving a Proposed Rule Change Regarding the e-DPM Membership Ownership Requirement

June 12, 2006.

On April 20, 2006, the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Incorporated ("CBOE" or "Exchange") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission"), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act")<sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> a proposed rule change to clarify the membership ownership requirements for e-DPMs set forth in CBOE Rule 8.92(d). Specifically, the proposal clarifies that a parent company of an e-DPM entity may own or lease the required memberships on behalf of the e-DPM entity provided such memberships are dedicated solely to the e-DPM organization's e-DPM activity. The proposed rule change was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on May 12, 2006.<sup>3</sup> The Commission received no comments on the proposal.

The Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities exchange<sup>4</sup> and, in particular, the requirements of Section 6 of the Act<sup>5</sup> and the rules and regulations thereunder. The Commission specifically finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with Section 6(b)(5) of the Act<sup>6</sup> in that it is designed to promote just and equitable principles of

trade, to remove impediments and to perfect the mechanism of a free and open market and a national market system, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest. The Commission believes that the proposal should provide more flexibility to e-DPM organizations in satisfying the membership ownership requirements of CBOE Rule 8.92.

*It is therefore ordered*, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,<sup>7</sup> that the proposed rule change (SR-CBOE-2006-39) is approved.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.<sup>8</sup>

Nancy M. Morris,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E6-9577 Filed 6-16-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-53972; File No. SR-NASD-2006-069]

### Self-Regulatory Organizations; National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change Extending the Pilot Relating To Manning Price-Improvement Standards for Decimalized Securities

June 12, 2006.

Pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act")<sup>1</sup> and Rule 19b-4 thereunder,<sup>2</sup> notice is hereby given that on June 1, 2006, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. ("NASD") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") the proposed rule change as described in Items I and II below, which Items have been prepared by NASD. NASD has designated the proposal as constituting a "non-controversial" proposed rule change under section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act<sup>3</sup> and Rule 19b-4(f)(6) thereunder,<sup>4</sup> which renders it effective upon filing with the Commission. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

### I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

NASD is proposing to extend through December 31, 2006, the current pilot price-improvement standards for decimalized securities contained in NASD Interpretive Material ("IM") 2110-2—Trading Ahead of Customer Limit Order ("Manning Rule"). There are no proposed changes to rule text.

### II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, NASD included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. NASD has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

#### A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

##### 1. Purpose

NASD's Manning Rule requires an NASD member firm to provide a minimum level of price improvement to incoming orders in Nasdaq and exchange-listed securities if the firm chooses to trade as principal with those incoming orders at prices equal to or better than customer limit orders the firm currently holds.<sup>5</sup> If a firm fails to provide the minimum level of price improvement to the incoming order, the firm must execute its held customer limit orders at the price at which the firm traded for its own account or better. Generally, if a firm fails to provide the requisite amount of price improvement and also fails to execute its held

<sup>5</sup> The Commission recently approved amendments to the Manning Rule to require members to provide price improvement to customer limit orders in certain circumstances and expand the application of the Manning Rule to exchange-listed securities. See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 52210 (August 4, 2005), 70 FR 46897 (August 11, 2005) (SR-NASD-2004-089). These amendments became effective January 2, 2006. See NASD Notice to Members 05-64.

The Commission also recently approved further amendments to the Manning Rule to codify NASD's existing position that the Manning Rule applies to all members, whether acting as a market maker or not. These amendments became effective April 14, 2006. See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 53653 (April 14, 2006), 71 FR 20429 (April 20, 2006) (SR-NASD-2006-035).

<sup>11</sup> 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12); 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(44).

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

<sup>3</sup> See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 53771 (May 8, 2006), 71 FR 27757.

<sup>4</sup> In approving this proposed rule change, the Commission notes that it has considered the proposed rule's impact on efficiency, competition, and capital formation. 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

<sup>5</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f.

<sup>6</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5).

<sup>7</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2).

<sup>8</sup> 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

<sup>2</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4.

<sup>3</sup> 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(3)(A).

<sup>4</sup> 17 CFR 240.19b-4(f)(6).