1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	hendricksk@gtlaw.com JASON K. HICKS, Bar No. 13149 hicksja@glaw.com KYLE A. EWING, Bar No 014051 ewingk@gtlaw.com GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP 10845 Griffith Peak Drive, Suite 600 Las Vegas, Nevada 89135 Telephone: (702) 792-3773 Facsimile: (702) 792-9002  JARROD L. RICKARD, Bar No. 10203 jlr@skrlawyers.com KATIE L. CANNATA, Bar No. 14848 klc@skrlawyers.com SEMENZA KIRCHER RICKARD 10161 Park Run Drive, Suite 150	DAVID R. ZARO* dzaro@allenmatkins.com JOSHUA A. del CASTILLO* jdelcastillo@allenmatkins.com MATTHEW D. PHAM* mpham@allenmatkins.com *admitted pro hac vice ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE MALLORY & NATSIS LLP 865 South Figueroa Street Suite 2800 Los Angeles, California 90017-2543 Telephone: (213) 622-5555 Facsimile: (213) 620-8816		
11	Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 Telephone: (702) 835-6803			
12	Facsimile: (702) 920-8669			
13	Attorneys for Geoff Winkler Receiver for J&J Consulting Services, Inc., J&J Consulting Services, Inc.,			
14	J and J Purchasing LLC, The Judd Irrevocable Tri and BJ Holdings LLC	ASI,		
15				
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
17	DISTRICT OF	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
18	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,	Case No. 2:22-cv-00612-CDS-EJY		
19	Plaintiff,	FIRST QUARTERLY REPORT AND		
20		PETITION FOR FURTHER		
21	V.	INSTRUCTIONS OF RECEIVER GEOFF WINKLER		
22	MATTHEW WADE BEASLEY; et. al.,	GEOFF WINKLER		
23	Defendants;			
24	THE JUDD IRREVOCABLE TRUST; et. al.,			
	Relief Defendants.			
25		<u> </u>		
26	///			
27	///			
28	///			
LAW OFFICES  Allen Matkins Leck Gamble  Mallory & Natsis LLP	4854-2958-9804.1ACTIVE			

681115122v1

Geoff Winkler of American Fiduciary Services, LLC (the "Receiver"), the Court-appointed receiver for defendant J&J Consulting Services, Inc., an Alaska corporation, defendant J&J Consulting Services, Inc., a Nevada corporation, defendant J and J Purchasing LLC (collectively, the "J&J Entities"), along with relief defendant The Judd Irrevocable Trust, and relief defendant BJ Holdings LLC and the Wells Fargo Interest on Lawyers' Trust Account ending in 5598 in the name of defendant Beasley Law Group PC, and the assets of defendants Matthew Wade Beasley, Jeffrey J. Judd, Christopher R. Humphries, Shane M. Jager, Jason M. Jongeward, Denny Seybert, and Roland Tanner<sup>1</sup> (all, collectively, the "Receivership Defendants" or "Receivership Entities"), submits his First Quarterly Report and Petition for Instructions ("Report") for the period June 3, 2022, through June 30, 2022 ("Reporting Period"), regarding the receivership pursuant to Local Rule 66-4(b).

### I. <u>PRELIMINARY STATEMENT</u>

As reflected in the Court's record and discussed further in this Report, the Receiver has been authorized, empowered, and directed to, among other things: (1) take exclusive authority and control over the Receivership Entities; (2) conduct such investigation and discovery as necessary to identify and locate outstanding assets of the Receivership Entities; (3) preserve and prevent the dissipation of such assets.

The Receiver has diligently pursued these goals since the June 3, 2022 inception of the receivership. As detailed herein, since the entry of the Order Appointing Receiver ("Appointment Order") (ECF 88), the Receiver has made substantial progress, particularly in connection with his efforts to assert control over the Receivership Entities and identify and marshal their assets for the "benefit of the receivership estate, investors, and other creditors. However, because the Receiver's work is ongoing, the conclusions presented herein must be deemed preliminary, and potentially subject to modification or amendment as more information becomes available. As of the date of this Report, the Receiver has not completed an investigation or accounting, nor arrived at any

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> On July 29, 2022, well after the end of the Reporting Period, this Court entered an order expanding the receivership to apply to additional defendants (see ECF 207).

definitive conclusions, including as to the allegations made by the plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission in the above-entitled matter.

### II. BACKGROUND

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

#### A. THE ALLEGATIONS<sup>2</sup>

As alleged by the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") in its Complaint, filed April 12, 2022 (ECF 1), and its Amended Complaint, filed June 29, 2022 (ECF 1118), the J&J Entities, beginning in at least January 1, 2017, and continuing until March 2022, directly and through Jeffrey Judd ("Judd"), Christopher Humphries ("Humphries"), Shane Jager ("Jager"), Jason Jongeward ("Jongeward"), Denny Seybert ("Seybert"), Roland Tanner ("Tanner"), Larry Jeffery ("Jeffery"), Jason Jenne ("Jenne"), Seth Johnson ("Johnson"), Christopher Madsen ("C. Madsen"), Richard Madsen "R. Madsen"), Mark Murphy ("Murphy"), Cameron Rohner ("Rohner"), Warren Rosegreen ("Rosegreen") and others promoted and offered investments in "purchase agreements" involving purported personal injury settlement contracts. Judd told investors that he had a litigation financing business with his attorney, Matthew Beasley ("Beasley"), whereby Judd invested money in contracts with personal injury plaintiffs while Beasley procured those contracts through his contacts with other attorneys around the country. Judd told investors that Beasley and his law firm Beasley Law Group had relationships with personal injury attorneys whose clients had settlements with insurance companies, and who were willing to pay a premium to receive a portion of their settlement in advance rather than wait for payment from the insurance companies. Judd is alleged to have told investors that the J&J Entities entered into "purchase agreements" with the personal injury plaintiffs whereby the J&J Entities advanced to the personal injury plaintiffs a portion of their expected insurance settlement payout, and the plaintiffs repaid the J&J Entities plus interest and fees when their insurance payout arrived.

24

25 1///

///

26

27

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Except as otherwise stated, these are the allegations as filed by the Securities and Exchange Commission. The Receiver is a neutral third party and does not yet have enough information to determine the veracity of individual allegations and is using the SEC complaint simply to notify investors of their claims. The Receiver will continue his investigation and will update his understanding of the facts as more information becomes available.

1 | 2 | c | 3 | ii | 4 | J | 5 | ii | 6 | a | 7 | b

8

111213

14

10

151617

18 19 20

2122

23

24 25

2627

28

As alleged in the Amended Complaint, Judd told investors that the purchase agreements came in amounts of \$80,000 or \$100,000, with a term of 90 days, although he also said he allowed investors to split contracts with him or other investors if they wanted to invest less than \$80,000. Judd told different investors that they would receive different returns. Judd allegedly told some investors that they would make up to \$22,000 within 90 days on an investment of \$100,000. Judd allegedly told other investors they would receive 12.5% on their investments (50% on an annual basis), for a return of \$12,500 within 90 days on an investment of \$100,000 or \$10,000 within 90 days on an investment of \$80,000.

The pleadings on file in this matter further allege that Judd told investors that at the end of the 90-day period, the J&J Entities would reinvest the principal in a new purchase agreement with a new tort plaintiff, and the investor could continue to receive his or her promised returns every 90 days. Judd allegedly told investors that they could get their principal back rather than reinvesting it at the end of the contract term if they chose.

Per the Amended Complaint, Judd told investors that the tort plaintiffs who entered the purchase agreements paid an administrative fee of \$5,000, half of which went to Beasley and Beasley Law Group, and the other half of which went to the tort plaintiff's attorney. Judd allegedly also told investors that Beasley and Beasley Law Group managed the relationships with the various personal injury attorneys and wrote the agreements with the personal injury plaintiffs, while Judd managed the investment side of the business with assistance from his son Parker Judd. The Amended Complaint also alleges, on information and belief, that Judd highlighted the fact that attorney Beasley was involved and that investor funds flowed through Beasley Law Group's IOLTA account.

The SEC also alleges that Judd told investors that the risk from investing in the purchase agreements was almost zero. Judd is alleged to have told some investors that he would make good any investor loss, saying that he and Beasley had a separate fund to make investors whole if a personal injury plaintiff failed to pay on a contract. He allegedly claimed he had "never had to use" this fund, because "we've never had one go bad."

///

#### B. FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS SEARCH WARRANTS

On March 3, 2022, the FBI served a search warrant on the home of Judd and then Beasley. It is believed that Beasley was tipped off that the FBI was coming. When confronted by FBI agents he brandished a weapon, was shot twice, survived and retreated into his home and engaged in a four-hour negotiation with the FBI, during which he allegedly confessed to an FBI negotiator that the J&J investment enterprise was a Ponzi scheme. Eventually, Beasley was disarmed and arrested by a SWAT team, and subsequently charged with one count of Assault on a Federal Officer and denied bail.

