1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	DAVID R. ZARO (BAR NO. 124334) JOSHUA A. DEL CASTILLO (BAR NO. MATTHEW D. PHAM (BAR NO. 28770 ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE MALLORY & NATSIS LLP 865 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800 Los Angeles, California 90017-2543 Phone: (213) 622-5555 Fax: (213) 620-8816 E-Mail: dzaro@allenmatkins.com		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA WESTERN DIVISION		
12			
13	COMMISSION,	RECEIVER'S FIFTEENTH INTERIM	
14	Plaintiff,	REPORT AND PETITION FOR FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS	
15	VS.	Date: June 15, 2023 Time: 10:00 a.m.	
16	RALPH T. IANNELLI and ESSEX CAPITAL CORP.,	Ctrm: 6D	
17	Defendants.	Judge: Hon. Fernando M. Olguin	
18			
19	///		
20	///		
21	///		
22	///		
23	///		
24	///		
25	///		
26	///		
27	///		
28	///		
LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP	4874-5774-5500.2		

Geoff Winkler (the "Receiver"), the Court-appointed permanent receiver for defendant Essex Capital Corporation ("Essex") and its subsidiaries and affiliates (collectively, with Essex, the "Receivership Entities" or "Entities"), hereby submits the following fourteenth interim report and petition for further instructions (the "Report") for the period from January 1, 2023 through March 31, 2023 (the "Reporting Period"¹), in accordance with Rule 66-6 of the Local Civil Rules of the United States District Court for the Central District of California and the Court's (a) Order Regarding Preliminary Injunction and Appointment of a Permanent Receiver (the "Appointment Order"), ECF No. 66, entered on December 21, 2018; (b) Order in Aid of Receivership (the "Order in Aid"), ECF No. 69, entered on February 1, 2019; and (c) Order Regarding Permanent Injunction (the "Permanent Injunction"), ECF No. 113, entered on September 9, 2019.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

During the Reporting Period, the Receiver's efforts were largely directed at identifying, recovering, and administering any available assets of the Receivership Entities (the "Receivership Assets" or "Assets"), with an eye towards completing Asset recovery efforts as expediently and efficiently as possible, and making an additional distribution to holders of allowed claims against the receivership estate (the "Estate"). This Report summarizes the Receiver's efforts and provides a summary of his Entity and Estate administration plans through the anticipated termination of the instant receivership.

During the Reporting Period, the Receiver took the following actions:

• Continued the prosecution of three remaining disgorgement actions brought by the Receiver against alleged profiting investors, seeking to recover, at

LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

4874-5774-5500.2

-2-

While this Report largely addresses efforts undertaken during the Reporting Period, it necessarily makes reference to efforts or events prior to or after the Reporting Period.

face value and in the aggregate, over \$3 million in fictitious profits received by those investors;

- Continued to perform his obligations under the Court-approved settlement agreement in the CVL Action and Reyner II Action (as defined below);
- Performed an evaluation of all known remaining Assets (including prospective litigation claims, pending settlement payments, and a corporate interest held by the Receiver for the benefit of the Estate) and developed a proposed plan for the administration of these assets, an additional interim distribution to holders of allowed claims, and the management of the Estate through the eventual termination of the instant receivership and the Receiver' eventual discharge and release; and
- Continued to monitor and appear, as appropriate, in all known, prereceivership litigation pending in California state courts involving or implicating the Receivership Entities or their Assets.

In addition to the above, the Receiver has continued to administer the remaining Assets of the Estate, and, as of the date of his standardized fund accounting report for the Reporting Period (the "SFAR"), attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**, held approximately \$2 million, in cash on-hand for the administration and benefit of the Receivership Entities and the Estate.

RELEVANT PROCEDURAL HISTORY II.

While the relevant filings in the instant receivership are too voluminous to list, the Receiver invites the Court and all interested parties to review the following filings² for the relevant factual and procedural background relating to the subjects addressed in this Report:

LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

-3-

4874-5774-5500.2

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

These filings, as well as others, are available on the Receiver's website, https://essex-receivership.com/.

