



1984

# Bibliography: State Securities Regulation

Gary David Raffel  
*University of Baltimore School of Law*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.law.ubalt.edu/ublr>



Part of the [Securities Law Commons](#)

### Recommended Citation

Raffel, Gary David (1984) "Bibliography: State Securities Regulation," *University of Baltimore Law Review*: Vol. 13: Iss. 3, Article 9.  
Available at: <http://scholarworks.law.ubalt.edu/ublr/vol13/iss3/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@University of Baltimore School of Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Baltimore Law Review by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@University of Baltimore School of Law. For more information, please contact [snolan@ubalt.edu](mailto:snolan@ubalt.edu).

# BIBLIOGRAPHY: STATE SECURITIES REGULATION

This Bibliography compiles periodical literature on state securities regulation from 1976 to the present. It does not include books, annotations, legislative studies, or judicial opinions. The most recent comprehensive bibliography was published in 1976 in L. LOSS, A COMMENTARY ON THE UNIFORM SECURITIES ACT (1976), hence the starting date of this bibliography.

The principal sources used in compiling this Bibliography include the Index to Legal Periodicals (through Vol. 77, No. 8, May 1984), and Legal Resource Index (through May 1984).

Each category in this Bibliography contains a listing by states (if applicable), and is further listed in reverse chronological order. The Bibliography is organized as follows:

- I. Security Defined
- II. Conflict of Law and Jurisdictional Issues
- III. Merit Regulation and Other Registration Aspects
- IV. State Limited and Private Offering Exemptions
- V. Other State Exemptions
- VI. Enforcement and Civil Liabilities
- VII. Regulation of Broker-Dealers and Other Securities Professionals
- VIII. State Takeover Regulation
- IX. Canadian Blue Sky Law
- X. Overview of State Statutes and Miscellaneous

## I. SECURITY DEFINED

### *Arkansas*

Bell, *Real Estate and Unconventional Securities Concepts under the Arkansas Securities Act*, 3 U. ARK. LITTLE ROCK L.J. 75 (1980).

### *California*

Comment, *Is a Limited Partnership Interest A "Security"?* *The Current State of the California and Federal Definitions Add a Legal Dimension to Economic Speculation*, 16 SANTA CLARA L. REV. 311 (1976).

### *Colorado*

Hillard & Ricciardelli, *Investment Contracts under the Colorado and Uniform Securities Acts*, 49 U. COLO. L. REV. 391 (1978).

*Georgia*

Carney & Fraser, *Defining a "Security": Georgia's Struggle with the "Risk Capital" Test*, 36 EMORY L.J. 73 (1981).

*In General*

Note, *The Paper Trail to Jail*, 11 N.M.L. REV. 255 (1980-1981).

Comment, *Definition of a Security—A Review*, 31 MERCER L. REV. 333 (1979).

Regan, *Securities Regulations: When is a Club Membership a Security?*, 10 LOY. L. REV. 356 (1977).

## II. CONFLICT OF LAW AND JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES

*In General*

Karmec, *Federal Pre-emption: A Cloud Over State Blue Sky Regulation*, 190 N.Y.L.J., Dec. 12, 1983, at 32.

Bartell, *Federal—State Relations Under the Federal Securities Code*, 32 VAND. L. REV. 457 (1979).

Long, *Conflict of Laws Provisions of the Uniform Securities Act, or When Does a Transaction "Take Place in this State?" Pt. 1*, 31 OKLA. L. REV. 781 (1978).

## III. MERIT REGULATION AND OTHER REGISTRATION ASPECTS

*California*

Comment, *Limited Partnerships and the California Securities Law: Restricting the Public Sale of Limited Partnership Interests*, 13 U.C.D. L. REV. 618 (1980).

Comment, *Regulation of Real Estate Syndicate Securities in California*, 16 SAN DIEGO L. REV. 399 (1979).

*Illinois*

Sosin & Fein, *The Landmark 1983 Amendments to the Illinois Securities Law*, 72 ILL. B.J., Dec. 1983, at 196.

*Kansas*

Sorensen & Oliver, *Regulation of Oil and Gas Securities in Kansas*, 22 WASHBURN L.J. 23 (1982).

*Massachusetts*

Honig, *Massachusetts Securities Regulation: A Revolving Matrix*, 27 B.B.J., Nov. 1983, at 10.

*Oklahoma*

Comment, *Oil and Gas Transactions Under the Oklahoma Securities Act—A Scheme of Investor's Insurance?* 15 TULSA L.J. 580 (1980).

