

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES ACT OF 1933
Release No. 10363 / May 12, 2017

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-17989

In the Matter of

the Registration Statement of

Lion Print Corp.
G. Washington St., 17/67
Lviv
Ukraine

Respondent.

ORDER FIXING TIME AND PLACE
OF PUBLIC HEARING AND
INSTITUTING PROCEEDINGS
PURSUANT TO SECTION 8(d) OF THE
SECURITIES ACT OF 1933

I.

The Commission's public official files disclose that:

On February 20, 2014, Lion Print Corp. ("Respondent") filed a Form S-1 registration statement seeking to register the offer and sale of 2,500,000 common shares in a \$100,000 public offering. Respondent filed an amendment to its registration statement dated April 7, 2014 (together, the "Registration Statement").

II.

After an investigation and examination, the Division of Enforcement alleges that:

A. RESPONDENT

1. Respondent is a Nevada corporation headquartered in Lviv, Ukraine.
2. Respondent purportedly was formed as a printing company that will operate primarily in the Ukraine. The purported printing company has no revenue and has never sold shares to the public.

B. FAILURE TO COOPERATE WITH SECTION 8(e) EXAMINATION

3. On April 24, 2014, Commission staff issued a document subpoena to Respondent. The subpoena was properly served on company counsel, who resides in the United States, on that date.

4. On May 6, 2014, the staff was informed by company counsel that he would represent the company with respect to the ongoing examination.

5. On May 8, 2014, Respondent, through company counsel, produced certain documents responsive to the staff's subpoena.

6. On May 16, the staff properly served a testimony subpoena to Respondent's Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") via company counsel, who resides in the United States.

7. On August 28, 2014, Respondent's CEO provided telephonic testimony to the staff.

8. On March 13, 2015, the staff was informed that company counsel no longer represented the Respondent.

9. On March 16, 2015, in order to obtain additional information relevant to its examination, the staff emailed Respondent at two different email addresses provided by the CEO during her testimony. One of the emails bounced back as undeliverable, and the staff received no response to the other.

10. On April 1, 2015, the staff attempted to call Respondent's CEO at the telephone number she provided during testimony. The person who answered the telephone, whom the staff believes was Respondent's CEO, spoke a language the staff believes was Russian. When the staff introduced themselves and stated that they had additional questions relevant to its examination, the woman hung up and did not answer the phone when the staff attempted to call back.

11. On September 28, 2015 and again on May 24, 2016, the staff again emailed Respondent's CEO to arrange a telephone call, but did not receive a response.

12. On June 21, 2016, the staff attempted to call Respondent's CEO at the previously used telephone number, but the number had been disconnected.

13. On July 11, 2016, the staff sent an email to the one working email address on file, attaching a copy of a notice informing the company of the staff's preliminary determination to recommend an enforcement action against Respondent. A copy of the notice was also sent via UPS to the company's designated agent for service in the United States, and directly to the company address in the Ukraine.

14. The staff did not receive a response to its email. The UPS package sent to the Ukraine was returned without any explanation, and the U.S. agent refused to accept delivery and informed the staff that the company is now defunct.

15. As a result of the conduct described in paragraphs nine through twelve above, Respondent failed to cooperate with the staff's examination.

III.

The Commission, having considered the aforesaid, deems it appropriate and in the public interest that public proceedings pursuant to Section 8(d) of the Securities Act be instituted with respect to the Registration Statement to determine whether the allegations of the Division of Enforcement are true; to afford the Respondent with an opportunity to establish any defenses to these allegations; and to determine whether a stop order should issue suspending the effectiveness of the Registration Statement referred to herein.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that public proceedings be and hereby are instituted under Section 8(d) of the Securities Act, such hearing to be commenced at 9:30 a.m. on June 1, 2017, at the Commission's offices at 100 F Street N.E., Washington, DC 20549, and to continue thereafter at such time and place as the hearing officer may determine.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that these proceedings shall be presided over by an Administrative Law Judge to be designated by further order, who is authorized to perform all the duties of an Administrative Law Judge as set forth in the Commission's Rules of Practice or as otherwise provided by law.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Respondent shall file an Answer to the allegations contained in this Order within ten (10) days after service of this Order, pursuant to Rule 220 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.220. If the Respondent fails to file the directed answer, or fails to appear at a hearing after being duly notified, the Respondent may be deemed in default and the proceedings may be determined against the Respondent upon consideration of this Order, the allegations of which may be deemed to be true as provided by Rules 155(a), 220(f), 221(f) and 310 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. §§201.155(a), 201.220(f), 201.221(f) and 201.310. This Order shall be served forthwith upon the Respondent in accordance with Rule 141 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. §201.141.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Administrative Law Judge shall issue an initial decision no later than 120 days from the occurrence of one of the following events: (A) The completion of post-hearing briefing in a proceeding where the hearing has been completed; (B) Where the hearing officer has determined that no hearing is necessary, upon completion of briefing on a motion pursuant to Rule 250 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.250; or (C) The determination by the hearing officer that a party is deemed to be in default under Rule 155 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.155 and no hearing is necessary.

In the absence of an appropriate waiver, no officer or employee of the Commission engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions in this or any factually related proceeding will be permitted to participate or advise in the decision of this matter, except as witness or counsel in proceedings held pursuant to notice. Since this proceeding is not “rule making” within the meaning of Section 551 of the Administrative Procedure Act, it is not deemed subject to the provisions of Section 553 delaying the effective date of any final Commission action.

By the Commission.

Brent J. Fields
Secretary