1 Plaintiff the Securities and Exchange Commission's *Complaint*, filed on 2 June 5, 2018 (ECF No. 1); 3 The Appointment Order, entered on December 21, 2018 (ECF No. 66); The Order in Aid, entered on February 1, 2019 (ECF No. 69); 4 5 The Permanent Injunction, entered on September 9, 2019 (ECF No. 113); 6 The Receiver's prior interim reports (ECF Nos. 78, 103, 123, 149, 174, 197, 7 206, 210, 215, 229, 236, 243, 249, and 256); The Stipulation for Order: (1) Establishing Claims Procedures; and 8 9 (2) Setting Claims Bar Date, filed on April 20, 2020 (ECF No. 168) and the 10 order thereon, entered on July 31, 2020 (ECF No. 179);

- The Motion of Receiver, Geoff Winkler, for Authority to Establish

 Disgorgement Procedures and Undertake Disgorgement Efforts, filed on

 October 13, 2020 (ECF No. 190) and the order thereon, entered on

 November 12, 2020 (ECF No. 195);
- The Motion for Order: (1) Approving Proposed Distribution Plan; (2) Approving Recommended Treatment of Claims; and (3) Authorizing Distributions on Allowed Claims, filed on December 21, 2021 (ECF No. 220) and the order thereon, entered on April 19, 2022 (ECF No. 234); and
- The Motion of Receiver, Geoff Winkler, for Order Approving and Authorizing Performance of Settlement Agreement, filed on September 7, 2022 (ECF No. 241) and the order thereon, entered on September 19, 2022, (ECF No. 246).

III. THE RECEIVER'S ACTIVITIES AND EFFORTS TO DATE

As discussed extensively in the Receiver's prior interim reports, the Receiver has been met with substantial success in his efforts to identify, marshal, administer, and ultimately distribute Receivership Assets for the benefit of the Receivership

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Entities, their Estate, and its creditors, including during the Reporting Period. Each of these efforts is discussed in turn below.

A. Identifying Receivership Assets.

Accounting for, tracing, and recovering the assets of the Receivership Entities was among the Receiver's top priorities. The Receiver and his staff conducted a comprehensive accounting, reviewing over 500,000 documents, culminating in the Receiver's Forensic and Investigative Accounting Report (the "Accounting Report") [ECF No. 171] and, later, his Supplemental Forensic Investigative Accounting Report (the "Supplemental Accounting Report," and together, with the Accounting Report, the "Accounting Reports") [ECF No. 235]. As reflected in the Accounting Reports, the Receiver's conclusions, after years of forensic review and analysis of hundreds of thousands of documents, included that in at least the twelve years preceding his appointment, the Entities raised approximately \$224 million from more than 150 investors in a manner consistent with a Ponzi investment scheme. In addition, the Receiver concluded that the Entities transferred funds raised from investors to and through myriad business accounts, individuals, and business entities, using funds raised from later investors to pay obligations owing to later investors, and diverting funds raised from investors for the personal use of Mr. Iannelli. By tracing the funds received by the Entities, the Receiver was able to identify a wide variety of Receivership Assets, including funds in bank accounts, equity interests in businesses, and receivables, along with claims for disgorgement against certain individuals or entities whom the Receiver alleged profited from the Ponzi scheme, or otherwise benefitted from the diversion of funds fraudulently obtained from other investors. Thereafter, and with the Court's permission, the Receiver commenced efforts to recover as many of these Receivership Assets as reasonably possible.

27

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

B. Marshaling Receivership Assets.

1. <u>Disgorgement of Fictitious Profits from Profiting Investors.</u>

While undertaking the analysis that resulted in the Accounting Reports, the Receiver carefully reviewed the transactions made between the Receivership Entities and each of their counterparties in an effort to identify those who had profited from the Ponzi scheme (the "Winners"). An investor's profits were calculated by subtracting that investor's (a) transfers to the Entities from (b) transfers received from the Entities, resulting in a net profit amount, calculated via a Court-approved money-in/money-out analysis (the "Profits"). Any such Profits, as proceeds of a Ponzi scheme, are fictitious and subject to disgorgement for the benefit of the Estate.

As reflected in prior interim reports, and the dockets for the disgorgement actions prosecuted by the Receiver against alleged Winners, maximizing the recovery of Profits from Winners in a fair and equitable fashion has been challenging, although the Receiver has ultimately been successful to date in settling on terms favorable to the Estate. The history, through the Reporting Period, of the Receiver's disgorgement actions against alleged Winners is as follows:

(a) Winkler v. Fazio, et al., Case No. 2:21-cv-02987-FMO-AFM (the "Fazio Action").

In the Fazio Action, the Receiver initially calculated the defendants' Profits to be in excess of \$2 million. Following the commencement of the action, and after his receipt of additional relevant materials, the Receiver adjusted this figure downward. Following two mandatory settlement conferences before the Honorable Alexander F. MacKinnon, the Receiver and the defendants reached a Court-approved, confidential settlement on terms favorable to the Estate. The settlement has been performed, and the defendants have paid all amounts owing to the Receiver.