*Texas*

Bromberg, *Texas Securities Act*, 46 TEX. B.J., Jan. 1983, at 36.  
Walker & Hadaway, *Merit Standards Revisited: An Empirical Analysis of the Efficacy of Texas Merit Standards*, 7 J. CORP. L. 651 (1982).

*In General*

Tyler, *More About Blue Sky*, 39 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 899 (1982).  
Makens, *State Regulatory Perspective of the Report of the Advisory Committee on Corporate Disclosure to the SEC*, 26 UCLA L. REV. 147 (1978).  
Brockmeyer, *Re-evaluation—"Going Public" Through a "Spin-Off" or Public Shell*, 52 CAL. ST. B.J. 208 (1977).  
Mofsky & Tollison, *Demerit in Merit Regulation*, 60 MARQ. L. REV. 367 (1977).  
Schoeman, *Subscription Advisors, Blue Sky Registration and the First Amendment*, 33 BUS. LAW. 249 (1977).  
Comment, *State Securities Law: A Valuable Tool for Regulating Investment Land Sales*, 7 N.M.L. REV. 265 (1977).  
Note, *State Securities Regulation: Investor Protection Versus Freedom of the Marketplace*, 29 U. FLA. L. REV. 947 (1977).  
Davis, *Developments in Real Property Syndication*, 39 TEX. B.J., July 1976, at 616.  
Goodkind, *Is There Merit in Merit Requirements?*, 1976 WIS. L. REV. 79.

## IV. STATE LIMITED AND PRIVATE OFFERING EXEMPTIONS

*Alabama*

Waters, *Sophistication and the Private Offering of Securities in Alabama—A Lack of Federal and State Law Coordination*, 44 ALA. L. REV. 240 (1983).

*California*

Comment, *California Corporate Securities Law: Small Business Capital Formation and Investor Protection*, 13 PAC. L.J. 459 (1982).

Comment, *Fine Tuning the California Small Offering Exemption*, 52 S. CAL. L. REV. 1827 (1979).

Matsen & Whitesides, *Basic Securities Law and Tax Aspects of Private Limited Offerings in California*, 4 W. ST. U.L. REV. 199 (1977).

### *Delaware*

*Delaware Response to Federal Regulation of Small Business Securities Offerings*, 7 DEL. J. CORP. L. 95 (1982).

### *Illinois*

Fein & Bright, *Private Offering of Securities Under the Illinois Securities Law—Judicial Changes and the Need for Further Amendment*, 31 DE PAUL L. REV. 307 (1982).

Van Cleave, *Illinois Securities Law 46, Report of Sale—How to Deal With it and its Consequences*, 60 CHI. B. REC., Sept.-Oct. 1978, at 96.

### *Iowa*

Hansell & Neuman, *Iowa Uniform Securities Act Exemptions* (pts. 1-2), 3 J. CORP. L. 437 (1978), *Transaction Exemptions*, 2 J. CORP. L. 437 (1977).

### *Maryland*

Matney & Sargent, *Bluer Skies in Maryland: An Introduction to the New Maryland Exemptions for Limited and Private Offerings of Securities*, U. BALT. L.F., Fall 1983, at 22.

### *Massachusetts*

Honig, *Massachusetts Securities Regulation: An Evolving Matrix*, 27 B.B.J., Nov. 1983, at 10.

### *Missouri*

Soraghan, *Streamlining Small Business Finance in Missouri: Exempt Offerings*, 36 MO. B.J. 430 (1980).

### *New Mexico*

Comment, *Securities: Private Placements in New Mexico*, 7 N.M.L. REV. 105 (1976-1977).

### *Oklahoma*

Note, *Securities Regulation: Hidden Danger of Indirect Remunera-*

*tion and the Limited Offering Exemption in Oklahoma*, 32 OKLA. L. REV. 924 (1979).

### *Oregon*

Schweitzer, *Securities Regulation: An Explanation of SEC Rule 240 and the Oregon Limited Offering Exemptions*, 55 OR. L. REV. 31 (1976).

### *Utah*

Mabey & Smith, *Elusive Limited Offering Exemption of the Utah Uniform Securities Act*, 1976 B.Y.U. L. REV. 825.

### *Virginia*

Grandis, *Virginia's New Limited Offering Securities Exemption*, 10 VA. B.A.J., Winter 1979, at 4.

### *In General*

*Regulation of Real Estate Securities, Including the Applicability of Federal Rule 146 and its Use in State Blue Sky Laws*, 13 REAL PROP. PROB. & TR. J. 841 (1978).

