

**CAUSE NO. 19-7298-367**

**ROBERT OBLON,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**JORDAN BROCK,**

**Defendant.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT**

**367<sup>TH</sup> JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

**DENTON COUNTY, TEXAS**

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

The Court, having received and reviewed the Amended Motion to Show Cause and Alternative Motion to Have Court Exercise Its Inherent Authority to Enforce Its Own (Previously Issued) Order filed by Plaintiff Robert Oblon in this case on November 15, 2019, FINDS and ORDERS that Keith Halls, John “JT” Thatch, and Kip H Allison shall appear before the Court on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2019 at \_\_\_ o’clock \_\_m. to show cause why they should not be held in contempt of court for failing to abide by the letter and the spirit of this Court’s August 22, 2019 Amended Temporary Restraining Order (that is attached to this Order as Exhibit “A”).

SIGNED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2019.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Presiding Judge

# EXHIBIT

A

FILED AT THE BENCH  
IN OPEN COURT THIS THE  
22 DAY OF AUG 2019  
*M. Baum*  
JUDGE, DENTON COUNTY  
367th DISTRICT COURT

CAUSE NO. 19-7298-367

ROBERT OBLON,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
JORDAN BROCK,  
  
Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

IN THE DISTRICT COURT  
  
  
  
367<sup>TH</sup> JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
  
  
DENTON COUNTY, TEXAS

AMENDED TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

On the 22 day of August, 2019 Plaintiff Robert Oblon presented his Verified Application for Injunctive Relief to this Court.

Having reviewed this Verified Application and the evidence attached thereto the Court finds that: the Plaintiff alleges that he is the sole founder of a business named Alchemist Holdings, LLC ("Alchemist") and that he is the sole member of/in Alchemist. Plaintiff also alleges that the sole member of Alchemist has the sole authority and power to act for and on behalf of Alchemist, that no assignment, transfer, or other disposition of all or any part of the interest of any member in Alchemist shall be binding upon Alchemist unless and until a duly executed and acknowledged counterpart of such assignment or instrument of transfer (in form and substance satisfactory to Alchemist) has been delivered to Alchemist, and that Defendant Brock and others have engaged in certain actions and conduct supporting the Plaintiff's contention that he is the sole founder of – and sole member of – Alchemist. A number of documents have been filed with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission in the past that identify Alchemist as an entity that is "controlled by" the Plaintiff. These filings do not say anything about Defendant Brock's *alleged* connection with Alchemist at all. These documents do not identify Defendant Brock as a member of/in Alchemist or as someone who has any (voting or other) control in or over Alchemist. A number of the above-referenced filings note that the Plaintiff is "deemed to be the beneficial owner"

of stock owned by Alchemist in a publicly traded company named Sharing Services Global Corporation (“Sharing Services”). None of these documents state – or suggest – that Defendant Brock is (or should be) deemed to be the beneficial owner of stock owned by Alchemist in Sharing Services.

Alchemist is the largest stockholder of/in Sharing Services (as evidenced by other filings that have been made with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission).

The Plaintiff has also alleged that Defendant Brock was never formally issued any ownership (a/k/a membership) units in Alchemist, and that Plaintiff never agreed to give Defendant Brock any acting or voting “control” over the business and operations of Alchemist.

Brock has admitted, in writing, that he and his affiliates (that were identified by name in this writing and did not include Alchemist) “fraudulently” executed certain funding agreements to the detriment of Sharing Services, and that he (Brock) and his affiliates (that, again, were identified by name in this writing and did not include Alchemist) benefited to a “material financial degree” from such wrongful conduct.

When making these damaging written admissions Brock falsely and wrongfully held himself out to others as being an owner of/in Alchemist and of having actual and voting control over the business and operations of Alchemist (when he did not have such ownership interest/control).

On or about February 21, 2019 Defendant Brock wrongfully purported to assigned the right to vote the stock that Alchemist owns in Sharing Services to a Trustee named Kip H. Allison. The Plaintiff never authorized – or agreed to – this assignment, and Defendant Brock had no lawful authority to make this assignment.

On or about July 31, 2019 Sharing Services filed a Schedule 14A with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission. According to this filing, the shareholders of Sharing Services have been invited to attend the 2019 Annual Meeting of Shareholders of Sharing Services which is

scheduled to take place on August 29, 2019 at the corporate offices of Sharing Services in Plano, Texas at 8:00 a.m. for certain specified purposes, including the following: "To elect three directors named in the accompanying Proxy Statement for the terms specified or until their successors are elected and qualified". The Proxy Statement that is attached to this filing advises shareholders of Class B common stock in Sharing Services that they can vote to elect Kip Allison to the Board of Directors, and that if Kip Allison is elected he will serve in this capacity until the Annual Meeting of Shareholders in 2021. As Sharing Services recognizes in this filing, only shareholders of the company's Class B common stock are entitled to vote for Kip Allison.

