

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RULINGS  
Release No. 2673/May 13, 2015

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING  
File No. 3-16515

In the Matter of

JESTERS RESOURCES, INC.,  
JET NEKO, INC., AND  
KENSINGTON GROUP, INC.

ORDER

On April 28, 2015, the Securities and Exchange Commission issued an Order Instituting Administrative Proceedings (OIP) against Respondents pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

On May 7, 2015, the Division of Enforcement filed a Declaration of Service stating that a process server served the OIP and other documents on Respondents. With regard to Respondent Jesters Resources, Inc., the Declaration states that service was accomplished “by leaving a copy of the Service Papers at the office of its Registered Agent, The Corporation Trust Co. of Nevada, 311 S. Division St., Carson City, NV 89703.” Declaration at 2.

Given Jesters’s status as a revoked Nevada corporation, on May 8, 2015, I postponed the hearing *sine die* and ordered the Division to notify this Office whether service had been accomplished in accordance with NEV. REV. STAT. § 78.750 (2014). *Jesters Res., Inc.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 2652, 2015 SEC LEXIS 1795. On May 13, 2015, the Division filed its Brief Regarding Personal Service on Registered Agent of Jesters (Brief). The Division argues that the language in NEV. REV. STAT. § 78.750 is neither mandatory nor exclusive, and requests that I find that personal service of the OIP on Jesters’s registered agent in Nevada was proper. Brief at 1.

NEV. REV. STAT. § 78.750 provides that service on a revoked Nevada corporation can be accomplished by serving “(a) the registered agent of the corporation, if there is one; **and** (b) each officer and director of the corporation as named in the list last filed with the Secretary of State before the dissolution or expiration of the corporation or the forfeiture of its charter” (emphasis added). Notwithstanding the use of the word “and,” the Nevada Supreme Court interpreted § 78.750 as permitting service on either the registered agent *or* each officer and director. *Canarelli v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct. of Nev.*, 265 P.3d 673, 675 n.2 (Nev. 2011). Accordingly, I find that service on Jesters was properly effected on April 29, 2015, through its

registered agent, in accordance with 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(ii), and that its Answer was therefore due on May 11, 2015. *See* OIP at 3. I further find that service on Kensington Group, Inc., and Jet Neko, Inc., was effected on May 1, 2015, in accordance with Commission Rule of Practice 141(a)(2)(ii). 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(ii); *see* Del. Code Ann. tit. 8, § 321(b).

On May 12, 2015, Jet Neko filed a Motion for Extension of Time to Answer (Motion). Jet Neko requests an extension of seven days and represents that it is “considering a proposed settlement, but needs additional time to consult with [its counsel] before making a decision regarding the proposed settlement and answering the OIP.” Motion at 3.

For good cause shown, I GRANT Jet Neko’s Motion. *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.161. Jet Neko’s Answer is now due by May 18, 2015.

I ORDER that on or before May 20, 2015, Jesters and Kensington SHOW CAUSE why the registrations of their securities should not be revoked by default due to their failure to file Answers. *See* OIP at 3; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a)(2), .220(f). If a Respondent fails to respond to this Order, it will be deemed in default, the proceeding will be determined against it, and the registration of its securities will be revoked.

I FURTHER ORDER that a telephonic prehearing conference be held on May 20, 2015, at 2:00 p.m. EDT.

---

James E. Grimes  
Administrative Law Judge