

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
before the  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934  
Release No. 73494 / November 3, 2014

Admin. Proc. File No. 3-15941

In the Matter of

NEW DRAGON ASIA CORP.

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 New Dragon Asia Corp. 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<sup>2</sup> has become the final decision of the Commission with respect to New Dragon Asia Corp. 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 New Dragon Asia Corp. is hereby 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> *New Dragon Asia Corp.*, Initial Decision Rel. No. 652 (Aug. 6, 2014), 109 SEC Docket 10, 2014 WL 3850002. The stock symbol and Central Index Key number are NDAC and 1089590 for New Dragon Asia Corp.

INITIAL DECISION RELEASE NO. 652  
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING  
File No. 3-15684

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

In the Matter of

NEW DRAGON ASIA CORP.

INITIAL DECISION OF DEFAULT  
August 6, 2014

APPEARANCE: David S. Frye for the Division of Enforcement,  
Securities and Exchange Commission

BEFORE: Cameron Elliot, Administrative Law Judge

**SUMMARY**

This Initial Decision revokes the registration of the registered securities of Respondent New Dragon Asia Corp. (New Dragon or Respondent). The revocation is based on Respondent's failure to timely file required periodic reports with the Securities and Exchange Commission (Commission).

**INTRODUCTION**

On January 24, 2014, the Commission initiated this proceeding with an Order Instituting Administrative Proceedings (OIP), pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Exchange Act). The OIP alleges that Respondent has a class of 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 on June 30, 2014, in accordance with Commission Rule of Practice (Rule) 141(a)(2)(iv), 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(iv), through methods prescribed in the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters, to which China, where New Dragon is located, is a signatory. New Dragon Asia Corp., Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 1624, 2014 SEC LEXIS 2566 (July 17, 2014). Respondent's Answer was due by July 10, 2014. Id. (citing OIP at 2; 17 C.F.R. § 201.220(b)). On July 17, 2014, I ordered Respondent to show cause by August 4, 2014, why the proceeding should not be determined against it due to its failure to file an Answer or otherwise defend this proceeding, warning that failure to do so would result in Respondent being deemed in default, having the proceeding determined against it, and having the registration of its securities revoked. Id. (citing OIP at 2-3; 17 C.F.R.

§§ 201.155(a)(2), .220(f)). To date, Respondent has not filed an Answer or responded to the Order to Show Cause.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Respondent is in default for failing to file an Answer or otherwise defend the proceeding. See OIP at 2-3; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a)(2), .220(f). Accordingly, as authorized by Rule 155(a), I find the following allegations in the OIP to be true.

New Dragon, Central Index Key No. 1089590, is a dissolved Florida corporation located in Longkou, Shandong Province, China, with a class of securities registered with the Commission pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12(g). New Dragon is delinquent in its periodic filings with the Commission, having not filed any periodic reports since it filed a Form 10-Q for the period ended September 25, 2011, which reported a net loss of \$5,628,000 for the prior nine months. As of January 16, 2014, the company's stock (symbol NDAC) was quoted on OTC Link (previously, Pink Sheets) operated by OTC Markets Group Inc., had ten market makers, and was eligible for the "piggyback" exception of Exchange Act Rule 15c2-11(f)(3).

In addition to its repeated failures to file timely periodic reports, Respondent failed to heed a delinquency letter sent to it by the 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 thereunder 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 (Mar. 22, 2007), 90 SEC Docket 879, 885, mot. for recons. denied, Exchange Act Release No. 55867 (June 6, 2007), 90 SEC Docket 2419. Scienter 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). There is no genuine issue of material fact that Respondent failed to timely file required periodic reports. As a result, Respondent failed to comply with Exchange Act Section 13(a) and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13.

### **SANCTIONS**

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 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 proceedings pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12(j) against issuers that violated Exchange Act Section 13(a) and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13, the determination "of what sanctions will ensure that investors will be adequately protected . . . turns on the effect on the investing public, including both current and prospective investors, of the issuer's violations, on the one hand, and the Section 12(j) sanctions, on the other hand." Gateway Int'l Holdings, Inc.,

Exchange Act Release No. 53907 (May 31, 2006), 88 SEC Docket 430, 438-39. 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.” Id. at 439.

Respondent’s failure to file required periodic reports is serious because it violates 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. Id. at 441. 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 violations are also recurrent in that it repeatedly failed to file periodic reports. See Nature’s Sunshine Prods., Inc., Exchange Act Release No. 59268 (Jan. 21, 2009), 95 SEC Docket 13488, 13496 (respondent failed to file seven required periodic reports due over a two-year period); Impax Labs., Inc., Exchange Act Release No. 57864 (May 23, 2008), 93 SEC Docket 6241, 6251 (respondent’s failure to make eight filings over an eighteen-month period considered recurrent). Respondent is culpable because it failed to heed a delinquency letter sent to it by the Division of Corporation Finance, and it 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 WL 5883342, at \*10 & 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 or otherwise participated in the proceeding to address whether it has made any efforts to remedy its past violations, and has made no assurances against further violations.

Considering these delinquencies, it is necessary and appropriate for the protection of investors to revoke the registration of each class of registered securities of Respondent.

### **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 New Dragon Asia Corp. is hereby REVOKED.

This Initial Decision shall become effective in accordance with and subject to the provisions of Rule 360. See 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. If a motion to correct a manifest error of fact is filed by a party, then that 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.

Respondent is notified that it may move to set aside the default in this case. 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.

---

Cameron Elliot  
Administrative Law Judge