I.

The Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) deems it appropriate that cease-and-desist proceedings be, and hereby are, instituted pursuant to Section 8A of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”), against Cancer Detection Corporation, formerly known as Xpention Genetics, Inc. (“Respondent”). Respondent changed its name to Cancer Detection Corporation in September 2008.

II.

In anticipation of the institution of these proceedings, Respondent has submitted an Offer of Settlement (the “Offer”) which the Commission has determined to accept. Solely for the purpose of these proceedings and any other proceedings brought by or on behalf of the Commission, or to which the Commission is a party, and without admitting or denying the findings herein, except as to the Commission’s jurisdiction over it and the subject matter of these proceedings, which are admitted, Respondent consents to the entry of this Order Instituting Cease-and-Desist Proceedings Pursuant to Section 8A of the Securities Act of 1933, Making Findings, and Imposing a Cease-and-Desist Order (“Order”), as set forth below.

III.

On the basis of this Order and Respondent’s Offer, the Commission finds that:

1. Respondent is a development stage, Nevada corporation based in Conifer, Colorado. It has licensed a patent related to a tumor-associated “marker” protein known as the p65
marker and funded research related to the marker’s correlation with the incidence of cancer in
dogs. Respondent is a reporting company pursuant to Section 15(d) of the Securities Exchange
Act of 1934. Respondent’s common stock is traded over the counter and quoted on the OTC
Bulletin Board.

2. These proceedings arise out of a February 2005 reverse merger, involving
Respondent, and a coincident failure to comply with the securities registration requirements of
Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act. Prior to the merger, Respondent was named Bayview
Corporation (“Bayview”) and ostensibly operated as an exploration-stage mining company, based in
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. Bayview’s stated plan of operation involved exploration of
two Ontario, Canada mineral claims in which Bayview held an option to acquire an ownership
interest.

3. In March 2004, Respondent filed a Form SB-2/A amended registration statement
with the Commission on behalf of 40 shareholders seeking to resell restricted shares that they had
bought directly from Bayview. In its registration statement, Respondent represented that: (1) the
described sale of shares by the 40 shareholders would occur without the involvement of
underwriters; and (2) Respondent would receive no proceeds from the sale of these shares.

4. In February 2005, Bayview merged with a privately-held biotech startup. This
transaction took the form of a reverse merger, with Bayview adopting the biotech startup’s business
plan and replacing its own management with that of the biotech startup.

5. A stock promotion firm directed the reverse merger as part of an agreement with the
biotech startup to take the startup public and raise funds for implementation of its business plan.
Contemporaneously, the stock promotion firm and its associates commenced a distribution of the
majority of the shares listed in Respondent’s registration statement, and Respondent changed its
name to Xpention Genetics, Inc. The stock promotion firm and its associates acted as underwriters
for the distribution by acquiring the majority of the shares listed in the registration statement and
selling such shares to a network of investors, transferring $400,000 of the proceeds to Respondent in
June 2005.

6. The distribution described above violated Respondent’s representations in its March
2004 Form SB-2/A and differed materially from the proposed sale of shares that Respondent had
registered with the Commission by filing the registration statement. No other registration
statements were filed or in effect with respect to the distributed shares, and no exemption from
registration applied.

7. Respondent thus participated in, and shared in the proceeds of, an unregistered
distribution of its shares. Respondent failed to verify whether the distribution of shares and
Respondent’s receipt of proceeds complied with representations made by prior management in the
March 2004 Form SB-2/A.
8. As a result of the conduct described above, Respondent violated Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act, which prohibit the offer or sale of unregistered securities in interstate commerce unless such securities are offered or sold pursuant to an exemption from registration.

IV.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission deems it appropriate to impose the sanctions agreed to in Respondent’s Offer.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 8A of the Securities Act, Respondent cease and desist from committing or causing any violations and any future violations of Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act.

By the Commission.

Elizabeth M. Murphy
Secretary