### C. THE STATE COURT RECEIVERSHIP

A complaint seeking declaratory relief and receivership was filed in the Eighth Judicial District Court for Clark County, Nevada on March 16, 2022 ("State Court Proceeding"). This action was brought on behalf of Plaintiff Mark Murphy ("Murphy") and a limited liability company called Mark A Murphy, LTD., who were pursuing litigation to recover lost funds in a purported Ponzischeme. The State Court Proceeding also sought the creation of a state court receivership to administer a constructive trust to recover and distribute funds from defendants Beasley, Beasley Law, Judd, J&J Consulting, J and J Purchasing, LLC, and multiple yet-named individuals and entities.

Though substantially similar to the narrative presented in the SEC's complaints, the State Court complaint stated that, for the subset of identified victims representing \$16,000,000 in investment funds, routine interest payments were made from 2017 through March of 2022, and that the range of 90-day interest payments was from 7.5% - 13%.

#### D. THE BANKRUPTCY CASES

On March 17, 2022, two Involuntary Chapter 11 Bankruptcy Petitions were filed by different creditor groups against J&J Consulting Services, Inc. and J and J Purchasing, LLC in the US Bankruptcy Court for the District of Nevada requesting relief.<sup>3</sup> These creditors represented \$3,814,000 in claims above the value of any lien in these petitions.

<sup>.....</sup> 

Case Nos. 22-10942-MKN and 22-10943-MKN discussed further in Section E (5) below.

#### E. THE HINDENBURG RESEARCH ARTICLE

On March 24, 2022, Hindenburg Research published an article on their website purporting to have conducted an extensive investigation into J&J Purchasing and J&J Consulting, concluding that the enterprise was suggestive of a Ponzi scheme. They found the subject companies to be entirely referral-based businesses that were offering 50% annual returns on a portfolio of 20,000 litigation funding contracts with no instance of default or any late payments over a four-year track record. Academic research showing default rates on post-settlement claims being non-zero, as well as observed personal injury settlement overall averages being significantly lower than the average investment taken in, helped Hindenburg Research determine the mathematical absurdity of these claims. The article further details that the various defendants had extremely limited industry experience to be able to back up such extraordinary investment returns and that it allegedly would have taken Beasley 40 years to draft 20,000 contracts in the manner described by the sales agents.

# F. THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION EX PARTE MOTION FOR ENTRY OF TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND ASSET FREEZE

On April 13, 2022 the SEC filed an Ex Parte Motion for Entry of Temporary Restraining Order and Orders: (1) Freezing Assets; (2) Requiring Accountings; (3) Prohibiting the Destruction of Documents; (4) Granting Expedited Discovery; and (5) Order to Show Cause Re Preliminary Injunction against Beasley, Judd, J&J Consulting Services, Inc., and the 19 other defendants and relief defendants identified at that time (ECF 2).

This Motion reiterated the allegations of the SEC's complaint and included references to the FBI standoff and Beasley's alleged confession, as well as illustrating defendants' apparent attempts to dissipate investor assets, as part of its justification for not giving notice of the Motion to the defendants. This Motion was approved by Court Order on April 21, 2022 (ECF 3).

25 ///

26 ///

<sup>&</sup>quot;J&J Purchasing: When It Sounds Too Good to Be True." *Hindenburg Research*, 24 Mar. 2022, https://hindenburgresearch.com/jj-purchasing/.

#### G. APPOINTMENT OF RECEIVER GEOFF WINKLER

The SEC filed a Motion to Appoint Receiver on May 3, 2022 (ECF 67), which was granted by the Court on June 3, 2022 (ECF 88) (again, the "Appointment Order"). The Motion reiterated the SEC's allegations that Defendants had raised hundreds of millions of dollars through their "purchase agreement" scheme and argued that bringing in a federal equity receiver consolidate all fiduciary functions for the benefit of all investors was the best approach forward. (ECF 67) In the resulting Appointment Order the Court took full jurisdiction and possession of the assets of the Receivership Entities, carving out the other Beasley Law Group PC's assets excepting the Defendant's Wells Fargo IOLTA account and ordering Receiver to investigate quality and whereabouts of all assets, taking custody of and preserving the same. (ECF 88)

#### H. INFORMATION ASCERTAINED FROM INVESTORS AND PROMOTERS<sup>5</sup>

As of the close of the Reporting Period, the Receiver had already conferred with multiple investors, directly and through counsel. Most of the investors that the Receiver and his professionals spoke with were friends, family, colleagues and acquaintances with either a promoter or another investor. Just as Beasley had allegedly explained in his "confession" to the FBI, investors reported that they were told that they could invest in purchase agreements for slip-and-fall settlement advances. Investors were presented with an Investor Agreement that included the purported tort plaintiff and attorneys' names but were told not to contact any related parties. At times, investors were told that their capital would be reinvested in a new purchase agreement. One investor that did reach out to the attorney identified on an Investor Agreement found that the firm had no record of the clients or the agreement. Beasley is alleged to have admitted to the FBI that the contracts provided to investors were fraudulent, and that no other attorneys were involved in any operations. Investors that wanted to withdraw their money prior to the end of the term of an Investor Agreement were also given the option to have different investors buy them out. When this occurred, the new investor apparently sent money directly to the old investor (that is, the funds did not flow through a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Unless otherwise directed by the Court, or necessitated by specific actions, the Receiver does not publish names of investors and non-defendant promoters.

J&J Consulting Entity for that transaction). However, the overwhelming majority of investor funds appear to have been sent to the Beasley IOLTA account.

The Receiver has been told that soon after J&J Purchasing, LLC was established, Humphries sent emails to investors telling them that changes would be taking place in the new year with standardized return rates of 12.5%. In January of 2022, the agreements with J&J Consulting, Inc. were changed to an agreement with J&J Purchasing, LLC. At that time, investors were given a revised Non-Compete/Non-Discloser/Non-Solicitation Agreement along with the new Confidential Subscription Agreement. While it is uncertain what precipitated these changes, it is important to note that Beasley did indicate an awareness of an investigation sometime in 2021. Notably, most investors that the Receiver has spoken to mentioned that they never suspected fraud because their quarterly payouts had been accurate and timely before the FBI executed their search warrant on March 3, 2022.

There is no evidence of a company website or promotional materials for the J&J Consulting Entities. It seems that most individuals that were involved with J&J learned about the opportunity from a friend, neighbor, colleague or relative. Information on operations has been learned primarily through conversations with defendants, investors and other third parties, as well as information in court pleadings.

# III. SUMMARY OF DEFENDANTS AND RELIEF DEFENDANTS

As described above, the SEC alleged in its Complaint and Amended Complaint and Amended Complaint, the J&J Entities directly, and through Beasley, Beasley Law, Judd, Humphries, J&J Consulting Services, Inc. (Alaska), J&J Consulting (Nevada), J and J Purchasing LLC, Jager, Jongeward, Seybert, Tanner, Jeffery, Jenne, Johnson, C. Madsen, R. Madsen, Murphy, Rohner, Rosegreen engaged in a long-running fraudulent offering of securities via personal injury settlement contracts. The Judd Irrevocable Trust, PAJ Consulting Inc, BJ Holdings LLC, Stirling Consulting, LLC, JL2 Investments LLC, Rocking Horse Properties, LLC, Triple Threat Basketball, LLC, ACAC LLC, Alberto Jr. and Monty Crew LLC, are entities or individuals that allegedly received proceeds from the fraud, many having received transfers from the Beasley Law Group IOLTA account.

#### A. THE DEFENDANTS

The persons and entities discussed below are the current defendants in the above-entitled action. As noted above, the information presented herein is preliminary, and based upon information available to the Receiver at this time, including allegations made by the SEC. The Receiver has not independently confirmed these allegations. The descriptions presented below are accordingly presented for background purposes only. Further investigation and accounting efforts may yield significantly different conclusions or information.

#### 1. Matthew Beasley

Matthew Beasley ("Beasley") is a resident of Las Vegas, Nevada, and is the President, Secretary, Treasurer, and Director of Beasley Law Group PC ("Beasley Law") and he has been licensed to practice law in Nevada since May 2006. It is believed that Beasley contacted Jeffrey Judd in 2016 or 2017 about the opportunity to collect returns on personal injury lawsuits.

### 2. Beasley Law Group PC

Beasley Law was formed in Nevada in 2011 and is controlled by Beasley. Beasley Law's practice involves litigation, family law, child custody, business, estate planning, real estate, personal injury, and divorce law.

### 3. Jeffrey Judd

Jeffrey Judd is a resident of Las Vegas, Nevada and is the director, president, and treasurer of J & J Consulting Services, Inc. (Nevada), director president, shareholder and treasurer of J&J Consulting Services, Inc. (Alaska), and the manager of J & J Purchasing, LLC. Judd personally promoted the "purchase agreement" investment scheme to multiple investors with false and misleading statements and omissions, and he compensated promoters who in turn found additional investors.

### 4. J&J Consulting Services, Inc. (Nevada)

J&J Consulting Services, Inc. ("J&J Consulting"), a Nevada corporation, was incorporated on May 26, 2005, by Jeffrey Judd ("Judd") as its president, treasurer and director, and Jennifer Judd is its secretary.

