UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 75369 / July 7, 2015

Admin. Proc. File No. 3-16515

In the Matter of

JESTERS RESOURCES, INC., AND
KENSINGTON GROUP, 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 Jesters Resources, Inc., or Kensington Group, 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 Jesters Resources, Inc., and Kensington Group, 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 Jesters Resources, Inc., and Kensington Group, 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] *Jesters Res., Inc., Jet Neko, Inc., and Kensington Group, Inc.*, Initial Decision Release No. 796 (May 22, 2015), 111 SEC Docket 11, 2015 WL 2444544. The Central Index Key numbers are: 1413661 for Jesters Resources, Inc.; and 1350113 for Kensington Group, Inc.

INITIAL DECISION RELEASE NO. 796
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-16515

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

In the Matter of JESTERS RESOURCES, INC., JET NEKO, INC., AND KENSINGTON GROUP, INC.	INITIAL DECISION OF DEFAULT AS TO TWO RESPONDENTS May 22, 2015

APPEARANCE: Neil J. Welch, Jr., for the Division of Enforcement, Securities and Exchange Commission

BEFORE: James E. Grimes, Administrative Law Judge

SUMMARY

This Initial Decision revokes the registrations of the registered securities of Respondents Jesters Resources, Inc., and Kensington Group, Inc. (collectively, the Two Respondents).[1] The revocations are based on the two Respondents' failures to timely file required periodic reports with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

INTRODUCTION

The Commission instituted this proceeding on April 28, 2015, pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. The Order Instituting Proceedings (OIP) alleges that the two Respondents each have a class of securities registered with the Commission pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12(g) and are delinquent in their periodic filings. The two Respondents were served with the OIP by May 1, 2015, and Answers were due by May 11, 2015. *See Jesters Res., Inc*., Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 2673, 2015 SEC LEXIS 1875 (May 13, 2015). On May 13, 2015, I ordered the two Respondents to show cause by May 20, 2015, why the registrations of their securities should not be revoked by default due to their failure to file Answers. *Id.* I warned that if a Respondent failed to respond, it would be deemed in default, the proceeding would be determined against it, and the registration of its securities would be revoked. *Id.* I further notified Respondents that a telephonic prehearing conference would be held on May 20, 2015. *Id.*

[1] This Initial Decision does not apply to Jet Neko, Inc., which has filed an Answer and provided the Division of Enforcement with a signed settlement offer that the Division is considering.

At the prehearing conference held on May 20, the Division and Jet Neko, Inc., appeared, but the two Respondents did not. To date, the two Respondents have failed to file an Answer or respond to the order to show cause.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The two Respondents are in default for failing to file Answers, appear at the prehearing conference, or otherwise defend the proceeding. *See* OIP at 3; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a)(1)-(2), .220(f), .221(f). Accordingly, as authorized by Rule of Practice 155(a), I deem the OIP's allegations to be true.

Jesters (CIK No. 1413661) is a revoked Nevada corporation located in Shanghai, China, with a class of securities registered with the Commission pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12(g). Jesters 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 April 30, 2009, which reported a net loss of $14,920 for the prior nine months.

Kensington (CIK No. 1350113) is a void Delaware corporation located in Shenzhen, China, with a class of securities registered with the Commission pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12(g). Kensington is delinquent in its periodic filings with the Commission, having not filed any periodic reports since it filed a Form 10 registration statement on February 6, 2006, which reported a net loss of $4,000 from the company's December 8, 2005, inception to December 31, 2005.

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 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 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). 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). By failing to timely file required periodic reports, the two Respondents violated 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 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).

The two 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). 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); *Impax Labs., Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 57864, 2008 SEC LEXIS 1197, at *25-26 (May 23, 2008). The two Respondents are culpable because they failed to heed delinquency letters sent to them by the Division of Corporation Finance or, through their failure to maintain a valid address on file with the Commission, did not receive such letters, and they 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, appeared at the prehearing conference, or otherwise defended the proceeding to address whether they have made any efforts to remedy their past violations, and have made no assurances against further violations.

Considering these delinquencies, 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 Jesters Resources, Inc., and Kensington Group, 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, 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 of Practice 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.

The two Respondents are notified that they may move to set aside the default in this case. Pursuant to Rule of Practice 155(b), the Commission is authorized, 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.*

_____

James E. Grimes
Administrative Law Judge