

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
before the  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934  
Release No. 76101 / October 8, 2015

Admin. Proc. File No. 3-16680

In the Matter of

HARVEST VALLEY VENTURES, INC.,  
and INTROTECH, 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 Harvest Valley Ventures, Inc., or Introtech, 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 Harvest Valley Ventures, Inc., and Introtech, 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 registrations of each class of registered securities of Harvest Valley Ventures, Inc., and Introtech, Inc., are 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> *Harvest Valley Ventures, Inc., and Introtech, Inc.*, Initial Decision Release No. 853 (Aug. 12, 2015), 112 SEC Docket 03, 2015 WL 4748230. The Central Index Key numbers are: 1101365 for Harvest Valley Ventures, Inc.; and 1125020 for Introtech, Inc.

INITIAL DECISION RELEASE NO. 853  
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING  
FILE NO. 3-16680

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

In the Matter of

HARVEST VALLEY VENTURES, INC.,  
and INTROTECH, INC.

INITIAL DECISION ON DEFAULT  
August 12, 2015

APPEARANCE:

Neil J. Welch, Jr., Division of Enforcement,  
Securities and Exchange Commission

BEFORE:

Brenda P. Murray, Chief Administrative Law Judge

The Securities and Exchange Commission instituted this proceeding on July 8, 2015, pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. The Order Instituting Proceedings (OIP) alleges that Respondents each have a class of securities registered with the Commission and are delinquent in their periodic filings. Respondents were served with the OIP by July 15, and Answers were due by July 28. *Harvest Valley Ventures, Inc.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 2947, 2015 SEC LEXIS 2970 (July 20, 2015). By order, I notified the parties that a telephonic prehearing conference would be held on August 10, and warned that I would default any Respondent that does not file an Answer, appear at the prehearing conference, or otherwise defend the proceeding. *Id.*; *Harvest Valley Ventures, Inc.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 2953, 2015 SEC LEXIS 2980 (July 21, 2015).

No Respondent appeared at the prehearing conference. To date, no Respondent has filed an Answer or otherwise defended the proceeding. Accordingly, Respondents are in default, and I deem as true the OIP's allegations. *See* OIP at 3; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a)(1)-(2), .220(f), .221(f).

**Findings of Fact**

Harvest Valley Ventures, Inc., CIK No. 1101365, is a delinquent Wyoming corporation located in Draper, Utah, 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 June 30, 2004, which reported a net loss of \$100 for the prior nine months.

Introtech, Inc., CIK No. 1125020, is a dissolved Colorado corporation located in Colorado Springs, Colorado, 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-SB on September 29, 2000.

In addition to their repeated failures to file timely periodic reports, 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 failure to maintain a valid address on file with the Commission, did not receive such letters.

### **Conclusions of Law**

Exchange Act Section 13(a) and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13 require issuers of securities registered with the Commission pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12 to file with the Commission current and accurate information in annual and quarterly reports, even if the registration is voluntary under Exchange Act Section 12(g). Specifically, Rule 13a-1 requires issuers to file annual reports and Rule 13a-13 requires domestic issuers to file quarterly reports. *See* 17 C.F.R. §§ 240.13a-1, .13a-13. "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), *mot. for recons. denied*, Exchange Act Release No. 55867, 2007 SEC LEXIS 1239 (June 6, 2007). By failing to timely file required periodic reports, 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 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 the public interest or what is necessary or appropriate for the protection of 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).

Respondents' failures to file required periodic reports are serious because they violate 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 \*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). Respondents' violations are also recurrent in that they repeatedly failed to file

periodic reports for over a decade. *See Nature's Sunshine Prods., Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 59268, 2009 SEC LEXIS 81, at \*20 (Jan. 21, 2009); *Impax Labs., Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 57864, 2008 SEC LEXIS 1197, at \*25-26 (May 23, 2008). Respondents are culpable because they knew, or should have known, of their obligation to file periodic reports. *See* 17 C.F.R. §§ 249.308a, .310 (Commission Forms 10-Q, 10-K); *China-Biotics, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 70800, 2013 SEC LEXIS 3451, at \*37 & n.60 (Nov. 4, 2013); *Robert L. Burns*, Investment Advisers Act of 1940 Release No. 3260, 2011 SEC LEXIS 2722, at \*40 n.60 (Aug. 5, 2011). By not participating in this proceeding, Respondents forfeited an opportunity to show they have made efforts to remedy their past violations and to offer assurances against further violations.

On these facts, it is necessary and appropriate for the protection of investors to revoke the registration of each class of Respondents' registered securities.

### **Order**

I ORDER that, pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrations of each class of registered securities of Harvest Valley Ventures, Inc., and Introtech, Inc., are REVOKED.

This Initial Decision shall become effective in accordance with and subject to the provisions of Rule of Practice 360. *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.360. Pursuant to that Rule, I FURTHER ORDER that a party may file a petition for review of this Initial Decision within twelve days after service of the Initial Decision. *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.360(b). A party may also file a motion to correct a manifest error of fact within ten days of the Initial Decision, pursuant to Rule of Practice 111. *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.111. 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 order resolving such motion to correct a manifest error of fact. The 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 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.

In addition, a respondent has the right to file a motion to set aside a default within a reasonable time, stating the reasons for the failure to appear or defend, and specifying the nature of the proposed defense. 17 C.F.R. § 201.155(b). The Commission can set aside a default at any time for good cause. *Id.*

---

Brenda P. Murray  
Chief Administrative Law Judge