

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING  
FILE NO. 3-12390

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
Before the  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
August 25, 2006

---

In the Matter of	:	
	:	
BILOGIC, INC.,	:	
CORPAS INVESTMENTS, INC.,	:	ORDER POSTPONING HEARING
DT SOLUTIONS, INC.,	:	
GLOBAL A, INC.,	:	
PAVING STONE CORP.,	:	
WASTECH, INC., and	:	
WEBCATALYST, INC.	:	

---

The Securities and Exchange Commission (Commission) issued its Order Instituting Proceedings (OIP) on August 9, 2006. The Chief Administrative Law Judge then assigned the matter to my docket and scheduled a hearing for August 28, 2006.

The Office of the Secretary and the Division of Enforcement (Division) submitted evidence to document service of the OIP. The Division has also submitted a motion to adjourn the hearing, to schedule a telephonic prehearing conference, to issue orders of default and/or grant it leave to file a motion for summary disposition.

I have reviewed the evidence submitted, and I find that the Delaware registered agents for Bilogic, Inc., and Global A, Inc., received the OIP on August 10, 2006. I further find that this service complies with Rule 141(a)(2)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice.

The Division has presented evidence that Carl Wright (otherwise unidentified) received the OIP on August 10, 2006, on behalf of Wastech, Inc. The connection between Mr. Wright and Wastech, Inc., is not explained on the record. As a separate matter, an attorney representing Wastech requested an enlargement of time, until August 28, 2006, to file an Answer on behalf of Wastech. The Division did not oppose this request for additional time.

The Division has also presented evidence of attempted delivery of the OIP to DT Solutions, Inc., at the address identified in that issuer's last filing with the Commission. The date of attempted delivery was August 10, 2006.

I will grant the enlargement of time sought by Wastech, Inc. As a matter of equity, I will grant a comparable enlargement of time to Bilogic, Inc., Global A, Inc., and DT Solutions, Inc.

The Division has next presented evidence that the registered agents for Webcatalyst, Inc., and Corpas Investments, Inc., received the OIP on August 16 and 17, 2006, respectively. The time for those Respondents to file Answers has not yet expired.

I find insufficient evidence that valid delivery or valid attempted delivery of the OIP on the other Respondent has been effectuated. The OIP identifies Paving Stone Corporation as a defaulted Nevada corporation located in Coral Springs, Florida. The August 22, 2006, Declaration of Jonathan P. Scott, an attorney for the Division (Scott Declaration), represents that service of the OIP was attempted at Paving Stone's most recent filing address in Pompano Beach, Florida. Paving Stone's most recent filings, a Form 12b-25 dated March 30, 2004, and a Form 10-Q for the quarter ended September 30, 2003, demonstrate that Paving Stone's most recent address was in Coral Springs, not in Pompano Beach.<sup>1</sup> The Division must either provide evidence of a subsequent change of address or evidence of delivery/attempted delivery at an address that complies with Rule 141(a)(2)(ii).

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

Bilogic, Inc., Global A, Inc., DT Solutions, Inc., and Wastech, Inc., are each granted an enlargement of time, until August 28, 2006, to file and serve Answers to the OIP;

The Division's motion for an order of default and its alternative motion for leave to file a motion for summary disposition are denied as premature;

The Division shall file a supplement to the Scott Declaration by September 14, 2006, demonstrating proper service as to Paving Stone Corporation; and

A telephonic prehearing conference will be held on September 28, 2006, at 10 a.m., E.D.T. The Division shall make the necessary arrangements and obtain a court reporter. The hearing previously scheduled for August 28, 2006, will be postponed to a date to be determined at the telephonic prehearing conference.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James T. Kelly  
Administrative Law Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> The text of recently revised Rule 141(a)(2)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice requires attempted delivery of the OIP to be made at "the most recent address shown on the entity's most recent filing with the Commission." The Rule is not confined to an entity's most recent periodic filing.