1 2 3	DAVID R. ZARO (BAR NO. 124334) NORMAN M. ASPIS (BAR NO. 313466 ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE MALLORY & NATSIS LLP 865 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800					
4	Los Angeles, California 90017-2543 Phone: (213) 622-5555					
5	Fax: (213) 620-8816 E-Mail: dzaro@allenmatkins.com naspis@allenmatkins.com					
6	EDWARD G. FATES (BAR NO. 227809					
7	ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE MALLORY & NATSIS LLP					
8	One America Plaza 600 West Broadway, 27th Floor					
9	San Diego, California 92101-0903 Phone: (619) 233-1155 Fax: (619) 233-1158					
10	Fax: (619) 233-1158 E-Mail: tfates@allenmatkins.com					
11	Attorneys for Receiver					
12	KRISTÁ FREITAG					
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
14	SOUTHERN DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNIA				
15						
16	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,	Case No. 3:19-cv-01628-LAB-AHG				
17	Plaintiff,	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND				
18	V.	AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF RECEIVER'S MOTION FOR				
19	GINA CHAMPION-CAIN and ANI	AUTHORITY TO PURSUE CLAWBACK CLAIMS AND				
20	DEVELOPMENT, LLC,	APPROVAL OF PROPOSED PROCEDURES				
21	Defendants,	Date: December 14, 2020				
22	AMERICAN NATIONAL INVESTMENTS, INC.,	Time: 11:15 a.m.				
23	, ,	Courtroom: 14A Judge: Hon. Larry Alan Burns				
24	Relief Defendant.					
25						
26						
27						
28						
40						

LAW OFFICES
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

1			TABLE OF CONTENTS	D
2	_	1) 100 1		<u>Page</u>
3	I.		RODUCTION	
4	II.		WBACK CLAIMS	
5	III.	PRO	POSED PROCEDURES	7
6		A.	Settlements	7
7		B.	Litigation	10
8		C.	Exceptional Cases	11
9		D.	Business Judgment	11
10	IV.	ARG	UMENT	11
11		A.	Broad Equitable Powers of the Court	11
12		B.	Voidable Transfers Under the CUVTA; Receiver Standing	13
13		C.	The Ponzi Presumption	13
14		D.	Profits and Referral Fees	14
15		E.	Statute of Limitations and Statute of Repose	15
16		F.	Pursuit of Clawback Claims	15
17		G.	Proposed Settlement Parameters	16
18		H.	Proposed Fee Arrangement for Counsel	16
19	V.	CON	ICLUSION	17
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

-2-

902733.01/SD

1	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
2	Page(s)
3	
4	<u>Cases</u>
5	AFI Holding, Inc. (In re), 525 F.3d 700 (9th Cir. 2008)
6	Cohen (In re), 199 B.R. 709 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1996)
7 8	Commodities Futures Trading Comm'n. v. Topworth Int'l, Ltd., 205 F.3d 1107 (9th Cir. 1999)12
9	Donell v. Ghadrdan, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26393 (C.D. Cal. 2013)14
10 11	Donell v. Kowell, 533 F.3d 762 (9th Cir. 2007)
12	Donell v. Mojtahedian, 976 F.Supp.2d 1183 (C.D. Cal. 2013)
13 14	Int'l Loan Network, Inc. (In re), 160 B.R. 1 (Bankr.D.D.C.1993)14
15	Klein v. Andres, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129744, 2013 WL 4809260 (D.Utah
16	2013)
17	Lake State Commodities, Inc. (In re), 253 B.R. 86614
18 19	Nat'l Consumer Mortgage, LLC (In re), 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5986 (D. Nev. 2013)
20	Ramirez Rodriguez (In re), 209 B.R. 424 (Bankr.S.D.Tex. 1997)
21	Randy (In re),
22	189 B.R. 425 (Bankr.N.D.Ill.1995)
23	SEC v. Capital Consultants, LLC, 397 F.3d 733 (9th Cir. 2005)12
24	SEC v. Elliot, 953 F.2d 1560 (11th Cir. 1992)12
2526	SEC v. Hardy, 803 F.2d 1034 (9th Cir 1986)
27	SEC v. Wencke,
28	622 F.2d 1363 (9th Cir. 1980)