This filing also recognizes that Alchemist has been issued – and holds – 7,500,000 shares of its Series B preferred stock and that Alchemist is – by far – the largest holder of Series B preferred stock in Sharing Services.

In addition, the Plaintiff has recently uncovered suggests that Kip Allison may not even be eligible to serve as Director for Sharing Services pursuant to the content of the Bylaws of that company. By way of example only, to properly serve as a Director of Sharing Services Allison must affirm that he has never been convicted of (among other things) fraud. Back in 2015 Allison was sued (in a County Court at Law in Dallas County, Texas), for common law fraud, fraud by non-disclosure, breach of fiduciary duty, conversion, and other causes of action. On April 15, 2016 the Court entered a Final Judgment in favor of the Plaintiff and against Allison in that action for (among other things) common law fraud, fraud by non-disclosure, breach of fiduciary duty, and conversion.

The facts set forth above have all been verified by Plaintiff Oblon. These facts demonstrate (among other things) that unless this Court takes action the Trustee purporting to have the right to exercise voting interest/control of Alchemist will attend the August 29, 2019 Annual Meeting of Shareholders of Sharing Services and vote to elect himself to the Board of Directors when (a) he does not, in truth, have proper legal authority to act as Trustee and vote the membership interests that

Temporary Restraining Order

Alchemist holds in Sharing Services (since he received an assignment to do so from Defendant Brock, who was not a member of/in Alchemist, had no actual or voting control of/over Alchemist, and had no authority to make such assignment, (b) a genuine dispute exists in this case about who has ownership of – and voting control over – the shares of stock held by Alchemist in Sharing Services, and (c) the Trustee appears to be disqualified from serving as a member of the Board of Directors of and for Sharing Services pursuant to the Bylaws of Sharing Services.

Plaintiff Oblon has requested entry of a declaratory judgment in this action declaring, among other things, that Defendant Brock has never been issued any units of membership in Alchemist, that Defendant Alchemist has no lawful ownership interest in and no voting control over the business and operations of Alchemist, and that he (the Plaintiff) is the sole member of/in Alchemist who has sole lawful voting rights/control in and over the business and operations of Alchemist. Plaintiff Oblon has also asserted other affirmative claims for relief against Defendant Brock in this case, i.e.: tortious interference with existing contract, common law fraud, statutory fraud, business disparagement, and unlawful appropriation of name of likeness. Based upon these verified facts, and the evidence presented to this Court, Plaintiff Oblon has a probable right to recover in this case.

The harm that Plaintiff Oblon will suffer if a Temporary Restraining Order and Temporary Injunction are not issued is probable, imminent, and irreparable unless this Court issues an order preventing the voting of any stock that Alchemist owns and claims to own in Sharing Services at the August 29, 2019 Annual Meeting of Shareholders.

The injuries to be suffered by the Plaintiff are irreparable because they cannot be accurately measured or compensated through a monetary damages award.

Even if money damages could be accurately calculated, the Plaintiff's losses are likely to exceed the amount that will likely be successfully recovered by Plaintiff based upon the financial status/situation of Defendant Brock and the Plaintiff's inability to file suit against Sharing Services

(given a confidential agreement that Plaintiff previously entered into with Sharing Services). Therefore, Plaintiff Oblon has no adequate remedy at law.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that, based upon the Verified Application and the evidence attached thereto, the Plaintiff's Application for a Temporary Restraining Order should be and hereby is GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that for fourteen (14) days from the date of this Order no individual or entity shall exercise or attempt to exercise the right to vote any interest and class of shares that Alchemist owns in Sharing Services Global Corporation at the August 29, 2019 Annual Meeting of Shareholders of Sharing Services Global Corporation.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, in addition to being binding upon Defendant Brock, this Temporary Restraining Order is also binding upon Brock's agents, servants, attorneys, and anyone acting in concert or participation with Brock or any of the agents who received actual notice of this Temporary Restraining Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties in the above-styled case shall appear before this Court on the 30<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2019 at 9:00 a.m. for a temporary injunction hearing.


IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Plaintiff shall post a bond in the amount of \$2,500.00 and that the posting of this bond is required for this Temporary Restraining Order to be deemed effective.

The Clerk of this Court is directed to issue (upon posting of this bond) a Temporary Restraining Order in conformity with the law and the terms of this Order.

Subject to further order of this court, this Temporary Restraining Order shall expire at the close of the above-referenced hearing on the 30<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2019.

**NOTICE – A violation of this Temporary Restraining Order can result in contempt of court, which is punishable by jail time, or a fine/sanction, or both jail time and a fine/sanction.**

SIGNED this 22 day of August, 2019 at 3:18 clock p.m.

  
Presiding Judge