1 2	DAVID R. ZARO (BAR NO. 124334) NORMAN M. ASPIS (BAR NO. 31346 ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE MALLORY & NATSIS LLP	56)
3	865 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800 Los Angeles, California 90017-2543	
4	Phone: (213) 622-5555	
5	Fax: (213) 620-8816 E-Mail: dzaro@allenmatkins.com	
6	naspis@allenmatkins.com	
7	EDWARD G. FATES (BAR NO. 2278) ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE	09)
8	MALLORY & NATSIS LLP One America Plaza	
9	600 West Broadway, 27th Floor San Diego, California 92101-0903 Phone: (619) 233-1155	
10	Phone: (619) 233-1155 Fax: (619) 233-1158 E-Mail: tfates@allenmatkins.com	
11	Attorneys for Receiver	
12	KRISTA FREITAG	
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
14	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
15		
16	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,	Case No. 3:19-cv-01628-LAB-AHG
17	Plaintiff,	
18	ŕ	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
19	V. CINA CIJAMDION CAIN and ANI	RECEIVER'S MOTION FOR
20	GINA CHAMPION-CAIN and ANI DEVELOPMENT, LLC,	APPROVAL OF SALE OF CAMINO DEGRAZIA PROPERTY
21	Defendants,	Date: December 30, 2020
22	AMERICAN NATIONAL	Time: 9:30 a.m. Courtroom: 3B
23	INVESTMENTS, INC.,	Mag. Judge: Hon. Allison H. Goddard
24	Relief Defendant.	
25		
26		
27		
28		
LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP		

904009.01/SD

1		TABLE OF CONTENTS
2		Page
3	I.	BACKGROUND FACTS
4	II.	PROPOSED SALE7
5	III.	LEGAL STANDARD7
6		A. The Court's Authority to Approve Sale8
7		B. 28 U.S.C. § 20019
8	IV.	DISCUSSION
9	V.	CONCLUSION
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

904009.01/SD -2-

1	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
2	Page(s)
3	Cosos
4	Cases Part Crowers Sugar Co. v. Columbia Trust Co.
5	Beet Growers Sugar Co. v. Columbia Trust Co. 3 F.2d 755 (9th Cir. 1925)9
6	Blakely Airport Joint Venture II v. Federal Sav. and Loan Ins. Corp. 678 F. Supp. 154 (N.D. Tex. 1988)9
7 8	Breeding Motor Freight Lines, Inc. v. Reconstruction Finance Corp. 172 F.2d 416 (10th Cir. 1949)10
9	CFTC. v. Topworth Int'l, Ltd. 205 F.3d 1107 (9th Cir. 1999)8
10	First Nat'l Bank v. Shedd
11	121 U.S. 74 (1887)
12	Gockstetter v. Williams 9 F.2d 354 (9th Cir. 1925)9
13 14	Miners' Bank of Wilkes-Barre v. Acker 66 F.2d 850 (2d Cir. 1933)8
15	Regions Bank v. Egyptian Concrete Co. 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 111381, at *8 (E.D. Mo. 2009)
16 17	SEC v. American Capital Invest., Inc. 98 F.3d 1133 (9th Cir. 1996)8
18	SEC v. Capital Consultants, LLC 397 F.3d 733 (9th Cir. 2005)
19	SEC v. Capital Cove Bancorp LLC 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 174856, at *13 (C.D. Cal. 2015)10
20	
21	SEC v. Elliot 953 F.2d 1560 (11th Cir. 1992)
22	SEC v. Goldfarb
23	2013 Ú.S. Dist. LEXIS 118942, at *5 (N.D. Cal. 2013)9
24	SEC v. Hardy 803 F.2d 1034 (9th Cir 1986)7
2526	SEC v. Kirkland 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 45353, at *5 (M.D. Fla. 2007)10
27	SEC v. Wencke
28	622 F.2d 1363 (9th Cir. 1980)7
amble	

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gambl
Mallory & Natsis LLP

904009.01/SD

-3-

1	$\underline{\mathbf{Page}(\mathbf{s})}$
2	<u>Statutes</u>
3	28 U.S.C. § 20019
4	28 U.S.C. § 2001(a)
5	28 U.S.C. § 2001(b)9
6	28 U.S.C. § 2002
7	<u>Treatises</u>
8	2 Ralph Ewing Clark, <u>Treatise on Law & Practice of Receivers</u> § 342
9	(3d ed. 1992)9
10	2 Ralph Ewing Clark, <u>Treatise on Law & Practice of Receivers</u> § 344 (3d ed. 1992)9
11	2 Ralph Ewing Clark, <u>Treatise on Law & Practice of Receivers</u> § 482
12	(3d ed. 1992)
13	2 Ralph Ewing Clark, <u>Treatise on Law & Practice of Receivers</u> § 482(a) (3d ed. 1992)9
14	2 Ralph Ewing Clark, <u>Treatise on Law & Practice of Receivers</u> § 487
15	(3d ed. 1992)
16	2 Ralph Ewing Clark, <u>Treatise on Law & Practice of Receivers</u> § 489 (3d ed. 1992)9
17	2 Ralph Ewing Clark, <u>Treatise on Law & Practice of Receivers</u> § 491
18	(3d ed. 1992)
19	2 Ralph Ewing Clark, <u>Treatise on Law & Practice of Receivers</u> § 500 (3d ed. 1992)
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
amble LP	