1 Winkler v. WLD Davis Holdings, LLC, et al., Case No. (b) 2 2:21-cv-03209-FMO-AFM (the "WLD Davis Action"). 3 In the WLD Davis Action, the Receiver calculated the defendants' Profits to be over \$660,000. Shortly after the filing of the complaint, the Receiver and the 4 5 defendants engaged in settlement discussions, ultimately reaching a confidential settlement on terms favorable to the Estate. The defendants have paid all settlement 6 7 funds owing to the Receiver. 8 (c) Winkler v. Siemens, et al., Case No. 2:21-cv-04515-FMO-AFM (the "Siemens Action"). 9 10 In the Siemens Action, the Receiver calculated the defendants' Profits to be more than \$109,000. Following a settlement conference before Judge MacKinnon, 11 12 the parties reached a Court-approved settlement agreement. Pursuant to that agreement, the defendants paid the Receiver \$75,000 in full satisfaction of his 13 claims. 14 Winkler v. Fead, Case No. 2:21-cv-04519-FMO-AFM 15 (d) 16 (the "Fead Action"). 17 In the Fead Action, the Receiver initially calculated the defendant's Profits to be in excess of \$275,000. Following the filing of the complaint, the Receiver 18 19 received additional information concerning the transactions between Essex and the 20 defendant. With that additional information in hand, the Receiver adjusted the amount of the Profits downwards. Following a settlement conference before Judge 21 22 MacKinnon, the parties reached a settlement, pursuant to which the defendant has paid the Receiver \$118,500 in full satisfaction of his claims. 23 24 Winkler v. Davis, et al. (formerly Winkler v. Largura), (e) 25 Case No. 2:21-cv-04534-FMO-AFM (the "Largura 26 Action"). 27 In the Largura Action, the Receiver calculated the defendant Robert Largura's 28 Profits to be in excess of \$460,000. As noted in prior interim reports, Mr. Largura

unfortunately passed away during the litigation and while the parties were engaging 1 2 in settlement discussions, both in connection with and outside of their mandatory settlement conference before Judge MacKinnon. Following the substitution of Mr. Largura's successors (the "Largura Trustees"), in their capacity as co-trustees of 4 the Robert Largura Administrative Trust Established April 22, 2022 (the "Largura 5 Trust"), the Receiver and the Largura Trustees reached a settlement pursuant to 6 7 which the Largura Trust agreed to pay the Receiver \$241,592.04 in full satisfaction 8 of his claims. The settlement amount has since been paid. 9 Winkler v. Emmons, et al., Case No. 2:21-cv-07267-**(f)** FMO-AFM (the "Emmons Action"). 10 11 In the Emmons Action, the Receiver initially calculated the defendants' Profits to be more than \$1,025,000 (though his complaint had originally, in error, 12 alleged the Profits to be \$585,000). Following the parties' first mandatory 13 settlement conference before Judge MacKinnon, the defendants provided the 14 15 Receiver with information and documents previously unavailable to him. After a review of this new information, the Receiver revised the Profits figure, to \$611,000. 16 17 After a second settlement conference, the parties reached a settlement pursuant to 18 which the defendants agreed to pay Receiver a total of \$305,500 in full satisfaction 19 of his claims. The defendants have since made the first settlement payment of 20 \$152,750 to the Receiver, with a second, for the same amount, due in June 2023. 21 Winkler v. Reyner, et al., Case No. 2:21-cv-05730-FMO-**(g)** 22 AFM (the "Revner Action"). 23 In the Reyner Action, the Receiver originally calculated the defendants' 24 Profits to be more than \$1,051,000. The parties subsequently filed cross motions for 25 summary judgment, in connection with which the Receiver sought to have the defendants disgorge a revised calculated profit amount of \$676,000. After the 26 27 summary judgment motions had been taken under submission by the Court, and

28

pretrial tasks were already underway, the Receiver and the defendants reached a

settlement agreement, pursuant to which the defendants agreed to pay the Receiver the sum of \$425,000, over two payments. The defendants have since paid the first installment of \$212,500, with the second installment, in the same amount, due in June 2023.

(h) Winkler v. McCloskey, et al., Case No. 2:21-cv-05757-FMO-AFM (the "McCloskey Action").

In the McCloskey Action, the Receiver calculated the defendants' Profits to be in excess of \$1.2 million. Prior to the Reporting Period, the Court denied the defendants' motion to compel arbitration, which they have since appealed to the Ninth Circuit (case no. 22-55856). During the Reporting Period, the Receiver, through counsel, continued his efforts to negotiate the resolution of this dispute. As of the date of this Report, the Receiver's efforts have not resulted in a settlement, and the Receiver filed his Answering Brief in the pending appeal on March 27, 2023. The defendants' Reply Brief is due to be filed on or before May 17, 2023. Notwithstanding the pending appeal, the Receiver will continue to press settlement discussions in the hopes of resolving the underlying disgorgement dispute.