Erwin, *Private Placements and Limited Partnership Offerings: Changes in the Rules*, 11 CREIGHTON L. REV. 280 (1977).

Royalty & Jones, *Private Placement Exemption and the Blue Sky Laws—Shoals in the Safe Harbor*, 33 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 877 (1976).

## V. OTHER STATE EXEMPTIONS

### *California*

Holland & Yerkes, *Employee Benefit Plans and Federal and State Securities Laws*, 33 BUS. LAW. 1727 (1977).

### *Iowa*

Hansell & Neumann, *Iowa Uniform Securities Exemptions* (pts. 1-2), 3 J. CORP. L. 437 (1977), 2 J. CORP. L. 437 (1977).

### *In General*

Martin, *Applicability of State "Blue Sky" Laws to Employee Benefit Plans*, 59 CHI. B. REC., May-June 1978, at 319.

Neugerbauer, *Municipal Securities: Disclosure Requirements*, 9 URB. L. 305 (1977).

## VI. ENFORCEMENT AND CIVIL LIABILITIES

*Florida*

Note, *Action Under State Law: Florida's Blue Sky and Common Law Alternatives to Rule 10b-5 for Relief in Securities Fraud*, 32 U. FLA. L. REV. 636 (1980).

*Georgia*

Fox, *Securities Investigations Under the Georgia Securities Act*, 17 GA. S.B.J., Aug. 1980, at 14.

*Oregon*

Stoll & Grenley, *Oregon Remedy for Securities Fraud and the Federal Remedy Available Under Rule 10b-5: A Comparative Analysis*, 14 WILLAMETTE L.J. 127 (1978).

*Texas*

Bromberg, *Civil Liability Under Texas Securities Act § 33 (1977) and Related Claims*, 32 SW. L.J. 867 (1978).

*Washington*

Comment, *Securities Fraud Under the Blue Sky of Washington*, 53 WASH. L. REV. 279 (1978).

*In General*

De Yonker, *Representing a Client in a State Securities Law Investigation*, 60 MICH. B.J., Jan. 1981, at 16.

Long, *A Guide to the Investigative and Enforcement Provisions of the Uniform Securities Act*, 37 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 739 (1980).

Banks & Mover, *Criminal Trials of Blue Sky Violations*, 42 TEX. B.J., Dec. 1979, at 997.

Cherner, *Considering the State Court as a Forum for Securities Actions*, 9 CUM. L. REV. 663 (1979).

Erwin, *Securities Fraud and the Statute of Limitations: The Strange Case of the "Modified Uniform" Securities Act*, 10 CREIGHTON L. REV. 324 (1976).

## VII. REGULATION OF BROKER-DEALERS AND OTHER SECURITIES PROFESSIONALS

*Oklahoma*

Note, *Securities Regulation: Hidden Danger of Indirect Remunera-*

*tion and the Limited Offering Exemption in Oklahoma*, 32 OKLA. L. REV. 924 (1979).

### VIII. STATE TAKEOVER REGULATION

#### *Arkansas*

Wolff, *Unconstitutionality of the Arkansas Tender Offer Statute*, 36 ARK. L. REV. 233 (1983).

#### *Delaware*

Ward, *Tender Offers Under Delaware Law—Some Constitutional Questions*, 4 DEL. J. CORP. L. 734 (1979).

#### *Idaho*

Recent Decision, *Securities Law—Tender Offers—Idaho State Take-Over Law is Preempted by the Williams Act and is an Impermissible Burden on Interstate Commerce*, 47 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 630 (1979).

Note, *Securities Regulation—The Idaho Takeover Statute is an Unconstitutional Burden on Interstate Commerce and is Preempted by the Williams Act*, 53 TUL. L. REV. 984 (1979).

Note, *Great Western United Corp. v. Kidwell* (439 F. Supp. —): *Idaho Takeover Laws Held Unconstitutional*, 14 IDAHO L. REV. 521 (1978).

#### *Illinois*

Note, *Illinois Business Take-Over Act: An Examination of Constitutional and Policy Considerations*, 1981 U. ILL. L. REV. 521.

Moylan, *Illinois Business Take-Over Act*, 59 CHI. B. REC., Mar.-Apr. 1978, at 274.

#### *Indiana*

Comment, *Edgar v. Mite Corp.* [, 102 S. Ct. 2629]: *The Death Knell for the Indiana Take Over Offers Act*, 16 IND. L. REV. 517 (1983).

