UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 90171 / October 14, 2020

Admin. Proc. File No. 3-19400

In the Matter of

AZTECH INTERNATIONAL LTD., BEV-TYME, INC., and CONCORD ENERGY INCORPORATED

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

The Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") issued an Order Instituting Proceedings ("OIP") on August 30, 2019, pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, against Aztech International Ltd., Bev-Tyme, Inc., and Concord Energy Incorporated ("Respondents").[1]

On September 13, 2019, the Division of Enforcement filed the Declaration of Allen Flood, and on October 30, 2019, the Division of Enforcement filed the Supplemental Declaration of David S. Frye. The declarations state that service of the OIP was made on Aztech International and Bev-Tyme on September 4, 2019, and on Concord Energy on September 5, 2019, pursuant to Rule 141(a)(2)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice.[2] On November 21, 2019, the Division filed a motion requesting that the Commission find Respondents in default for not filing answers and that it revoke the registration of each class of their securities based on the record and the allegations in the OIP.[3]

---

1 *Aztech Int'l, Ltd.*, Exchange Act Release No. 86826, 2019 WL 4135418 (Aug. 30, 2019).

2 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(ii).

3 The Division's motion for default, which seeks relief with respect to respondents in 18 different administrative proceedings, was filed before the Commission's recent guidance that "it typically should not be necessary for the Division to file motions for default in Section 12(j) proceedings unless it wishes to adduce evidence of new or changed circumstances, to otherwise supplement the record beyond the allegations in the OIP, or to request that the Commission afford expedited consideration to a matter." *NXChain, Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 87652, 2019 WL 6528959, at *2 n.15 (Dec. 3, 2019). "Omnibus" filings covering parties across different proceedings should not be filed unless leave for consolidation has been sought and obtained. *See* Rule of Practice 201(a), 17 C.F.R. § 201.201(a) (requiring that leave be obtained for consolidation of proceedings).

As stated in the OIP, Respondents' answers were required to be filed within ten days of service of the OIP.[4] As of the date of this order, Respondents have not filed answers. Nor has any Respondent filed an opposition to the Division's motion for default. The prehearing conference and the hearing are thus continued indefinitely.

Accordingly, Respondents are ORDERED to SHOW CAUSE by October 28, 2020, why the registrations of their securities should not be revoked by default due to their failure to file an answer, to respond to the Division's motion for default, and to otherwise defend this proceeding. When a party defaults, the allegations in the OIP will be deemed to be true and the Commission may determine the proceeding against that party upon consideration of the record without holding a public hearing.

If Respondents fail to respond to this order to show cause, they may be deemed in default, the proceeding may be determined against them, and their securities may be revoked.[5] Upon review of the filings in response to this order, the Commission will either direct further proceedings by subsequent order or issue a final order resolving the matter.

The parties' attention is called to the Commission's March 18, 2020 order regarding the filing and service of papers, which provides that pending further order of the Commission parties to the extent possible shall submit all filings electronically at apfilings@sec.gov.[6]

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

Vanessa A. Countryman
Secretary

---

[4] *Aztech Int'l, Ltd.*, 2019 WL 4135418, at *2; Rules of Practice 151(a), 160(b), 220(b), 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.151(a), 160(b), .220(b).

[5] Rules of Practice 155, 180, 17 C.F.R. § 201.155, .180; *see Aztech Int'l, Ltd.*, 2019 WL 4135418, at *2 ("If Respondents fail to file the directed Answers, . . . [they] may be deemed in default and the proceedings may be determined against them . . . ."). The failure to timely oppose a dispositive motion is also a basis for a finding of default. *See* Rules of Practice 155(a)(2), 180(c), 17 C.F.R. § 201.155(a)(2), .180(c); *see, e.g.*, *Benham Halali*, Exchange Act Release No. 79722, 2017 WL 24498, at *3 n.12 (Jan. 3, 2017).

[6] *See Pending Administrative Proceedings*, Exchange Act Release No. 88415, https://www.sec.gov/litigation/opinions/2020/33-10767.pdf.