

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RULINGS
Release No. 3913/June 13, 2016

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-17256

In the Matter of

DRAGON BRIGHT MINTAI BOTANICAL
TECHNOLOGY CAYMAN LTD.,
JINZANGHUANG TIBET
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., and
MACAU RESOURCES GROUP LTD.

ORDER FOLLOWING
PREHEARING CONFERENCE
AND TO SHOW CAUSE AS TO
TWO RESPONDENTS

On May 20, 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 and are delinquent in their periodic filings. Respondents were served with the OIP by May 24, 2016, and their answers were due June 6. *Dragon Bright Mintai Botanical Tech. Cayman Ltd.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 3887, 2016 SEC LEXIS 1948 (ALJ June 1, 2016).

Dragon Bright Mintai Botanical Technology Cayman Ltd. was the only Respondent to file an answer and to appear at the prehearing conference on June 8, 2016. At the conference, we discussed the defenses Dragon Bright raised in its answer, the viability of which I questioned, given that Dragon Bright has not filed a required periodic report since June 17, 2013. <http://1.usa.gov/1UDyCAJ>; *see* 17 C.F.R. § 201.323 (“Official notice may be taken of . . . any matter in the public official records of the Commission.”). The Division of Enforcement stated that it would provide Dragon Bright’s counsel with copies of the delinquency notices alleged in the OIP to have been sent to Dragon Bright. The Division also advised that Respondent Macau Resources Group Ltd. had contacted the Division and had shown interest in settlement.

At the conclusion of the prehearing conference, I indicated that I would order all respondents to show cause why the registration of their securities should not be revoked. However, given that Dragon Bright filed an answer and participated in the prehearing conference, and on the advice of my law clerks that Dragon Bright should have an opportunity to challenge the arguments and evidence proffered by the Division in support of the OIP’s allegations and the sanction it seeks, I conclude it wise to ORDER the following schedule. *See Kornman v. SEC*, 592 F.3d 173, 182-83 (D.C. Cir. 2010); *China-Biotics, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 70800, 2013 SEC LEXIS 3451, at *62 & n.105 (Nov. 4, 2013).

I GRANT the Division leave to file a motion for summary disposition as to Dragon Bright by July 1, 2016. Dragon Bright's opposition is due July 15, 2016, and the Division's reply, if any, is due July 22, 2016. *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.250.

I further ORDER Respondents JinZangHuang Tibet Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Macau Resources Group Ltd. to SHOW CAUSE by June 23, 2016, why the registrations of their securities should not be revoked by default due to their failures to file answers, appear at the prehearing conference, or otherwise defend the proceeding. OIP at 3; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a), .220(f), .221(f).

Brenda P. Murray
Chief Administrative Law Judge