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gambl
Mallory & Natsis LLP

902733.01/SD

1	Page(s)
2	Slatkin (In re), 525 F.3d 805 (9th Cir. 2008)13
3 4	United Energy Corp. (In re), 944 F.2d 589 (9th Cir. 1991)
5	Warfield v. Byron, 436 F.3d 551 (5th Cir. 2006)15
6	Wing v. Dockstader,
7 8	482 Fed. Appx. 361, 2012 WL 2020666 (10th Cir. 2012)14
	<u>Statutes</u>
9	California Civil Code § 343913
10	California Civil Code § 3439.04(a)
11	California Civil Code § 3439.08(a)
12	California Civil Code § 3439.09(a)
13	California Civil Code § 3439.09(c)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
amble	

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

902733.01/SD

-4-

Krista Freitag ("Receiver"), the Court-appointed permanent receiver for Defendant ANI Development, LLC ("ANI"), Relief Defendant American National Investments, Inc., and their subsidiaries and affiliates ("Receivership Entities"), submits this Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of her Motion for Authority to Pursue Clawback Claims and Approval of Proposed Procedures ("Motion").

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

This case concerns a Ponzi scheme involving a fictitious liquor license lending program. The scheme spanned approximately eight (8) years, during which time investors¹ paid significant sums of money directly and indirectly to the Receivership Entities, and the Receivership Entities made payments directly and indirectly to investors, aggregators, insiders and other third parties. The assets of the Receivership Estate include claims to recover these payments (or transfers), which include but are not limited to (a) investor profits, (i.e., amounts the Receivership Entities paid to investors above and beyond their total amounts paid to the Receivership Entities), (b) referral fees and commissions the Receivership Entities paid to those who referred investors to the scheme, (c) amounts paid to insiders and other parties related to or affiliated with the Receivership Entities or Gina Champion-Cain, and (d) amounts paid to other third parties (e.g., gifts, donations) without reasonably equivalent value received in exchange (collectively, "Wrongful Transfers"). The Receiver has standing to pursue claims to recover these Wrongful Transfers under the California Uniform Voidable Transactions Act ("CUVTA") and that such Wrongful Transfers from Ponzi schemes are presumed to be voidable transactions subject to recovery.

28

26

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

902733.01/SD -5-

²⁷

The term "investors" is used herein to include all persons, institutions and/or entities who paid money into the liquor license lending program, whether the money was characterized as an investment or loan.

As is common in Ponzi schemes, some investors received substantial profits ("Profiting Investors") and some received well less than they invested, if they received any payments at all ("Losing Investors"). In order to recover and return as much as possible to the Losing Investors, it is necessary to pursue recovery of not only profits paid to Profiting Investors (which may include referral fees or commissions), but also other amounts paid to aggregators, insiders and other third parties. Accordingly, the Receiver seeks authority to pursue claims for recovery of these Wrongful Transfers ("Clawback Claims") and to settle Clawback Claims in accordance with the below described proposed procedures. The proposed procedures are designed to create an efficient and effective system of resolving Clawback Claims, either through settlement or litigation, while conserving judicial and receivership estate resources.

II. <u>CLAWBACK CLAIMS</u>

Investors who indirectly or directly deposited their funds primarily did so believing that they were funding loans to purchasers of California liquor licenses. Funds were invested in a variety of ways, and primarily via the following: (1) investors (or their retirement account custodian) sent money to Chicago Title, (2) investors sent money to other investors and/or entities, who then sent such funds (directly or after aggregating with other monies) on to Chicago Title or to a Receivership Entity directly, and (3) investors (or their retirement account custodian) sent money directly to a Receivership Entity. Funds were paid out from the Receivership Entities primarily in the same ways (in reverse). Declaration of Krista Freitag filed herewith ("Freitag Decl."), ¶ 2.

Federal equity receiverships such as this one are judicial proceedings in equity designed to right the wrong suffered by all victims of a fraudulent scheme. Allowing Profiting Investors, aggregators, insiders and other third parties ("Prospective Defendants") to retain profits, referral fees, commissions, and other amounts received from the Ponzi scheme while Losing Investors and other

LAW OFFICES
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

902733.01/SD -6-

claimants suffer devastating losses would be inequitable and run counter to the purposes of this receivership. Accordingly, the law allows the Receiver to pursue claims on behalf of the receivership estate to recover such transfers. The recoveries from these Clawback Claims will go to the receivership estate and be available for distribution to Losing Investors and other claimants.

III. PROPOSED PROCEDURES

The Receiver's proposed procedures for pursuing Clawback Claims are designed to resolve the claims as efficiently as possible, conserve judicial and existing receivership estate resources, and maximize recoveries for the benefit of victims of the scheme. Given the timing of transfers to Profiting Investors, the Receiver seeks to move promptly and expeditiously so as to avoid losing the ability to recover transfers that fall outside the seven-year statute of repose, which is discussed further below. Of course, when it comes to litigation, the Receiver's goals must be balanced with the due process rights of the Prospective Defendants. Accordingly, the Receiver proposes the following procedures for pursuing Clawback Claims.