///

LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

#### 5. J&J Consulting Services, Inc. (Alaska)

On November 20, 2019, J&J Consulting Services, Inc. was incorporated in Alaska with Jeffrey Judd as the president, treasurer and director, Jennifer Judd as the secretary and Northwest Registered Agent LLC as its registered agent.

#### 6. J and J Purchasing LLC

On October 13, 2021, J&J Purchasing, LLC was incorporated in the state of Florida. Jeffrey Judd is the president and treasurer, and Northwest Registered Agent LLC is the listed registered agent. One promoter explained that "[o]bviously, J&J Consulting does not give the right impression to the SEC (Securities and Exchange Commission) that you're not giving any financial advice, right? So [Jeff] changed the name to J&J Purchasing."

As alleged in the SEC complaints, from 2017 through March 2022, the J&J entities offered investments in "purported settlement contracts with tort plaintiffs called "purchase agreements" with almost zero risk. These contracts were initially managed by Beasley and his law firm Beasley Law Group. Investors were solicited by Judd and other promoters. The Receiver has seen no proof that investor money was ever used for these alleged settlement claims. Instead, the SEC alleges that \$411 million was distributed to Judd, Beasley and the defendants and relief defendants. Judd, a resident of Henderson, NV, received the largest percentage of this at \$315.3 million dollars.

#### 7. Christopher Humphries

Christopher Humphries is a resident of Henderson, Nevada. He started soliciting investments from friends and family, as well as acquaintances from his church and gym no later than August 2019. Humphries formed CJ Investments LLC in Nevada in November 2019. According to the SEC complaint, Humphries offered a variety of returns to different investors, ranging from 10%-15% every 90 days. He claimed that there was little to no risk, as no deal had ever fallen through. Humphries had reported to an investor that he was making \$250,000 every quarter and received 5% commissions from investments he solicited. The Defendant entity received at least \$25 million from the Beasley Law Group IOLTA account.

LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> "J&J Purchasing: When It Sounds Too Good to Be True." *Hindenburg Research*, 24 Mar. 2022, https://hindenburgresearch.com/jj-purchasing/.

<sup>4854-2958-9804.1</sup>ACTIVE 681115122v1

#### 8. Shane Jager

Shane Jager is a resident of Henderson, Nevada that began promoting for J&J Consulting in 2017 and formed Stirling Consulting, LLC in April 2018. Stirling Consulting, LLC received at least \$30 million from the Beasley IOLTA account. According to the SEC Complaint, Jager successfully solicited over \$200 million in funds from 250 investors. In October of 2018, Beasley, Judd and Jager created Nevada Pro Pest Control, Inc. in Nevada. In July of 2020, Jager and Judd created ORC Holdings, LLC.

### 9. Jason Jongeward

Jason Jongeward is a resident of Washington, Utah, and was first reported to have elicited investments in September of 2019. He formed JL2 Investments, LLC in Washington state in November 2019 and moved the business to Washington, Utah in 2021. Jongeward reportedly managed upwards of 150 investors and \$52 million in investment funds.

#### 10. Denny Seybert

Denny Seybert is a resident of Henderson, Nevada, that formed Rocking Horse Properties LLC in Nevada in January of 1997. This defendant entity received at least \$690,000 from Beasley IOLTA. Seybert told investors that he received commissions of \$1,250 or \$1,500 on each contract that was funded by investors that he brought in.

#### 11. Roland Tanner

Roland Tanner is a resident of Henderson, Nevada. Ronald Tanner reportedly worked under Jager and raised over \$50,000,000 in investor funds. Tanner is a manager of five corporations in Nevada: Anthem Assets LLC, Nevada Housing Solutions LLC, Tanner Capital Group LLC, Tanner Legacy LLC, and ZZYZX Capital LLC.

#### B. THE RELIEF DEFENDANTS

#### 12. The Judd Irrevocable Trust (described above)

According to the SEC, The Judd Irrevocable Trust is a trust of unknown date and domicile, likely controlled by Jeffrey Judd and/or Jennifer Judd. It is also believed that Beasley may have also controlled The Judd Irrevocable Trust, which received at least \$1,400,000 in transfers from the Beasley Law IOLTA account.

#### 13. PAJ Consulting Inc

Preston Judd, Jeffrey Judd's son, formed PAJ Consulting Inc. in Nevada in October 2019. According to the SEC, PAJ received over \$990,000 in proceeds from J&J Consulting Services and at least \$824,500 from the Beasley Law IOLTA account. PAJ's bank records do not suggest a legitimate business operation and the money was spent on traveling, gambling, purchasing cryptocurrencies, shopping, and restaurants.

#### 14. BJ Holdings LLC

BJ Holdings LLC was incorporated on March 25, 2021, in Nevada. Matthew Beasley is the registered agent, and J&J Consulting and Beasley Law, PC are managing members. BJ Holdings received at least \$500,000 in proceeds from the fraud from the Beasley Law Group IOLTA. According to the SEC, it is believed that BJ Holdings LLC purchased a private jet and other assets using investor funds.

#### 15. Stirling Consulting, LLC

Shane Jager created Stirling Consulting, LLC in April of 2018 in the state of Nevada. Jager is the sole managing member of this entity. Stirling Consulting, LLC received at least \$30,000,000 in proceeds from the Beasley Law IOLTA account. The entity was dissolved on April 29, 2022.

### 16. CJ Investments, LLC

CJ Investments was formed on November 21, 2019, in Nevada. Jessica Humphries is the listed registered agent. Jessica and Christopher Humphries are the managing members. The entity is registered in Henderson, Nevada and it received at least \$25,000,000 in proceeds from the Beasley Law IOLTA account.

#### 17. JL2 Investments, LLC

JL2 Investments, LLC was formed in the state of Washington on November 21, 2019. Jason Jongeward is the registered agent, executor, and governor. While this entity was initially located in Cheney, Washington, its principal place of business moved to Washington, Utah in 2021. According to the SEC complaint, JL2 Investments received proceeds from the J&J Consulting Entities.

///

LAW OFFICES
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

#### 18. Rocking Horse Properties LLC

Rocking Horse Properties, LLC was formed on January 30, 1997, in the state of Nevada. Smith and Shapiro, PLLC is the registered agent and Denny Seybert is the manager. The Beasley Law IOLTA sent over \$690,000 to Rocking Horse Properties.

#### 19. Triple Threat Basketball, LLC

Triple Threat Basketball, LLC is a Nevada limited liability company formed on April 30, 2009. BD & Associates CPAs PLLC is the registered agent and Warren Rosegreen and Priscilla Rosegreen are managers. Triple Threat Basketball LLC received transfers of over \$9 million from the Beasley Law IOLTA account.

#### 20. ACAC LLC

ACAC LLC is a Utah limited liability company that was owned and controlled by Christopher Madsen. A bank account in the name of ACAC LLC received at least \$6,500,000 in proceeds from the fraud via the Beasley Law IOLTA account. ACAC LLC voluntarily dissolved on 11/13/2020.

#### 21. Monty Crew LLC

Monty Crew LLC was formed on January 14, 2019, in the state of Nevada. Anthony Michael Alberto, Jr. was the manager and Evans and Associates was the registered agent. Monty Crew LLC became inactive in September 2021 and was revoked in February 2022. Monty Crew LLC received nearly \$3,000,000 in proceeds from the Beasley Law IOLTA account. During his standoff with FBI agents on March 3, 2022, Beasley allegedly stated that the money paid to Monty Crew LLC was used to pay gambling debts.

#### 22. Anthony Michael Alberto, Jr.

Anthony Michael Alberto, Jr. is an individual known to reside in both Nevada and Pennsylvania. Beasley allegedly confessed to the FBI negotiators that Alberto was his "bookie." As referenced above, Mr. Alberto formed Monty Crew LLC in January 2019, and the entity and Mr. Alberto together received a total of nearly \$4,000,000 in proceeds from Beasley Law IOLTA account.

///

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble

Mallory & Natsis LLP

#### C. THE AMENDED COMPLAINT

On June 29, 2022, the SEC filed an amended complaint (ECF 118) seeking to add an additional seven relief defendants accused of promoting and profiting from the alleged Ponzi scheme: Larry Jeffery, Jason A. Jenne, Seth Johnson, Christopher M. Madsen, Mark A. Murphy, Cameron Rohner and Warren Rosegreen. The majority of the new relief defendants were or are residents of Henderson, Nevada and had either pre-existing entities or established entities after involvement to receive investor funds and payments from Judd and Beasley.

#### 23. Jason Jenne

Jason Jenne is a resident of Las Vegas, Nevada that used an account in the name of his entity J & D Consulting Firm, Inc. to receive investor funds and distribute purported returns to his investors. Beasley assisted Jenne to incorporate J & D Consulting Firm, Inc., a Nevada corporation in December of 2017. According to the SEC, Jenne gave investors 10% every 90 days, for an annualized return of 40%. Judd actually paid much higher returns and Jenne kept the difference.

