

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RULINGS
Release No. 2567/April 22, 2015

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-16418

In the Matter of

CHINA INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT CORP.

ORDER FOLLOWING
PREHEARING
CONFERENCE

On March 4, 2015, 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 Respondent has securities registered with the Commission and is delinquent in its periodic filings.

On April 2, 2015, the Division of Enforcement filed a declaration, establishing that Respondent was served with the OIP on March 23, 2015. Accordingly, Respondent's Answer was due by April 2, 2015. *See* OIP at 3; 17 C.F.R. § 201.220(a). On April 9, 2015, with no Answer having been filed, I ordered Respondent to show cause by April 20, 2015, why the registrations of its securities should not be revoked by default due to its failure to file an Answer or otherwise defend this proceeding. *China Infrastructure Inv. Corp.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 2529, 2015 SEC LEXIS 1351.

On April 20, 2015, Respondent filed a motion, seeking an extension of time to file an Answer and a discharge of the order to show cause. On that same day, Respondent filed an Answer. A prehearing conference was held on April 21, 2015, attended by counsel for the Respondent and the Division of Enforcement. The Division did not oppose Respondent's motion. Accordingly, for good cause shown and consistent with 17 C.F.R. § 201.161, I GRANT Respondent an extension of time to file an Answer and will treat its Answer as timely filed. I also DISCHARGE the order to show cause.

At the prehearing conference, the parties agreed to the following schedule:

- May 12, 2015: Motions for Summary Disposition are due;
- June 2, 2015: Oppositions to Motions for Summary Disposition are due;
- June 12, 2015: Replies to oppositions, if any, are due.

During the prehearing conference, counsel for Respondent suggested that Respondent may attempt to remedy the filing deficiencies counsel conceded had occurred. In the event Respondent remedies its deficiencies, it should promptly notify the Division and this Office.

SO ORDERED.

James E. Grimes
Administrative Law Judge