A. <u>Settlements</u>

The Receiver recommends Prospective Defendants be given an incentive to settle Clawback Claims promptly without litigation. Litigation is expensive and time-consuming, consumes judicial and receivership estate resources and by its very nature, carries some level of risk. Accordingly, the Receiver proposes and seeks approval of the following settlement procedures:

• The Receiver will vet and send demand letters to Prospective

Defendants stating the total amount of profits, referral fees or other
amounts paid to them which are subject to recovery by the Receiver
("Profit Amount"). The letters will include the payment details and a
response deadline, state the Receiver's intention to pursue Clawback
Claims to recover the Profit Amount, along with the legal basis for such

902733.01/SD -7-

claims, and offer to settle the Clawback Claims without litigation as follows:

Profit Amount	Lump Sum	12 Monthly
	Settlement	Installments
First \$100,000	70%	75%
Next \$250,000	75%	80%
Next \$500,000	80%	85%
All amounts over \$850,000	85%	90%

• For example, as reflected in the following table, if a Prospective Defendant received a Profit Amount of \$2,500,000 from the Ponzi scheme, the settlement amount (for the initial 90 days and without litigation having been commenced, as discussed below) would be \$2,060,000 if paid in one lump sum:

Profit Amount	Lump Sum	Discount	Cumulative
	Settlement %		Discount %
First \$100,000	70%	\$30,000	30%
Next \$250,000	75%	\$62,500	26.4%
Next \$500,000	80%	\$100,000	22.6%
\$850,000 \$2,500,000	85%	\$247,500	17.6%
Total Discount		\$440,000	
Total Settlement Payment		\$2,060,000	

• The demand letter will also advise that the offer will expire 90 days from the date of the letter. Once 90 days has passed, if the proposed settlement has not been accepted, the Receiver may proceed to file a complaint and the minimum settlement amount will increase to 85% for the first \$500,000, and 90% for all amounts over \$500,000. Again,

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

using the example of a Prospective Defendant who received Profit Amount of \$2,500,000, the minimum settlement amount after litigation is commenced would increase to \$2,225,000 (11% cumulative discount). This would be a minimum threshold – not a set amount – such that if significant litigation expenses are incurred in connection with a particular clawback action (through pleading challenges, discovery, motion for summary judgment, or otherwise), the Receiver, in her discretion, could increase the settlement demand accordingly.

- A template settlement agreement and stipulated judgment will be provided with the demand letter in the forms attached hereto as Exhibits A and B. All terms of the settlement agreement will be final (the Prospective Defendant can choose the lump sum or 12 monthly installments by clearly marking the appropriate line in the agreement). The stipulated judgment will be for the full Profit Amount. In order to accept the lump sum settlement offer, the Prospective Defendant must sign the settlement agreement and return it to the Receiver with a certified funds or wire transfer for the lump sum settlement sum. In order to accept the 12 monthly installments settlement offer, a Prospective Defendant must sign the settlement agreement and stipulated judgment and return them to the Receiver along with the initial monthly installment payment (the first of the 12 monthly installments) via certified funds or wire transfer. The offer will not be deemed accepted until the signed documents and lump sum or first installment payment has been received.
- Settlement agreements executed in compliance with these procedures will be immediately effective, without further Court approval.
- Stipulated judgments signed as part of the 12 monthly installments settlement will be held by the Receiver and not filed with the Court or

otherwise enforced, provided the Prospective Defendant timely makes all required installment payments. If the Prospective Defendant defaults on any payments and does not cure such default within 10 days, the Receiver, in her discretion, may file a complaint against the Prospective Defendant together with the stipulated judgment (requesting entry thereof) and proof of the Prospective Defendant's default.

B. <u>Litigation</u>

As discussed above, if 90 days have passed from mailing of the demand letter and a Prospective Defendant has not accepted the settlement offer, the Receiver may file a complaint against the Prospective Defendant. In order to minimize the administrative expenses associated with these cases, it is important they all be managed and adjudicated by one District Court Judge and one Magistrate Judge who are familiar with the underlying facts. Having the cases before this Court will also avoid inconsistent rulings, which would complicate the litigation and potentially lead to disparate treatment of similarly situated Profiting Investors. Accordingly, the Receiver proposes and seeks Court approval of having these cases transferred to this Court as related actions. If the Court approves this request, the Receiver will file a Notice of Related Action with each complaint.