### 24. Christopher Madsen

Christopher Madsen is a resident of Henderson, Nevada that was reported to have discussed the investment opportunity with an investor as early as 2017. Jager and Judd came together with C. Madsen and other non-defendants in October of 2019, to create LVB Investments, LLC. C. Madsen used an account in the name of his entity ACAC LLC to receive at least \$6.5 million investor funds and distribute fictitious returns to investors.

#### 25. Richard Madsen

Richard "Rocko" Madsen is a resident of Kanab, Utah that handled investor funds through accounts held in the names of two Nevada corporations over which R. Madsen had sole control: Ruger Investments RM, Inc., and Ruger Investments, Inc. At all relevant times, R. Madsen owned and controlled at least two other shell companies, including Red Hills Investments, Inc. and Battle Born Funding LLC.

### 26. Cameron Rohner

Cameron Rohner is a resident of Las Vegas, Nevada. He formed the entity Prestige Consulting LLC in October of 2020 with Seth Johnson to promote the investment. Investors would

also send funds to Rohner's separate entity CR6 LLC, an entity established in January of 2021. Like Jenne and Johnson, Rohner received higher rates of return directly from Judd and kept the difference for himself.

#### 27. Seth Johnson

Seth Johnson is a resident of Gilbert, Arizona that promoted the investment and received compensation for doing so. He founded Prestige Consulting LLC in October of 2020 with Cameron Rohner to promote the investment. Like Jenne and Rohner, Johnson received higher rates of return directly from Judd and kept the difference for himself.

### 28. Larry Jeffrey

Larry Jeffery is a resident of Laguna Beach, California that began working as a promoter for J&J Consulting in 2021, at the latest. He handled investor funds through accounts in the names of two entities that he controlled: FD Consulting Corp. and Capital Core Financial, Inc. Jeffery on occasion told investors to send their investment money directly into the account in the name of one or the other of these two entities, and at other times Jeffery told investors to send money directly to Beasley Law Group's IOLTA account. Jeffery told investors that he made commissions on the investments. Jeffrey told an investor that he managed \$20 million in investments.

### 29. Mark Murphy

Mark Murphy is a resident of Henderson, Nevada that used accounts in the name of his entity American Colocation Services, LLC, and potentially others, to receive investor funds and distribute purported returns to investors. American Colocation Services, LLC is a Nevada limited liability company whose sole manager is Murphy. It did business under the fictitious names "MJ Chown Management" and "Black Rock Business Services" and had accounts under these fictitious names through which Murphy received and distributed investor funds.

#### 30. Warren Rosegreen

Warren Rosegreen used an account in the name of his entity Triple Threat Basketball, LLC to receive investor funds and to distribute fictitious returns to investors. The entity received \$9 million in investor funds.

///

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

# IV. SUMMARY OF THE RECEIVER'S OPERATIONS (LR 66-4(b)(1))

#### A. THE RECEIVER'S INVESTIGATIVE AND MARSHALLING ACTIVITIES

When the Court appointed the Receiver on June 3, 2022, the Receiver immediately conducted an initial review of each of the defendants' background to understand the assets that were to be potentially acquired. The Receiver and his counsel reached out to each defendant and their counsel to discuss the turnover of assets and documentation related to bank statements, investor communications, and other information pertinent to the work of the Receiver. The Receiver's counsel experienced some hesitancy to fully comply with the Appointment Order, and the Receiver was forced to file two Motions to Compel Turnover<sup>7</sup>. The Receiver also made attempts to communicate with defendants at their residences and addresses of business.

The Receiver was successfully able to secure real and personal property which he presently values, in the aggregate, at over \$32.3 million. A description of all assets in the custody and control of the Receiver is included in Section VII, below. The Receiver has estimated that there may be more than fifty properties and 150 vehicles that are assets of the receivership estate. The Receiver has identified more than twenty financial institution accounts apparently belonging to the Receivership Entities in addition to the 100 bank accounts previously frozen by the SEC.

In total, as of the end of the Reporting Period, the Receiver recovered a total of \$11,411,246 in cash. A breakdown of the funds and assets received is detailed in Section VII – Schedule of Receiver's Receipts and Disbursements.

#### B. INVESTOR AND CREDITOR COMMUNICATION

The Receiver has established a website (http://www.jjconsulting-receivership.com), email address (contact@jjconsulting-receivership.com) and direct dial phone number ((702) 832-2299) to provide interested parties with a source of information about the receivership and to allow investors and creditors a platform to provide the Receiver with updated contact information. The Receiver and his team have collected nearly 100 forms through the website that include contact information and specific information regarding how investors were associated with J&J Consulting. The

LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Or in the alternative, a Motion to Show Cause re Contempt. Both motions were subsequently withdrawn after assets were turned over to the Receiver.

Receiver is using this information to update his list of investors. The investor list as of June 30, 2022, had roughly 491 individuals listed. In addition to the receiver's website, investor contacts information was collected from Judd, Jager and Jongeward.

#### C. COOPERATION OF DEFENDANTS

While the Receiver has encountered some pushback and delay from certain Defendants, he would like to take a moment to acknowledge the cooperation of a number of the Defendants and related parties. This cooperation includes the turnover of attorney client trust accounts, real and personal property, refund checks, investment assets, investor contact information and investor accounting documents. The Defendants that have at least cooperated in part during the Reporting Period include: Beasley, Judd, Humphries, Jager, Jongeward, and Tanner. This cooperation helps reduce the cost to administer the receivership estate and maximize return to investors. To the extent that any individuals or entities subject to the provisions of the Appointment Order fail to provide the Receiver with required information, documents, or assets, the Receiver will file additional motions to compel compliance and turnover.

#### D. THE RECEIVER'S FORENSIC ACCOUNTING ACTIVITIES

During this reporting period the Receiver was able to acquire access to a multitude of bank statements from Defendants. This includes statements from the Beasley Law, CJ Investments LLC, J & J Consulting, Bugraiders Pest Control, Anderson Dairy Creamery, JCH Consulting, JD Consulting, Nevada Pro Pest Control, Stirling Consulting, Triple Threat Basketball, LLC, and others. It is important to note that each of these files is incomplete and a request for missing documents has or will be made. These bank statement will allow the Receiver to begin the forensic accounting that will be necessary to understand the full amount owed to investors, the amounts received by promoters, and potentially locate additional assets.

Additionally, the Receiver is working closely with Defendants to obtain investor lists and accountings that will be crucial to complete the forensic accounting as the Receiver has discovered that there were previously unknown payments that were made between investors that never reached any of the Defendant bank accounts. The Receiver will continue to keep the Court and all other

///

parties updated on the progress of the accounting and steps necessary to obtain additional information.

#### E. ADDITIONAL RECEIVERSHIP ADMINISTRATION ACTIVITIES.

During the Application Period, and at the Receiver's behest and direction, attorneys at Greenberg Traurig LLP performed services on multiple projects. Their work included, among other things: (1) investigating, analyzing, and drafting necessary documents to ensure that Receivership property was properly preserved and where feasible transferred to the Receiver; (2) liaising and negotiating with counsel for Defendants and Relief Defendants for turnover of assets; (3) obtaining certified copies of documents needed for 754 filings; (4) preparing and filing motions to compel when assets were unlawfully retained; (5) identifying and monitoring litigation proceedings which may impact receivership case; (6) assisting the Receiver in obtaining documents and records from multiple sources; and (7) responding to investor inquiries as received.

Additionally, at the Receiver's behest and direction, the law firm of Allen Matkins assisted with (1) recovering funds turned over by numerous Receivership Defendants or their agents; (2) obtaining possession and control of numerous vehicles purchased with funds raised by the Receivership Defendants; (3) obtaining possession of millions of dollars in real property turned over by certain Receivership Defendants; (4) attending to critical deadlines outstanding in the Bankruptcy Cases and prepared a detailed report and recommendation to this Court regarding the further administration of the Bankruptcy Cases; (5) conferring with the SEC regarding the Receiver's anticipated sales of personal and real property out of receivership and prepared and filed a motion in this Court in support of those efforts; and (6) commencing the retrieval of essential documents relating to the business and financial activities of the Receivership Defendants primarily from financial institutions for the Receiver's later review and analysis.

#### 1. Initial Turnover Requests to Counsel for Defendant Judd

Pursuant to Paragraphs 15, 16, and 17 of the Appointment Order, which authorize the Receiver to "take immediate possession of all assets, bank accounts, or other financial accounts" of the Receivership Defendants, and direct the "Receivership Defendants, as well as their agents, servants, employees, attorneys, [and] any persons acting for or on behalf of the Receivership

Defendants ... having possession of the property, business, books, records, accounts or assets of the Receivership Defendants . . . to deliver the same to the Receiver", the Receiver requested that all then-known counsel for Defendant Judd turn over to the Receiver the balance of any client trust funds held by or for Mr. Judd's benefit. Specifically, the Receiver transmitted turnover requests to: (1) Oberheiden P.C.; (2) Fabian VanCott; (3) the Law Offices of Kamille Dean P.C.; (4) attorney Michael Peters; and (5) attorney John Sellers, all of whom the Receiver determined were holding client trust funds subject to the turnover provisions of the Appointment Order.<sup>8</sup>

The majority of the firms and attorneys have cooperated with the Receiver. As of the end of the Reporting Period, these attorneys had turned over to the Receiver a total of \$7,105,446.90. In several instances, counsel has taken the position that they should be permitted to retain certain funds they were provided by Defendants for legal services. In those cases, the counsel retaining funds have agreed to file a motion with the Court seeking the ability to keep the same and each of the attorneys have assured the Receiver that they are holding the funds in their accounts and not applying alleged outstanding obligations until the Court enters a ruling on the applicable motion(s).