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble

Mallory & Natsis LLP

904009.01/SD

-4-

Krista Freitag ("Receiver"), the Court-appointed permanent receiver for Defendant ANI Development, LLC, Relief Defendant American National Investments, Inc., and their subsidiaries and affiliates ("Receivership Entities"), submits this Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of her concurrently-filed Motion for Approval of Sale of Camino Degrazia Property ("Motion").

I. BACKGROUND FACTS

One of the residential real properties included in the receivership estate is a condominium located at 7243 Camino Degrazia, San Diego, California, 92111 ("Camino Degrazia Property"). The Camino Degrazia Property is 1,046 square feet with two bedrooms and two bathrooms. The Camino Degrazia Property was purchased by Receivership Entity 2466 1st Avenue LLC on April 5, 2019 for \$460,000. Freitag Decl., ¶ 2.

Upon her appointment, the Receiver and her staff performed an analysis of the value of the Camino Degrazia Property, including a review of automated valuation scores for the property and a survey of the market comparable properties. The Receiver also consulted with multiple licensed brokers about the value of the property and terms of a potential listing agreement. Ultimately, the Receiver selected Resonate Real Estate ("Broker") and had the Camino Degrazia Property listed for sale at \$510,000. The property was rented to a former employee of the Receivership Entities, who moved out in March 2020. Freitag Decl., ¶ 3.

To market the Camino Degrazia Property, Broker listed the property on the local MLS and its website in April 2020. Through the MLS listing, the listing was also syndicated to many consumer websites like Realtor.com, Redfin, Zillow & Trulia. Post COVID-19, in compliance with guidance from the California Association of Realtors, 3D marketing and socially distant property tours were enforced. Due to the lack of buyer interest at higher prices, the list price was reduced periodically until it reached the range of \$450,000 - \$475,000. The broker coordinated dozens of showings and four offers were received. Through Broker, the

Receiver negotiated terms with the prospective buyers and the property went into escrow on or around October 12, 2020 with a purchase price of \$450,000 and a \$5,000 credit to the buyer, Dani J. Harelson ("Buyer"). Freitag Decl., ¶ 4.

The Camino Degrazia Property, along with two other remaining receivership estate assets, 1 is encumbered by a deed of trust in favor of Seattle Funding Group ("SFG"). The outstanding principal balance on the interest-only loan is \$692,000, and the loan is being paid current. Lender has agreed to extend the maturity date of this loan from December 1, 2020 to March 1, 2021 and a release price of 85% of the sales price or \$382,500, approximately 55% of the loan balance. Assuming the 7940 University Property closes first, the principal balance of the loan after the sale of the Camino Degrazia Property is expected to reduce to \$11,150 (\$1,100,000 less \$408,000 less \$298,350 less \$382,500). The remaining receivership asset encumbered by this loan has an estimated market value of \$399,000. Freitag Decl., ¶ 5.

Depending on when the sale closes (assuming a December 2020 closing), the amount required to pay down the loan will likely be in the range of approximately \$382,500 to \$387,500. Depending on when the sale closes (assuming a December 2020 closing after December 10th), a small credit for property taxes will be owed to the receivership estate. The Broker's commission pursuant to the listing agreement is 4% of the sale price, or \$18,000, which amount will be split with Buyer's broker. The costs of sale, including escrow, title and recording fees are estimated to be approximately \$2,250. Additionally, the Receiver has agreed to give the buyer a credit of \$5,000 towards closing costs. While exact amounts will be determined at closing, after all the aforementioned amounts are paid out of escrow, the net sale

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

This loan previously covered a total of four receivership estate assets, but one of the properties – the Bella Pacific property – was sold with Court approval and \$408,000 of the sale net proceeds were applied to pay down the principal balance of the loan.

proceeds for the receivership estate are estimated to be in the range of approximately 37,000 to 42,000. Freitag Decl., 6.

II. PROPOSED SALE

The key terms of the proposed California Residential Purchase Agreement and Joint Escrow Instructions, including Addendum thereto ("Agreement"), a copy of which is attached to the Freitag Declaration as Exhibit A, are summarized as follows:

Overbid and Court Approval. The sale is subject to qualified overbids pursuant to the public sale process laid out below and approval by the Court.