To the extent these cases do not settle, the Receiver anticipates they will be resolved via summary judgment. As discussed below, the law is very clear regarding federal equity receivership estate recovery of profits paid to investors, referral fees, commissions and other transfers made from Ponzi schemes. The salient facts of the subject Ponzi scheme are largely known at this point and have been admitted by Defendant Gina Champion-Cain as part of her guilty plea in the related criminal case.

902733.01/SD -10-

C. <u>Exceptional Cases</u>

For a small number of Prospective Defendants, the Receiver may have claims for recoveries that go beyond the Profit Amount reflected in the Receiver's accounting and that arise from the Prospective Defendants' knowledge and assistance in the scheme (or expansion of the scheme). The Receiver, with the assistance of counsel, is evaluating these potential claims. If the Receiver believes it is in the best interests of the receivership estate to pursue such claims, she will file one or more further motions seeking authority to do so. These potential actions, although they would likely include Clawback Claims along with additional claims, involve factual and legal issues that are distinct from those involved in more straight-forward Clawback Claims based on Profit Amounts, and therefore are not intended to fall under this Motion or the settlement parameters proposed herein.

D. <u>Business Judgment</u>

As discussed above, the ultimate goal is to maximize the net recovery to the receivership estate. The Receiver will use her business judgment, including collectability assessment, at all times in pursuing Clawback Claims and remain focused on the ultimate goal. This may include seeking exceptions to the procedures and settlement parameters described above in rare circumstances where such exceptions are warranted. In the event these rare circumstances arise, the Receiver will seek permission from the Court to deviate from the proposed procedures and settlement parameters. The Receiver will also use her business judgment in managing the fees and costs associated with pursuing Clawback Claims. Of course, all fees and costs of the Receiver and her counsel are subject to review and approval by the Court through quarterly fee applications.

IV. ARGUMENT

A. Broad Equitable Powers of the Court

"The power of a district court to impose a receivership or grant other forms of ancillary relief does not in the first instance depend on a statutory grant of power

from the securities laws. Rather, the authority derives from the inherent power of a court of equity to fashion effective relief." SEC v. Wencke, 622 F.2d 1363, 1369 (9th Cir. 1980). The "primary purpose of equity receiverships is to promote orderly and efficient administration of the estate by the district court for the benefit of 4 creditors." SEC v. Hardy, 803 F.2d 1034, 1038 (9th Cir 1986). As the appointment 5 of a receiver is authorized by the broad equitable powers of the court, any 6 7 distribution of assets must also be done equitably and fairly. See SEC v. Elliot, 8 953 F.2d 1560, 1569 (11th Cir. 1992). 9 District courts have the broad power of a court of equity to determine the appropriate action in the administration and supervision of an equity receivership. 10 See SEC v. Capital Consultants, LLC, 397 F.3d 733, 738 (9th Cir. 2005). The Ninth 11 12 Circuit explained: A district court's power to supervise an equity receivership 13 and to determine the appropriate action to be taken in the administration of the receivership is extremely broad. The 14 district court has broad powers and wide discretion to determine the appropriate relief in an equity receivership. 15 The basis for this broad deference to the district court's supervisory role in equity receiverships arises out of the 16 fact that most receiverships involve multiple parties and complex transactions. A district court's decision 17 concerning the supervision of an equitable receivership is reviewed for abuse of discretion. 18 19 Id. (citations omitted); see also Commodities Futures Trading Comm'n. v. Topworth 20 *Int'l, Ltd.*, 205 F.3d 1107, 1115 (9th Cir. 1999) ("This court affords 'broad deference' 21 to the court's supervisory role, and 'we generally uphold reasonable procedures 22 instituted by the district court that serve th[e] purpose' of orderly and efficient administration of the receivership for the benefit of creditors."). Accordingly, the 23 Court has broad equitable powers and discretion in the administration of the 24 25 receivership estate. 26 27

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

902733.01/SD

-12-

28

LAW OFFICES

B. <u>Voidable Transfers Under the CUVTA²</u>; Receiver Standing

Under the CUVTA, a transfer is subject to avoidance and recovery when made with (1) actual intent to defraud or (2) constructive fraudulent intent based on the lack of reasonably equivalent value provided in exchange. Cal. Civ. Code § 3439.04(a). Federal equity receivers have standing to pursue fraudulent or voidable transfer claims on behalf of entities in receivership against the recipients of fraudulent transfers. *See Donell v. Kowell*, 533 F.3d 762, 776-777 (9th Cir. 2007).

