

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 84797 / December 11, 2018

Admin. Proc. File No. 3-18731

In the Matter of

CHINA HEALTH RESOURCE, INC., AND
CHINA LOGISTICS GROUP, INC.

Respondents.

ORDER CONCERNING SERVICE OF THE ORDER INSTITUTING PROCEEDINGS

The Securities and Exchange Commission issued an Order Instituting Proceedings (“OIP”) on September 7, 2018, pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, against respondents China Health Resource, Inc. and China Logistics Group, Inc. (collectively, “Respondents”).¹

On September 24, 2018, the Division of Enforcement filed the Declaration of Ronald Turnbaugh, which stated that service of the OIP was made on China Health Resource, Inc. on September 20, 2018, “by delivering two copies . . . at the office of the Delaware Secretary of State, Division of Corporations, . . . with . . . a clerk or other person in charge of the office.” But the declaration does not state what steps the Division took to ensure valid service of the OIP, including the steps to determine that no other option for service within the State of Delaware was available.²

On October 5, 2018, the Division filed the Declaration of George Sano, which stated that service of the OIP was made on China Logistics Group, Inc. on October 1, 2018, by “serv[ing] the [OIP] at [REDACTED], . . . on Theresa Shum, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides therein.” The declaration stated that this address is the “personal residence” of “Davy H. Shum, Vice President of International Marketing for China Logistics Group, Inc.” But the declaration does not state what steps the Division took to ensure valid service of the OIP, including the steps to determine that Davy H. Shum is an officer of

¹ *China Health Resource, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 84059, 2018 WL 4293443 (Sept. 7, 2018).

² *See* 8 Del. Code § 321(b).

China Logistics Group, Inc., and to determine the address of his “dwelling house or usual place of abode.”³ Also, the declaration does not state how a copy of the OIP was “served” on Theresa Shum, such as whether the process server delivered it by leaving a copy with her.⁴

Accordingly, the Division is directed to file another declaration in this proceeding with information concerning what steps it took to ensure valid service of the OIP upon Respondents.

For the Commission, by the Office of the General Counsel, pursuant to delegated authority.

Brent J. Fields
Secretary

³ See Rule of Practice 141(a)(2)(i)-(ii), 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(i)-(ii).

⁴ See Rule of Practice 141(a)(2)(i), 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(i).