

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA**

NAVIN PASEM,

Plaintiff,

Case No.: 25-CA-002901

v.

**JOHN DOE 1, JOHN DOE 2, JOHN DOE 3,
and DOES 4 through 200**

Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S SECOND RENEWED EMERGENCY EX PARTE
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF WITHOUT NOTICE**

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff’s Second Renewed Emergency *Ex Parte* Motion for Preliminary Injunctive Relief Without Notice (the “Motion”). The Court has carefully reviewed the Motion and the record and is otherwise fully advised of the matter.

Plaintiff moves pursuant to Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.610 and Florida Statute § 812.035(6) for entry of a temporary injunction without notice to Defendants prohibiting the sale, exchange, transfer, dissipation, pledge or other disposition or encumbrance of the crypto wallets attached to the Motion and attached hereto as Appendix A.

For the reasons set forth herein, Plaintiff’s Motion is **GRANTED**.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleges that Defendants engaged in a fraudulent scheme to misappropriate cryptocurrency by impersonating Coinbase technical support. On or about February 25, 2025, Plaintiff received a text message from Defendant John Doe 1, falsely claiming to be from Coinbase Support and warning of unauthorized activity on Plaintiff’s Coinbase account. The message instructed Plaintiff to call a phone number to prevent unauthorized access.

Believing the message to be legitimate, Plaintiff called the provided number and spoke to Defendant John Doe 2, who posed as a Coinbase support agent. Defendant John Doe 2 falsely

claimed that overseas actors were attempting to access Plaintiff's account and escalated the call to Defendant John Doe 3, who posed as a fraud prevention specialist. Defendant John Doe 3 instructed Plaintiff to download the Coinbase Wallet mobile app and falsely asserted that it was a secure extension of Plaintiff's existing Coinbase account.

Relying on Defendants' repeated false assurances and the urgency conveyed, Plaintiff transferred 76.099 Ethereum (ETH) and 4.909 Bitcoin (BTC), valued at \$607,492.38 at the time of theft, to the wallet addresses provided by Defendant John Doe 3. Immediately after the transfers, Plaintiff was unable to contact any of the individuals involved, and the assets were swiftly moved to other wallets beyond Plaintiff's control.

Following the theft, Plaintiff engaged Applied Technology Solutions (ATS) to investigate and trace the stolen assets. ATS used blockchain analytics tools to identify the wallets used to receive, consolidate, and disperse the misappropriated funds. The analysis confirmed that Defendants employed deliberate obfuscation techniques, including fragmentation, swap protocols, cross-chain transfers, and commingling, to conceal the origin and movement of Plaintiff's cryptocurrency. Despite these efforts, ATS successfully traced the stolen assets to deposit addresses hosted by known centralized exchanges, listed in Appendix A.

ATS's findings indicate that Defendants deliberately moved the stolen cryptocurrency through a series of wallets they controlled to obscure the funds' origins and hinder recovery. There is a high likelihood that Defendants will continue to move or dissipate the assets if they become aware of this action, thereby eliminating the possibility of recovery.

LEGAL STANDARD

To obtain a temporary injunction, a party must demonstrate that (1) he is substantially likely to succeed on the merits of his claims; (2) he will suffer irreparable injury if the injunction is not granted; (3) an adequate remedy at law is unavailable; and (4) entry of the injunction will serve the public interest. *See Florida Dep't of Health v. Florigrown, LLC*, 317 So. 3d 1101, 1110 (Fla. 2021). Where injunctive relief is sought pursuant to *Fla. Stat.* § 812.035(6), the same standard applies, except that no showing of special or irreparable damage is required. Instead, the plaintiff

must make a showing of immediate danger of significant loss or damage and post a proper bond against damages for an injunction improvidently granted. *See Fla. Stat.* § 812.035(6).

A temporary injunction may be granted without notice to the adverse party if “(A) it appears from the specific facts shown by affidavit or verified pleading that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result to the movant before the adverse party can be heard in opposition; and (B) the movant’s attorney certifies in writing any efforts that have been made to give notice and the reasons why notice should not be required.” *Fla. R. Civ. P.* 1.610(a). Although this section is written in the conjunctive, “it makes no common sense to require certification of efforts to give notice to a party when there are good reasons not to give notice. Verified allegations as to why notice should not be given in a particular case are sufficient.” *Bansal v. Bansal*, 748 So. 2d 335, 337 (Fla. 5th DCA 1999) (citing *Smith v. Knight*, 679 So. 2d 359 (Fla. 4th DCA. 1996)). To establish that a temporary injunction may issue without notice, the movant must “demonstrate (1) how and why the giving of notice would accelerate or precipitate the injury or (2) that the time required to notice a hearing would actually permit the threatened irreparable injury to occur.” *Smith v. Knight*, 679 So. 2d 359, 361 (Fla. 4th DCA 1996).