C. The Ponzi Presumption

Actual intent to defraud is presumed when the payments were made from a Ponzi scheme. In re Cohen, 199 B.R. 709,717 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1996); see also Donell, 533 F.3d at 767; In re AFI Holding, Inc., 525 F.3d 700, 704 (9th Cir. 2008); In re Nat'l Consumer Mortgage, LLC, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5986 at *32-33 (D. Nev. 2013) ("Courts presume actual intent in relation to a Ponzi scheme because the debtor knows at the time of the transfer that the scheme ultimately must collapse."). Once fraudulent intent is established, the burden then lies with the transferee to show it took in good faith *and* provided equivalent value in exchange. *See* Cal. Civ. Code § 3439.08(a); *In re Cohen*, 199 B.R. at 718-719. It is the transferor's actual intent that matters – the transferee's intent does not matter unless it can also show it provided value in exchange for the transfer. *In re Cohen*, 199 B.R. at 716-717 ("The focus of the inquiry into actual intent is on the state of mind of the debtor."); In re Slatkin, 525 F.3d 805, 814 (9th Cir. 2008), holding that transferor's operation of a Ponzi scheme "with the actual intent to defraud his creditors conclusively establishes the debtor's fraudulent intent under 11 U.S.C. § 548(a)(1)(A) and California Civil Code § 3439.04(a)(1), and precludes relitigation of that issue").

LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

-13-

902733.01/SD -

² California Uniform Voidable Transactions Act. Cal. Civ. Code § 3439 et seq.

D. Profits and Referral Fees

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Payments made to Profiting Investors beyond the amount of their investment are not considered to be in exchange for value. *In re United Energy Corp.*, 944 F.2d 589, 595 n.6 (9th Cir. 1991) ("Such excess amounts would be avoidable because the debtor would not have received reasonably equivalent value for them."). This is because such profits are fictitious as "they do not represent a return on legitimate investment activity." *See In re Lake State Commodities, Inc.*, 253 B.R. 866, 872 (citing to *In re United Energy Corp., supra*, 944 F.2d at 595). Thus, the Ninth Circuit has adopted the "netting rule" whereby amounts paid to investors are netted against their investments. *See Donell v. Ghadrdan*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26393, *5 (C.D. Cal. 2013) (citing *Donell v. Kowell*, 533 F.3d at 771). Any excess in the form of fictitious profits are subject to disgorgement. *Id*.

As it relates to commissions or referral fees, courts deem these payments fraudulent transfers because generating investments for a Ponzi scheme provides no legitimate value to the enterprise. See *In re Randy*, 189 B.R. 425, 441 (Bankr.N.D.III.1995) (holding that commissions paid pursuant to a Ponzi scheme were fraudulent transfers because "the contract that underlies the transaction is illegal, and therefore no value could have been given by the transferee to the debtor for the transfer"); Klein v. Andres, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129744, 2013 WL 4809260, *2 (D.Utah 2013) (rejecting the argument "that payments made as compensation for drawing in new investors to a Ponzi scheme constitute an exchange of reasonably equivalent value"); In re Ramirez Rodriguez, 209 B.R. 424, 434 (Bankr.S.D.Tex. 1997) ("As a matter of law, the defendant gave no value to the debtors for the commissions attributable to investments made by others."); In re Int'l Loan Network, Inc., 160 B.R. 1, 16 (Bankr.D.D.C.1993) (defendants who enticed new investors into Ponzi scheme, even if they had a contract, conferred no value since such services were predicated upon an illegal agreement); Wing v. Dockstader, 482 Fed. Appx. 361, 2012 WL 2020666, *2 (10th Cir. 2012) (holding unlicensed

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

902733.01/SD -14-

security broker could not enforce his right to referral fees where such right was predicated upon an illegal contract). Indeed, "[i]t takes cheek to contend that in exchange for the payments he received, the . . . Ponzi scheme benefited from his efforts to extend the fraud by securing new investments." *Warfield v. Byron*, 436 F.3d 551, 560 (5th Cir. 2006). Therefore, for investor profits, referral fees, and commissions paid from a Ponzi scheme, the transferor's actual intent to defraud is presumed and there is no value provided in exchange.

E. Statute of Limitations and Statute of Repose

Under the CUVTA, a claim for recovery of a voidable or fraudulent transfer based on actual intent to defraud must be brought within four years of the transfer or within one year of when the transfer was or reasonably could have been discovered by the claimant. Cal. Civ. Code § 3439.09(a). Accordingly, claims to recover investor profits, referral fees, and commissions paid from a Ponzi scheme, for which actual intent to defraud is presumed, must be brought within four years of the transfer or one year of when the court-appointed receiver discovered them (generally through performing an accounting) or reasonably could have discovered them. *See Donell v. Mojtahedian*, 976 F.Supp.2d 1183, 1188-1189 (C.D. Cal. 2013) (rejecting argument that the one year limitations period from discovery begins to run immediately upon a receiver's appointment).

