Case 2:18-cv-05008-FMO-AFM Document 190-1 Filed 10/13/20 Page 1 of 7 Page ID #:4276

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	865 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800 Los Angeles, California 90017-2543 Phone: (213) 622-5555	. 239015)	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
11	WESTERN DIVISION		
12	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,	Case No. 2:18-cv-05008-FMO-AFM	
13	Plaintiff,	DECLARATION OF RECEIVER, GEOFF WINKLER, IN SUPPORT OF	
14	V.	MOTION FOR AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH DISGORGEMENT	
15	RALPH T. IANNELLI and ESSEX	PROCEDURES AND UNDERTAKE DISGORGEMENT EFFORTS	
16	CAPITAL CORP.,	[Notice of Motion and Motion; and	
17	Defendants.	[Proposed] Order submitted concurrently herewith]	
18 19		Date: November 12, 2020 Time: 10:00 a.m.	
19 20		Ctrm: 6D Judge Hon. Fernando M. Olguin	
20 21			
21 22	ΝΕΩΊ ΑΒΑΤΙΩΝ ΟΙ	e ceoee windt ed	
	DECLARATION OF GEOFF WINKLER		
23	I, Geoff Winkler, declare as follows:		
24	1. I am the Court-appointed permanent receiver (the "Receiver") for		
25	Defendant Essex Capital Corporation ("Essex") and its subsidiaries and affiliates		
26	(collectively, the "Receivership Entities" or "Entities") in the above-entitled matter.		
27	I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this Declaration, and make this		
LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP	Declaration in support of my concurrently	tiled Motion for Authority to Establish	

Disgorgement Procedures and Undertake Disgorgement Efforts (the "Motion"). I 1 2 was appointed as Receiver for the Entities on December 21, 2018, by virtue of this Court's Order Regarding Preliminary Injunction and Appointment of a Permanent 3 Receiver (the "Appointment Order") (ECF No. 66), and was vested with exclusive 4 authority and control over the Receivership Entities and their assets ("Receivership 5 Assets" or "Assets"). On September 9, 2019, the Court entered its Order Regarding 6 Permanent Injunction (the "Permanent Injunction") (ECF No. 113), which 7 8 reaffirmed the authority initially conveyed upon me via the Appointment Order.

9 2. In connection with my duties as Receiver, I and my staff have reviewed
10 more than 500,000 pages of materials, reflecting hundreds of thousands of
11 individual transactions, relating to the business and financial activities of the
12 Receivership Entities.

13 3. This effort has enabled me to identify and quantify a significant portion of those Entity transactions relating to potentially recoverable Assets. On the basis 14 15 of my review, I have confirmed that the operations of the Receivership Entities were not profitable, and were unsustainable absent ongoing infusions of new funds from 16 investors or lenders. I further confirmed that Essex's payments of so-called returns 17 on investments to certain investors were funded in substantial part by money 18 19 obtained from new investors, in a manner consistent with the operation of a Ponzi 20 scheme. On this basis, and as detailed significantly in my prior submissions to the Court, including my Forensic and Investigative Accounting Report, I have 21 22 concluded and reported that the activities of the Receivership Entities bear the hallmarks of a Ponzi investment scheme. 23

4. Via my analysis and accounting of the Entities' transactions, I have
confirmed that certain Receivership Entity investors ("Net Winners") were paid
more than the aggregate amounts they invested in the Entities, while other investors
("Net Losers") lost money on their investments. I have determined, in my
reasonable business judgment, that in order to recover and return as much as

LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

-2-

possible to the investors and creditors of the Entities, including Net Losers, it is
 necessary and appropriate to pursue recovery of profits paid to the Net Winners.
 My investigation and accounting has identified at least fifty-one (51) potential Net
 Winners, who, collectively, appear to have been paid profits in excess of their
 principal investments in an aggregate amount that may exceed \$25 million.

5. Based upon my experience, and a comprehensive review of materials
from comparable federal equity receiverships in this district, I believe that average
recoveries from the Net Winners are unlikely to reach 100% of each Net Winner's
individual respective profits ("Profit Amount").

6. Accordingly, I recommend that I be authorized to undertake
 disgorgement procedures tailored to enable me to pursue recoveries from Net
 Winners which minimize the costs to the receivership estate, while maximizing
 funds (including any recoveries from Net Winners) available for distribution to Net
 Losers and other Entity creditors whose claims are ultimately allowed by the Court.
 My recommended procedures are as follows:

16 I. <u>Settlements.</u>

17 7. Net Winners will be provided with an opportunity and incentive to settle claims for the recovery of Profit Amounts prior to incurring the cost and delay 18 19 of litigation. Accordingly, I propose sending demand letters to all Net Winners 20 whom I have determined to pursue for reimbursement of Profit Amounts which 21 shall: (a) identify my calculation of the Net Winner's Profit Amount; (b) state the 22 my intention to pursue claims against the Net Winner to recover the Profit Amount, 23 along with a brief description of the basis for such claims; and (c) offer to settle my claims prior to the commencement of litigation for 60% of the Profit Amount, if 24 25 payment is made in a lump sum, and within ninety (90) days of demand, or 67.5% 26 of the Profit Amount if payment is made over time, not to exceed twelve (12) 27 monthly installments. The demand letter will also advise that such preliminary 28 offers to settle shall expire sixty (60) days after its transmittal date. In order to

LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP effectuate the procedures set forth in the Motion, I believe that I must be vested with
 the discretion to fashion settlement agreements and releases as I deem appropriate,
 in my reasonable business judgment.

