

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
Before the  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20549

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RULINGS

Release No. 3874/May 26, 2016

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING

File No. 3-17256

In the Matter of

DRAGON BRIGHT MINTAI BOTANICAL  
TECHNOLOGY CAYMAN LTD.,  
JINZANGHUANG TIBET  
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., and  
MACAU RESOURCES GROUP LTD.

ORDER POSTPONING HEARING  
AND SCHEDULING  
PREHEARING CONFERENCE

On May 20, 2016, the Securities and Exchange Commission issued an order instituting proceedings (OIP) pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, alleging that Respondents have securities registered with the Commission and are delinquent in their periodic filings. A hearing is currently scheduled for June 14, 2016.

The Division of Enforcement filed a declaration stating that on May 24, 2016, Respondents Dragon Bright Mintai Botanical Technology Cayman Ltd. and Macau Resources Group Ltd. were served with the OIP by U.S. Postal Service priority mail express at their addresses in Hong Kong. The People's Republic of China, although a signatory to the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters, prohibits service by mail for mainland China by its declarations to that convention. See <https://www.hcch.net/en/instruments/conventions/status-table/notifications/?csid=393&disp=resdn>. However, because China provides a different set of declarations for Hong Kong containing no objection to service by mail, such service is permitted. See *id.*; see also *TracFone Wireless, Inc. v. Unlimited PCS Inc.*, 279 F.R.D. 626, 630 (S.D. Fla. 2012); Hong Kong Response to 2008 Questionnaire on Hague Service Convention, at PDF page 20, <https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=5470&dtid=33>. I therefore find that service of the OIP on Dragon Bright and Macau Resources was accomplished in accordance with 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(iv). As such, their answers are due June 6, 2016. OIP at 3; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.160(b), .220(b).

As to Respondent JinZangHuang Tibet Pharmaceuticals, Inc., the Division separately filed a declaration of a process server stating that he served the OIP "on Respondent JinZangHuang Pharmaceuticals, Inc." by leaving copy of it "at the office of the Delaware Secretary of State." But there are two aspects of the declaration that raise questions. First, it omits the word "Tibet" from this Respondent's name, creating some ambiguity as to whether the papers were properly addressed. Second, it includes no evidence as to this Respondent's

corporate status or why service on the Delaware Secretary of State is appropriate here in lieu of service on an officer, director, or registered agent of the corporation. *See* 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(ii); Del. Code Ann. tit. 8, § 321(a)-(b). I therefore find that service of the OIP on JinZangHuang Tibet Pharmaceuticals, Inc., has not yet been established.

I ORDER the Division to file by June 6, 2016, an updated declaration addressing the status of service on JinZangHuang Tibet Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

I also POSTPONE the hearing and schedule a telephonic prehearing conference for June 8, 2016, at 11:00 a.m. Eastern. Respondents are on notice that if they fail to file timely answers, appear at the prehearing conference, or otherwise defend the proceeding, I will deem them in default, determine that the allegations in the OIP are true, and revoke the registrations of their securities. OIP at 3; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a), .220(f), .221(f).

---

Brenda P. Murray  
Chief Administrative Law Judge