

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Release No. 93742 / December 8, 2021

Admin. Proc. File No. 3-20346

In the Matter of

INTERNATIONAL TECHNOLOGY
ENTERPRISES LTD.

ORDER REGARDING SERVICE

The Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) issued an Order Instituting Proceedings (“OIP”) on May 27, 2021, pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, against respondent International Technology Enterprises Ltd. (“Respondent”).¹

The Division of Enforcement has filed three status reports and a declaration describing the steps it has taken to attempt to serve Respondent with the OIP. The first report, filed on September 7, 2021, explained that the Division, with the assistance of the Office of International Affairs (“OIA”), had determined that Belize was a signatory to the Hague Convention and did not object to service by mail. As a result, the Division attempted to serve Respondent by mailing the OIP to Respondent in Belize.² But the report represented that this effort was ineffective.

The report represented further that, since that attempt, the Division had been attempting to effect service that was compliant with the Hague Convention.³ But Belize required payment

¹ *Int’l Tech. Enters. Ltd.*, Exchange Act Release No. 91939, 2021 WL 2019954 (May 27, 2021).

² See Rule of Practice 141(a)(2)(iv)(A), 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(iv)(A) (providing that service may be made upon foreign corporations or entities in a foreign country by “[a]ny method specified in” Rule 141(a)(2)(ii) “that is not prohibited by the law of the foreign country”); Rule of Practice 141(a)(2)(ii), 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(ii) (providing that service may be made on an issuer with a class of securities registered with the Commission by sending a copy of the OIP to the most recent address shown on the respondent’s most recent filing with the Commission); *Alife Corp.*, Exchange Act Release No. 89179, 2020 WL 3529897 (June 29, 2020) (providing that a supplemental declaration “established service of the OIP by describing the steps taken by the Division to determine . . . that mail service is an acceptable means of service in Singapore”).

³ See Rule of Practice 141(a)(2)(iv)(B), 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(iv)(B) (providing that service may be made upon foreign corporations or entities in a foreign country by “any internationally agreed means of service that is reasonably calculated to give notice, such as those authorized by the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents”).

of a fee by money order for service under the Hague Convention. And, according to the Division, “federal agencies are generally prohibited from making advance payments by law.”

The second report, filed on October 5, 2021, represented that the Division with OIA’s assistance was attempting to serve Respondent under the Hague Convention using a third-party vendor. The report stated that the third-party vendor had fulfilled the money order requirement and that “the vendor confirmed that the OIP had been filed with the Belize Supreme Court.”

The third report, filed on October 21, 2021, represented that an agent of the Belize Supreme Court could not hand-deliver the OIP at the Belize address listed on Respondent’s most recent filing with the Commission. On November 3, 2021, we issued an order stating that because the Belize Supreme Court “certified that the OIP ‘has not been served,’ it was not clear that the OIP had been served in a manner that complied with Rule of Practice 141(a)(2)(iv)(B).”⁴ We ordered that the Division provide further information on its efforts to effect service including by explaining why its efforts effected valid service under Rule 141(a)(2).⁵

On November 10, 2021, the Division filed a declaration representing that it believed it had served the OIP on Respondent by mailing the OIP to the Belize address on Respondent’s most recent filing with Commission and receiving a confirmation of attempted delivery.⁶ The declaration did not explain why the Division believed it had effected service of the OIP by mailing it to Respondent in Belize and did not address how service by mail was now accomplished after the unsuccessful attempt to serve by mail addressed in its September 7, 2021 report.

To assist the Office of the Secretary in maintaining a record of service that establishes that the OIP has been properly served,⁷ IT IS ORDERED that by December 22, 2021, the Division of Enforcement shall file a declaration or status report providing additional information regarding its efforts to effect service of the OIP on Respondent.

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

Vanessa A. Countryman
Secretary

⁴ *Int’l Tech. Enters. Ltd.*, Exchange Act Release No. 93517, 2021 WL 5107470 (Nov. 3, 2021) (citing 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(iv)(B)).

⁵ *Id.* (citing 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)).

⁶ *See supra* note 2.

⁷ *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(3).