PUBLIC RECORDS / WORKED EXAMPLE

Alpine 4: show-cause order and registration status

Case walkthrough

Prepared by Dossier Editorial | November 17, 2026

EVIDENCE SOURCES	EVIDENCE CHECKED	PUBLISHER INSTITUTIONS
4	2026-11-17	1

SECTIONS	READER QUESTIONS	REVIEW SCOPE
7	5	Public records

EVIDENCE CHECKED	2026-11-17
EDITION	1 | Public-source research
ARTICLE	dossierplus.ai/blog/alpine-4-sec-show-cause-order-registration-revocation

IMPORTANT USE NOTE

Prepared by Dossier Editorial with AI assistance from public SEC records. This educational document review does not claim a live Dossier investigation, a complete proceeding file, company confirmation, human approval or legal review. It is not investment advice, a trading-status determination or a filing instruction for a party.

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-DNDF-93RY-9BZT · Seal 1AAE82543CB3 · SHA-256 20252D51D34666EC · Issued 2026-11-17 17:07 UTC

PART 01

The decision in brief

No, not by itself. The SEC's November 12, 2026 order directs Alpine 4 Holdings, Inc. to explain by November 27 why it should not be found in default and have its securities registration revoked. It does not itself order revocation. A defensible case-status review must distinguish the allegations, the service finding, the response deadline and a later operative disposition.

Publication date: November 17, 2026. Historical event dates are identified separately. This PDF and the article use the same structured source selection and findings.

PART 02

Executive summary: identify what this order actually does

A serious regulatory proceeding can be open without the threatened sanction already having taken effect. The useful diligence question is precise: does the document direct a response, establish a procedural fact or actually impose a consequence?

- Supported outcome: the November 12 order finds that the records described in it establish service on September 2 and says no answer had been filed as of the order's date.
- Next stated step: Alpine 4 must explain the failure to answer and include a proposed answer by November 27. The order describes a later decision directing further proceedings or resolving the matter.
- Material boundary: neither the show-cause order nor the earlier service order is an operative revocation order. The reviewed case page does not establish a complete inventory of every filing. [S1] [S4]

This review uses three original orders and the SEC's proceeding page, checked November 17. All four sources come from one institution. Their value is the official procedural record, not four independent accounts of the alleged reporting failures.

PART 03

Match the company and proceeding before interpreting the result

The respondent is Alpine 4 Holdings, Inc., identified in the orders as formerly Alpine 4 Technologies, Inc. The administrative proceeding is File No. 3-22679. The August 28 initiating order identifies CIK 1606698 and symbol ALPP, and describes a Delaware corporation located in Phoenix, Arizona with a class registered under Exchange Act Section 12(g). These are identifiers from that dated record, not a fresh corporate-registry or quotation check. [S3]

This is a Commission administrative proceeding under Section 12(j), rather than a district-court case. The initiating order says the proceeding will determine the truth of the enforcement allegations and whether suspension or revocation of securities registration is appropriate. The scope is securities registration; these documents do not determine the company's current corporate good standing, solvency or every aspect of its market status. [S3]

The Division of Enforcement alleges periodic-reporting failures, including no periodic reports after the Form 10-Q for the period ended September 30, 2023. That is the allegation stated in the August order. This review does not independently certify the completeness of the company's EDGAR reporting history or turn those allegations into an adjudicated merits finding. [S3]

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-DNDF-93RY-9BZT · Seal 1AAE82543CB3 · SHA-256 20252D51D34666EC · Issued 2026-11-17 17:07 UTC

PART 04

Source-linked chronology: the service record changed

DATE AND RECORD	WHAT IT ESTABLISHES	WHAT IT DOES NOT ESTABLISH
August 28, 2026; Release 34-106212	The SEC institutes the Section 12(j) proceeding and sets out the Division's allegations. The order provides an opportunity to defend.	The allegations are not a final decision that registration must be revoked. [S3]
October 21, 2026; Release 34-106708	The SEC says the declaration then described does not appear to establish service. It identifies a delivery-address mismatch and missing evidence of agent appointment.	An evidentiary problem at that stage is not a dismissal or a finding that service can never be established. [S2]
November 3 filing, described in the later order	The November 12 order identifies a status report filed on November 3. Together with the earlier declaration, the SEC says it establishes September 2 service.	The status-report filing date is not the service date. The underlying report was not separately reviewed here. [S1]
November 12, 2026; Release 34-106874	The SEC issues the show-cause order, states that no answer had been filed as of that date and continues the prehearing conference and hearing indefinitely.	Continuing the hearing is not terminating the proceeding. The order does not itself revoke registration. [S1]
November 27, 2026; stated response deadline	The order directs an explanation and proposed answer by this date.	A future deadline is not proof of a missed response, default determination or automatic sanction. [S1]

