In the Matter of

New Western Energy Corp., Preferred Restaurant Brands, Inc., and Primco Management, Inc.

Initial Decision on Default as to Two Respondents
July 26, 2017

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

Before: Brenda P. Murray, Chief Administrative Law Judge

On June 1, 2017, 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 New Western Energy Corp. and Primco Management, Inc. (the two Respondents),1 were served with the OIP, and their answers were due by June 19, 2017. New W. Energy Corp., Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 4884, 2017 SEC LEXIS 1895, at *1 (ALJ June 21, 2017).

On July 24, 2017, this office was informed by the Division of Enforcement that Respondent Preferred Restaurant Brands, Inc., has agreed in principle with the Division to a settlement on all major terms, and I therefore stayed the proceeding as to Preferred Restaurant. New W. Energy Corp., Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 4925, 2017 SEC LEXIS 2189 (ALJ July 25, 2017).
I held a prehearing conference on June 20, 2017, at which counsel for the Division appeared. No one appeared for the two Respondents. Following the prehearing conference, I issued an order to show cause. *Id.* To date, the two Respondents have not filed answers or responded to the show cause order.

The two Respondents are in default for failing to file answers, participate in the prehearing conference, or otherwise defend the proceeding. 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 the two Respondents. 17 C.F.R. § 201.155(a).

**Findings of Fact**

New Western, Central Index Key (CIK) No. 1479488, is a defaulted Nevada corporation located in Irvine, 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 September 30, 2015, which reported a net loss of over $2.45 million for the prior nine months. As of May 23, 2017, the company’s stock (symbol “NWTR”) was quoted on OTC Link operated by OTC Markets Group Inc. (OTC Link), had seven market makers, and was eligible for the “piggyback” exception of Exchange Act Rule 15c2-11(f)(3).

Primco Management, CIK No. 1516522, is a void Delaware corporation located in Seattle, Washington, 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-K for the period ended December 31, 2014, which reported a net loss of over $9 million for the prior nine months. As of May 23, 2017, the company’s stock (symbol “PMCM”) was quoted on OTC Link, had six market makers, 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, 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 failures to maintain valid addresses on file with the Commission as required by Commission rules, did not receive such letters.
Conclusions of Law


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 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. Eagletech Comms’n, Inc., Exchange Act Release No. 54095, 2006 SEC LEXIS 1534, at *12 (July 5, 2006) (quoting SEC v. Beisinger Indus. Corp., 552 F.2d 15, 18 (1st Cir. 1977)). The violations are recurrent in that the two Respondents failed to file any periodic reports since 2015. See Nature’s Sunshine Prods., Inc., Exchange Act Release No. 59268, 2009 SEC

The two Respondents are culpable because they 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 registrations of each class of the two Respondents’ registered securities.

Order

I ORDER that, pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrations of each class of registered securities of New Western Energy Corp. and Primco Management, Inc., are REVOKED.2

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 twenty-one 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

---

2 This order applies to all classes of the two Respondents’ 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.
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