

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RULINGS  
Release No. 4049/August 8, 2016

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING  
File No. 3-17307

In the Matter of

GALILEO PETROLEUM LTD.,  
HYPERION ACQUISITION CORP., and  
SATORI BEVERAGES INTERNATIONAL, LTD.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AS  
TO HYPERION ACQUISITION  
CORP.

On June 21, 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. On July 15, 2016, I found that Respondents Galileo Petroleum Ltd. and Satori Beverages International, Ltd., were served with the OIP by June 28 and their answers were due by July 11, 2016; in addition, I scheduled a telephonic prehearing conference for July 22, 2016, and notified these Respondents that if they failed to file timely answers, appear at the prehearing conference, or otherwise defend the proceeding, I would deem them in default, determine that the allegations in the OIP are true, and revoke the registrations of their securities. *Galileo Petroleum Ltd.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 3989, 2016 SEC LEXIS 2457.

Galileo and Satori did not appear at the July 22, 2016, prehearing conference, and on that date I issued an order requiring these two respondents to show cause by August 1, 2016, why the registrations of their securities should not be revoked by default due to their failures to file timely answers, appear at the prehearing conference, or otherwise defend this proceeding. *Galileo Petroleum Ltd.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 4015, 2016 SEC LEXIS 2536 (citing OIP at 3; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a), .220(f), .221(f)).

The OIP alleges that Hyperion Acquisition Corp. is a forfeited Delaware corporation located in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. As part of a declaration filed on July 18, 2016, the Division of Enforcement represented that the Office of the Secretary mailed a copy of the OIP Priority Mail Express to Hyperion at the Vietnam address shown on its most recent filing with the Commission and submitted a USPS tracking printout showing that delivery was attempted on June 27, 2016, in Vietnam at the address on its most recent Commission filing. According to the Division, Vietnam signed the Hague Convention on Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters and does not oppose service through postal channels if the documents are forwarded via registered mail with acknowledgement of

receipt, but to date no return receipt has been obtained. The declaration cites no authority regarding the applicability of Hague service, and it appears that the service provisions of the Hague Convention do not become effective as to Vietnam until October 1, 2016. <https://www.hcch.net/en/instruments/conventions/status-table/?cid=17> (last accessed Aug. 1, 2016). Case law confirms that Vietnam was previously not a signatory to the Hague Convention. *See, e.g., TracFone Wireless, Inc. v. Bitton*, 278 F.R.D. 687, 691 (S.D. Fla. 2012). To rely on the attempted mail delivery in Vietnam as establishing service, there must be evidence that “the method of service used is not prohibited by the law of the foreign country.” 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(iv).

Given these facts, the Division established service on Hyperion through other means. On July 28, 2016, Division counsel filed his own declaration and the declaration of a process server, establishing that Hyperion was served with the OIP on July 26, 2016, via personal service on the Delaware Secretary of State as allowed by Delaware law inasmuch as Hyperion had no registered agent or officer in the state of Delaware. *See Del. Code Ann. tit. 8 § 321(a)-(b); SEC v. Am. Land Co.*, No. 87-cv-1453, 1987 WL 19930, at \*4 (D.D.C. Nov. 6, 1987). Hyperion’s answer was therefore due by August 5, 2016. OIP at 3; 17 C.F.R. § 201.220(b).

Hyperion has not filed an answer and has not otherwise defended the proceeding. Accordingly, I ORDER Hyperion to SHOW CAUSE by August 18, 2016, why the registration of its securities should not be revoked by default for its failure to timely file an answer or otherwise defend this proceeding. Failure to do so will result in the revocation of its registered securities. 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a), .220(f).

---

Brenda P. Murray  
Chief Administrative Law Judge