Note, *Indiana Business Takeover Act*, 51 IND. L.J. 1051 (1976).

#### *Iowa*

Note, *The Iowa Tender Offer Act: A Constitutional State Take-Over Statute*, 5 J. CORP. L. 145 (1979).



*Maine*

Comment, *The Constitutionality of the Maine Takeover Bid Disclosure Law*, 30 ME. L. REV. 246 (1979).

*Michigan*

Comment, *Tender Offers in Michigan: Has Something New Been Added?*, 1977 DET. C.L. REV. 347.

*Missouri*

Jefferies, *Tender Offers and the New Missouri Takeover Bid Disclosure Act*, 35 MO. B.J., Mar. 1979, at 123.

*New York*

Note, *The Constitutionality of the New York Security Takeover Disclosure Act: An Analysis after Edgar v. Mite Corp.* [102 S. Ct. 2629], 48 ALB. L. REV. 239 (1983).

Rich & McSherry, *Conflict Between Federal and State Regulation of Tender Offers: The SEC's Challenge and New York's Response*, 52 N.Y. ST. B.J. 466 (1980).

*North Carolina*

Comment, *Securities Regulation: The Validity of North Carolina's Tender Offer Disclosure Act*, 19 WAKE FOREST L. REV. 267 (1983).

Comment, *North Carolina Tender Offer Disclosure Act: Congenitally Defective?*, 14 WAKE FOREST L. REV. 1035 (1978).

*Ohio*

Kreider, *Fortress Without Foundation? Ohio Takeover Act II*, 52 U. CIN. L. REV. 108 (1983).

Rapp, *Interface Between Securities Act § 225 3(a)(10) and Ohio Revised Code § 1707.04: Utilitarian Considerations for Ohio Mergers and Corporate Reorganization Transactions*, 27 CLEV. ST. L. REV. 1 (1978).

*Pennsylvania*

Tiger, *Pennsylvania Takeover Disclosure Law: A Statute Waiting To Be Invalidated*, 25 VILL. L. REV. 458 (1980).

*Utah*

Note, *Utah Take-Over Offer Disclosure Act: Constitutional and Practical Considerations*, 1979 UTAH L. REV. 583.

*Virginia*

McCauliff, *Federalism and the Constitutionality of State Takeover Statutes: 25th Annual Survey of Developments in Virginia Law 1979-80*, 67 VA. L. REV. 295 (1981).

*Wisconsin*

Malingrey & Pelisek, *Takeovers of Wisconsin Corporations: A New Era of Shareholder Protection Begins*, WIS. B. BULL., May 1984, at 26.

Comment, *Regulation of Going Private Transactions in Wisconsin and the Effect of Edgar v. Mite* [Corp., 102 S. Ct. 2629], 1983 WIS. L. REV. 689.

Comment, *Regulation of Tender Offers in Wisconsin and the Effect of Great Western v. Kidwell* (577 F.2d 1256): *The Day of Reckoning Approaches*, 1978 WIS. L. REV. 833.

*In General*

Profusek & Gompf, *State Takeover Legislation after Mite* [Edgar v. Mite Corp., 102 S. Ct. 2629]: *Standing Pat, Blue Sky, or Corporation Law Concepts?*, 7 CORP. L. REV. 3 (1984).

Sparks, *State Law Developments Concerning Defensive Techniques*, 14 INST. ON SEC. REG. 225 (1983).

Comment, *State Regulation of Tender Offers Reexamined*, 19 TULSA L.J. 225 (1983).

Comment, *Edgar v. Mite Corp.* [, 102 S. Ct. 2629]: *Is the Preemption of State Takeover Statutes Complete?*, 1983 UTAH L. REV. 415.

Note, *The Unsung Death of State Takeover Statutes: Edgar v. Mite Corp.*, [102 S. Ct. 2629], 24 B.C.L. REV. 1017 (1983).

Note, *State Regulation of Tender Offers for Insurance Companies after Edgar v. Mite* [Corp., 102 S. Ct. 2629], 51 FORDHAM L. REV. 943 (1983).

Note, *Can State Tender Offer Regulation be Made Confidential?* *Edgar v. Mite Corp.*, [102 S. Ct. 2629], 20 Hous. L. REV. 1975 (1983).

*Corporate Battles for Control—Edgar v. Mite* [Corp., 102 S. Ct. 2629] *and the Constitutionality of State Takeover Legislation—The Continuing Saga*, 26 HOW. L.J. 1425 (1983).