# 2. Outreach to Financial Institutions Regarding Turnover of Accounts

As with other third parties in possession of receivership assets, the Receiver requested that certain financial institutions turn over certain accounts maintained by or for the benefit of the Receivership Defendants. It appears that the many of the corporate and individual Defendants did their banking and other financial activities at Wells Fargo Bank, U.S. Bank, Bank of America, Citi Bank, American Funds, Coinbase, Robinhood and Western Alliance (Bank of Nevada). Immediately after his appointment the Receiver transmitted notices to these financial institutions, providing notice of the Appointment Order and identifying certain accounts that appeared to fall within the Appointment Order's turnover provisions, and requesting that those accounts be turned over. As of the end of the Reporting Period, Wells Fargo Bank, U.S. Bank, and Coinbase have

-19-

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

4854-2958-9804.1ACTIVE 681115122v1

Subsequent to the close of the reporting period, funds provided by Defendant Humphries to counsel were identified and a request for turnover made.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> To be clear, the Receiver believes the Appointment Order requires the turnover of all funds counsel holds in trust for Defendants benefit to be turned over. In circumstances where counsel has retained funds and fails to file a motion regarding the same by an agreed upon date, the Receiver intends to file a Motion to Compel and/or Order to Show Cause why the funds should not be turned over.

expressed their intent to comply with the requirements of the Appointment Order, and have begun providing the Receiver with documents related to the accounts, along with the certified statements required by the Appointment Order, although not all accounts had been turned over as of the end of the Reporting Period. U.S. Bank has alerted the Receiver to the fact that one of the accounts subject to turnover had been pledged to the bank as part of a collateral package in connection with a home equity line of credit taken out by Defendant Judd against a real property in California. U.S. Bank has claimed a security interest in that account, and the Receiver is presently working with the bank to address this matter and secure the turnover of all non-contested funds and accounts. Bank of America did not respond to the Receiver's notice, and counsel for the Receiver is in the process of following up to press for the bank's compliance with the Appointment Order.

#### 3. Personal Property Sales

As reflected in the Receiver's recently filed Motion for Order Authorizing and Approving General Procedures for Sale of Personal Property out of Receivership (the "personal property Sale Motion") (ECF 137), the Receiver has determined, in his reasonable business judgment, that it is appropriate to market and sell certain personal property assets over which the Receiver has authority (or which are turned over to the Receiver pursuant to the Appointment Order), including a private aircraft, numerous automobiles, and other personal property. During the Reporting Period, the Receiver worked diligently to identify those personal property assets he believed were subject to the turnover provisions of the Appointment Order, and began taking possession of such assets, in addition to arranging for their storage and insurance, and undertaking appropriate due diligence with respect to title, condition, and other matters potentially affecting salability. The Receiver also worked with his counsel to develop appropriate procedures for the sale of these assets intended to result in the highest and best returns to the receivership estate – efforts that ultimately took the form of his Personal Property Sale Motion.

### 4. Real Property Sales

As with personal property, the Receiver has determined, in his reasonable business judgment, that it is appropriate to market and sell certain real property assets of the receivership estate. While he did not, during the Reporting Period, formally petition the Court for authority to

do so, the Receiver commenced his efforts to identify and assume authority and control over those real property assets falling within the ambit of the Appointment Order's turnover provisions. Additionally, the Receiver began securing valuations of some properties, and worked with counsel to develop his proposed procedures for the sale of real property assets out of receivership. 10

#### **5. Participation in the Bankruptcy Proceedings**

At the time of the Receiver's appointment, two of the Receivership Entities, J & J Consulting Services, Inc., a Nevada corporation ("J&J Consulting (NV)") and J and J Purchasing LLC ("J&J Purchasing," and together, with J&J Consulting (NV), the "J&J Debtors" or "Debtors") were debtors in possession in two chapter 11 cases, styled as In re J and J Consulting Services, Inc. (Case No. 22-10942-MKN) (the "J&JC Bankruptcy Case") and In re J and J Purchasing, LLC (Case No. 22-10943-MKN) (the "J&JP Bankruptcy Case", and together, with the J&JC Bankruptcy Case, the "Bankruptcy Cases"), respectively, before the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Nevada (the "Bankruptcy Court"). The Bankruptcy Cases had been commenced by involuntary petitions filed by five investors (the "Petitioning Creditors"), with the J&J Debtors subsequently consenting to the entry of orders for relief once the Bankruptcy Court approved their retention of a chief restructuring officer (the "CRO").

Upon the entry of and pursuant to the Appointment Order, the CRO was deemed terminated by this Court, and the Receiver was granted sole and exclusive control over the J&J Debtors in the Bankruptcy Cases. In that capacity, the Receiver and his professionals then took various actions to maintain the *status quo* in the Bankruptcy Cases (in light of the Appointment Order's litigation stay). The Receiver promptly requested the Debtors' professionals to suspend incurring significant fees, transition all bankruptcy-related work to the Receiver's professionals, and then contacted the subjects of the Debtors' scheduled Rule 2004 examinations to inform them that the examinations were being postponed indefinitely. The Receiver also secured documents produced to the Debtors from third parties pursuant to Rule 2004 subpoenas, as well as the Debtors' work product relating to the Bankruptcy Cases.

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

28

LAW OFFICES

<sup>27</sup> 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> A motion to facilitate the same was filed on July 18, 2022 (ECF 172).

The United States trustee (the "U.S. Trustee") accommodated the Receiver's request to continue the § 341(a) meeting of creditors, adjourning the meeting for approximately 60 days, to a date to be determined. Counsel for the Receiver and the U.S. Trustee briefly called into the § 341(a) meeting for the sole purpose of providing creditors with the contact information for the Receiver's counsel. Since then, the Receiver's counsel has fielded phone calls or responded to emails from roughly 100 investors with inquiries relating to the receivership.

On June 21, 2022, the Bankruptcy Court held an omnibus hearing on a number of pending matters in the Bankruptcy Cases. At the Receiver's request, the Bankruptcy Court deemed a number of motions as having been withdrawn (as they were effectively mooted by the entry of the Appointment Order) and continued the hearings on the remaining motions and applications to August 25, 2022, in order to provide sufficient time for the Receiver to prepare and submit his report and recommendation regarding the Bankruptcy Cases to this Court, and for the Court to issue any resultant orders it deems appropriate in light thereof.

## **6.** The Bankruptcy Report and Recommendation

Paragraph 47 of the Appointment Order directed the Receiver to, within 30 days of his appointment, submit a report to this Court as to his recommended course of action with respect to the Bankruptcy Cases (i.e., "whether the Bankruptcy Cases should continue in Chapter 11, or be converted to Chapter 7, dismissed or suspended during the course of the receivership"). On July 1, 2022, the Receiver timely filed the *Receiver's Report and Recommendation Regarding Chapter 11 Cases* (the "Bankruptcy Report"), (ECF 127), which recommended that the Bankruptcy Cases ultimately be dismissed.

To prepare the Bankruptcy Report and evaluate the utility of the Bankruptcy Cases to the Receivership Estate, the Receiver and his counsel (a) thoroughly reviewed the Debtors' schedules, their statements of financial affairs, and other pertinent filings in the Bankruptcy Cases and the five related adversary proceedings, as well as other documents obtained from third parties; (b) communicated with counsel for the Debtors (and CRO), the official committee of unsecured creditors, and the Petitioning Creditors regarding their own assessment of the Bankruptcy Cases; and (c) considered, based on the information presently known to the Receiver, the anticipated or

potential courses of action that he could pursue in connection with the receivership (e.g., asset sales, clawback or disgorgement actions, and other litigation), analyzing (1) whether the substantive relief needed for the Receiver to pursue those courses of action can be sought in either the Bankruptcy Cases or the receivership, in only the Bankruptcy Cases, or in only the receivership, (2) the possible administrative and procedural hurdles to overcome in order to obtain that relief in each forum, and (3) the associated cost or expense of seeking that relief in each forum. As detailed in the Bankruptcy Report, the Receiver, after giving sincere consideration to these matters, ultimately determined that the Bankruptcy Cases are administratively unnecessary and should thus be dismissed.

#### 7. Attention to Current Class Action Litigation

In addition to the foregoing work to recover real and personal property assets, during the Reporting Period, the Receiver commenced his evaluation of prospective claims against third parties who may have directly or indirectly aided and abetted the Individual Defendants in their fraudulent scheme. The Receiver will need to complete an analysis of the financial records of the corporate and individual Receivership Defendants in order to identify the specific targets and to formulate the appropriate causes of action. At present, the Receiver has tentatively identified accountants, promoters and financial institutions as potential targets.