(i) Winkler v. Nicholson, Case No. 2:21-cv-07458-FMO-AFM (the "Nicholson Action").

In the Nicholson Action, the Receiver calculated the defendant's Profits to be more than \$1.5 million. During the Reporting Period the Receiver and the defendant attended a settlement conference before Judge MacKinnon but were unable to reach an agreement. Accordingly, the parties filed their respective summary judgment motions on December 14, 2022, with hearing initially set for January 26, 2023. Due to a health-related emergency, all pretrial and trial dates and deadlines have been temporarily vacated. A status conference was set for April 20, 2023, at which time the Receiver understands the Court may set a new trial date.

(j) Winkler v. Grimm, et al., Case No. 2:22-cv-05736-FMO-AFM (the "Grimm Action").

In the Grimm Action, the Receiver calculated the defendants' Profits to be in excess of \$1.1 million. As mentioned in prior interim reports, the Receiver filed his complaint commencing the Grimm Action on August 12, 2022, after his efforts to settle this disgorgement dispute with the defendants were unsuccessful and the parties' tolling agreement was set to expire. During the Reporting Period, the Receiver attended to miscellaneous discovery tasks in anticipation of future settlement discussions.

(k) Recoveries from Winners Without Litigation.

The Receiver has also successfully recovered Profits from Winners without the need for litigation. Pursuant to Court-approved disgorgement procedures, the Receiver was authorized to, among other things, demand in writing that alleged Winners return of any Profits they were paid, and to settle his prospective disgorgement claims against such winners at a discount, provided settlement demands were agreed to on a Court-approved schedule. Utilizing this process, the Receiver has recovered more than \$2.3 million in Profits from alleged Winners, without having to resort to costly litigation.

All told, between the settlements agreed to after the commencement of litigation, and the settlements agreed to without resorting to litigation, the Receiver stands to recover more than \$4 million for alleged investor Winners, not including any settlements reached in the McCloskey, Nicholson, or Grimm Actions. Inclusive of settlements unrelated to profits paid out to Winners, the Receiver stands to recover more than \$5.8 milion.

2. Other Litigation.

In addition to the disgorgement actions discussed above, the Receiver has also prosecuted other claims involving, among other things, contract disputes relating to

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

Essex's leasing business, off-balance sheet financing vehicles, and equity interests in third-party businesses. Several noteworthy examples follow:

(a) Essex Capital Corp. v. Garipalli, et al., Case No. 1:17-cv-6347-JFK (the "Garipalli Action").

At the time of the Receiver's appointment, Essex was already prosecuting the Garipalli Action, seeking damages suffered in connection with commercial lease agreements implicating Sequoia Healthcare Services, LLC ("Sequoia") and its principals. Upon his appointment, the Receiver continued this litigation and quickly reached an agreement with Sequoia, pursuant to which Sequoia would pay the Receiver \$925,000 in exchange for the dismissal of the action.

(b) The Grant/Amagansett Matter (Settled Without Litigation).

Amagansett LLC ("Amagansett") was established in 2018 by two creditors of the Receivership Entities—the Grants—to serve as a debt-refinancing vehicle for debt owed by the Entities to the Grants. For the Entities' purposes, Amagansett served as an off-balance sheet financing vehicle in which illiquid assets could be used to offset current liabilities. Due to inconsistent and irreconcilable accounting records, the Receiver was unable to accurately determine the amount or nature of the payments or other consideration transferred between the Entities and Amagansett. Despite this challenge, the Receiver successfully negotiated a settlement with the Grants. The Grants paid the Receiver \$150,000 in exchange for the release of all claims against Grant and Amagansett. The Court approved this agreement on July 29, 2020 (see ECF No. 178).