The sequence matters. A review that stops at October 21 retains an outdated service gap. A review that reads only the November 12 title may incorrectly jump to a completed sanction. Keep both originals and state which finding the later order changes. [S1] [S2]

PART 05

Findings and material gaps

First, service and merits are separate questions. On October 21 the SEC identified two shortcomings in the declaration: the EDGAR address was in Phoenix while the delivery tracking showed Scottsdale, and the record lacked evidence of the registered agent's appointment. On November 12 the SEC stated that the declaration and the subsequent status report together established service. That later statement updates the procedural conclusion without resolving the reporting allegations. [S1] [S2]

Second, the show-cause order contains a real obligation to respond and a serious conditional consequence. It warns that failure to respond may lead the SEC to find default, treat the allegations as true, decide the matter without a public hearing and revoke registration. The document also expressly contemplates a later order directing further proceedings or a final order. Preserve both the risk and the procedural stage. [S1]

Third, November 17 is before the stated November 27 deadline. The November 12 statement that no answer had been filed is evidence as of November 12; it is not a certification that nothing was submitted afterward. A response, extension, default determination or final disposition would each require its own original record. [S1]

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-DNDF-93RY-9BZT · Seal 1AAE82543CB3 · SHA-256 20252D51D34666EC · Issued 2026-11-17 17:07 UTC

- Reviewed: all eight pages across the three SEC orders, including the operative text and footnotes, plus the proceeding page.
- Not separately reviewed: the September 16 declaration, the November 3 status report or a substantive response from Alpine 4. The orders describe the first two, but that does not replace reading their contents if service is the question under investigation.
- Still unresolved: any later response or extension, the ultimate disposition and its operative scope or effective date. No conclusion about current tradeability, shareholder recovery or corporate dissolution is drawn.

The proceeding page retrieved on November 17 listed the August 28, October 21 and November 12 orders. A bounded search did not identify a later original disposition or a current company response in the material reviewed. This is a coverage statement, not proof that no additional filing exists. Recheck the original proceeding record before relying on the status for a decision. [S4]

PART 06

Decision tree: when can you record a final sanction?

1. DO THE EXACT RESPONDENT NAME, FILE NUMBER AND DOCUMENT DATE MATCH THE CASE?

- If established: Attach those identifiers to the finding and read the operative paragraphs.
- If unresolved: Hold the match as unresolved. Do not import an order from a similarly named entity or another proceeding.

2. DOES THE OPERATIVE TEXT EXPRESSLY IMPOSE REVOCATION?

- If established: If it expressly imposes revocation, record the affected securities, effective terms and any later stay or modification.
- If unresolved: If it only directs a response, record the deadline and conditional consequence; leave final disposition unresolved.

3. HAS A LATER ORIGINAL CHANGED AN EARLIER PROCEDURAL FINDING?

- If established: Update the current finding while retaining the earlier source and the reason it changed.
- If unresolved: Keep the dated finding and its limits. Do not treat an old service defect as permanently unresolved.

4. DOES THE PROPOSED CONCLUSION EXTEND TO TRADING, CORPORATE STATUS OR MONEY RECOVERED?

- If established: Obtain the original records for that separate question. A registration proceeding alone does not establish those outcomes.
- If unresolved: Publish the narrower case-status conclusion with the evidence date and the next record needed.

PART 07

Reproduce this review in a Dossier

- Write the question before collecting documents: for example, has the SEC already revoked registration in File No. 3-22679, or is the matter at a response stage?

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-DNDF-93RY-9BZT · Seal 1AAE82543CB3 · SHA-256 20252D51D34666EC · Issued 2026-11-17 17:07 UTC

- Retain each original order and the proceeding-page capture with its URL, retrieval time, release number and page references. Keep the initiating allegations separate from later findings.
- Build a chronology with distinct fields for document date, event date and response deadline. Here, September 2 service, the November 3 status report and the November 12 finding belong in separate entries.
- For each proposed statement, pair the operative language with its outcome: alleged reporting failure, service established by the SEC, response required, or final disposition unverified.
- Add contrary and superseding material. The October service deficiency must remain visible, but the November order supplies the later finding. Record the underlying declaration and report as unreviewed if you have only the orders' descriptions.
- Produce the report from the same source register and findings as the article. Assign the open question to a future check for a response, extension or operative disposition; do not generate an outcome merely because a deadline passes.