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Affidavits Plaintiff has submitted in support of the Motions support the following conclusions of law:

1. Plaintiff has shown a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of his claims against Defendants for conversion and injunctive relief. The Plaintiff was victimized by the theft of his cryptocurrency, and it appears from the record that Defendants have no right to claim either possession or ownership of the Plaintiff’s stolen assets.
2. Because of the speed and potential anonymity of cryptocurrency transactions, Plaintiff is likely to suffer an immediate and irreparable injury if a temporary injunction is not issued. Moreover, considering the actions already taken to steal the Plaintiff’s cryptocurrency, conceal the theft, and dissipate the stolen cryptocurrency, Plaintiff has good reason to believe that the Defendants

will take further action to hide or dissipate their ill-gotten gains unless those assets are restrained.

3. For the same reasons, Plaintiff has also met the lesser requirement to show “immediate danger of significant loss or damage” under *Fla. Stat.* § 812.035(6).
4. Giving notice of Plaintiff’s motion to the Defendants is likely to exacerbate the threat of irreparable injury by accelerating the dissipation of the stolen cryptocurrency. Considering the speed with which these transactions occur, and the pattern of deception thus far, in the time required to notice a hearing, the Defendants could easily liquidate or transfer any stolen cryptocurrency (or the proceeds thereof) that remain in any accounts that they control. *See Order Granting Ex Parte Emergency Motion for Entry of Temporary Restraining Order at 7, Heissenberg v. Doe*, No. 21-Civ-80716 (S.D. Fla. Apr. 23, 2021). Plaintiff has therefore demonstrated sufficient grounds to excuse notice in this case.
5. Plaintiff has as an inadequate remedy at law. His only remedy to recover his stolen property is through equitable relief, beginning with the imposition of injunctive relief. A legal remedy for monetary damages alone will not protect his ownership interest in these valuable assets. *See Martinangeli v. Akerman, LLP*, No. 1:18-cv-23607-UU, 2018 WL 6308705, *2 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 14, 2018).
6. To the extent the public interest is implicated by Plaintiff’s Motion for a Temporary Injunction, that interest would be served by entry of the requested temporary injunction. In cases like this, the public interest “is properly served by promoting the objectives of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (“FinCEN”) ... and providing assurance that courts will protect investors’ assets from theft and will aid investors in their recovery of stolen assets when they can be readily located and traced to specific actions.” *Martinangeli v. Akerman, LLP*, 2018 WL 6308705, *2 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 14, 2018).
7. The Court has the authority to issue the requested temporary injunction both pursuant to *Fla. Stat.* § 812.035(6), *see Escudero v. Hasbun*, 689 So. 2d 1144, 1145–46 (Fla. 3d DCA 1997), and to ensure the availability of the equitable relief Plaintiff seeks.

8. Based on the evidence presented by Plaintiff, the Court finds that a bond in the amount of \$_____ is reasonable under the circumstances and considering the foreseeable damages for a wrongful injunction. Plaintiff shall file affidavits of service with the Court as this Order is served, and Plaintiff shall advise the Court promptly upon learning of accounts or other assets and transactions that are restrained by this Order so that the Court can assess whether the undertaking should be supplemented.

TEMPORARY INJUNCTION

1. Defendants, each of their agents, servants, employees, attorneys, partners, successors, assigns, and all other persons or entities through which they act or who act in concert or participation with any of them, who receive actual notice of this Order by the methods set forth herein or otherwise, are hereby temporarily restrained from withdrawing, transferring, moving, selling, exchanging, encumbering, assigning, conveying, liquidating, or in any other manner disposing of any assets, whatever their present form, that is contained in the wallets described in Appendix A to this Order.
2. All cryptocurrency exchanges hosting any of the wallet addresses listed in Appendix A — including but not limited to Coinbase Global, Inc., OKX, TradeOgre, Binance, KuCoin, HTX, WireApp, HitBTC, ChangeNow, CoinEx, OxaPay, Stake.com, CoinPal, and Uphold — and any of their agents, servants, employees, attorneys, partners, successors, assigns, subsidiaries, or any other persons through which they act or who act in active concert or participation with any of them, who receive actual notice of this Order, whether acting directly or through any trust, corporation, subsidiary, division, or other device — are hereby ordered to immediately freeze the identified wallets and any associated wallets as described in Appendix A, including suspending all withdrawals, transfers, or other dissipation of assets from any account reasonably determined to control, own, or manage the identified wallets, or that is otherwise associated with the identified wallets through overlapping control mechanisms, common ownership, or internal compliance data.

