

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

SECURITIES ACT OF 1933
Rel. No. 8678 / April 13, 2006

Admin. Proc. File No. 3-12035

In the Matter of
THE REGISTRATION STATEMENT OF APOLLO PUBLICATION
CORPORATION

ORDER DISMISSING REVIEW PROCEEDING AND NOTICE OF FINALITY

On December 7, 2005, an administrative law judge issued an initial decision pursuant to Section 8(d) of the Securities Act of 1933 suspending the effectiveness of a registration statement filed by Apollo Publication Corporation ("Apollo" or the "Company"). 1/ The law judge found that the registration statement, which was filed on September 8, 2005, contained no financial statements or any financial information at all. Additionally, the law judge found, the registration statement was not signed by the Company's chief financial officer, comptroller, or authorized representative in the United States. 2/ The law judge found that the inclusion of this information was required by federal securities laws and regulations thereunder, and that the omissions were material. 3/

On January 23, 2006, we granted Apollo's petition for review of the law judge's initial decision and issued a schedule requiring that a brief in support of the petition for review be filed

1/ The Registration Statement of Apollo Publication Corporation, Initial Decision Rel. No. 302 (Dec. 7, 2005), __ SEC Docket _____. Securities Act Section 8(d), 15 U.S.C. § 77h(d), in relevant part, authorizes the Commission to issue a stop order suspending the effectiveness of a registration statement, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, if it appears that the registration statement "includes any untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state any material fact required to be stated therein."

2/ The registration statement represents that Apollo is organized under the laws of Ontario, Canada.

3/ The law judge further found that the registration statement contained material misrepresentations regarding the involvement of various world leaders as officers and directors of Apollo and the relationship of Apollo to the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce.

by February 22, 2006. 4/ The order stated that, pursuant to Rule 180(c) of our Rules of Practice, 5/ failure to file a brief in support of the petition may result in dismissal of the review proceeding as to that petitioner. Notwithstanding our order, Apollo has filed no brief, extension request, or anything else with respect to its appeal subsequent to its petition for review.

On March 23, 2006, the Division of Enforcement requested that we dismiss the proceeding based on Apollo's failure to file a supporting brief. 6/ Under the circumstances, we find that dismissal is appropriate.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that this proceeding be, and it hereby is, dismissed.

We also hereby give notice that the December 7, 2005 initial decision of the administrative law judge has become the final decision of the Commission with respect to Apollo Publication Corporation. The order contained in that decision suspending the effectiveness of the registration statement of Apollo Publication Corporation is hereby declared effective.

By the Commission.

Nancy M. Morris
Secretary

4/ See Securities Exchange Act Rel. No. 53065 (Jan. 23, 2006), ___ SEC Docket ___. Our order also vacated the notice of finality that had been issued against Apollo on January 6, 2006. The notice of finality had been issued prior to the receipt, by the Commission's Secretary, of Apollo's petition for review, which had been misdirected.

5/ 17 C.F.R. § 201.180(c).

6/ The Division also requested, as an alternative to dismissal, that the decision of the law judge be upheld "because Apollo offered no argument that effectively questions the [law judge's] findings and conclusions." Apollo has not responded to the Division's filing.