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

4874-5774-5500.2 -11-

Winkler v. 915 Elm Avenue CVL, LLC, Case No. 2:21-1 (c) 2 cv-00869-FMO-AFM (the "CVL Action"), and Winkler v. Revner, et al., Case No. 2:22-cv-00800-FMO-AFM 3 (the "Reyner II Action"). 4 5 915 Elm Avenue CVL, LLC ("CVL") is a limited liability company formed in November 2015, by defendant Ralph T. Iannelli ("Iannelli") and William S. Reyner, 6 7 Jr., ("Reyner") to purchase, own, and operate a lumber-yard business. Following his 8 forensic accounting and a lengthy investigation, the Receiver determined that Iannelli fraudulently diverted over \$2.1 million in funds of the Receivership Entities to the CVL enterprise. Specifically, the Receivership Entities and their funds were 10 used to establish CVL, fund its operations, purchase its lumber yard, and service its 11 12 debt. Independent of this action, Iannelli assigned his approximately 39% interest in 13 CVL to the Receiver. 14 As discussed in detail in the prior interim report, the Receiver successfully reached a settlement agreement which resolved both the CVL Action and the 15 16 Reyner II Action (see ECF No. 246). Pursuant to the settlement agreement, CVL 17 will pay the Receiver a total of \$1.1 million, of which the Receiver has so far 18 received \$800,000 from CVL (and the remaining \$300,000 to be paid by CVL in 19 \$100,000 annual installments each September for the next three years). 20 Furthermore, the Receiver will retain his ownership interest of approximately 39% in CVL. 21 22 (d) Winkler v. Hopen Life Science Ventures, Case No. 2:21-23 cv-06049-FMO-AFM (the "Hopen Action"). 24 In the Hopen Action, the Receiver calculated the defendant' Profits to be 25 \$256,000, representing a \$256,000 transfer that Essex had made to the defendant in 26 2014. However, through discovery, the Receiver developed a better understanding 27 of Essex's transactional relationship with the defendant, which reflected that the 28 defendant had entered into a series of agreements with Essex, Iannelli, and a third

party, the last of which involved Essex agreeing to pay \$256,000 to the defendant in exchange for releases benefiting all of the counterparties, not just Essex.

Prior to the Reporting Period, the Receiver successfully reached confidential a settlement with the defendant. This Court approved the settlement on November 14, 2022, and the defendant has since paid the undisclosed settlement sum to the Receiver.

(e) Recovery of Fraudulent Transfers Made to Third-Party Non-Profit Organizations.

Prior to the appointment of the Receiver, the Entities transferred hundreds of thousands of dollars to third-party non-profit organizations for no consideration. The Receiver successfully obtained the return of more than \$250,000. These disgorgements were sought by the Receiver via written demand letters and without having to resort to formal litigation.

In all, the Receiver's non-disgorgement Asset recovery efforts have yielded recoveries in the amount of more than \$2.5 million.

C. Administration of Receivership Assets.

A significant portion of the Receiver's early efforts related to his administration of Receivership Entities' equipment-leasing operations. Under the Receiver's oversight, these operations yielded more than \$2.2 million in gross revenue from equipment leasing and nearly \$1.5 million in revenue from post-lease equipment buyouts.

The Receiver is presently administering several equity investments held for the benefit of the Estate, most notably the Estate's interest in CVL. As detailed below, the Receiver hopes to cause the sale of these holdings or deposit them into a liquidating trust, at such time as he deems appropriate, ideally in a manner that raises additional funds for the Estate.

D. Completed Distribution on Allowed Claims.

In April of 2020, the Receiver proposed a claims procedure by which claims against the Receivership Entities could be submitted to the Receiver, and an associated bar date established by which all such claims would be due. This Court approved the claims procedure and bar date on July 31, 2020. (*See* ECF No. 179.) Thereafter, the Receiver began soliciting and reviewing prospective claims.

The Receiver subsequently developed a methodology of reviewing claims and determining claim amounts, including a hybrid "rising tide" approach to his contemplated distributions on allowed claims. Under this system, the first 50% of funds would be distributed to the least "whole" investor group, in order to restore them to a more equitable loss "floor," and the second 50% of funds would subsequently be distributed on a strict *pro rata* basis. The Receiver's hybrid rising tide proposal was approved by this Court on April 19, 2022. (*See* ECF No. 234.)

In early August 2022, the Receiver made his first distribution on allowed claims, making distributions to sixty claimants in the aggregate amount of \$3 million, with individual payments ranging from \$628 to over \$300,000 (and determined by the application of the hybrid rising tide system). As detailed below, The Receiver anticipates that there will be at least one (and potentially two) additional distribution on allowed claims, to be paid from additional funds obtained through litigation or settlement, including contemporaneously with the wind down and termination of the instant receivership.

E. Attending to Pre-Receivership Litigation Matters.

At the time of the Receiver's appointment, there were two actions against the Receivership Entities pending before the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Barbara, both of which had been stayed pursuant to the Permanent Injunction: (a) the action captioned as *Gabler v. Essex Capital Corp., et al.* and bearing Case No. 18CV03423 (the "Gabler Action"); and (b) the action captioned as *Dennis v. Iannelli, et al.* and bearing Case No. 18CV03317 (the "Dennis Action").