Purchase Price. The purchase price is \$450,000 - before application of a \$5,000 buyer credit - which amount will be financed.

Deposit. Buyer has deposited \$8,750 into escrow.

Closing Date. Closing shall occur upon entry of the Court order approving the sale.

III. <u>LEGAL STANDARD</u>

"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 creditors." *SEC v. Hardy*, 803 F.2d 1034, 1038 (9th Cir 1986). As the appointment of a receiver is authorized by the broad equitable powers of the court, any distribution of assets must also be done equitably and fairly. *See SEC v. Elliot*, 953 F.2d 1560, 1569 (11th Cir. 1992).

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. *See SEC v. Capital Consultants, LLC*, 397 F.3d 733, 738 (9th Cir. 2005). The Ninth Circuit explained:

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

904009.01/SD -7-

A district court's power to supervise an equity receivership and to determine the appropriate action to be taken in the administration of the receivership is extremely broad. The district court has broad powers and wide discretion to determine the appropriate relief in an equity receivership. The basis for this broad deference to the district court's supervisory role in equity receiverships arises out of the fact that most receiverships involve multiple parties and complex transactions. A district court's decision concerning the supervision of an equitable receivership is reviewed for abuse of discretion.

Id. (citations omitted); see also CFTC. v. Topworth Int'l, Ltd., 205 F.3d 1107, 1115 (9th Cir. 1999) ("This court affords 'broad deference' to the court's supervisory role, and 'we generally uphold reasonable procedures 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 Court has broad discretion in the administration of the receivership estate and the disposition of receivership assets.

A. The Court's Authority to Approve Sale

It is widely accepted that a court of equity having custody and control of property has power to order a sale of the same in its discretion. *See, e.g., SEC v. Elliott,* 953 F.2d 1560, 1566 (11th Cir. 1992) (the District Court has broad powers and wide discretion to determine relief in an equity receivership). "The power of sale necessarily follows the power to take possession and control of and to preserve property." *See SEC v. American Capital Invest., Inc.*, 98 F.3d 1133, 1144 (9th Cir. 1996), *cert. denied* 520 U.S. 1185 (decision abrogated on other grounds) (*citing* 2 Ralph Ewing Clark, Treatise on Law & Practice of Receivers § 482 (3d ed. 1992) (citing *First Nat'l Bank v. Shedd,* 121 U.S. 74, 87 (1887)). "When a court of equity orders property in its custody to be sold, the court itself as vendor confirms the title in the purchaser." 2 Ralph Ewing Clark, Treatise on Law & Practice of Receivers § 487 (3d ed. 1992).

"A court of equity, under proper circumstances, has the power to order a receiver to sell property free and clear of all encumbrances." *Miners' Bank of Wilkes-Barre v. Acker*, 66 F.2d 850, 853 (2d Cir. 1933). *See also*, 2 Ralph Ewing

1 Clark, Treatise on Law & Practice of Receivers § 500 (3d ed. 1992). To that end, a

2 | federal court is not limited or deprived of any of its equity powers by state statute.

Bleet Growers Sugar Co. v. Columbia Trust Co., 3 F.2d 755, 757 (9th Cir. 1925)

(state statute allowing time to redeem property after a foreclosure sale not applicable

5 | in a receivership sale).

Generally, when a court-appointed receiver is involved, the receiver, as agent for the court, should conduct the sale of the receivership property. *Blakely Airport Joint Venture II v. Federal Sav. and Loan Ins. Corp.*, 678 F. Supp. 154, 156 (N.D. Tex. 1988). The receiver's sale conveys "good" equitable title enforced by an injunction against the owner and against parties to the suit. *See* 2 Ralph Ewing Clark, Treatise on Law & Practice of Receivers §§ 342, 344, 482(a), 487, 489, 491 (3d ed. 1992). "In authorizing the sale of property by receivers, courts of equity are vested with broad discretion as to price and terms." *Gockstetter v. Williams*, 9 F.2d 354, 357 (9th Cir. 1925).

B. 28 U.S.C. § 2001

Specific requirements are imposed by 28 U.S.C. § 2001 for public sales of real property under subsection (a) and specific requirements for private sales of real property under subsection (b). Although both involve significant cost and delay, the cost and delay of a public sale are significantly less than those for a private sale. *SEC v. Goldfarb*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118942, at *5 (N.D. Cal. 2013) ("Section 2001 sets out two possible courses of action: (1) property may be sold in public sale; or (2) property may be sold in a private sale, provided that three separate appraisals have been conducted, the terms are published in a circulated newspaper ten days prior to sale, and the sale price is no less than two-thirds of the valued price."). Therefore, by proceeding under Section 2001(a), the receivership estate can avoid the significant costs and delay of (a) the Court having to appoint three disinterested appraisers, and (b) obtaining three appraisals from such appraisers.