*Securities Regulation/State Takeover Acts: A State's Power to Regulate Corporate Takeovers is Limited to Regulation that Maintains a Neutral Stance Between the Target Company and the Offeror and Does Not Excessively Burden Interstate Securities*

- Transactions*. Edgar v. Mite Corp., 102 S. Ct. 2629, 71 ILL. B.J. 737 (1983).
- Tender Offers*—Edgar v. Mite Corp. [, 102 S. Ct. 2629] and *State Tender Offer Regulation*, 9 J. CORP. L. 95 (1983).
- Note, *A Failed Experiment: State Takeover Regulation after Edgar v. Mite Corp.* [, 102 S. Ct. 2629], 1983 U. ILL. L. REV. 457.
- Veaszy, *State Takeover Statutes*, 13 INST. ON SEC. REG. 85 (1982).
- Blue Sky Laws and State Takeover Statutes: New Importance for an Old Battleground*, 7 J. CORP. L. 689 (1982).
- Bloomenthal, *New Tender Offer Regimen. State Regulation, and Preemption*, 30 EMORY L.J. 35 (1981).
- Bunch, *Edgar v. Mite Corporation (102 S. Ct. 2629): A Proposed Analysis*, 17 TULSA L.J. 229 (1981).
- Kennedy, *State Insurance Commissioner Involvement in Takeovers of Insurers: An Overview of Procedures and Some Constitutional Considerations*, 17 FORUM 374 (1981).
- Pozen, *Rule 14d-2(b) Under the '34 Act and State Regulation of Takeover Bids*, 12 INST. ON SEC. REG. 227 (1981).
- Sargent, *On the Validity of State Takeover Regulation: State Responses to Mite and Kidwell*, 42 OHIO ST. L.J. 689 (1981).
- Shapiro, *State Takeover Laws*, 12 INST. ON SEC. REG. 235 (1981).
- Comment, *State Regulation of Tender Offers: How Much is Constitutional?*, 33 BAYLOR L. REV. 657 (1981).
- Note, *Validity of State Tender Offer Statutes: SEC Rule 14d-2(b) and Post-Kidwell Federal Decisions*, 38 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 1025 (1981).
- Fettner, *Corporate Takeover Legislation: An Overview*, 52 N.Y.S.B.J. 475 (1980).
- Boehm, *State Interests and Interstate Commerce: A Look at the Theoretical Underpinnings of Takeover Legislation*, 36 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 733 (1979).
- Feldman & Kutcher, *State Takeover Statutes: A Constitutional Confrontation*, 26 L.A.B.J. 234 (1979).
- Royalty, *State Takeover and Blue Sky Law Developments*, 10 INST. ON SEC. REG. 301 (1979).
- Comment, *Cash Tender Offers in the Corporate Supermarket*, 10 CUM. L. REV. 93 (1979).
- Comment, *State Takeover Statutes: An Unconstitutional Approach?*, 19 SANTA CLARA L. REV. 391 (1979).
- Note, *Preemption and the Constitutionality of State Tender Offer Legislation*, 54 NOTRE DAME LAW. 725 (1979).
- Note, *Securities Law and the Constitution: State Tender Offer Statutes Reconsidered*, 88 YALE L.J. 510 (1979).