4874-5774-5500.2

The plaintiff in the Gabler Action, who had alleged that defendants Melissa Iannelli, Ralph Iannelli, and Essex breached the terms of a promissory note, however, has since voluntarily dismissed his action, without prejudice. The plaintiff in the Dennis Action, which remains pending, had alleged that defendants Iannelli and Essex operated a fraudulent investment scheme, and sought relief upon a number of tort claims.

The Receiver and his counsel have continued to monitor the Dennis Action and have previously informed the court presiding over that action of the litigation stay imposed by the Appointment Order and maintained by the Permanent Injunction, in order to protect and preserve the Estate from diminution. The Receiver will continue to monitor and, through counsel, make necessary appearances and keep the court presiding over the Dennis Action abreast of developments in the instant action, as appropriate.

F. Communications with Investors and Other Interested Parties.

In accordance with the Order in Aid, the Receiver continues to maintain a receivership website for this matter, which, among other things, he uses as a means of communicating with investors in the Receivership Entities. Specifically, the Receiver posts all of his filings to the website, which also includes a portal through which investors and other interested parties may register to receive email notice of such filings. The Receiver will continue to post additional updates to the website as they become relevant and available.

IV. <u>RECEIVER'S RECOMMENDATIONS.</u>

As noted above, the Receiver has negotiated certain settlements with extended payment terms. As of the date of this Report, portions of the settlements in the Reyner and Emmons, and CVL Actions remained unperformed, with more than \$650,000 in settlement payments due between the date of this Report and September 2025 (\$350,000 of which is due to be paid by the end of June 2023). The McCloskey, Nicholson, and Grimm Actions have not yet settled, although the

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

4874-5774-5500.2 -15-

Receiver remains confident that settlements in these matters may yet be reached, meaning potentially significant additional settlement funds remain unrecovered. Finally, the Receiver still holds an interest in CVL for the benefit of the Estate.

In order to complete his Asset recovery efforts and secure the maximum amount possible for distribution on allowed claims, the Receiver recommends the following courses of action:

- Monitor Reyner, Emmons, and CVL settlements to ensure timely payment of settlement funds: As noted above, these three settlements require approximately \$650,000 in as yet unpaid settlement payments. The Receiver will monitor these actions and coordinate with appropriate counterparties to ensure timely payment as provided for in the applicable Court-approved settlement agreements.
- Prosecute and pursue settlement in McCloskey, Nicholson, and Grimm Actions: At face value, the Receiver has alleged that these defendants were paid as much as \$3.8 million in aggregate Profits from the Ponzi scheme conducted through the Entities. Given that the Receiver's appellate briefing in the McCloskey Action, and his summary judgment briefing in the Nicholson Action, has been completed, the Receiver recommends the continued prosecution of these matters. Likewise, in the Grimm Action, discovery has commenced and a mandatory settlement conference has been scheduled for May 24, 2023. The Receiver believes that the continued prosecution of these matters, paired with meaningful and substantive settlement outreach and discussion, is likely to yield the most beneficial outcome (along with an appropriate monetary recovery) for the Estate.
- Monetize the Estate's interest in CVL: As noted above, the Receiver holds a significant interest in CVL for the benefit of the Estate. As of the date of this Report, the Receiver believes this interest to have substantial monetary value. Accordingly, and consistent with his authority under the Appointment

Order and Preliminary Injunction, the Receiver recommends that he immediately begin marketing his interest in CVL for sale, including via discussions with Mr. Reyner, who individually and collectively with family members and a related trust, holds the majority interest in the Company. In the event that the Receiver is unable to locate suitable buyers for remaining Receivership Assets, he will petition the Court to establish a liquidating trust into which they may be deposited for the benefit of the Estate and all holders of allowed claims.

Given the extended period of time before the final settlement payment is due to be made in the CVL Action, and the fact that it may take some time for the Receiver to monetize the Estate's non-litigation interests, the Receiver hopes to make a nominal interim distribution on allowed claims, if possible. At present, the Receiver is in the process of calculating how much is available for such a distribution, to be paid out consistent with this Court's prior orders. Whether or not a second interim distribution ultimately proves possible, the

Receiver expects to make final distribution on allowed claims once he has

monetized all remaining and available Assets, and is prepared to wind-down

Complete a second interim distribution on allowed claims, if possible:

