

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 77999 / June 7, 2016

Admin. Proc. File No. 3-17144

In the Matter of

MED-ZONE BIOTECHNOLOGIES ACQUISITION, INC.,
and
MILLENNIUM DIRECT, 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 Med-Zone Biotechnologies Acquisition, Inc., or Millennium Direct, 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,¹ that the initial decision of the administrative law judge has become the final decision of the Commission with respect to Med-Zone Biotechnologies Acquisition, Inc., and Millennium Direct, Inc.² 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 registrations of each class of registered securities of Respondents Med-Zone Biotechnologies Acquisition, Inc., and Millennium Direct, Inc., are revoked.

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

Brent J. Fields
Secretary

¹ 17 C.F.R. § 201.360(d).

² *Map IV Acquisition, Inc., Med-Zone Biotechnologies Acquisition, Inc., and Millennium Direct, Inc.*, Initial Decision Release No. 1002 (Apr. 18, 2016), 113 SEC Docket 19, 2016 WL 1554846. The Central Index Key numbers are: 1294604 for Med-Zone Biotechnologies Acquisition, Inc.; and 1114835 for Millennium Direct, Inc.

INITIAL DECISION RELEASE NO. 1002
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-17144

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

In the Matter of

MAP IV ACQUISITION, INC.,
MED-ZONE BIOTECHNOLOGIES ACQUISITION, INC.,
and
MILLENNIUM DIRECT, INC.

INITIAL DECISION OF
DEFAULT
April 18, 2016

APPEARANCE: 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 registrations of the registered securities of Respondents Med-Zone Biotechnologies Acquisition, Inc., and Millenium Direct, Inc. (the Two Respondents) due to their failures to timely file required periodic reports with the Securities and Exchange Commission.¹

INTRODUCTION

On March 1, 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 the Two Respondents have securities registered with the Commission pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12(g) and have repeatedly failed to file timely periodic reports with the Commission, in violation of Exchange Act Section 13(a) and Rules 13a-1 and/or 13a-13 thereunder. The Two Respondents were served with the OIP by March 10, 2016, and their answers were due by March 23. *Map IV Acquisition, Inc.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 3732, 2016 SEC LEXIS 1110 (ALJ Mar. 24, 2016). When the Two Respondents failed to file answers, I ordered them to show cause by April 5, 2016, why the registrations of their securities should not be revoked by default due to their failures to file answers or otherwise defend the

¹ This decision does not apply to the third respondent, Map IV Acquisition, Inc., which settled with the Commission. *Map IV Acquisition, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 77597, 2016 WL 1445947 (Apr. 13, 2016).

proceeding. *Id.* To date, neither of the Two Respondents has filed an answer, responded to the show cause order, or otherwise defended this proceeding.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Two Respondents are in default for failing to file answers or otherwise defend the proceeding. *See* OIP at 3; 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.

Med-Zone Biotechnologies Acquisition, Inc., Central Index Key (CIK) No. 1294604, is a void Delaware corporation located in New York, New York, 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 August 31, 2005, which reported a net loss of \$3,119.80 for the prior three months.

Millennium Direct, Inc., CIK No. 1114835, is an inactive Delaware corporation located in North Blenheim, New York, 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, 2001, which reported a net loss of \$28,931 for the prior three months.

In addition to their repeated failures to file timely periodic reports, the Two Respondents failed to heed delinquency letters sent to them by the Commission's Division of Corporation Finance requesting compliance with their periodic filing obligations, or, through their failures to maintain valid addresses on file with the Commission as required by Commission rules, did not receive such letters.

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). Scierter 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). The Two Respondents failed to file timely periodic reports. As a result, the Two Respondents 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).

The Two Respondents’ failures to file required periodic reports are serious because the failures constitute violations 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). The Two Respondents’ violations are also recurrent in that they 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). The Two Respondents are also culpable because they failed to heed delinquency letters sent to them by the Division of Corporation Finance or, through their failures to maintain valid addresses on file with the Commission as required by Commission rules, did not receive the letters, and were therefore on notice, even before the OIP issued, of their obligations 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, the Two Respondents have not answered the OIP, responded to the show cause order, or otherwise participated in the proceeding to address whether they have made any efforts to remedy their past violations. They have also made no assurances against further violations.

For these reasons, it is necessary and appropriate for the protection of investors to revoke the registrations of each class of the Two Respondents’ registered securities.

ORDER

It is ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrations of each class of registered securities of Respondents Med-Zone Biotechnologies Acquisition, Inc., and Millennium Direct, Inc., are 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