



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Before the SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

August 11, 2013

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

3

5

6

7

8

9

In the Matter of

Camelot Entertainment Group, Inc.,

Cavico Corp.,

Global 8 Environmental Technologies, Inc.,

TTC Telecom Corp.,

ICF Corporation, and

16 New NRG, Inc.,

File No. 500-1

ANSWER BY GLOBAL 8 ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES 3-/5387

Administrative Law Judge: Carol Fox Foelak Hearing date: September 5, 2013

COMES NOW Respondent Global 8 Environmental Technologies ("GBLE"), represented by Daniel H. Wolf, President, *in pro se* in answer to the Order of Suspension of Trading and the Order Instituting Administrative Proceedings and Notice of Hearing Pursuant to Section 12(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

I.

With respect to the allegations that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning GBLE, Respondent answers as follows:

GBLE does not contest the allegation. It is true that GBLE has not filed any periodic reports since June 30, 2009.

Respondent GBLE Answer to Order of Suspension of Trading, August 11, 2013 - 1 of 4

With respect to any defenses available to Respondent for failure to file, Respondent answers as follows:

GBLE's intention since the fall of 2009, when Daniel Wolf became Chairman of the Board, has been to come back into compliance as a good corporate citizen. The company failed to file periodic reports because Rene Branconnier, *de facto* managing director of GBLE until October, 2009, unlawfully seized control of company records and refused to release them, in spite of an order from a Nevada Superior Court judge to do so. To this date those records remain in Branconnier's possession. Without them, according to PCAOB auditors with whom GBLE has consulted, the required 2009 10-K could not be completed.

Branconnier's boiler-room operator was a defendant in a regulatory action in British Columbia, Canada, in connection with GBLE and was found "liable". Branconnier himself is currently a defendant in a regulatory action being undertaken by the Alberta Securities Commission ("ASC"), in which the ASC has alleged that Branconnier had engaged in an illegal and unregistered securities distribution in that jurisdiction in the amount of approximately \$19,500,000. He is likely be found "liable" and to have his hand slapped.

During the course of his management of GBLE, Branconnier appears to have raised between \$40,000,000 and \$50,000,000 from investors in the United States, Canada and other countries, only a portion of which actually was made over to GBLE. Of the portion made over and reported in GBLE's periodic filings, approximately 85 percent was paid out to Branconnier in "related party transactions" for unspecified "bookkeeping and management" duties in one-page contracts lacking details, milestones, consequences, or protections for GBLE. These contracts were never approved by an independent board or ratified by shareholders.

Branconnier was able to do this because he appointed persons he could control as directors and officers. During the course of this fraud, Branconnier, acting through these agents, made numerous material misrepresentations and distributed millions of dollars in unregistered

26.

securities that did not fall under any exemption to the Securities Exchange Acts of 1933 and 1934.

Both the Corporate Finance and Investigative divisions of the Securities and Exchange Commission were duly and repeatedly informed of these crimes. To date they have taken no action. GBLE's attorney William Aul has written to and spoke with these divisions and they have reacted with indifference.

Messrs. Wolf and Aul believe that Branconnier's success in carrying out these crimes under the very nose of the SEC exposes a serious policy problem in U.S. securities law and enforcement. By informing the SEC, in periodic filings approved by deceived PCAOB auditors, that he was essentially robbing the investors, he exploited the SEC's lack of jurisdiction over criminal fraud. And by keeping the number of investors affected in each American state small, he kept his crimes below the prosecution thresholds of most state Attorneys General. In this way he has escaped prosecution by any agency. The only remaining jurisdictional avenue for SEC enforcement is material misrepresentation and illegal distribution, both of which the SEC has demonstrated itself unwilling to pursue.

GBLE is aware of at least three other fraudulent schemes conducted by Branconnier, one of which raised over \$100,000,000 from investors in the U.S. and Canada and another of which is ongoing. Both of these have been ignored by the SEC.

GBLE does not know how widely Branconnier's methods are being used by other malfeasants, but if they were to become popular they would represent a genuine threat to the integrity and safety of small-cap markets in the United States.

III.

With respect to the Commission's decision to suspend or revoke GBLE's registration, Respondent wishes to inform the Commission of the following facts.

The acting Board of Directors, composed of persons elected in a valid shareholders meeting, is dedicated to restoring GBLE to regulatory compliance, to legal and ethical management, to profitability in order to win back some if not all of the shareholder value

destroyed by Branconnier, and to clawing back some of Branconnier's illegal takings, which proceeds would be used to fund further growth. Implementing a turnaround in a company devoid of business, intellectual property and cash, however, not to mention one plagued by the sorts of legal questions that arise as a consequence of management fraud, is no small challenge. Building up a war chest for clawing back the stolen wealth is equally difficult.

What motivates management, however, is the directors' sense of justice denied, the knowledge that there are shareholders who are living in penury as a result of Branconnier's fraud, and the awareness that the SEC and its sister regulatory agencies are unlikely to do anything to redress the crimes cited, ever.

GBLE's core rebuilding strategy has been to partner with private companies to provide liquidity for their investors, and to receive a share of their revenues in return. To that end, GBLE signed a revenue-sharing agreement with a wheat-based plastics company for 10 percent of its EBITDA revenues in exchange for about one-third of GBLE's stock. That company is now on the verge of sales and revenues, according to reports by its management. If it achieves its projected revenues, GBLE will have the ability to become compliant with the SEC and to achieve its other goals.

IV.

It is in GBLE's interest to negotiate a suspension or revocation agreement that provides the best prospects for achieving its goals. GBLE therefore declares itself ready and willing to sign a consent agreement with the Division of Enforcement that satisfies the Commission while not unduly inhibiting GBLE's pursuit of its goals of good corporate citizenship and profitability. It is in the interest of the SEC and of public policy, as well as of GBLE, to endeavor to identify and act on the commonality of our interests.

DATED this August 11, 2013

Respectfully Submitted:

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES

By Daniel H. Wolf, Esq.

Respondent GBLE Answer to Order of Suspension of Trading, August 11, 2013 - 4 of 4