Following the commencement of investigations or litigation by the Department of Justice and the Commission in the pre-receivership period, a number of would-be creditors of the receivership estate undertook the proverbial "race to the courthouse", all seeking to commence class-action lawsuits against at least one financial institution. The Receiver has been in contact with counsel for at least one of the putative class plaintiffs to inquire as to the status of their cases and to inform the parties of the Receiver's potential claims against third parties, including but not limited to any financial institutions who were involved with or aided and abetted the Individual Defendants.

It is the Receiver's preliminary belief that the Receiver is in the best position to pursue such claims because, among other things, he represents those entities with direct claims and can most effectively and efficiently resolve the cases. For example, the Receiver may be able to reach favorable settlements with third parties, in exchange for a bar of claims against the subject defendants (which would protect settling third parties from facing multiple lawsuits by investors or

others.) To that end, during the Reporting Period, the Receiver met with and is considering appropriate litigation counsel qualified to bring such actions.

The Receiver anticipates seeking Court approval to bring such litigation and retaining litigation counsel before filing such lawsuits. At that time, the Receiver may request this Court to stay third-party claims. The Receiver is not in a position to identify any specific litigation targets at this time and is simply advising the Court and the parties as to the foregoing matters.

### V. CONFIRMATION OF ACCOUNT ESTABLISHMENT

The Receiver has established a receivership checking account with East West Bank (a/e 0050) for the purpose of receiving and collecting funds for the receivership estate in anticipation of further order of this Court. The Receiver opened an additional account with East West Bank (a/e 0043) in order to segregate the funds from the Beasley IOLTA account until an accounting can be completed to determine if it contains any non-investor client funds.

# VI. <u>INVENTORY OF ASSETS AND ESTIMATE VALUE (LR 66-4(b)(2))</u><sup>11</sup>

#### A. CASH

From June 3 to June 30, 2022, the Receiver was able to recover approximately \$11,411,246. 12 The Standardized Fund Accounting Report for the period is attached to this report as **Exhibit A.** This cash is made up of \$7,105,447 turned over by various law firms representing Defendants, \$3,812,305 from the Beasley Law IOLTA account, \$374,827 from liquidation of Defendant bank accounts, and \$118,677 from other sources. There were expenses of \$12,440.36 related to repair and insuring the assets below.

Aside from the cash, the major assets in this case consist of real properties, vehicles, and other valuable assets. The total value of assets collected during the reporting period is \$44,211,246, inclusive of the \$11,411,246 in cash.

24 ///

As a reminder, the assets listed here are only those recovered from June 3, 2022 through June 30, 2022. There were significant additional assets marshalled after this time period that will be detailed in the Receiver's next report.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> The funds from the Beasley Law Firm IOLTA account are being segregated until an accounting can be completed to determine how much, if any, client funds reside in the account.

#### В. REAL PROPERTY

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The real property secured by the Receiver during the Reporting Period consists of a home purchased by Jeffrey Judd located at 9 Sky Arc, Henderson, Nevada that was previously listed for \$7.8 million and had an accepted offer for \$6.7 million. Judd was living in the home at the time of the receivership appointment, and Judd quickly vacated the home within the week after meeting with the Receiver.

#### *C*. PERSONAL PROPERTY

During the same week, Judd also handed over a 2022 Rolls Royce Cullinan, valued at \$650,000. Paula Beasley handed over six vehicles during the first week of the receivership: a 2021 Chevy Tahoe valued at \$70,000, a 2020 Chevy Silverado valued at \$45,000, a 2019 Cadillac Escalade valued at \$100,295, a 2021 Jeep Wrangler valued at \$43,020 and a 2020 RV valued at roughly \$750,000. The total value of all vehicles acquired during the period between June 3 and June 30, 2022, is \$1,730,000.

Year	Make	Model	Approximate Value	Defendant
2022	Rolls Royce	Cullinan Black Badge	\$650,000	Judd
2021	Chevrolet	Tahoe	\$70,000	Beasley
2021	Jeep	Wrangler Rubicon	\$40,000	Beasley
2020	Chevrolet	Silverado 1500	\$45,000	Beasley
2019	Cadillac	Escalade Platinum	\$100,000	Beasley
1973	Volkswagen	Kombi	\$75,000	Jager
2020	Newmar Dutch Star	Spartan RV	\$750,000	Beasley
2008	Hawker	900XP	\$5,500,000	BJ Holdings LLC
Approximate Total			\$7,230,000	

26

27

///

28 ///

LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

# VII. SCHEDULE OF RECEIVER'S RECEIPTS & DISBURSEMENTS (LR 66- 4(b)(3))

Below is the schedule of Receiver's Receipts and Disbursements pursuant to the Order Appointing Receiver and Local Rule 66-4(b)(3).

#### A. EAST WEST BANK RECEIVERSHIP ACCOUNT (A/E 0050)

• Total inflows: \$7,598,941.50

• Total outflows: \$12,440.36

• Balance (6/30/22): \$7,586,501.14

See Exhibit B for a complete list of transactions.

## B. EAST WEST BANK BEASLEY LAW IOLTA ACCOUNT (A/E 0043)

• Total inflows: \$3,812,304.74

• Total outflows: \$0.00

• Balance (6/30/22): \$3,812,304.74

See Exhibit C for a complete list of transactions.

In addition to the foregoing, please see the Standardized Financial Accounting Report attached as **Exhibit A** and the Summary Cash Flow Statement and Summary Balance Sheet attached as **Exhibit D**.

# VIII. LIST OF KNOWN CREDITORS WITH ADDRESSES AND AMOUNT OF CLAIMS (LR 66-4(b)(4))

LR 66-4 requires that the Receiver file a list of all currently known creditors with their addresses and the amounts of their claims. The Receiver has compiled a list of trade creditors from J&J Consulting's books and records, although he cannot yet vouch for its accuracy. However, the Receiver is concerned about publicly disclosing the names, addresses, and claim amounts of J&J Consulting's investors out of concern for maintaining their privacy and to prevent them from being targeted for fraudulent investment schemes by other parties who may seek to prey upon them. Accordingly, the Receiver requests that he be excused from filing a list of investors with their addresses and claim amounts or alternatively be allowed to file the same under seal. In addition, the Receiver requests that when he is required by LR 66-5 to serve notice of a hearing on the investors, that, as detailed below, he be deemed to have served such notice by posting a copy of the notice on

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

the receivership website and emailing investors (where possible), and that the proof of service filed with the Court use only the investors' first initial and last name, and not include their street address. Counsel for the Receiver will, however, maintain a complete proof of service in its records for this case.

## IX. OTHER ITEMS TO REPORT

#### A. CURRENT AND FUTURE LITIGATION

As referenced above, the actions of several defendants and/or their representatives in this matter have necessitated the filing of motions to facilitate the turnover of assets. Notably, on June 10, 2022 the Receiver filed a motion to compel or alternative motion for order to show cause why Jeffery J. Judd and/or those acting on this behalf should not be held in contempt for failure to comply with this Court's order appointing receiver due to failure to turn over assets ("Judd Motion to Compel") (ECF 91). Subsequent to the filing of the same, all of the law firms that were identified by the Receiver as having received funds directly from Judd turned over at least a portion of the monies held in their trust accounts and the firms retaining funds will seek court approval relating to the same. As such, the Judd Motion to Compel was withdrawn on July 5, 2022 (ECF 136). Similarly, the Receiver filed a Motion to Compel the turnover of a Bentley Continental GT automobile ("Bentley") that Defendant Beasley had given to his attorney Garrett Ogata on June 29, 2022 ("Ogata Motion to Compel") (ECF 122). Mr. Ogata subsequently turned over the Bentley to the Receiver and the Ogata Motion to Compel was withdrawn (ECF 145).

Additionally, the Receiver has identified the following ancillary proceedings that may impact this matter:

PARTIES	COURT	CASE NO.
Mark A. Murphy, et al. v. Matthew	Clark County District Court	A-22-849806-B
Beasley, et al.		(removed to BK court as identified below)
Barrett Henzel, et al. v. Wells Fargo	United States District Court,	2:22-cv-00529-GMN-
Bank, N.A.	Nevada	NJK
Stanley Dowdy v. Wells Fargo Bank,	United States District Court,	2:22-cv-00631-GMN-
N.A.	Nevada	NJK
PMM3, LLC et al. v. Wells Fargo	United States District Court,	2:22-cv-00654-GMN-
Bank	Nevada	NJK

LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2

///

PARTIES	COURT	CASE NO.
Elizabeth Lewis, et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.	United States District Court, Nevada	2:22-cv-00658-GMN- NJK
J&J Consulting Services, Inc.	United States District Court, Nevada	22-10942-mkn
J and J Purchasing, LLC	United States Bankruptcy Court, Nevada	22-10943-mkn
J&J Consulting Services, Inc., an Alaska Corp. v. Jeffrey J. Judd, et al. (adversary)	United States Bankruptcy Court, Nevada	22-01061-mkn
J and J Purchasing, LLC v. Jeffrey J. Judd, et al. (adversary)	United States Bankruptcy Court, Nevada	22-1062-mkn
Mark A. Murphy, et al. v. Matthew Beasley, et al (adversary)	United States Bankruptcy Court, Nevada	22-1066-mkn
J and J Consulting Services, Inc., a Nevada Corp., et al. v. Mark A. Murphy, et al. (adversary)	United States Bankruptcy Court, Nevada	22-1069-mkn
J and J Consulting Services, Inc., et al. v. Mark A. Murphy, et al. (adversary)	United States Bankruptcy Court, Nevada	22-1070-mkn

As noted above, the Receiver filed a report and recommendation regarding the Bankruptcy Cases and related bankruptcy matters on July 1, 2002 (ECF 127). Therein, a detailed analysis of the seven pending bankruptcy matters is provided and recommendations made based on the Receiver's review and analysis of the same. As to the other litigation matters identified, the Receiver is monitoring and investigating the claims alleged and anticipates being in a position to provide additional details and information during the next reporting period.