• Reduce Estate expenses by limiting Receiver and professional fees: As noted above, a number of the settlements negotiated to date have payment terms extending as far as 2025. Other than prosecuting the outstanding disgorgement cases to judgment (or, ideally, negotiating near-term settlements in each action) and selling those remaining Assets in the possession of the Receiver, the Receiver has largely completed his obligations as initially set forth in the Appointment Order. Accordingly, the Receiver anticipates filing a motion, under separate cover, for an order adjusting certain Estate administrative obligations (e.g., reporting deadlines) in such a way as

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble

Mallory & Natsis LLP

4874-5774-5500.2 -17-

and terminate the receivership.

to enable him and his professionals to "put their pencils down" with respect to certain non-critical administrative tasks – thereby reducing fees and expenses - while the Receiver concentrates on prosecuting (or settling) the pending disgorgement matters, monetizing other remaining Receivership Assets, and developing a plan for a final distribution on allowed claims and the winddown and termination of the instant receivership.

CONCLUSION AND PETITION FOR FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS V.

Assuming that the Court accepts this Report and authorizes the Receiver to undertake the actions recommended herein, as well as to continue those actions provided for in the Appointment Order, Order in Aid, and Permanent Injunction, the Receiver proposes to submit a further interim report to this Court, addressing his progress, findings, conclusions, and additional recommendations, in approximately 90 to 120 days.

Accordingly, and based on the foregoing, the Receiver respectfully requests that the Court enter an order:

- 1. Accepting this Report;
- Authorizing the Receiver to continue to administer the Receivership 2. Entities and their Estate in accordance with the terms of the Appointment Order, Order in Aid, and Permanent Injunction;
- Authorizing the Receiver to undertake the recommendations presented 3. herein; and
- 22 ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 23 ///
- 24 ///
- 25 ///
- 26 ///
- 27 ///
- ///

28

LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

> -18-4874-5774-5500.2

Case 2:18-cv-05008-FMO-AFM Document 262 Filed 05/15/23 Page 19 of 23 Page ID #:6342

1	4. Providing such other and further relief as the Court deems necessary					
2	and appropriate under the circumstances.					
3						
4	Dated: May 15, 2023	ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE MALLORY & NATSIS LLP				
5	I	DAVID R. ZARO				
6	Ň	OSHUA A. DEL CASTILLO MATTHEW D. PHAM				
7	F	By: /s/ Matthew D. Pham				
8		MATTHEW D PHAM				
9		Attorneys for Receiver GEOFF WINKLER				
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19 20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
Gamble LLP						

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

4874-5774-5500.2 -19-

VERIFICATION OF GEOFF WINKLER 1 I, Geoff Winkler, verify as follows: 2 3 I am the Court-appointed permanent receiver for Essex Capital Corporation and its subsidiaries and affiliates. 4 I have read the foregoing RECEIVER'S FIFTEENTH INTERIM 5 2. REPORT AND PETITION FOR FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS and know its 6 7 contents. 3. The matters stated in the foregoing document are true to the best of my 8 knowledge, information, and belief. I verify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of 10 America that the foregoing is true and correct. 11 Executed on May 15, 2023, at Salem, Oregon. 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

4874-5774-5500.2

-20-

EXHIBIT 1

STANDARDIZED FUND ACCOUNTING REPORT for SEC v. Essex Capital Corporation Receivership; Civil Docket No. 18-cv-05008-FMO-AFM Reporting Period from 01/01/2023 to 03/31/2023