The CUVTA also contains a seven-year statute of repose which limits recoverable transfers to those that occurred within seven years of filing the complaint. *See* Cal. Civ. Code § 3439.09(c). Accordingly, the maximum "reach back" period for recoverable fraudulent transfers is seven years from the date a complaint is filed.

F. Pursuit of Clawback Claims

Here, recovering fraudulent or voidable transfers is very important to maximizing the funds in the receivership estate for distribution to victims of the scheme. The law is clear that the profits paid to investors, referral fees,

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

902733.01/SD -15-

commissions and other amounts transferred to insiders and third parties are recoverable by the Receiver. Equity demands that those who received profits and other financial gains from the Ponzi scheme be required to return those amounts for distribution to victims of the scheme, including Losing Investors.

Given the firm factual and legal basis for the Clawback Claims, the proposed settlement and case management procedures are tailored to provide a fair process for resolving them, while at the same time reducing the use of judicial and receivership estate resources. These procedures will provide Prospective Defendants with due process and allow the Receiver to act promptly and efficiently to maximize the net recovery from Clawback Claims.

G. Proposed Settlement Parameters

The Receiver's goal in formulating the proposed settlement parameters is to maximize the net recovery for the receivership estate by providing a sufficient incentive for Prospective Defendants at all Profit Amount levels to settle Clawback Claims promptly and without litigation. Litigation necessarily consumes resources of the receivership estate, as well as the Court, and although the Receiver believes the Clawback Claims are very strong, all litigation involves some measure of risk. The settlement parameters, however, should not allow for an outsized discount for those who received the largest sums of profits, referral fees, or other payments. Accordingly, the proposed settlement parameters include a graduated scale based on the Profit Amounts involved (*i.e.*, as the Profit Amount goes up, the settlement discount goes down). The Receiver believes this graduated scale balances the objectives in a reasonable and fair manner and will promote the efficient resolution of Clawback Claims. Freitag Decl., ¶ 3.

H. Proposed Fee Arrangement for Counsel

The Receiver has carefully considered whether the Clawback Claims should be pursued on a contingent fee basis, but believes the net recovery will be greater if counsel is paid on an hourly basis. The Receiver does not anticipate controversial

902733.01/SD -16-

issues of law or fact with the Clawback Claims, other than perhaps the accounting of 1 transfers. Because any issues surrounding the amount or timing of transfers would primarily involve work by the Receiver and her staff, rather than counsel, the anticipated time expended by counsel on any given Clawback Claim would not 4 necessarily support the amount of fees paid under a typical contingent fee 5 arrangement. Moreover, as noted above, in pursuing judgments and/or once 6 7 judgments are obtained, the Receiver will use her business judgment in pursuing 8 collection and managing the fees and costs associated therewith. Accordingly, the Receiver believes the net recovery for the receivership estate from Clawback Claims 9 10 will be greater if her counsel is compensated on an hourly basis, subject to Court approval, rather than on a contingent fee basis. Freitag Decl., ¶ 4. 11 V. 12 CONCLUSION 13 WHEREFORE, the Receiver requests authority to pursue Clawback Claims 14 and approval of the proposed procedures and settlement parameters for such claims 15 set forth above. 16 Dated: October 29, 2020 17 ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE MALLORY & NATSIS LLP 18 s/Edward G. Fates By: 19 DAVID R. ZARO EDWARD G. FATES 20 NORMAN M. ASPIS Attorneys for Receiver 21 KRISTÀ FREITAG 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

902733.01/SD -17-

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble

Mallory & Natsis LLP

EXHIBIT INDEX

EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
Exhibit A	Settlement & Release Agreement	19
Exhibit B	Stipulation for Entry of Judgment	24