# B. ASSERTION OF JURISDICTION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 754

The territorial jurisdiction of this Court – and thus of the Receiver – is extended to any district of the United States where assets of the receivership are located. 28 U.S.C. § 754; see also Haile v. Henderson Nat'l Bank, 657 F.2d 816, 822 (6th Cir. 1981). Based on information obtained by the Receiver since his appointment and during the Reporting Period, the Receiver has identified assets located in other jurisdictions and therefore filed and registered the original Complaint and Appointment Orders in United States District Courts in Alaska, California, Montana, Utah, and Washington, in conformity with 28 U.S.C. § 754 and applicable federal law. As additional

information becomes available, the Receiver may file/register the Complaint and Appointment Orders in other districts as well.

In addition, and to ensure formal notice of the receivership at the county level, the Receiver has transmitted copies of his 28 U.S.C. § 754 registration, and the Appointment Order, for recordation in all counties in which real property assets of the receivership are believed to be located. This is an important means by which the Receiver can protect assets from being wrongfully transferred or encumbered during the course of the receivership. Again, as additional information concerning receivership assets becomes available, the Receiver may seek to record relevant receivership materials in additional counties.

# C. THE RECEIVER REQUESTS INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE COURT The Receiver Requests That Local Rule 66-5 Be Modified to Permit Notices of Hearings to Be Served on Investors by Email and Posting on the Receivership Website

LR 66-5 requires that notice of the time and place of the hearings on reports of the Receiver, petitions for confirmation of sales of property, applications for fees, and petitions for authority to sell property at a private sale be given to all interested parties and creditors "unless the court orders otherwise." It does not specify the manner of notice. In this case, investor records are inconsistent and appear to be incomplete and the Receiver does not have complete contact information for all potential investors. Moreover, based on the available books and records, it appears to the Receiver that most investor communication was done by email. As such. the Receiver does not currently have mailing addresses for many of the investors. Accordingly, the Receiver requests Court authority to give the notices of hearings required by LR 66-5 to investors by email to their last known email address and by posting the pleadings on the website that is maintained for the receivership at https://www.jjconsulting-receivership.com. Additionally due to the unique circumstances of this case and the inherent costs associated with mailing notices, the Receiver requests that he not be required to mail notices unless a specific request by an investor is received requesting notices by United States mail and/or if the court specifically orders otherwise.

Additionally, because of the privacy concerns referenced above, the Receiver also requests that when service is accomplished by email, a proof of service will be prepared and maintained

concurrently but that he be excused from filing the proof of service with the Court. This will prevent the investor email addresses from becoming part of the public record.

# X. RECOMMENDATION OF THE RECEIVER (LR 66-4(b)(5))

At this juncture, the Receiver has initially concluded that J&J Consulting was not operating a viable business and was quickly dissipating investor funds. So that the Receiver can continue to identify assets and claims and pursue them for the benefit of the receivership estate, the Receiver recommends that the receivership continue.

### XI. CONCLUSION AND REQUESTED RELIEF

Assuming the Court authorizes the Receiver to undertake the actions recommended herein, as well as to continue those actions provided for in the Appointment Order, any amendments thereto and any subsequent orders, the Receiver proposes to submit further interim reports to this Court, addressing his progress, findings, final conclusions, and additional recommendations, approximately every 90 days. Accordingly, and based on the foregoing, the Receiver respectfully requests that the Court enter an order similar to the proposed order attached hereto as **Exhibit E**:

- 1. Accepting this First Status Report;
- 2. Authorizing the Receiver to continue to administer the Receivership Entities and their estate in accordance with the terms of the Appointment Order;
- 3. Modifying Local Rule 66-4 and excuse the Receiver from filing a list of investors with their addresses and claim amounts due to privacy reasons;
- 4. Modifying Local Rule 66-5 to permit notice of hearings and other activity to be served on the investors by email and posting on the Receivership Website unless the Receiver receives a specific request for written notice or the Court orders otherwise;
- 5. Authorizing the Receiver to undertake the recommendations presented herein, including a continued engagement of those professionals he deems necessary for the proper administration of the Receivership Entities and their estate; and
- 26

///

///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 27
- 28 ///

LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

6. Providing such other and further relief as the Court deems necessary and appropriate. 1 DATED this 1<sup>st</sup> day of August, 2022 2 3 I, Geoff Winkler, verify under penalty of perjury that the statements made in the foregoing report are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. 4 5 6 7 DATED this 1st day of August, 2022. 8 **GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP** 9 By: /s/ Kara B. Hendricks 10 KARA B. HENDRICKS, Bar No. 07743 JASON K. HICKS, Bar No. 13149 11 KYLE A. EWING, Bar No. 014051 12 JARROD L. RICKARD, Bar No. 10203 13 KATIE L. CANNATA, Bar No. 14848 SEMENZA KIRCHER RICKARD 14 DAVID R. ZARO\* 15 JOSHUA A. del CASTILLO\* MATTHEW D. PHAM\* 16 \*admitted pro hac vice ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE 17 MALLORY & NATSIS LLP 18 Attorneys for Receiver Geoff Winkler 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** I hereby certify that, on the 1st day of August, 2022, a true and correct copy of the foregoing FIRST QUARTERLY REPORT AND PETITION FOR FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS OF RECEIVER GEOFF WINKLER was filed electronically via the Court's CM/ECF system. Notice of filing will be served on all parties by operation of the Court's CM/ECF system, and parties may access this filing through the Court's CM/ECF system. /s/ Evelyn Escobar Gaddi An employee of GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP 

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

# SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION V. MATTHEW WADE BEASLEY, et al., USDC CASE NO. 2:22-CV-00612-JCM-EJY

Ехнівіт	DESCRIPTION
Exhibit A	STANDARDIZED FUND ACCOUNTING REPORT
Exhibit B	EAST WEST BANK RECEIVERSHIP ACCOUNT
Exhibit C	EAST WEST BANK BEASLEY LAW IOLTA ACCOUNT
Exhibit D	SUMMARY CASH FLOW STATEMENT AND SUMMARY BALANCE SHEET
Exhibit E	[PROPOSED] ORDER

# EXHIBIT A

# EXHIBIT A

Standardized Fund Accounting Report

# STANDARDIZED FUND ACCOUNTING REPORT for SEC v. JJ Consulting Services, Inc. et al. Civil Docket No. 2:22-cv-00612-CDS-EJY Reporting Period from 06/03/2022 to 06/30/2022

FUND ACCO	UNTING (See instructions)	Doto!!	Cubtatal	Crond T-t-l
Line 1	Beginning Balance (As of 06/03/2022):	Detail	Subtotal	Grand Total
Line i	Increases in Fund Balance:			
		440.077.00		
Line 2	Business Income	118,677.30		
Line 3 Line 4	Cash and Securities (in transit)	5,552,463.05		
Line 4	Interest/Dividend Income Business Asset Liquidation			
Line 6	Personal Asset Liquidation	1,927,801.15		
Line 7	Third-Party Litigation Income	-		
Line 8	Miscellaneous - Other (Restricted: Beasley IOLTA Account)	3,812,304.74		
	Total Funds Available (Lines 1 - 8):		11,411,246.24	11,411,246.24
	Decreases in Fund Balance:			
Line 9	Disbursements to Investors			
Line 10	Disbursements for Receivership Operations			
Line 10a	Disbursements to Receiver or Other Professionals	-		
Line 10b	Business Asset Expenses	-		
Line 10c	Personal Asset Expenses	(12,440.36)		
Line 10d	Investment Expenses	-		
Line 10e	Third-Party Litigation Expenses	-		
	1. Attorney Fees	_		
	Litigation Expenses     Total Disbursements for Receivership Operations	I ———	(12,440.36)	
Line 10f	Tax Administrator Fees and Bonds		(12,440.36)	
Line 101	Federal and State Tax Payments		_	
	Total Disbursements for Receivership Operations			(12,440.36)
Line 11	Disbursements for Distribution Expenses Paid by the Fund:			(12,110100)
Line 11a	Distribution Plan Development Expenses:			
	1. Fees:			
	Fund Administrator	-		
	Independent Distribution Consultant (IDC)	-		
	Distribution Agent	-		
	ConsultantsLegal Advisers	-		
	Tax Advisers			
	2. Administrative Expenses	_		
	3. Miscellaneous			
	Total Plan Development Expenses		-	
Line 11b	Distribution Plan Implementation Expenses:			
	1. Fees: Fund Administrator	_		
	IDC	_		
	Distribution Agent	_		
	Consultants	-		
	Legal Advisers	-		
	Tax Advisers	-		
	2. Administrative Expenses	-		
	Investor Identification:     Notice/Publishing Approved Plan	_		
	Claimant Identification	1 -		
	Claims Processing	_		
	Web Site Maintenance/Call Center	-		
	4. Fund Administrator Bond	-		
	5. Miscellaneous	-		
	6. Federal Account for Investor Restitution			
	(FAIR) Reporting Expenses	<u> </u>		
	Total Plan Implementation Expenses Total Disbursements for Distribution Expenses Paid by the Fund	<del> </del>	-	
Line 12	Disbursements to Court/Other:			-
Line 12 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		(12,440.36
Line 13	Ending Balance (As of 06/30/2022):	1		11,398,805.88
Line 14	Ending Balance of Fund - Net Assets:			
Line 14a	Cash & Cash Equivalents	1	11,398,805.88	
Line 14b	Investments Other Assets or Ungleared Funds	1	30 300 000 00	
Line 14c	Other Assets or Uncleared Funds Total Ending Balance of Fund - Net Assets	1	38,300,000.00	49,698,805.88
	Trotal Enality Dalatice of Lunius Net Assets		l	+0,000,000.00

