

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
before the
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
Rel. No. 61448 / January 29, 2010

Admin. Proc. File No. 3-13304

In the Matter of

OOO CENTREINVEST SECURITIES

ORDER DISMISSING PETITION FOR REVIEW AND NOTICE OF FINALITY

On August 31, 2009, an administrative law judge issued an initial decision, finding that OOO CentreInvest Securities ("OOO CentreInvest"), a broker-dealer based in the Russian Federation, violated Section 15(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934¹ by soliciting institutional investors in the United States to purchase and sell stocks of Russian companies without registering with the Commission. The law judge barred OOO CentreInvest from associating with any broker or dealer, imposed a cease-and-desist order, required disgorgement of \$2,400,000 plus prejudgment interest, and assessed a \$1,275,000 civil money penalty.²

On September 24, 2009, in response to a petition for review of the initial decision filed by OOO CentreInvest on September 22, 2009, the Commission issued an order granting the petition and scheduling briefing ("Initial Order"). Pursuant to Rules of Practice 141(b) and 150(c)(2), the Commission attempted to serve the Initial Order by U.S. Postal Service to the Moscow address provided (in English) in the proceeding before the law judge, but the mailing was returned as undeliverable.³

¹ 15 U.S.C § 78o(a).

² *OOO CentreInvest Sec.*, Initial Decision Rel. No. 387 (Aug. 31, 2009), ___ SEC Docket ___ (granting Division of Enforcement's unopposed motion for summary disposition).

³ 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.141(b), 150(c)(2) (permitting service of orders other than orders instituting proceedings by "mailing the papers through the U.S. Postal Service by first class, certified, registered, or Express Mail").

On November 5, 2009, the Commission issued an amended order granting OOO CentreInvest's petition for review of the law judge's initial decision and setting a schedule requiring that a brief in support of the petition for review be filed by December 21, 2009 ("Amended Order"). The Amended Order further stated that, pursuant to Commission Rule of Practice 180(c),⁴ "failure to file a brief in support of the petition may result in dismissal of this review proceeding as to that petitioner." To ensure delivery of the Amended Order, the Commission sent it to the Moscow mailing address on the letterhead of the September 22, 2009 petition for review. The address label was written in Russian, using the Cyrillic alphabet and the correct format for addressing mail to Russia. On December 22, 2009, the Amended Order mailing was returned because, as reflected on the return receipt, the firm had "moved."

Pursuant to Commission Rule of Practice 150(d), service of the Amended Order was "complete upon mailing."⁵ Moreover, to the extent that OOO CentreInvest may have moved, Commission Rule of Practice 102(d) requires parties to "keep current . . . the business address" at which any notice or written communication may be sent.⁶ To date, OOO CentreInvest has failed to file a brief, extension request, or anything else with respect to its appeal subsequent to its petition for review. It thus appears that the OOO CentreInvest has abandoned its appeal. Under the circumstances, we find that dismissal is appropriate.⁷

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the petition for review of OOO CentreInvest Securities be, and it hereby is, dismissed.

We also hereby give notice that the initial decision issued on August 31, 2009, by the administrative law judge has become the final decision of the Commission with respect to OOO CentreInvest Securities. The sanctions imposed in that decision are hereby declared effective.

By the Commission.

Elizabeth M. Murphy
Secretary

⁴ 17 C.F.R. § 201.180(c).

⁵ 17 C.F.R. § 201.150(d).

⁶ 17 C.F.R. § 201.102(d)(2).

⁷ See, e.g., *Markland Techs., Inc.*, Securities Exchange Act Rel. No. 59476 (Feb. 27, 2009), 95 SEC Docket 14599 (dismissing appeal for failure to file supporting brief).