

1 William Delgado (SBN 222666)
2 DTO LAW
3 601 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2130
4 Los Angeles, CA 90017
5 T: (213) 335-6999
6 wdelgado@dtolaw.com

7 SHAUN P. MARTIN (SBN 158480)
8 5998 Alcalá Park, Warren Hall
9 San Diego, CA 92110
10 T: (619) 260-2347 | F: (619) 260-7933
11 smartin@sandiego.edu

12 *Counsel for Plaintiff Younes Younes*

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
6/18/2024 8:57 AM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By K. Valenzuela, Deputy Clerk

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

YOUNES YOUNES, on behalf of
himself and all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

ELVIRA TAYLOR and DOES 1
through 200, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 24STCV12520

**DECLARATION OF CHARLES ZACH
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S EX
PARTE APPLICATION FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF MINUTE
ORDER OF JUNE 14, 2024**

Assigned for All Purposes to:
Judge: The Hon. Elihu Berle
Date: June 20, 2024
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Place: 312 N. Spring Street,
Los Angeles, CA 90012,
Dept. 6

1 I, Charles Zach, declare under penalty of perjury as follows:


2 1. I am an employee at Inca Digital, a company that investigates
3 cryptocurrency schemes. I submitted a Declaration in support of Plaintiff's *ex parte*
4 application in this matter, filed on June 11, 2024. I am over 18 years of age, of sound
5 mind, and am competent to make this Declaration. The evidence set forth in the
6 foregoing Declaration is based on my personal knowledge unless expressly stated
7 otherwise.

8 2. Plaintiffs in other cryptocurrency seizure cases I have been involved in
9 have successfully obtained TROs seizing wallets and then delivered, post-seizure,
10 electronic "tokens" to those wallets. This delivery and the seizure itself amply notified
11 the Defendants of the lawsuit and their chance to oppose the seizure. This is the notice
12 process that Plaintiffs proposed in their *ex parte* application. But there is no precedent
13 in these cases that provides a similar electronic notice process before the assets are
14 actually seized and tokens then delivered.

15 3. If Defendants received notice of a motion pre-seizure that identified the
16 cryptocurrency wallets that were proposed to be seized, Defendants likely would within
17 minutes withdraw the cryptocurrency from those wallets and remove it overseas where
18 it could no longer be reached. This is a standard modus operandi of cryptocurrency
19 theft, and is why the thieves hold these assets in cryptocurrency rather than hard assets
20 or fiat currency.

21 Executed this 18th day of June, 2024, in Sinj, Croatia.

22
23
24
25
26
27
28



Charles Zach