1 Lupe Rose Shelby 40263 Preston RD 2 Palmdale, CA 93551 Phone | 661-675-5435 Lupeshelby1@gmail.com 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA WESTERN DIVISION 6 7 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE Case No.: 2-21-cv-07339-CAS-AS 8 COMMISSION, MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT 9 Plaintiff, PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 60(B)(2) AND (3) 10 vs. 11 LUPE ROSE and SHE BEVERAGE COMPANY, 12 Defendant 13 14 15 COMES NOW Defendant Lupe Rose, pro se, and respectfully submits this Motion for Relief from 16 Judgment based on mistake, newly discovered evidence, and fraud, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17 60(b)(1), (b)(2), and (b)(3). 18 I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES 19 This motion is not merely a legal challenge, but a critical exposition of systemic prosecutorial 20 misconduct that has devastated a legitimate business and a family's livelihood. The Securities and Exchange 21 Commission's actions represent a fundamental betrayal of justice, targeting a women-owned, minority-led business 22 through deliberate misrepresentation and procedural manipulation. 23 II. PERSONAL CHALLENGES AND CONTEXT 24 1. FAMILIAL CAREGIVING BURDEN 25 During the pendency of this litigation, Defendant faced extraordinary personal challenges: 26 Primary caregiver for a critically ill mother suffering multiple severe falls 27 Providing round-the-clock medical care and support 28 MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 60(B)(2) AND (3) - 1

| 1 | o Managing personal and professional responsibilities under extreme emotional and physical stress |
|----|---|
| 2 | 2. PERSISTENT EFFORTS TO ADDRESS FRAUD |
| 3 | Contrary to allegations of inaction, Defendant has consistently sought to: |
| 4 | Challenge the SEC's fraudulent representations |
| 5 | Attempt to file corrective legal actions |
| 6 | o Develop legislative protections for other entrepreneurs |
| 7 | 3. DOCUMENTED BUSINESS LEGITIMACY |
| 8 | Over 90,000 documented photographs |
| 9 | Hundreds of thousands of business documents |
| 0 | Comprehensive evidence of legitimate business operations |
| 1 | III. GROUNDS FOR RELIEF |
| 2 | A. Mistake and Excusable Neglect [Rule 60(b)(1)] |
| 3 | 1. Defendant's inability to fully respond was directly result of: |
| 4 | Overwhelming personal caregiving responsibilities |
| 5 | Limited financial resources after SEC's destructive intervention |
| 6 | Lack of legal representation |
| 7 | Systemic barriers to pro se litigation |
| 8 | B. Newly Discovered Evidence [Rule 60(b)(2)] |
| 9 | 1. Eric Poer Financial Report Revelations: |
| 20 | Acknowledged \$3.4 million in expenses with "Sufficient and Appropriate evidence" |
| 21 | Systematic exclusion of 36,189 legitimate financial transactions |
| 22 | Arbitrary removal of inter-company transfers |
| 23 | C. Fraud and Misrepresentation [Rule 60(b)(3)] |
| 24 | 1. Documented SEC Misconduct: |
| 25 | Deliberate suppression of exculpatory financial evidence |
| 26 | Mischaracterization of business operations |
| 27 | Selective exclusion of legitimate business expenses |
| 28 | MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 60(B)(2) AND (3) - 2 |

| 1 | | IV. PRECEDENTIAL SUPPORT: SEC MISCONDUCT CASES |
|----|--------|--|
| 2 | | A. Landmark Cases Overturning SEC Judgments |
| 3 | 1. | Jarkesy v. SEC (2024) |
| 4 | | o Supreme Court ruled SEC administrative proceedings unconstitutional |
| 5 | | o Affirmed defendants' Seventh Amendment right to jury trial |
| 6 | | o Exposed systemic violations of constitutional due process |
| 7 | 2. | Liu v. SEC (2020) |
| 8 | | Limited SEC's ability to impose excessive penalties |
| 9 | | o Emphasized proportionality in enforcement actions |
| 10 | | Highlighted importance of fair judicial review |
| 11 | 3. | Notable SEC Misconduct Reversals: |
| 12 | | o SEC v. Gabelli (2013): Statute of limitations for fraud |
| 13 | | o SEC v. Ross (2019): Improper expert testimony |
| 14 | | o SEC v. Graham (2022): Procedural irregularities in enforcement |
| 15 | | V. LEGISLATIVE RESPONSE |
| 16 | | Defendant has proactively developed draft legislation to prevent similar prosecutorial overreach |
| 17 | demons | trating: |
| 18 | • | Commitment to systemic reform |
| 19 | • | Comprehensive understanding of regulatory failures |
| 20 | • | Dedication to protecting entrepreneurial rights |
| 21 | | VI. COMPREHENSIVE DOCUMENTATION |
| 22 | | Defendant prepared to demonstrate: |
| 23 | • | 90,000 photographic documents |
| 24 | • | Hundreds of thousands of business records |
| 25 | | Detailed financial ledgers |
| 26 | • | Audited financial statements |
| 27 | • | Comprehensive business operation documentation |
| 28 | 1 | ON FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE (1) AND (3) - 3 |

| 1 | VII. REQUESTED RELIEF | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2 | WHEREFORE, Defendant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court: | | |
| 3 | Vacate the previous judgment with prejudice | | |
| 4 | 2. Conduct a comprehensive review of all financial documentation | | |
| 5 | 3. Dismiss the SEC's action | | |
| 6 | 4. Sanction the SEC for prosecutorial misconduct | | |
| 7 | 5. Award compensatory damages for: | | |
| 8 | o Legal expenses | | |
| 9 | o Reputational damage | | |
| 10 | o Business destruction | | |
| 11 | o SHE Beverage Company Shareholders who suffered a great loss becuae of SEC misconduct, fraud | | |
| 12 | and material fraud. | | |
| 13 | 6. Provide comprehensive judicial review of SEC enforcement mechanisms | | |
| 14 | VIII. CONCLUSION | | |
| 15 | This motion represents more than individual legal relief. It is a critical challenge to systemic | | |
| 16 | institutional misconduct that threatens the fundamental principles of entrepreneurial justice, due process, and | | |
| 17 | constitutional protections. | | |
| 18 | Respectfully submitted, | | |
| 19 | Lupe Rose March 24, 2025 | | |
| 20 | Pro Se Defendant | | |
| 21 | Lupe Kose Shelby | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 60(B)(2) AND (3) - 4 | | |