In order to accept any pre-litigation settlement offer, a Net Winner 8. 4 must: (a) confirm, in writing within sixty (60) days of the transmittal of the demand 5 6 letter, his or her intent to settle; (b) execute a settlement agreement, along with a stipulated judgment in the amount of his or her total Profit Amount, and return both 7 8 the executed settlement agreement and stipulated judgment to me within one hundred and five (105) days of the transmittal of the initial demand letter. I 9 respectfully request that settlement agreements executed in accordance with these 10 procedures be effective immediately, without further Court approval. 11

12 9. I will hold stipulated judgments and not file any of them with the Court or otherwise seek there enforcement, provided a settling Net Winner timely makes 13 all payments required under the applicable settlement agreement. If a settling Net 14 15 Winner defaults on any payment, or otherwise fails to timely make all required payments, and does not cure such default within ten (10) calendar days of such 16 17 default, I may, in my sole discretion, file a complaint in this Court against the Net 18 Winner together with the stipulated judgment, and promptly request entry of the 19 stipulated judgment. In the event that any initial settlement offer lapses, either by 20 failure of a Net Winner to respond or otherwise, I may, in my sole discretion and 21 exercising my reasonable business judgment, file a complaint in this Court against 22 any Net Winner, subject to the proposed litigation procedures described in the 23 Motion. In the event that a Net Winner seeks to settle after a complaint is filed, but before litigation is concluded, the 60% and 67.5% settlement thresholds above will 24 25 be raised to 80% and 90%, respectively, as will be stated in the demand letter.

26 II. <u>Litigation.</u>

27 10. In the event that any initial settlement offer lapses, either by failure of a
28 Net Winner to respond or otherwise, I would then be authorized, without further

LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

1	order of the Court, to initiate litigation against the Net Winner. In order to minimize
2	the administrative expenses associated with any claims against Net Winners, and to
3	maximize judicial efficiency, I propose that all actions relating to such claims be
4	prosecuted in this Court, which can exercise ancillary and supplemental jurisdiction
5	over such claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1345 and 1367(a). Accordingly, in
6	connection with the filing of any action against a Net Winner in this Court, I
7	propose promptly filing a notice of related action with each such complaint, in
8	compliance with L.R. 83-1.3.1.
9	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
10	Executed this 8th day of October, 2020, at Salem, Oregon.
11	
12	- Ch UM
13	GEOFF WINKLER
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19 20	
20	
21 22	
22	
23 24	
24 25	
25 26	
20	
28	
LAW OFFICES Atkins Leck Gamble	
lorv & Natsis LLP	

Allen Matkins Leck Mallory & Natsis

1	PROOF OF SERVICE	
2	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Ralph T. Iannelli and Essex Capital Corporation USDC, Central District of California – Case No. 2:18-cv-05008-FMO-AFM	
3	I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age	
4	of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 865 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 2800, Los Angeles, California 90017-2543.	
5 6	On October 13, 2020, I caused to be served on all the parties to this action addressed as stated on the attached service list the document entitled: DECLARATION OF	
7	RECEIVER, GEOFF WINKLER, IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH DISGORGEMENT PROCEDURES AND UNDERTAKE	
8	DISGORGEMENT EFFORTS	
9	■ OFFICE MAIL : By placing in sealed envelope(s), which I placed for collection and mailing today following ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with	
10	the firm's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing; such correspondence would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the same day in	
11	the ordinary course of business.	
12	OVERNIGHT DELIVERY : I deposited in a box or other facility regularly	
13	maintained by express service carrier, or delivered to a courier or driver authorized by said express service carrier to receive documents, a true copy of the foregoing	
14 15	document(s) in sealed envelope(s) or package(s) designed by the express service carrier, addressed as indicated on the attached service list, with fees for overnight delivery paid or provided for.	
16	 HAND DELIVERY: I caused to be hand delivered each such envelope to the office of the addressee as stated on the attached service list. 	
17 18	 ELECTRONIC MAIL: By transmitting the document by electronic mail to the electronic mail address as stated on the attached service list. 	
19	E-FILING : By causing the document to be electronically filed via the Court's	
20	CM/ECF system, which effects electronic service on counsel who are registered with the CM/ECF system.	
21	FAX : By transmitting the document by facsimile transmission. The transmission	
22	was reported as complete and without error.	
23	I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the Bar of this Court at	
24	whose direction the service was made. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on	
25	October 13, 2020 at Los Angeles, California.	
26	/s/ Martha Diaz	
27	Martha Diaz	
28		
	1153214.89/LA - 1 -	

Case 2:18-cv-05008-FMO-AFM Document 190-1 Filed 10/13/20 Page 7 of 7 Page ID #:4282

1	SERVICE LIST
2	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Ralph T. Iannelli and Essex Capital Corporation USDC, Central District of California – Case No. 2:18-cv-05008-FMO-AFM
3	
4	Mark Riera, Esq. Jeffer Mangels Butler & Mitchell LLPP
5 1900 Avenue of the Stars, 7 ^a Floor	1900 Avenue of the Stars, 7 ^e Floor Los Angeles, CA 90067-4308
6	Los Angeles, CA 90007-4300
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	1153214.89/LA