

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RULINGS
Release No. 1111 / December 18, 2013

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-15302

In the Matter of	:	
	:	
ACTAVISION VENTURES, INC.,	:	
AMERICAN RESOURCES GROUP, INC.,	:	
AUDIOSCIENCE, INC.,	:	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AS
BASSET ENTERPRISES, INC.,	:	TO BASSET ENTERPRISES, INC.
CYBERTEX ENTERPRISES, INC.	:	
(n/k/a SYNVIION CORP.), and	:	
DUCT UTILITY CONSTRUCTION &	:	
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	:	

The Securities and Exchange Commission (Commission) issued an Order Instituting Administrative Proceedings (OIP), pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Exchange Act), on April 25, 2013. The OIP alleges that Respondents repeatedly failed to file timely periodic reports with the Commission in violation of Section 13(a) of the Exchange Act and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13 thereunder. This proceeding has ended as to all Respondents except Basset Enterprises, Inc. (Basset). See Actavision Ventures, Inc., Exchange Act Release No. 69697, 2013 WL 2432672 (June 5, 2013).

On December 17, 2013, this Office received a Return of Service From the Chinese Hague Convention Authority and English Translation, as to Basset indicating that service of the OIP was attempted on September 11, 2013, and that there is “no such company at the address provided.” The address provided was 3102-3105 Time Square Plaza, Yitian Road, Futian District, Shenzhen, China, which is Basset’s “most recent address shown on [its] most recent filing with the Commission,” a Form 10-Q for the period ended March 31, 2010. 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(ii), (iv). The address listed in the Hague Convention Certificate is the address listed in the Form 10-Q, but the address listed in the translation of the Proof of Service attached to it is slightly different. However, because the Hague Convention Certificate is the official Chinese government Hague Convention response, and because the Proof of Service is a translation and the Hague Convention Certificate is not, I find that the OIP was sent to the correct address. Accordingly, Basset was served with the OIP on September 11, 2013. Id. To date, Basset has not filed an Answer, which was due within ten days after service of the OIP. See OIP at 3; 17 C.F.R. § 201.220(b).

It is ORDERED that on or before January 9, 2014, Basset shall SHOW CAUSE why this proceeding should not be determined against it. See 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a)(2), .220(f). If Basset fails to respond to this Order, it will be deemed in default, this proceeding will be determined against it, and the registration of its securities will be revoked. See 17 C.F.R. § 201.155(a)(2).

Cameron Elliot
Administrative Law Judge