

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
before the  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934  
Release No. 78255 / July 8, 2016

Admin. Proc. File No. 3-17185

In the Matter of  
  
RINGS TO DINE FOR, INC.

NOTICE THAT INITIAL DECISION HAS BECOME FINAL

The time for filing a petition for review of the initial decision in this proceeding has expired. No such petition has been filed by Rings to Dine For, Inc., and the Commission has not chosen to review the decision on its own initiative.

Accordingly, notice is hereby given, pursuant to Rule 360(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice,<sup>1</sup> that the initial decision of the administrative law judge has become the final decision of the Commission with respect to Rings to Dine For, Inc.<sup>2</sup> The order contained in that decision is hereby declared effective. The initial decision ordered that, pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registration of each class of registered securities of Rings to Dine For, Inc., is revoked.

For the Commission, by the Office of the General Counsel, pursuant to delegated authority.

Brent J. Fields  
Secretary

<sup>1</sup> 17 C.F.R. § 201.360(d).

<sup>2</sup> *Rings to Dine For, Inc.*, Initial Decision Release No. 1011 (May 11, 2016), 114 SEC Docket 02, 2016 WL 2731924. The Central Index Key number for Rings to Dine For, Inc., is 1069493.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
Before the  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20549

In the Matter of  
  
RINGS TO DINE FOR, INC.

INITIAL DECISION OF  
DEFAULT  
May 11, 2016

APPEARANCES: David S. Frye and Neil J. Welch, Jr., for the Division of Enforcement,  
Securities and Exchange Commission

BEFORE: Jason S. Patil, Administrative Law Judge

### SUMMARY

This initial decision revokes the registration of the registered securities of Respondent Rings to Dine For, Inc., due to its failure to timely file required periodic reports with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

### INTRODUCTION

On March 29, 2016, the Commission initiated this proceeding with an order instituting proceedings (OIP) pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. The OIP alleges that Respondent has securities registered with the Commission pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12(g) and has repeatedly failed to file timely periodic reports with the Commission, in violation of Exchange Act Section 13(a) and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13 thereunder. Respondent was served with the OIP by April 6 and its answer was due by April 19, 2016. *Rings to Dine For, Inc.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 3807, 2016 SEC LEXIS 1513 (ALJ Apr. 25, 2016). When Respondent failed to file an answer, I ordered it to show cause by May 9, 2016, why the registration of its securities should not be revoked by default due to its failure to file an answer or otherwise defend the proceeding. *Id.* To date, Respondent has not filed an answer, responded to the show cause order, or otherwise defended this proceeding.

### FINDINGS OF FACT

Respondent is in default for failing to file an answer or otherwise defend the proceeding. *See* OIP at 2; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a)(2), .220(f). Accordingly, as authorized by Rule of Practice 155(a), 17 C.F.R. § 201.155(a), I find the following allegations in the OIP to be true.

Rings to Dine For, Inc., Central Index Key No. 1069493, is a void Delaware corporation located in Muntinlupa City, Metro Manila, Philippines, with a class of securities registered with the Commission pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12(g). The company is delinquent in its periodic filings with the Commission, having not filed any periodic reports since it filed a Form 10-QSB for the period ended March 31, 2007, which reported no revenue or expenses for the prior nine months. As of March 28, 2016, the company's common stock was not publicly quoted or traded.

In addition to its repeated failures to file timely periodic reports, Respondent failed to heed a delinquency letter sent to it by the Commission's Division of Corporation Finance requesting compliance with its periodic filing obligations.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Exchange Act Section 13(a) and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13 require public corporations to file annual and quarterly reports with the Commission. "Compliance with those requirements is mandatory and may not be subject to conditions from the registrant." *America's Sports Voice, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 55511, 2007 SEC LEXIS 1241, at \*12 (Mar. 22, 2007), *recons. denied*, Exchange Act Release No. 55867, 2007 SEC LEXIS 1239 (June 6, 2007). Scierer is not required to establish violations of Exchange Act Section 13(a) and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13. *See SEC v. McNulty*, 137 F.3d 732, 740-41 (2d Cir. 1998); *SEC v. Wills*, 472 F. Supp. 1250, 1268 (D.D.C. 1978). Respondent failed to file timely periodic reports and as a result violated Exchange Act Section 13(a) and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13.

