

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**  
**Before the**  
**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

**SECURITIES ACT OF 1933**  
**Release No. 10313 / February 27, 2017**

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING**  
**File No. 3-17861**

**In the Matter of**

**the Registration Statement of**

**Go EZ Corporation**  
**6782 Collins Ave.**  
**Miami Beach, FL 33141**

**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 12, 2015, Go EZ Corporation ("Respondent") filed a Form S-1 registration statement seeking to register the offer and sale of 250,000 shares of common stock by Respondent for \$4.00 per share along with registering another 1,137,500 shares of common stock offered by selling shareholders at \$4.00 per share until Respondent's common stock becomes quoted. The registration statement was amended on April 22, June 29, August 28, September 16, and October 22, 2015 (together, the "Registration Statement"). As amended, the Registration Statement sought to register 137,500 shares of common stock offered by selling shareholders, and 250,000 shares by Respondent. The Registration Statement was declared effective on November 6, 2015. The offering had not been completed on April 1, 2016, when the Commission initiated an Examination pursuant to Section 8(e) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Securities Act") and suspended trading in Respondent, effective April 4, 2016.

**II.**

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

A. RESPONDENT

1. Respondent is a Delaware corporation purportedly headquartered in Miami, Florida.

B. MATERIAL MISSTATEMENTS AND OMISSIONS

2. The Registration Statement includes untrue statements of material facts and omits to state material facts necessary to make the statements contained therein not misleading concerning disclosures regarding Respondent's operations, control persons and/or promoters.

3. The Registration Statement states that Respondent's principal executive office is located at 6782 Collins Avenue in Miami Beach, Florida. This disclosure is false and misleading because Respondent does not occupy that location, which is occupied by an unrelated motorsport vendor.

4. The Registration Statement fails to disclose Basilio Chen as Respondent's promoter and control person. This omission is materially misleading because Respondent is majority-owned by Chen's alter-ego company, Evotech Capital, S.A. ("Evotech"), Chen came up with the idea for Respondent and recruited its only officer, and Chen has controlled Respondent since its acquisition by Evotech and its name change.

5. The Registration Statement fails to disclose the relationship of its majority owner and promoter, Chen, to Roger Ng. This omission is materially misleading because Ng entered into various transactions with Respondent at the request of Chen, and each of those transactions was described as if it were an arms-length transaction, when in fact they were not.

6. The Registration Statement fails to disclose that the relationship of its majority owner and promoter, Chen, to the owner of Federal Technology Agency, Inc. ("FTA"), Benedict Chen. This omission is materially misleading because Benedict Chen, son of Basilio Chen, created FTA as his alter ego. Although FTA had no operations, assets, or revenue, Chen convinced Ng to pay his son, Benedict, for a 70% interest in FTA. Chen then convinced Ng to sell that interest to Respondent in exchange for shares of the Respondent. The related-party nature of these transactions, as well as the potential conflict of interest, was never disclosed.

7. The Registration Statement claims that FTA is "a provider of computer software programming, testing and development services to tech companies such as Apple." (emphasis added) This is false because FTA has only ever provided services to Apple, not to any other companies, and its contract with Apple concluded before it was acquired by Respondent. At the time the initial Registration Statement was filed on February 12, 2015, FTA was not providing any services to any companies, nor has it since that time.

8. The Registration Statement claims that additional development of Respondent's Smartwatch is underway to improve the user experience. This statement is false. Respondent's sole officer acknowledged that no such development is underway, nor is any such development planned.

9. The Registration Statement claims that it is uncertain whether FTA can maintain its current customer base. This statement is misleading because at the time it was made FTA had no customers.

10. The Registration Statement claims that Glophone “has one retail store, of approximately 700 square feet, located at 6782 Collins Avenue, Miami Beach, Florida 33141, which also serves as [Respondent’s] physical mailing address.” This statement is false, because 6782 Collins Avenue in Miami Beach houses an unrelated and unaffiliated motorsport company. A cellular phone and accessory store previously located at that address, which had moved to a new location long before the Registration Statement became effective, is not owned nor operated by Respondent nor by its subsidiary, Glophone. Respondent’s sole officer acknowledged that he did not know what was at the 6782 Collins Avenue address and that he did not know the current address of the cellular phone and accessory store that the Registration Statement claims is owned and operated by Respondent.

11. The Registration Statement claims that Respondent’s previous principal executive offices were located at 101 First Street, #493, Los Altos, California. This statement is false because that location is a mailbox facility and has no executive offices. Further, that specific box has been rented for several years by Martin Nielson, CEO of E-Waste Systems, Inc., who is not affiliated with Respondent.

12. The Registration Statement claims both that “FTA has its own leased office space, at 1047 Amarillo Avenue, Palo Alto, California,” and that “[a]n officer/shareholder of the Company is allowing the Company to use his office as a mailing address, as needed, at no expense to the Company.” These statements are false, as well as contradictory. The Amarillo Avenue address is Benedict Chen’s home. Benedict Chen, son of Basilio Chen, is not an officer of Respondent, whose only officer is Cinta. Benedict Chen is also not disclosed as a shareholder of Respondent. FTA does not have “its own leased office space” in Benedict’s home, nor has any officer or shareholder of Respondent allowed Respondent to use his/her office as a mailing address.

13. The Registration Statement claims that Cinta had no prior relationship to Carlos Lopez, whom FTA retained as a consultant. This is false because Cinta and Lopez both worked together at Evotech.

14. The Registration Statement discloses that Respondent is a development stage company and is “no longer a shell company.” This is materially misleading because Cinta’s own statements show that Respondent has no operations and no genuine intent to develop operations.

#### C. FAILURE TO COOPERATE WITH THE SECTION 8(e) EXAMINATION

16. On April 4, 2016 the staff issued a subpoena to Respondent for the production of documents and testimony. Respondent has failed to fully respond to the subpoena. Respondent provided only limited and incomplete productions that omitted, among other things, almost all relevant communications, including but not limited to responsive communications

involving Respondent's director, Fang Ren, or its promoter and control person, Basilio Chen. Respondent has not represented that it has no additional responsive documents.

17. Respondent failed to make key individuals with knowledge relevant to the examination available to the staff. Respondent's sole officer, its directors, and its promoter and control person all refused to appear for testimony pursuant to the subpoenas issued to them on April 4, 2016. Only one shareholder, Roger Ng, appeared for testimony.

### **III.**

The Commission, having considered the aforesaid, deems it appropriate that public proceedings pursuant to Section 8(d) of the Securities Act of 1933 ("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 March 16, 2017 in Hearing Room 2 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 for the 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 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, pursuant to Rule 360(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.360(a)(2), the Administrative Law Judge shall issue an initial decision no later than 30 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.

By the Commission.

Brent J. Fields  
Secretary