- Note, *Constitutionality of State Takeover Statutes: A Response to Great Western* [Great Western United Corp. v. Kidwell, 577 F.2d 1256], 53 N.Y.U. L. REV. 872 (1978).
- Royalty & Bartell, *Developments in State Takeover Laws*, 9 INST. ON SEC. REG. 135 (1978).
- Dedman, *Insurance Company Mergers and Acquisitions—Compliance with State Requirements*, 13 FORUM 965 (1978).
- Note, *Overtaking State Take-over Statutes*, 32 SW. L.J. 689 (1978).
- Gould & Jacobs, *Practical Effects of State Tender Offer Legislation*, 23 N.Y.L. SCH. L. REV. 399 (1978).
- Comment, *Problems in the Regulation of Tender Offers: The Williams Act, State Takeover Statutes, and SEC Rules*, 13 TULSA L.J. 552 (1978).
- Note, *Securities—State Regulation—Tender Offer—Validity and Constitutionality of State Takeover Statutes*, 28 CASE W. RES. 955 (1978).
- Recent Decision, *Securities Regulation—Preemption—A State “Fiduciary Approach” Tender Offer Statute is Invalid Under the Commerce Clause and Because it Conflicts with the Accomplishment of Federal Regulatory Objectives is Preempted by the Williams Act*, 13 GA. L. REV. 265 (1978).
- Securities Regulation—State Acts Regulating Tender Offers*, 1978 ANN. SURVEY AM. L. 161.
- Nathan & Moloney, *State Tender Offer Statutes: An Analysis of the Practical and Policy Considerations*, 23 N.Y.L. SCH. L. REV. 647 (1978).
- Note, *Supremacy and Commerce Clause Limitations On State Regulation of Tender Offers*, 42 ALB. L. REV. 492 (1978).
- Legislation, *Take-Over-Bid Disclosure Act*, 12 U. RICH. L. REV. 749 (1978).
- Royalty, *State Takeover Statutes and New Takeover Strategies—A Panel. An Overview*; Arsht, *The Delaware Takeover Statute—Special Problems for Directors*; Bartell, *The Wisconsin Takeover Statute*; Buford, *The Virginia Takeover Statute*; Berman, *The New York Takeover Statute*; Sommer, *Commentary*, 32 BUS. LAW. 1459 (1977).
- Comment, *State Takeover Statutes Versus Congressional Intent: Preempting the Maze*, 5 HOFSTRA L. REV. 857 (1977).
- Langevoort, *State Tender—Offer Legislation: Interest, Effects, and Political Competency*, 62 CORNELL L. REV. 213 (1977).
- Wilner & Landy, *Tender Trap: State Takeover Statutes and their Constitutionality*, 45 FORDHAM L. REV. 1 (1976).

## IX. CANADIAN BLUE SKY LAW

Buckley, *Small Issuers Under the Ontario Securities Act, 1978: A Plea for Exemptions*, 29 U. TORONTO L.J. 309 (1979).

Taylor, *Comments on the Mandate and Operation of the Ontario Securities Commission*, 36 U. TORONTO FAC. L. REV. 1 (1978).

Getz, *Corporate and Financial Services Commission—Reflections Upon a Statutory Tribunal*, 11 U. BRIT. COLUM. L. REV. 1 (1977).

Steel, *Mens Rea and Public Trades Prohibited Under the Securities Act*, 14 OSGOODE HALL L.J. 633 (1976).

Demers, *Prospectus Liability and Investor Protection in Quebec Law*, 18 C. DE D. 745 (1977).

## X. OVERVIEW OF STATE STATUTES AND MISCELLANEOUS

*Massachusetts*

Honig, *Massachusetts Securities Regulation: An Evolving Matrix*, 27 B.B.J., Nov. 1983, at 10.

*Michigan*

Sargent, Book Review, 39 BUS. LAW. 359 (1983) (reviewing MOSCOW & MAKENS, eds., MICHIGAN SECURITIES REGULATIONS (1983)).

*Nebraska*

Lake, *Corporate Recission Offers Under the Nebraska Securities Act*, 58 NEB. L. REV. 718 (1979).

Comment, *Securities Act of Nebraska: An Overview*, 56 NEB. L. REV. 836 (1977).

*Ohio*

Note, *Ohio Securities Act: Amendments, Rules, Unanswered Questions*, 48 U. CIN. L. REV. 459 (1979).

*South Dakota*

Grunewaldt, *Securities Law in South Dakota*, 24 S.D.L. REV. 36 (1979).

*Texas*

Bromberg, *Texas Securities Act*, 46 TEX B.J., Jan. 1983, at 36.

Bateman, *Securities Litigation: The 1977 Modernization of Section 33 of the Texas Securities Act*, 15 HOUS. L. REV. 839 (1978).

Bateman, *1975 Amendments to the Texas Business Corporation and The Texas Securities Acts*, 39 TEX. B.J. 781 (1976).

### *Utah*

Legislation, *Utah Legislative Survey—1979*, 1980 UTAH L. REV. 155.

### *In General*

Comment, *State Regulation of Proxies in Alaska Native Corporations*, 12 U.C.L.A. [UCLA]-ALASKA L. REV. 69 (1983).

Tyler, *More About Blue Sky*, 39 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 899 (1982).

Long, *State Securities Regulation—An Overview*, 32 OKLA. L. REV. 549 (1979).

Comment, *One-Two Combination: Will Federal and State Securities Regulation Knock Out Small Business?*, 14 TULSA L.J. 132 (1978).

Note, *The Pre-emption Doctrine and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission Act: In Favor of State Law*, 11 IND. L. REV. 467 (1978).

Russo & Lyon, *Exclusive Jurisdiction of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission*, 6 HOFSTRA L. REV. 57 (1977).

*Bibliography compiled by Gary D. Raffel*