

INITIAL DECISION RELEASE NO. 880  
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING  
FILE NO. 3-16747

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

In the Matter of

MATTMAR MINERALS, INC.,  
STRATEGIC MINING CORPORATION, and  
THOMAS PHARMACEUTICALS, LTD.

INITIAL DECISION OF DEFAULT

September 14, 2015

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

BEFORE: Cameron Elliot, Administrative Law Judge

**SUMMARY**

This Initial Decision revokes the registrations of Respondents' registered securities due to their failures to timely file required periodic reports with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

**INTRODUCTION**

The Commission instituted this proceeding on August 12, 2015, pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Exchange Act). The Order Instituting Proceedings (OIP) alleges that Respondents have securities registered with the Commission and are delinquent in their periodic filings. Respondents were served with the OIP by August 17, 2015, and their Answers were due by August 31. *Mattmar Minerals, Inc.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 3087, 2015 SEC LEXIS 3575 (Sept. 1, 2015). On September 1, 2015, I ordered Respondents to show cause by September 11 why the registrations of their securities should not be revoked by default due to their failures to file Answers or defend this proceeding. *Id.* I warned that if a Respondent failed to respond to the Order to Show Cause, it would be deemed in default, the proceeding would be determined against it, and the registration of its securities would be revoked. *Id.* To date, none of the Respondents have filed an Answer or responded to the Order to Show Cause.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

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 deem the OIP's allegations to be true.

Mattmar Minerals, Inc., Central Index Key (CIK) No. 1366317, is a forfeited Delaware corporation located in Summit, New Jersey, 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 February 28, 2013, which reported a net loss of \$33,411 for the prior nine months. As of August 7, 2015, the company's common stock was traded on the over-the-counter markets.

Strategic Mining Corporation, CIK No. 1490381, is a dissolved Wyoming corporation located in Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 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 September 30, 2012, which reported a loss from operations of \$470,314 for the prior nine months. As of August 7, 2015, the company's common stock was traded on the over-the-counter markets.

Thomas Pharmaceuticals, Ltd., CIK No. 1391428, is a revoked New Jersey corporation located in Matawan, New Jersey, 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 September 30, 2009, which reported a net loss applicable to common shares of \$337,937 for the prior nine months. As of August 7, 2015, the company's common stock was traded on the over-the-counter markets.

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 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). Scierer 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 Respondents failed to timely

file required periodic reports. As a result, 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 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).

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.” *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). 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). 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 as required by Commission rules, 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, Respondents have not answered the OIP 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 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 Mattmar Minerals, Inc., Strategic Mining Corporation, and Thomas Pharmaceuticals, Ltd., 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.

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.*

---

Cameron Elliot  
Administrative Law Judge