amendments to Rule G–48, generally reflect a unified approach to SMMP status, which would require additional affirmations by the customer regarding the customer's sophistication on certain matters to qualify for SMMP status and which would result in exemptions from certain associated MSRB rules for dealer transactions with SMMPs. Relevant to the proposed best execution obligation for dealers, the proposed amendments to the SMMP definition would require an additional affirmation by the customer that the customer is exercising independent judgment in evaluating the quality of the dealer's execution of the customer's transactions in order for the customer to qualify for SMMP status and the proposed amendments to Rule G–48 would provide an exemption from a dealer's best execution obligation to customers for transactions with SMMPs. The Commission requests comment on the proposed unified approach to SMMP status, including the particular context of the proposed best execution obligations for dealers. The Commission requests comment on whether or not there are circumstances in which an otherwise-eligible SMMP may prefer to affirm that it is exercising independent judgment in evaluating the recommendations of a dealer and not be covered by the protections of the dealer's obligation to conduct a customer-specific suitability analysis, but not to affirm that it is exercising independent judgment with respect to the dealer's quality of execution of the SMMP's transactions and remain protected by the proposed best execution obligation imposed on dealers. Commenters also are invited to provide comments regarding the required customer affirmations generally under the SMMP definition.

Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments

- Use the Commission's Internet comment form (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*); or
- Send an email to *rule-comments@sec.gov.* Please include File Number SR–MSRB–2014–07 on the subject line.

Paper Comments

- Send paper comments in triplicate to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549.

All submissions should refer to File Number SR–MSRB–2014–07. This file number should be included on the subject line if email is used. To help the Commission process and review your comments more efficiently, please use only one method. The Commission will post all comments on the Commission's Internet Web site (*http://www.sec.gov/rules/sro.shtml*). Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for Web site viewing and printing in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 100 F Street NE., Washington, DC 20549 on official business days between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Copies of the filing also will be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the MSRB. All comments received will be posted without change; the Commission does not edit personal identifying information from submissions. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly. All submissions should refer to File Number SR–MSRB–2014–07 and should be submitted on or before September 29, 2014.

For the Commission, pursuant to delegated authority.[36]

Kevin M. O'Neill,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014–21249 Filed 9–5–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–72955; File No. SR–EDGX–2014–05]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; EDGX Exchange, Inc.; Notice of Withdrawal of Proposed Rule Change To Adopt a New Order Type Called the Mid-Point Discretionary Order

September 2, 2014.

On March 7, 2014, EDGX Exchange, Inc. (''Exchange'' or ''EDGX'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'') [1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] a proposed rule change to amend its rules to add a new order type called the Mid-Point Discretionary Order (''MDO'') and to reflect the priority of MDOs. The proposed rule change was published for comment in the **Federal Register** on March 25, 2014.[3] On May 2, 2014, the Commission extended the time period in which to either approve or disapprove the proposed rule change to June 23, 2014.[4] On June 20, 2014, the Commission instituted proceedings to determine whether to approve or disapprove the proposed rule change.[5] The Commission received no comment letters on the proposed rule change. On August 22, 2014, EDGX withdrew the proposed rule change (SR–EDGX–2014–05).

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.[6]

Kevin M. O'Neill,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014–21248 Filed 9–5–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[File No. 500–1]

In the Matter of Bay Acquisition Corp. (a/k/a SecureLogic Corp.) (n/k/a Goozex Holdings, Inc.), BTHC XV, Inc., Caleco Pharma Corp., and CareAdvantage, Inc., Order of Suspension of Trading

September 4, 2014.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Bay Acquisition Corp. (a/k/a SecureLogic Corp.) (n/k/a Goozex Holdings, Inc.) because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended September 30, 2012.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of BTHC XV, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended December 31, 2011.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Caleco Pharma Corp. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended April 30, 2011.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a

[36] 17 CFR § 200.30–3(a)(12).

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 71747 (March 19, 2014), 79 FR 16401.

[4] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 72086 (May 2, 2014), 79 FR 26473 (May 8, 2014).

[5] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 72445 (June 20, 2014), 79 FR 36354 (June 26, 2014).

[6] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(31).