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A

SETTLEMENT & RELEASE AGREEMENT

This SETTLEMENT & RELEASE AGREEMENT (" Agreement "), dated as of, 202 is made by and between KRISTA L. FREITAG (" Receiver "), in her
capacity as Court-appointed permanent receiver for ANI DEVELOPMENT, LLC, AMERICAN NATIONAL INVESTMENTS, INC., and their subsidiaries and affiliates ("Receivership Entities"), and [NAME], a/an ("Transferee").
RECITALS
A. On August 28, 2019, the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") filed a Complaint in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California ("District Court") against Defendants Gina Champion-Cain ("Champion-Cain") and ANI Development, Inc., and Relief Defendant American National Investments, Inc. Concurrently with filing the Complaint, the Commission and Champion-Cain filed a Joint Motion and Stipulated Request by All Parties for a Preliminary Injunction Order and Orders (1) Freezing Assets; (2) Requiring Accountings; (3) Prohibiting the Destruction of Documents; and (4) Appointing a Permanent Receiver ("Joint Motion").
B. On September 3, 2019, the District Court granted the Joint Motion and entered its Order; Granting the Parties Joint Motion and Stipulated Request by all Parties for a Preliminary Injunction Order and Order (1) Freezing Assets; (2) Requiring Accountings; (3) Prohibiting the Destruction of Documents; and (4) Appointing a Permanent Receiver, including appointment of the Receiver on a permanent basis.
C. The Receiver alleges that within the last seven years, Transferee received ("Profit Amount") from the Receivership Entities in excess of any amounts paid or value provided to the Receivership Entities ("Transfers"). The Receiver has asserted claims against Transferee for return of the Profit Amount as representing one or more voidable transactions under the California Uniform Voidable Transactions Act.
D. The Receiver and Transferee have agreed to settle and resolve all disputes, and release all claims arising from the Transfers from the Receivership Entities to Transferee, under the terms and conditions provided herein.
E. The District Court via its Order (Dkt No), has authorized the Receiver to enter into this Agreement.
AGREEMENT
NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the covenants and conditions hereinafter contained, and for other good and valuable consideration the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged the undersigned agree as follows:

Payment. By checking one of the two boxes below, Transferee selects, agrees,

and covenants to make payment(s) to the Receiver in accordance with the applicable terms

provided in the corresponding paragraph as follows:

2. <u>Mutual Release</u>. On the condition that all payments due under Section 1 above have been fully made and effective only upon satisfaction of such condition, the Receiver, on the one hand, and Transferee on the other hand, and each of them, for themselves, their agents, employees, partners, directors, officers, successors and assigns, forever, irrevocably and unconditionally release and discharge one another, and their respective officers, directors, representatives, heirs, executors, administrators, receivers, successors, assigns, predecessors, agents, attorneys and employees, of and from any and all claims, demands, debts, obligations, liabilities, costs, expenses, rights of action, causes of action, awards and judgments arising from the Transfers, all of which are hereinafter called, "**Released Claims**."

Each of the Receiver and Transferee acknowledges and agrees that the Released Claims may include claims of every nature and kind whatsoever, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected and further acknowledge that they may be presently unknown or unsuspected, and may be based upon hereafter discovered facts different from, or in addition to, those which they now know, or believe to be true. Nevertheless, the parties agree that the foregoing release shall be and remain effective in all respects, notwithstanding such different or additional facts, or the discovery thereof, and further hereby expressly waive and relinquish any and all rights provided in California Civil Code Section 1542 which provides as follows:

"A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO

EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY."

The Receiver and Transferee expressly waive and release any rights and benefits that they have or may have under any similar law or rule of any other jurisdiction pertaining to the matters released herein. It is the intention of the parties through this Agreement and with the advice of counsel to fully, finally and forever settle and release the claims and disputes existing between them as provided herein, known or unknown. The releases herein given shall be and remain in effect as full and complete releases of all such matters notwithstanding the discovery of any additional claims or facts relating thereto.

- 3. <u>Voluntary Signing</u>. Each of the parties to this Agreement has executed this Agreement without any duress or undue influence.
- 4. <u>Independent Counsel</u>. Each of the parties acknowledge and agree that it has been represented by independent counsel of its own choice throughout all negotiations which preceded the execution of this Agreement, that it has executed and approved of this Agreement after consultation with said counsel, and that it shall not deny the validity of this Agreement on the ground that such party did not have the advice of legal counsel.
- 5. <u>Governing Law and Venue</u>. This Agreement shall in all respects be interpreted, enforced, and governed by and under the laws of California, and Federal Equity Receivership law, and subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the District Court.
- 6. <u>Waiver/Amendment</u>. No breach of any provision of this Agreement can be waived unless in writing. Waiver of any one breach of any provision of this Agreement is not a waiver of any other breach of the same or of any other provision of this Agreement. Amendment of this Agreement may be made only by written agreement signed by the parties.
- 7. <u>Fax and Counterparts</u>. This Agreement may be executed by the parties hereto electronically and/or in counterparts and, if so executed, each electronic copy and/or counterpart shall have the full force and effect of an original.
- 8. <u>Attorneys' Fees and Costs</u>. The parties hereto shall each bear their own costs and attorneys' fees incurred in connection with the negotiation and documentation of this Agreement. If any proceeding, action, suit or claim is undertaken to interpret or enforce this Agreement, the prevailing party shall be entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in connection with such dispute.

