

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
before the  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934  
Release No. 75097 / June 3, 2015

Admin. Proc. File No. 3-16452

In the Matter of  
  
FIRST CHINA PHARMACEUTICAL 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 First China Pharmaceutical 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,<sup>1</sup> that the initial decision of the administrative law judge has become the final decision of the Commission with respect to First China Pharmaceutical Group, 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 First China Pharmaceutical Group, Inc., 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> *First China Pharm. Group, Inc.*, Initial Decision Release No. 779 (Apr. 21, 2015), 111 SEC Docket 07, 2015 WL 1801468. The Central Index Key number is 1432254 for First China Pharmaceutical Group, Inc.

INITIAL DECISION RELEASE NO. 779  
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING  
File No. 3-16452

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

In the Matter of

FIRST CHINA PHARMACEUTICAL GROUP, INC.

INITIAL DECISION OF DEFAULT

April 21, 2015

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

BEFORE: James E. Grimes, Administrative Law Judge

**SUMMARY**

This Initial Decision revokes the registration of the registered securities of Respondent First China Pharmaceutical Group, Inc. (First China). The revocation is based on Respondent's failure to timely file required periodic reports with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

**INTRODUCTION**

On March 20, 2015, the Commission issued an Order Instituting Administrative Proceedings (OIP) pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. The OIP alleges that Respondent has a class of securities registered with the Commission and has repeatedly failed to file timely periodic reports with the Commission. Respondent was served with the OIP by March 24, 2015, and its Answer was due by April 6, 2015. *First China Pharm. Grp., Inc.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 2527, 2015 SEC LEXIS 1350 (Apr. 9, 2015). On April 9, 2015, I issued an order notifying the parties that a telephonic prehearing conference would be held on April 20, 2015, and ordered Respondent to show cause, by that date, 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; 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, and Respondent did not appear at the telephonic prehearing conference held on April 20, 2015.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

Respondent is in default for failing to file an Answer, appear at the prehearing conference, or otherwise defend the proceeding. See OIP at 2; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a)(1)-(2),

.220(f), .221(f). Accordingly, as authorized by Rule of Practice 155(a), I find the following allegations in the OIP to be true.

First China, Central Index Key No. 1432254, is a defaulted Nevada corporation located in Kunming City, Yunnan Province, China, with a class of securities registered with the Commission pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12(g). First China 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 30, 2012. As of March 16, 2015, the common stock of First China was quoted on OTC Link, had twelve 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 the 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). 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). 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, 2006 SEC LEXIS 1288, at \*19 (May 31, 2006). 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 \*19-20.

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 \*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 violations are 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 delinquency letters sent to it by the Division of Corporation Finance, and it was therefore on notice, even before the OIP issued, of its 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, Respondent has not answered the OIP, appeared at the prehearing conference, or otherwise defended 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 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 First China Pharmaceutical Group, Inc., is hereby REVOKED.

This Initial Decision shall become effective in accordance with and subject to the provisions of 17 C.F.R. § 201.360. Pursuant to 17 C.F.R. § 201.360, 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 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.

Respondent is notified that it 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