This is a reproducible public-document workflow. It does not represent a platform matter created, a provider research run or legal work performed on behalf of the respondent. A party's actual filing obligations require its own current case record and professional advice.

PART 08

What evidence would support the next installment?

A useful follow-up needs a new original that changes the answer: a filed response, an extension order, an order directing further proceedings, a default determination or a final disposition. For any sanction, read exactly which registration is affected and any stated effective terms; then check for a later stay or modification before summarizing the current result. [S1]

If the issue is whether notice was properly documented, obtain the original declaration, tracking exhibits, appointment evidence and November 3 report. If the issue is financial-reporting compliance, separately review the actual filings and any defenses. Neither question should be answered solely by the title of an order.

The practical conclusion for this edition is limited but useful: the November 12 show-cause order is an instruction to address possible default and revocation, not the final revocation itself. The next evidence request follows from that distinction. [S1]

PART 09

Questions readers ask

DID THE NOVEMBER 12 SEC ORDER REVOKE ALPINE 4'S SECURITIES REGISTRATION?

No. It directs Alpine 4 to show cause by November 27 and describes possible default and revocation. It anticipates a later order directing further proceedings or resolving the matter. [S1]

WHAT COMPANY AND PROCEEDING DOES THIS WALKTHROUGH CONCERN?

Alpine 4 Holdings, Inc., formerly identified in these orders as Alpine 4 Technologies, Inc.; SEC Administrative Proceeding File No. 3-22679. The initiating order gives CIK 1606698 and symbol ALPP. [S3] [S4]

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-DNDF-93RY-9BZT · Seal 1AAE82543CB3 · SHA-256 20252D51D34666EC · Issued 2026-11-17 17:07 UTC

WAS THE OCTOBER SERVICE-EVIDENCE PROBLEM STILL UNRESOLVED IN NOVEMBER?

The November 12 order states that the earlier declaration and a November 3 status report together establish service on September 2. That updates the October order's assessment of the evidence then described. [S1] [S2]

DOES MISSING A SHOW-CAUSE DEADLINE AUTOMATICALLY ESTABLISH REVOCATION?

The reviewed order describes what the Commission may do if no response is filed. A status review should obtain the actual subsequent order rather than substitute a calendar calculation for a disposition. [S1]

DOES A HEARING CONTINUED INDEFINITELY MEAN THE CASE WAS DISMISSED?

No. The November 12 order continues the prehearing conference and hearing while directing a show-cause response and describing further proceedings or a final order. It does not dismiss the case. [S1]

PART 10

Linked source register

Titles with a recorded URL link to that source. Entries without a URL identify retained material but do not open an original file. For any court or business record being used in litigation, obtain a certified copy directly from the clerk or filing authority and preserve the retrieval date.

S1 **Alpine 4: November 12 order to show cause**
Original Commission order. Anchor: Release 34-106874; File 3-22679; PDF pp. 1-2, service finding, November 27 deadline and subsequent-order language. Both pages visually reviewed. Establishes the stated procedural steps, not an operative revocation or a complete later filing history. · retrieved 2026-11-17

S2 **Alpine 4: October 21 order regarding service**
Original Commission order. Anchor: Release 34-106708; File 3-22679; PDF p. 1, two service-evidence gaps and status-report direction; p. 2, filing reminders. Both pages visually reviewed. Preserve as a dated procedural finding alongside the later November order; it is not a dismissal. · retrieved 2026-11-17

S3 **Alpine 4: August 28 order instituting proceedings**
Original initiating order and notice of hearing. Anchor: Release 34-106212; PDF p. 1, identity and allegations; p. 2, issues for determination and answer requirement; pp. 3-4, default and final-order procedure. All four pages visually reviewed. The Division's reporting allegations are not presented as final merits findings or a fresh EDGAR-history audit. · retrieved 2026-11-17

S4 **SEC proceeding page: File No. 3-22679**
Official proceeding index. Anchor: Respondent caption and three linked orders dated August 28, October 21 and November 12, 2026, as retrieved November 17. Used for identity and a bounded later-record check. The displayed index is not certified as a complete case file. All sources are from the SEC. · retrieved 2026-11-17

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-DNDF-93RY-9BZT · Seal 1AAE82543CB3 · SHA-256 20252D51D34666EC · Issued 2026-11-17 17:07 UTC