9.	Notices.	Notices to be	e provided	hereunder	shall be ϵ	effective if	sent to the
following:							
To Transferee	: :						
							

To the Receiver:

Krista L. Freitag, Receiver c/o Allen Matkins 600 W. Broadway, 27th Floor San Diego, CA 92101 Attn: Ted Fates, Esq.

TRAN	ISFEREE:
By:	[NAME], a/an/its
	[11112], w www.
VDIC:	EAL EDELTAC COLUDE ADDOLNTED
	TAL. FREITAG, COURT-APPOINTED
	IANENT RECEIVER FOR ANI
	ELOPMENT, LLC, AMERICAN
	ONAL INVESTMENTS, INC., AND THEIR
SUBS	IDIARIES AND AFFILIATES
Bv:	

KRISTA L. FREITAG, Receiver

EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT B

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		9) DISTRICT COURT			
14	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
15					
17	KRISTA FREITAG, in her capacity as Court-appointed permanent receiver for ANI Development, LLC, American National Investments, Inc., and their subsidiaries and affiliates,	Case No. STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT			
19	Plaintiff,				
20	vs.				
21	[NAME], TRANSFEREE,				
22	Defendant.				
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP	1222962 01// A CTYPN II A THON FOR I	ENTEN OF HID CHENT			

1222863.01/LA

STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT

Krista Freitag ("Receiver"), the Court-appointed permanent receiver for Defendant ANI Development, LLC, Relief Defendant American National Investments, Inc., and their subsidiaries and affiliates (collectively, "Receivership Entities") pursuant to this Court's Order; Granting The Parties' Joint Motion And Stipulated Request By All Parties For A Preliminary Injunction Order And Order (1) Freezing Assets; (2) Requiring Accountings; (3) Prohibiting Destruction Of Documents; And (4) Appointing A Permanent Receiver (Dkt. No. 6) in the Securities and Exchange Commission enforcement action styled SEC v. Gina Champion-Cain and ANI Development, LLC, Defendants, and American National Investments, Inc., Relief Defendant, S.D. Cal. Case No. 3:19-cv-01628-LAB-AHG (the "Action"), and [NAME] ("Transferee") hereby agree and stipulate to the entry of judgment on the terms set forth herein.

WHEREAS, the Receiver was appointed as the federal equity receiver in the Action for the Receivership Entities;

WHEREAS, in connection with her accounting of transactions relating to the Receivership Entities, including her review and analysis of business and other records relating to the Receivership Entities, the Receiver determined that Transferee received a total of \$XX in payments (the "Profit Amount") from one or more of the Receivership Entities in excess of any investment in or other value provided to the Receivership Entities (collectively, the "Transfers");

WHEREAS, the Receiver and Transferee have reached a settlement in connection with the Profit Amount and Transfers, and entered into a written settlement agreement (the "Settlement Agreement") pursuant to which Transferee agreed to stipulate to judgment in the full Profit Amount, but also agreed to make certain discounted installment payments to the Receiver, which, if all installments payments were timely made via certified funds or wire transfer, would result in a

aside or overturn any judgment entered on this stipulation; and

28

1	6. The undersigned partie	s to this Stipulation for Entry of Judgment (the	
2	"Stipulation") have read the foregoing terms and provisions. The undersigned		
3	parties hereby acknowledge that they understand the foregoing terms and provisions		
4	of the Stipulation, their respective rights hereunder, and that the foregoing terms and		
5	provisions are hereby agreed to and accepted.		
6	IT IS SO STIPULATED.		
7	Dated:, 2020	ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE MALLORY & NATSIS LLP	
8		DAVID R. ZARO EDWARD G. FATES	
9		NORMAN M. ASPIS	
10		By:	
11		EDWARD G. FATES Attorneys for Receiver	
12		Attorneys for Receiver KRISTA FREITAG	
13			
14	Dated:, 2020	COUNSEL	
15			
16		By:	
17		Attorneys for Transferee	
18			
19	APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT.		
20			
21	Dated:, 2020	TRANSFEREE	
22		T.	
23		By:	
24		[2 \ 22 \ 22 \], \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	
25	Dated:, 2020	RECEIVER, KRISTA FREITAG	
26			
27		By: KRISTA FREITAG	
28		Court-appointed permanent receiver	
		-4-	
	12222863.01/LA STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT Exhibit B, Page 28		
	II		