	JNTING (See instructions)	Detail	Subtotal	Grand Total
Line 1	Beginning Balance (As of 01/01/2023):	\$ 2,550,594.03		
	Increases in Fund Balance:			
Line 2	Business Income	\$ -		
Line 3	Cash and Securities (in transit)	Ψ -		
Line 4	Interest/Dividend Income	_		
Line 5	Business Asset Liquidation	_		
Line 6	Personal Asset Liquidation	-		
Line 7	Third-Party Litigation Income	24,996.24		
Line 8	Miscellaneous - Unicleared			
	Total Funds Available (Lines 1 - 8):		\$ 24,996.24	\$ 2,575,590.27
	Decreases in Fund Balance:			
Line 9	Disbursements to Investors	(113,399.15)		
Line 10	Disbursements for Receivership Operations	, , ,		
Line 10a	Disbursements to Receiver or Other Professionals	(460,905.24)		
Line 10b	Business Asset Expenses	-		
Line 10c	Personal Asset Expenses	-		
Line 10d	Investment Expenses	-		
Line 10e	Third-Party Litigation Expenses	-		
	1. Attorney Fees	\$ -		
	2. Litigation Expenses	1		
	Total Disbursements for Receivership Operations		\$ (574,304.39)	
Line 10f	Tax Administrator Fees and Bonds		-	
Line 10g	Federal and State Tax Payments			
	Total Disbursements for Receivership Operations			\$ (574,304.39
Line 11	Disbursements for Distribution Expenses Paid by the Fund:			
Line 11a	Distribution Plan Development Expenses: 1. Fees:			
	T. Fees: Fund Administrator	\$ -		
	Independent Distribution Consultant (IDC)	Φ -		
	Distribution Agent			
	Consultants	_		
	Legal Advisers	-		
	Tax Advisers	-		
	2. Administrative Expenses	-		
	3. Miscellaneous	-		
	Total Plan Development Expenses		\$ -	
	Distribution Plan Implementation Expenses:			
	1. Fees: Fund Administrator			
	IDC			
	Distribution Agent	_		
	Consultants	_		
	Legal Advisers	-		
	Tax Advisers	-		
	Administrative Expenses	-		
	Investor Identification:			
	Notice/Publishing Approved Plan	-		
	Claimant Identification	-		
	Claims Processing			
	Web Site Maintenance/Cail Center4. Fund Administrator Bond	1		
	5. Miscellaneous			
	6. Federal Account for Investor Restitution			
	(FAIR) Reporting Expenses	_		
	Total Plan Implementation Expenses		\$ -	
	Total Disbursements for Distribution Expenses Paid by the Fund	-		\$ -
	Disbursements to Court/Other:			
Line 12a	Investment Expenses/Court Registry Investment System (CRIS) Fees	\$ -		
Line 12b	Federal Tax Payments	-		
	Total Disbursements to Court/Other:		\$ -	
	Total Funds Disbursed (Lines 9 - 11):	1		\$ (574,304.39
	Ending Balance as of 03/31/2023			\$ 2,001,285.88
	Ending Balance of Fund - Net Assets:			
Line 14a	Cash & Cash Equivalents	1	2,001,285.88	
Line 14b	Investments Other Appets or Uncleared Funda		354,816.17	
Line 14c	Other Assets or Uncleared Funds Total Ending Balance of Fund - Net Assets		5,802,316.00	\$ 8,158,418.05
		-		

STANDARDIZED FUND ACCOUNTING REPORT for SEC v. Essex Capital Corporation Receivership; Civil Docket No. 18-cv-05008-FMO-AFM

Reporting Period from 01/01/2023 to 03/31/2023

OTHER SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:					
		Detail	Subtotal	Grand Total	
Line 15	Disbursements for Plan Administration Expenses Not Paid by the Fund:				
Line 15a	Plan Development Expenses Not Paid by the Fund				
	1. Fees:				
	Fund Administrator	\$ -			
	IDC	-			
	Distribution Agent	-			
	Consultants	-			
	Legal Advisers	-			
	Tax Advisers	-			
	2. Administrative Expenses	-			
	3. Miscellaneous				
	Total Plan Development Expenses Not Paid by the Fund		\$ -		
Line 15b	Plan Implementation Expenses Not Paid by the Fund:				
	1. Fees:				
	Fund Administrator	\$ -			
	IDC Distribution Agent	-			
	•	-			
	Consultants Legal Advisers	-			
	Tax Advisers	-			
	Administrative Expenses	_			
	3. Investor Identification:	1 _			
	Notice/Publishing Approved Plan				
	Claimant Identification	_			
	Claims Processing	_			
	Web Site Maintenance/Call Center	_			
	4. Fund Administrator Bond	_			
	5. Miscellaneous	_			
	6. FAIR Reporting Expenses	_			
	Total Plan Implementation Expenses Not Paid by the Fund		\$ -		
Line 15c	Tax Administrator Fees & Bonds Not Paid by the Fund	•			
	Total Disbursements for Plan Administration Expenses Not Paid by the Fund			-	
Line 16	Disbursements to Court/Other Not Paid by the Fund		i		
Line 16a	Investment Expenses/CRIS Fees		\$ -		
Line 16b	Federal Tax Payments		-		
	Total Disbursements to Court/Other Not Paid by the Fund:			\$ -	
	DC & State Tax Payments	1		\$ -	
	No. of Claims:	1		Ŧ	
Line 18a	# of Claims Received This Reporting Period	0			
Line 18b	# of Claims Received Since Inception of Fund	75			
	No. of Claimants/Investors:				
Line 19a	# of Claimants/Investors Paid This Reporting Period	0			
Line 19b	# of Claimants/Investors Paid Since Inception of Fund	64			

Receiver: Geoff Winkler

Geoff Winkler

(printed name)

Chief Executive Officer
American Fiduciary Services LLC
Receiver, Essex Capital Corporation, et al.

Date: April 28, 2023