

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 80294 / March 21, 2017

Admin. Proc. File No. 3-17715

In the Matter of

SEN YU INTERNATIONAL HOLDINGS, 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 Sen Yu International Holdings, 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 Sen Yu International Holdings, Inc.² The order contained in that decision is hereby declared final. 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 Sen Yu International Holdings, Inc., is hereby revoked. The revocation is effective as of March 22, 2017.

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 *Sen Yu Int'l Holdings, Inc.*, Initial Decision Rel. No. 1105 (Jan. 23, 2017), 115 SEC Docket 19, 2017 WL 344350. The stock symbol and Central Index Key number for Sen Yu International Holdings, Inc., is CSWG and 724915.

INITIAL DECISION RELEASE NO. 1105
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-17715

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

In the Matter of

SEN YU INTERNATIONAL HOLDINGS, INC.

INITIAL DECISION OF DEFAULT
January 23, 2017

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 registrations of the registered securities of Respondent based on its failure to file timely periodic reports with the Securities and Exchange Commission, as required by law.

INTRODUCTION

On December 8, 2016, the Commission initiated this proceeding under Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with an order instituting proceedings (OIP). The OIP alleges that Respondent has securities registered with the Commission under 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 by December 15, 2016, and its answer was due by December 27, 2016. *Sen Yu Int'l Holdings, Inc.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 4498, 2017 SEC LEXIS 3 (ALJ January 3, 2017). I noted that Respondent had not answered and ordered it to show cause by January 13, 2017, why the registration of its securities should not be revoked by default due to its failure to file an answer or otherwise defend the proceeding. *Id.* Respondent did not file an answer or respond to the show cause order and did not appear at a prehearing conference held on January 18, 2017.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Respondent is in default for failing to file an answer, respond to the order to show cause, appear at the prehearing conference, or otherwise defend the proceeding. *See* OIP at 2; 17 C.F.R.

§§ 201.155(a)(2), .220(f), .221(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.

Respondent Sen Yu International Holdings, Inc., Central Index Key No. 724915 and ticker symbol CSWG, is a void Delaware corporation located in Qianjin District, Jiamusi City, China, 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-Q for the period ended March 31, 2012. As of December 5, 2016, the common stock of CSWG was quoted on OTC Link operated by OTC Markets Group, Inc. (formerly “Pink Sheets”), had six market makers, and was eligible for the “piggyback” exception of Exchange Act Rule 15c2-11(f)(3).

In addition to its repeated failure to file timely periodic reports, Respondent failed to bring its filing current in response to the 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 require domestic public corporations to file annual and quarterly reports with the Commission. “Compliance with those [reporting] 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 the rules thereunder. *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). Respondent failed to file timely periodic reports. As a result, Respondent failed to comply with 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 ensure that investors are adequately protected, 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).

Respondent’s failure to file required periodic reports is serious because it violates a central provision of the Exchange Act. The purpose of 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). Respondent's violations are recurrent in that they repeatedly failed to file current and periodic reports. *See Nature's Sunshine Prods., Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 59268, 2009 SEC LEXIS 81, at *20 (Jan. 21, 2009) (viewing the failure to file seven required periodic reports over a two-year period as recurrent); *Impax Labs., Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 57864, 2008 SEC LEXIS 1197, at *25-26 (May 23, 2008) (considering the failure to make eight filings over an eighteen-month period to be recurrent). Even if Respondent, through its failure to maintain a valid address on file with the Commission as required by Commission rules, did not receive notice of the violations, it is still culpable. *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). Respondent has not answered the OIP, responded to the show cause order, appeared at the prehearing conference, or otherwise participated in the proceeding to address whether it has made any effort to remedy its past violations or ensure future compliance.

For the reasons described above, it is necessary and appropriate for the protection of investors to revoke the registration of each class of the Respondent's registered securities.

ORDER

It is ORDERED that, under Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registration of each class of registered securities of Sen Yu International Holdings, Inc., is hereby REVOKED.¹

This initial decision shall become effective in accordance with and subject to the provisions of Rule 360, 17 C.F.R. § 201.360. Under this 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, under 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. 17 C.F.R. § 201.360(d). 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. *Id.* If any of these events occur, the initial decision shall not become final as to that party. *Id.*

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

1. This order applies to all classes of the Respondent's securities registered under Section 12 of the Exchange Act, whether or not such securities are specifically identified by ticker symbol or otherwise in this initial decision.

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