

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

In the Matter of

HORNBY INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
IMPART MEDIA GROUP, INC.,
INTEGRATED MICROMETALLURGICAL SYSTEMS, INC., and
INTELLICAPITAL, INC.

INITIAL DECISION OF
DEFAULT

July 16, 2015

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

BEFORE: James E. Grimes, Administrative Law Judge

SUMMARY

This Initial Decision revokes the registrations of the registered securities of Respondents Hornby International, Inc., Impart Media Group, Inc., Integrated Micrometallurgical Systems, Inc., and IntelliCapital, Inc. The revocations are based Respondents' failures to timely file required periodic reports with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

INTRODUCTION

On June 16, 2015, the Commission initiated this proceeding with an Order Instituting Administrative Proceedings (OIP) pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. The OIP alleges that Respondents have a class of securities registered with the Commission pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12(g) and have repeatedly failed to file timely periodic reports with the Commission, in violation of Exchange Act Section 13(a) and Rules 13a-1 and/or 13a-13.

Respondents were served with the OIP by June 17, 2015, in accordance with Commission Rule of Practice 141(a)(2)(ii), 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(ii), and their Answers were due by June 30, 2015. *Hornby Int'l, Inc.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 2887, 2015 SEC LEXIS 2698 (July 1, 2015). I ordered Respondents to show cause by July 13, 2015, why the registrations of their securities should not be revoked by default due to their failures to file Answers or otherwise defend this proceeding. *Id.*

On July 13, 2015, I held a telephonic prehearing conference, which the Division attended but Respondents did not. To date, Respondents have not filed Answers or responded to the order to show cause.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Respondents are in default for failing to file Answers, attend the prehearing conference, or otherwise defend this proceeding. See OIP at 3; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a)(1)-(2), .220(f), .221(f). Accordingly, as authorized by Rule 155(a), I find the following allegations in the OIP to be true. 17 C.F.R. § 201.155(a).

Hornby, Central Index Key (CIK) No. 1079642, is a forfeited Delaware corporation located in Vancouver, Washington, with a class of securities registered with the Commission pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12(g). Hornby 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 \$120,559 for the prior nine months.

Impart, CIK No. 1104161, is a revoked Nevada corporation located in Seattle, Washington, with a class of securities registered with the Commission pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12(g). Impart 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 June 30, 2008, which reported a net loss of \$3,939 for the prior nine months.

Integrated, CIK No. 1357577, is a revoked Nevada corporation located in Spokane, Washington, with a class of securities registered with the Commission pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12(g). Integrated 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 March 31, 2008, which reported a net loss of \$74,310 for the prior nine months.

IntelliCapital, CIK No. 1386976, is a void Delaware corporation located in Airway Heights, Washington, with a class of securities registered with the Commission pursuant to Exchange Act Section 12(g). IntelliCapital 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 June 30, 2007, which reported a net loss of \$3,134 from the company's January 9, 2007 inception to June 30, 2007.

In addition to their repeated failures to file timely periodic reports, 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 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 public corporations to file annual and quarterly reports with the Commission. "Compliance with those 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). Scierter is not required to establish violations of Exchange Act Section 13(a) and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13. *See SEC v. McNulty*, 137 F.3d 732, 740-41 (2d Cir. 1998); *SEC v. Wills*, 472 F. Supp. 1250, 1268 (D.D.C. 1978). There is no genuine issue of material fact that Respondents failed to file timely periodic reports. As a result, Respondents failed to comply with 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 hearing, that the issuer of the security has failed to comply with any provision of the Exchange Act or rules thereunder. In determining the public interest or what is necessary or appropriate for the protection of 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).

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. *SEC v. Beisinger Indus. Corp.*, 552 F.2d 15, 18 (1st Cir. 1977). Respondents’ violations are also recurrent in that they repeatedly failed to file required periodic reports. *See Nature’s Sunshine Prods., Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 59268, 2009 SEC LEXIS 81, at *20 (Jan. 21, 2009) (respondent failed to file seven required periodic reports due over a two-year period); *Impax Labs., Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 57864, 2008 SEC LEXIS 1197, at *25-26 (May 23, 2008) (respondent’s failure to make eight filings over an eighteen-month period considered recurrent). Respondents are also culpable because they failed to heed delinquency letters sent to them by the Division of Corporation Finance or, through their failure to maintain a valid address on file with the Commission as required by Commission rules, did not receive such letters, and they were therefore on notice, even before the OIP issued, of their obligation to file periodic reports. *See China-Biotics, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 70800, 2013 SEC LEXIS 3451, at *37 & n.60 (Nov. 4, 2013) (holding that revocation may be warranted even without proof that a respondent was aware of its reporting obligations). Finally, Respondents have not answered the OIP, attended the prehearing conference, or otherwise participated in the proceeding to address whether they have made any efforts to remedy their past violations, and have provided no assurances against further violations.

For these reasons, it is necessary and appropriate for the protection of investors to revoke the registration of each class of registered securities of Respondents.

ORDER

It is ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrations of each class of registered securities of Hornby International, Inc., Impart Media Group, Inc., Integrated Micrometallurgical Systems, Inc., and IntelliCapital, Inc., are hereby REVOKED.

This Initial Decision shall become effective in accordance with and subject to the provisions of Rule 360, 17 C.F.R. § 201.360. Pursuant to that Rule, a party may file a petition for review of this Initial Decision within twenty-one days after service of the Initial Decision. A party may also file a motion to correct a manifest error of fact within ten days of the Initial Decision, pursuant to Rule 111, 17 C.F.R. § 201.111(h). If a motion to correct a manifest error of fact is filed by a party, a party shall have twenty-one days to file a petition for review from the date of the undersigned's 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 a 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 may move to set aside the default in this case. Rule 155(b) permits the Commission, at any time, to set aside a default for good cause, in order to prevent injustice and on such conditions as may be appropriate. 17 C.F.R. § 201.155(b). A motion to set aside a default shall be made within a reasonable time, state the reasons for the failure to appear or defend, and specify the nature of the proposed defense in the proceeding. *Id.*

James E. Grimes
Administrative Law Judge