### SANCTION

Under Exchange Act Section 12(j), the Commission is authorized, "as it deems necessary or appropriate for the protection of investors," to revoke the registration of a security or suspend the registration for a period not exceeding twelve months if it finds, after notice and an opportunity for hearing, that the issuer of the security has failed to comply with any provision of the Exchange Act or rules thereunder. In determining what sanctions will adequately protect investors, the Commission "consider[s], among other things, the seriousness of the issuer's violations, the isolated or recurrent nature of the violations, the degree of culpability involved, the extent of the issuer's efforts to remedy its past violations and ensure future compliance, and the credibility of its assurances, if any, against further violations." *Gateway Int'l Holdings, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 53907, 2006 SEC LEXIS 1288, at \*19-20 (May 31, 2006).

Respondent's failure to file required periodic reports is serious because the failure constitutes a violation of a central provision of the Exchange Act. The purpose of periodic reporting is "to supply investors with current and accurate financial information about an issuer so that they may make sound [investment] decisions." *Gateway Int'l Holdings, Inc.*, 2006 SEC LEXIS 1288, at \*26. The reporting requirements are the primary tool that Congress fashioned for the protection of investors from negligent, careless, and deliberate misrepresentations in the sale of securities. *SEC v. Beisinger Indus. Corp.*, 552 F.2d 15, 18 (1st Cir. 1977). Respondent's violation is also recurrent in that it repeatedly failed to file periodic reports. *See Nature's Sunshine Prods., Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 59268, 2009 SEC LEXIS 81, at \*20 (Jan. 21,

2009) (respondent failed to file seven required periodic reports due over a two-year period); *Impax Labs., Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 57864, 2008 SEC LEXIS 1197, at \*25-26 (May 23, 2008) (respondent's failure to make eight filings over an eighteen-month period considered recurrent). Respondent is also culpable because it failed to heed a delinquency letter sent to it by the Division of Corporation Finance and was therefore on notice, even before the OIP issued, of its obligation to file periodic reports. *See China-Biotics, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 70800, 2013 SEC LEXIS 3451, at \*37 & n.60 (Nov. 4, 2013) (holding that revocation may be warranted even without proof that a respondent was aware of its reporting obligations). Finally, Respondent has not answered the OIP, responded to the show cause order, or otherwise participated in the proceeding to address whether it has made any efforts to remedy its past violation. It has also made no assurances against further violations.

For these reasons, it is necessary and appropriate for the protection of investors to revoke the registration of each class of Respondent's registered securities.

### **ORDER**

It is ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registration of each class of registered securities of Respondent Rings to Dine For, Inc., is REVOKED.

This initial decision shall become effective in accordance with and subject to the provisions of Rule 360, 17 C.F.R. § 201.360. Pursuant to that rule, a party may file a petition for review of this initial decision within twenty-one days after service of the initial decision. A party may also file a motion to correct a manifest error of fact within ten days of the initial decision, pursuant to Rule 111, 17 C.F.R. § 201.111(h). If a motion to correct a manifest error of fact is filed by a party, then a party shall have twenty-one days to file a petition for review from the date of the undersigned's order resolving such motion to correct a manifest error of fact.

This initial decision will not become final until the Commission enters an order of finality. The Commission will enter an order of finality unless a party files a petition for review or a motion to correct a manifest error of fact or the Commission determines on its own initiative to review the initial decision as to a party. If any of these events occur, the initial decision shall not become final as to that party.

A respondent may move to set aside a default. Rule 155(b) permits the Commission, at any time, to set aside a default for good cause, in order to prevent injustice and on such conditions as may be appropriate. 17 C.F.R. § 201.155(b). A motion to set aside a default shall be made within a reasonable time, state the reasons for the failure to appear or defend, and specify the nature of the proposed defense in the proceeding. *Id.*

---

Jason S. Patil  
Administrative Law Judge