

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

In the Matter of

KOGETO, INC.,  
LUSTROS, INC., and  
MED-X SYSTEMS, INC.

INITIAL DECISION ON DEFAULT  
AS TO TWO RESPONDENTS

December 21, 2016

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

BEFORE: Brenda P. Murray, Chief Administrative Law Judge

On November 16, 2016, the Securities and Exchange Commission issued an order instituting proceedings (OIP) pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, alleging that Respondents have securities registered with the Commission under Section 12(g) of the Exchange Act and are delinquent in their periodic filings. Respondents were served with the OIP by November 17, 2016, and their answers were due by November 30, 2016. *Kogeto, Inc.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 4416, 2016 SEC LEXIS 4495 (ALJ Dec. 5, 2016). No answers were filed. I ordered Respondents to show cause by December 15, 2016, why the registrations of their securities should not be revoked by default. *Id.*

On December 19, 2016, the Commission accepted a settlement offer by Respondent Kogeto, Inc., and revoked the registration of its securities. *Kogeto, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 79588, 2016 SEC LEXIS 4674. This proceeding has ended as to Kogeto, Inc.

The two remaining Respondents, Lustros, Inc., and Med-X Systems, Inc., did not file answers, respond to the order to show cause, participate in the prehearing conference held December 16, 2016, or otherwise defend the proceeding. Lustros and Med-X Systems are therefore in default. OIP at 3; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a)(1)-(2), .220(f), .221(f). Accordingly, I find the allegations in the OIP to be true as to them. 17 C.F.R. § 201.155(a).

## **Findings of Fact**

Lustros, Inc., Central Index Key (CIK) No. 922011, is an expired Utah corporation located in Santee, California, 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, 2014, which reported a net loss of \$1,430,523 for the prior three months. As of November 14, 2016, the company's common stock (ticker symbol LSTS) was quoted on OTC Link operated by OTC Market Group Inc., had six market makers, and was eligible for the "piggyback" exception of Exchange Act Rule 15c2-11(f)(3).

Med-X Systems, Inc., CIK No. 1145420, is a permanently revoked Nevada corporation located in New York, New York, 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 September 30, 2007, which reported a net loss of \$698,349 for the prior nine months. As of November 14, 2016, the company's common stock (ticker symbol MXSS) was quoted on OTC Link, had one market maker, and was eligible for the "piggyback" exception of Exchange Act Rule 15c2-11(f)(3).

In addition to their repeated failures to file timely periodic reports, Lustros and Med-X Systems 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 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). 17 C.F.R. §§ 240.13a-1, .13a-13. "Compliance with [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). Scierer is not required to establish violations of Exchange Act Section 13(a) and rules thereunder. *SEC v. McNulty*, 137 F.3d 732, 740-41 (2d Cir. 1998). By failing to file timely required annual and quarterly reports, Lustros and Med-X Systems 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

the registration for a period not exceeding twelve months if it finds, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, that the issuer of the security has failed to comply with any provision of the Exchange Act or rules thereunder. 15 U.S.C § 78l(j). 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).

The failure of Lustros and Med-X Systems 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). The violations are recurrent in that Lustros, Inc., failed to file periodic reports for more than two years and Med-X Systems, Inc., failed to file periodic reports for more than nine years. 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).

Lustros and Med-X Systems are culpable because they each knew, or should have known, of their obligations to file periodic reports. *China-Biotics, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 70800, 2013 SEC LEXIS 3451, at \*37 & n.60 (Nov. 4, 2013) (holding that scienter is not necessary to establish grounds for revocation); *Robert L. Burns*, Investment Advisers Act of 1940 Release No. 3260, 2011 SEC LEXIS 2722, at \*41 n.60 (Aug. 5, 2011) (stating that the Commission has “repeatedly held that ignorance of the securities laws is not a defense to liability thereunder”). By not participating in this proceeding, they forfeited an opportunity to show they made efforts to remedy their past violations or to offer any assurance against further violations.

On these facts, it is necessary and appropriate for the protection of investors to revoke the registration of each class of registered securities of Lustros and Med-X Systems.

### **Order**

I ORDER that, pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registration of each class of registered securities of Lustros, Inc., and Med-X Systems, Inc., are REVOKED.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. This order applies to all classes of 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.

This initial decision shall become effective in accordance with and subject to the provisions of Rule of Practice 360. 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. 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. 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. 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 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.

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