1 Lupe Rose Shelby P.O. Box 9312 2 Lancaster CA 93539 Phone | 661-675-5435 Lupeshelby1@gmail.com 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 WESTERN DIVISION 7 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION Case No.: 2:21-cv-07339-CAS-AS Plaintiff. 8 SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM REGARDING 9 VS. SEC EXPERT'S SELECTIVE DATA MANIPULATION LUPE ROSE & SHE BEVERAGE COMPANY 10 AND MISREPRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE Defendant 11 To the Honorable Court: 12 I respectfully submit this supplemental memorandum to bring to the Court's attention several 13 grave concerns regarding the SEC expert's methodology and conduct, specifically: 14 I. IMPROPER EXCLUSION OF LEGITIMATE BUSINESS ACTIVITIES 15 16 The SEC's financial expert has admitted, in his own analysis, to systematically eliminating vast amounts of legitimate business data through a four-step process that fundamentally distorts the financial reality of 17 the enterprise: 18 19 1. Selective Account Analysis The expert deliberately excluded all transactions not labeled specifically as "SHE Beverage" or "SHE 20 Brand," despite the existence of legitimate subsidiary operations and acquisitions. This single action 21 eliminated 36,189 legitimate business transactions from consideration. 22 **Subsidiary Elimination** 23 The expert explicitly removed all transactions related to legitimate subsidiary entities (including Pink Leaf 24 and Just Go Green LLC), eliminating 2,102 additional transactions totaling \$315,603 in net outflows. This 25 26 removal effectively erased legitimate business operations from the financial picture. 27 28 SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM REGARDINGSEC EXPERT'S SELECTIVE DATA MANIPULATIONAND MISREPRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE - 1

1	3. Cash Flow Manipulation
2	The expert systematically removed 2,555 cash inflow transactions, choosing to analyze only outflows. This
3	selective approach creates an inherently biased analysis that fails to present a complete picture of the
4	business's financial operations.
5	4. Arbitrary Time Restrictions
6	The expert imposed temporal limitations on the data, further restricting the scope of analysis without prope
7	justification.
8	II. MISREPRESENTATION TO DEFENDANT
9	Of particular concern to this Court should be that the SEC agent made representations to Ms. Lupo
10	Rose that her evidence would be presented to a judge, when in fact:
11	a) Such evidence was not allowed, or
12	b) The SEC agent failed to explain to the Court that he had systematically removed all legitimate company expenses
13	from his analysis
14	III. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS
15	This methodological approach raises serious concerns about:
16	1. Due Process Violations
17	The selective elimination of legitimate business data without proper disclosure to the Court constitutes a
18	potential violation of due process rights.
19	2. Misrepresentation of Financial Reality
20	The expert's methodology effectively:
21	Ignored legitimate subsidiary operations
22	Eliminated valid business transactions
23	Created an artificially limited view of the business's financial operations
24	o Failed to account for the complete corporate structure and its associated financial obligations
25	IV. PREJUDICIAL IMPACT
26	The expert's admitted elimination of:
27	36,189 transactions in the initial cut
28	   SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM REGARDINGSEC EXPERT'S SELECTIVE DATA

MANIPULATIONAND MISREPRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE - 2

MANIPULATIONAND MISREPRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE - 3