3. Within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving actual notice of this Order, such exchanges are further directed to provide notice of the same to any of their customers associated with the wallet addresses identified in Appendix A, including Defendants, and to provide counsel for Plaintiff with a copy of such notice.
4. This Order further extends to any and all cryptocurrency wallets that are controlled by, or associated with, the same individuals or entities responsible for the identified wallets. This includes, but is not limited to, additional wallets linked to the identified wallets through shared ownership, common control mechanisms, or overlapping access patterns as reasonably identified by the exchange's internal compliance systems (e.g., shared IP addresses, device IDs, or KYC data).

BOND TO BE POSTED

Pursuant to *Fla. R. Civ. P.* 1.610(b), Plaintiff shall maintain a bond in the amount of \$ 1,000.00, to be held in trust by Plaintiff's counsel, as payment of costs or damages to which Defendants may be entitled for a wrongful injunction or restraint, during the pendency of this Action or until further Order of this Court.

DURATION OF TEMPORARY INJUNCTION

The Temporary Injunction will remain in effect until further order of this Court. Any party against whom the Order was entered may move to dissolve or modify the Order at any time, and is entitled to a hearing on any such motion within 5 days of request.

HEARING

A follow-up Hearing on Plaintiff's Motion shall be set for April 21, 2025.
at 11:30 am via zoom.

Electronically Conformed 4/3/2025
Alissa Ellison

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

Appendix A

Coinbase (3)

0x8495D0D64835bBbcA933501488483f83184AEE04
0x829f8Dc756f7bfe0fa93c4A4A349A248Abf3FBf9
0xD141b2a341B66Ba3FC98a83204bB3c13FA3979D0

OKX (2)

0x946A6903512eD5C758Ff29674CE2D80Ab3acf8D1
0xb96029D98301ebda17189dF57666A06019FC0f42

TradeOgre (4)

0x4648451b5F87FF8F0F7D622bD40574bb97E25980
bc1qnru0urp778ju4v3datvrhwh7v772shpkajk89
bc1qmp6kgcmtzl944slcyp5dprx3vjgk20nuk2j43
bc1qhxmay86etyg9nzykgcsm2wjt7ccul4wmnhsyg8

Binance (5)

0x56957739BAe1b7C0725f4e517309eFC8EF6EB73e
0x615790F841d626688Bbc7C397a1dC15785487996
0x08E163449a1951c560c4c93E6638c346633aA56D
0x2c6E2140Fa5FD157fab66263f241DdDb3b92946
15fJm7DahbW5vF71ns8UXdx74ZPCGPXv4N

KuCoin (1)

0x5021aF4f24c5Bd4Cb7c1CCF8eCc198664414A326

HTX (1)

1JaUhzMuXo3Xuvn5p67LNzmLhXnP32FZn

WirexApp (1)

0x8b4A8493fDcD038e04E5fd6AE6A93b3a53c8967a

HitBTC (3)

0x52103366eB89a5f8c833c34B77892Ef90521C167
0x187fE1a8B76c60b85c00A2819152ff00Ff642386
0x32E2EeF43D74601a0eB52eA71c142A6f432F1924

ChangeNow (3)

0xfAaEf33462e2256cfeF3F96C7347Dd7e3C175F09
0xc9148Db23F4217fb320113724946D97bD373eCba
0xdA01f89Bce7E66BCe7a523E0F11A3a9a21Aa68f0

CoinEx (2)

0x7086ac523208cc53619Dc63dC7F47E8fb316D057
0x4C6324ebB5B438cfEcf0f878c776574FEeDE4F36

OxaPay (1)

0xC842355888f47C9E4F0eBEF7627A66724Be01295

Stake.com (1)

0x993Cd9D9eb1647eAD826C7F7bC8277E5227c2218

CoinPal (3)

0xAe2b3879ede4732FfD6942be25Ff796B31d67749

0x1472924b0325a37A71E71519ffaF765dc9D27cea

0x429d947cFDD87e4cb1ca3eBDa9075C6B4E801B9a

Uphold (1)

0x06a909c7ED913a8c3b613A4B2a5168Ca579b515c