

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS RULINGS
Release No. 4071/August 17, 2016

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING
File No. 3-17353

In the Matter of

SCANNER TECHNOLOGIES CORP.,
SEVILLE VENTURES CORP.,
STARINVEST GROUP, INC., and
THE DIGITAL DEVELOPMENT GROUP CORP.

ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO
ANSWER FOR RESPONDENT
STARINVEST GROUP, INC., AND
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
DIRECTED TO THE OTHER
RESPONDENTS

On July 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. On July 29, 2016, the Division of Enforcement filed a declaration of service indicating that the OIP was served on Respondent StarInvest Group, Inc., in accordance with 17 C.F.R. § 201.141(a)(2)(ii), by attempted delivery on July 28, 2016, though “the package was undeliverable as addressed.” Div. Decl. ¶ 5; *see Scanner Techs. Corp.*, Admin. Proc. Rulings Release No. 4047, 2016 SEC LEXIS 2707 (ALJ Aug. 5, 2016). Absent an extension, StarInvest’s answer would have been due on August 10, 2016. *Scanner Techs. Corp.*, 2016 SEC LEXIS 2707.

On August 8, 2016, StarInvest moved for a 60-day extension of time “to alleviate . . . concerns regarding the Securities Act of 1934 Section 12(j) hearing.” StarInvest Reply at 2. I construe this as a request for an extension of time to answer the OIP.¹ StarInvest cites various factors in support of its request, including a recent transition in company leadership, StarInvest Reply at 1 (twice citing a “new CEO” who appears to be representing StarInvest in this matter), and good faith efforts in “addressing the Commission[’s] concerns,” *id.* at 2, one of which, I note, is the Commission’s direction to StarInvest to answer the OIP. *See* OIP at 3.

Under Rule of Practice 161(a), a hearing officer “may, for good cause shown,” extend any time limits for filing any papers. 17 C.F.R. § 201.161(a). “In determining whether to grant any requests,” I must “consider, in addition to any other relevant factors: (i) [t]he length of the

¹ StarInvest’s request appears to have been filed without the benefit of counsel. StarInvest may find it advantageous to retain an attorney, as provided by Rule of Practice 102(b), 17 C.F.R. § 201.102(b).

proceeding to date; (ii) [t]he number of postponements, adjournments or extensions already granted; (iii) [t]he stage of the proceedings at the time of the request; (iv) [t]he impact of the request on the hearing officer's ability to complete the proceeding in the time specified by the Commission; and (v) [a]ny other such matters as justice may require.” 17 C.F.R. § 201.161(b)(1) (formatting altered). The first three factors weigh in favor of granting the request because the proceeding is at a preliminary stage and there have been no extensions. The fourth factor weighs against a 60-day extension because that, by itself, would consume fifty-percent of the total time allotted to complete this 120-day proceeding. *See* OIP at 3. On August 11, 2016, the Division filed an opposition to extending time to allow StarInvest to correct the alleged filing deficiencies. Div. Opp. at 2-3. This objection does not speak to whether to grant a modest extension to accommodate other concerns. Notwithstanding StarInvest's difficulties, a moderate fifteen-day extension of the August 10 answer deadline should be adequate to allow StarInvest to answer the OIP.

The Division has moved for leave to file a motion for summary disposition. Div. Opp. at 1-2. If StarInvest agrees that this proceeding should be resolved by summary disposition in lieu of a hearing, then it should file and serve a letter confirming that by August 25, 2016. If StarInvest instead opts to proceed to a hearing on the merits, it shall advise the Division by August 25, and by August 29, 2016, the parties shall file a joint proposed schedule culminating in a hearing to be held in Washington, D.C., no later than September 23, 2016.

The motion for extension is GRANTED in part. StarInvest's answer is due August 25, 2016.

The remaining three Respondents—Scanner Technologies Corp., Seville Ventures Corp., and The Digital Development Group Corp.—were also served with the OIP by July 28, 2016, and were required to file answers by August 10, 2016. *Scanner Techs. Corp.*, 2016 SEC LEXIS 2707. To date, those Respondents have not filed answers or otherwise defended the proceeding. Accordingly, those Respondents are ORDERED to SHOW CAUSE by August 29, 2016, why the registrations of their securities should not be revoked by default due to their failures to file answers or otherwise defend this proceeding. Any of those Respondents that fails to respond to this order will be deemed in default and the registration of its securities will be revoked. *See* OIP at 3; 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a)(2), .220(f).

Jason S. Patil
Administrative Law Judge