#### STANDARDIZED FUND ACCOUNTING REPORT for SEC v. JJ Consulting Services, Inc. et al. Civil Docket No. 2:22-cv-00612-CDS-EJY Reporting Period from 06/03/2022 to 06/30/2022

OTHER SUPP	LEMENTAL INFORMATION:			
		Detail	Subtotal	Grand Total
l inc 45	Dishurasments for Disn Administration Events Not Daid by the Food			
Line 15 Line 15a	Disbursements for Plan Administration Expenses Not Paid by the Fund:  Plan Development Expenses Not Paid by the Fund			
Line isa	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	-		
	2. Administrative Expenses	-		
	3. Investor Identification:	-		
	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			
Line 16a Line 16b	Investment Expenses/CRIS Fees Federal Tax Payments		-	
LITTE TOD	•		<u> </u>	
	Total Disbursements to Court/Other Not Paid by the Fund:	-		-
Line 17	DC & State Tax Payments			-
Line 18	No. of Claims:			
Line 18a	# of Claims Received This Reporting Period	-		
Line 18b	# of Claims Received Since Inception of Fund	-		
Line 19	No. of Claimants/Investors:			
Line 19a Line 19b	# of Claimants/Investors Paid This Reporting Period # of Claimants/Investors Paid Since Inception of Fund	-		
LITIE 190	# or Grammanics/investors Paid Since inception of Fund	-		

Receiver: **Geoff Winkler** 

**Geoff Winkler** 

(printed name)

**Chief Executive Officer** 

American Fiduciary Services LLC
Receiver, J&J Consulting Services, Inc. et al.

Date: July 30, 2022

# EXHIBIT B

# EXHIBIT B

East West Bank Receivership Account

# EAST WEST BANK RECEIVERSHIP ACCOUNT (A/E 0050) JUNE 3, 2022 - JUNE 30, 2022

Date	Туре	Amount	Payee	Description
06/14/2022		1,927,801.15	Synergy Insurance Inc.	Refund of Insurance Proceeds
06/15/2022	Wire In	1,390,688.24		Turnover of Funds
06/16/2022	Wire In	2,053,377.51	Oberheiden PC	Turnover of Funds
06/21/2022	Check 6001	(10,557.00)	Triple Crown Insurance	Insurance on 9 Sky Arc
06/21/2022	Wire In	1,684,640.00	Nevada Law Foundation Trust Account	Turnover of Funds
06/23/2022	Wire In	77,464.05	J&J Consutling Services, Inc.	Transfer of Funds
06/23/2022	Wire In	52,620.58	CJ Investments, LLC	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	8,427.38	JCH Consulting LLC	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	9,950.36	J&J Purchasing, LLC	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	275.00	Jason Jongeward	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	5,156.21	Jessica Humphries	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	5,473.92	Infused LLC	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	312.79	Shane Jager	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	2,263.67	Stirling Consulting LLC	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	51,311.74	Bugraiders Pest Control LLC	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	12,083.04	Shane Jager	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	39,711.85	Nevada Pro Pest Control Inc.	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	2,678.88	Roland Tanner	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	40.00	Orc Holdings, LLC	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	604.26	Jager Capital LLC	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	28,249.06	Nevada Pro Pest Control Inc.	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	48,940.00	Law Office of Kamilla Dean	Turnover of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	10,930.20	JL2 Investments	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In	4,039.97	Anthem Assets LLC	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In		Christopher Humphries	Transfer of Funds
06/24/2022	Wire In		Matthew Beasley	Transfer of Funds
06/28/2022	ACH In		Cirrus Aviation Services LLC	Airplane Lease Income
06/28/2022	ACH Out	(1,883.36)	Trustee Insurance	Insurance on Vehicles

Total 7,586,501.14

# EXHIBIT C

# EXHIBIT C

East West Bank Beasley Law IOLTA Account

# EAST WEST BANK BEASLEY LAW IOLTA ACCOUNT (A/E 0043) JUNE 3, 2022 - JUNE 30, 2022

Date	Туре	Amount	Payee	Description
6/24/2022	Wire In	3,812,304.74	Beasley Law IOLTA	Transfer of Funds

Total 3,812,304.74

# EXHIBIT D

# EXHIBIT D

Summary Cash Flow Statement and Summary Balance Sheet

### SEC v. J & J Consulting Services, LLC et al Summary Cash Flow Statement For the period ending June 30, 2022

Cash at Beginning of Period

#### Cash Inflows

 Residual Defendant Accounts
 \$ 4,187,122

 Attorney Retainers Returned
 \$ 5,177,646

 Insurance Refund
 \$ 1,927,801

 Aviation Rental
 \$ 118,677

 Total Cash Inflows
 \$ 11,411,246

#### Cash Outflows

Asset Expenses \$ 12,440

Total Cash Outflows 12,440

Cash at End of Period 11,398,806

### SEC v. J & J Consulting Services, LLC et al Summary Balance Sheet As of June 30, 2022

#### Assets

 EWBK Account
 11,398,806

 Real Property\*
 30,000,000

 Personal Property\*
 2,800,000

 Airplane (FMV)
 5,500,000

 Total Assets
 49,698,806

#### Liabilities

Outstanding Professional Fees 286,846
Accrued Professional Holdbacks 67,095
Net Cash Investors\* 450,000,000

Total Liabilities 450,353,941

#### Equity

Retained Earnings (400,655,135) *Total Equity* (400,655,135)

<sup>\*</sup>Accounts are estimated values and are subject to change as more information is available and the Receiver completes his forensic accounting.

# **EXHIBIT** E

# EXHIBIT E

[Proposed] Order Approving First Quarterly Report and Petition for Further Instructions

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89135 TELEPHONE: (702) 938- 6856 1

KARA B. HENDRICKS, Bar No. 07743

hendricksk@gtlaw.com

DAVID R. ZARO\* dzaro@allenmatkins.com JOSHUA A. del CASTILLO\* idelcastillo@allenmatkins.com MATTHEW D. PHAM\* mpham@allenmatkins.com \*admitted pro hac vice ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE MALLORY & NATSIS LLP 865 South Figueroa Street **Suite 2800** Los Angeles, California 90017-2543 Telephone: (213) 622-5555 Facsimile: (213) 620-8816

CASE NO. 2:22-cv-00612-CDS-EJY

**GEOFF WINKLER** 

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

#### DISTRICT OF NEVADA

[PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING FIRST QUARTERLY REPORT AND PETITION FOR FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS OF RECEIVER

The Court having reviewed the First Quarterly Report and Petition for Further Instructions of Receiver Geoff Winkler, (the "Status Report") and having held a hearing at which appearances were noted on the record, for the reasons set forth on the record,

#### IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. The Status Report and the actions of Geoff Winkler, the receiver (the "Receiver"), set forth therein are approved, and the Court finds that the receivership should continue pursuant to the terms of the Order Appointing Receiver ("Appointment Order") (ECF 88);
- 2. The Court hereby modifies Local Rule 66-4 and excuses the Receiver from filing a list of investors with their addresses and claim amounts due to privacy reasons;
- 3. The Court hereby modifies Local Rule 66-5 to permit notice of hearings and other activity to be served on the investors by email and posting on the Receivership Website unless the Receiver receives a specific request for written notice or the Court orders otherwise; and
- 4. The Receiver is authorized to undertake the recommendations presented in the Status Report including a continued engagement of those professionals he deems necessary for the proper administration of the Receivership Entities and their estate.

#### IT IS SO ORDERED.

U.S. Distr	ict Court Judge	
DATED:		