

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
before the  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934  
Release No. 94561 / March 30, 2022

Admin. Proc. File No. 3-20728

In the Matter of  
  
BLUE STATE CORP.

ORDER REGARDING SERVICE

The Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) issued an Order Instituting Proceedings (“OIP”) on January 31, 2022, pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, against respondent Blue State Corp. (“Respondent”).<sup>1</sup>

On March 7, 2022, the Division of Enforcement filed a Declaration of Gina Joyce, which stated that the Commission’s Office of the Secretary mailed a copy of the OIP to Respondent by U.S. Postal Service priority mail, to the San Jose, Costa Rica address on Respondent’s most recent EDGAR filing. Tracking information attached to the declaration reflects that the mailing was returned to the Commission without delivery or attempted delivery. The declaration also stated the Division arranged for a second mailing by U.S. Postal Service priority mail of the OIP to Respondent to the same San Jose, Costa Rica address. Although the declaration stated that “delivery of the service package was attempted . . . on March 1, 2022,” the tracking information attached to the declaration stated next to March 1, 2022: “International shipment release - Import,” “At local FedEx facility,” and “Operational Delay Incorrect Address.”

It is not clear that the OIP has been served in a manner that complies with Rule of Practice 141(a)(2) because it is not clear that delivery has been attempted.<sup>2</sup> The Division is directed to clarify whether the tracking information attached to its declaration establishes that delivery of the OIP was attempted at the address on Respondent’s most recent EDGAR filing.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Blue State Corp.*, Exchange Act Release No. 94112, 2022 WL 294318 (Jan. 31, 2022).

<sup>2</sup> 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(ii), (iv); *see Water Splash, Inc. v. Menon*, 137 S. Ct. 1504, 1512-13 & n.7 (2017) (holding that “in cases governed by the Hague Service Convention, service by mail is permissible if . . . the receiving state has not objected to service by mail; and . . . service by mail is authorized under otherwise-applicable law”); *Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP v. Rosenthal-Hidago*, No. 1:19-cv-01331, 2020 WL 7386320 at \*2 (D.D.C. July 24, 2020) (“Costa Rica permits service via direct mail under the Hague Convention.”).

We also note that Respondent is a defaulted Nevada corporation and thus it may be possible to effect service on Respondent via a registered service agent or the Nevada Secretary of State.<sup>3</sup>

To assist the Office of the Secretary in maintaining a record of service that establishes that the OIP has been properly served,<sup>4</sup> IT IS ORDERED that the Division of Enforcement file a status report concerning service of the OIP by April 27, 2022, and every 28 days thereafter until service is accomplished.

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

Vanessa A. Countryman  
Secretary

---

<sup>3</sup> See *Blue State Corp.*, 2022 WL 294318, at \*1; *Emarine Global Inc.*, Exchange Act Release No. 93842, 2021 WL 6062970 (Dec. 21, 2021) (describing options for serving Nevada corporations consistent with Rule of Practice 141(a)(2)(ii)).

<sup>4</sup> See 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(3).