904009.01/SD

-9-

The requirements of a public sale under Section 2001(a) are that notice of the sale be published as proscribed by Section 2002 and a public auction be held at the courthouse "as the court directs." 28 U.S.C. § 2001(a); SEC v. Capital Cove Bancorp LLC, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 174856, at *13 (C.D. Cal. 2015); SEC v. Kirkland, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 45353, at *5 (M.D. Fla. 2007). In terms of publication of notice, Section 2002 provides: A public sale of realty or interest therein under any order, judgment or decree of any court of the United States shall not be made without notice published once a week for at least four weeks prior to the sale in at least one newspaper regularly issued and of general circulation in the county, state, or judicial district of the United States wherein the realty is situated. If such realty is situated in more than one county, state, district or circuit, such notice shall be published in one or more of the counties, states, or districts wherein it is situated, as the court directs. The notice shall be substantially in such form and contain such description of the property by reference or otherwise as the court approves. The court may direct that the publication be made in other newspapers. This section shall not apply to sales and proceedings under Title 11 or by receivers or conservators of banks appointed by the Comptroller of the Currency. The notice of sale is sufficient if it describes the property and the time, place, and terms of sale. Breeding Motor Freight Lines, Inc. v. Reconstruction Finance *Corp.*, 172 F.2d 416, 422 (10th Cir. 1949). The Court may limit the auction to qualified bidders, who "(i) submit to the Receiver . . . in writing a bona fide and binding offer to purchase the [property]; and (ii) demonstrate . . ., to the satisfaction of the Receiver, that it has the current ability to consummate the purchase of the [property] per the agreed terms." Regions Bank v. Egyptian Concrete Co., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 111381, at *8 (E.D. Mo. 2009). IV. **DISCUSSION** The Receiver believes the proposed sale to Buyer pursuant to the Agreement is

in the best interests of the receivership estate. The Camino Degrazia Property was

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

904009.01/SD -10-

listed on the MLS with a licensed broker and shown to interested parties since April 2020. The property was properly marketed, four offers were received, highest and best terms negotiated, and the Agreement signed. The purchase price is fair and reasonable and reflects the market value of the property. Freitag Decl., ¶ 7.

Moreover, the proposed sale is subject to overbid to further ensure the highest and best price is obtained. The Receiver proposes to conduct a public auction consistent with the requirements of Section 2001(a). Specifically, the Receiver will publish the following notice of the sale once a week for four weeks in the San Diego Union-Tribune, a newspaper of general circulation in San Diego County:

In the action pending in U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California, Case No. 19-CV-01628-LAB-AHG, Securities and Exchange Commission v. Gina Champion-Cain, et al., notice is hereby given that the court-appointed receiver will conduct a public auction for the real property located at 7243 Camino Degrazia in San Diego County, California. Sale is subject to Court confirmation after the auction is held. Minimum bid price is at least \$455,000. The auction will take place on December 4, 2020, at 1:30 p.m. in front of the entrance to the United States Courthouse, 221 W. Broadway, San Diego, California or as otherwise determined by the Court. To be allowed to participate in the auction, prospective purchasers must meet certain bid qualification requirements, including submitting a signed purchase and sale agreement, an earnest money deposit of \$9,625, and proof of funds. All bidders must be qualified by 5:00 p.m. PT on November 30, 2020, by submitting the required materials to the receiver at 501 West Broadway, Suite 290, San Diego, California, 92101. If interested in qualifying as a bidder, please contact Geno Rodriguez at (619) 567-7223 or grodriguez@ethreeadvisors.com.

In order to conduct an orderly auction and provide sufficient time for the publication of notices discussed above, the Receiver will require bidders to complete the above steps by November 30, 2020 ("Bid Qualification Deadline") and conduct the live public auction on December 4, 2020.

The Receiver will inform all interested persons of the opportunity to overbid at the public auction, provided they qualify themselves to bid by the Bid Qualification Deadline by (a) signing a purchase and sale agreement for the properties on the same

terms and conditions as Buyer, but with a purchase price of at least \$455,000, 1 2 (b) providing the Receiver with an earnest money deposit of \$9,625, and 3 (c) providing proof of funds necessary to close the sale transaction in the form of a current bank statement, cashier's check delivered to the Receiver, or other evidence 4 deemed sufficient by the Receiver. 5 6 In the event one or more prospective purchasers qualify themselves to bid, the 7 auction will be conducted by the Receiver as noted above and bids will be allowed in 8 increments of at least \$1,000. The Receiver will then file a notice advising the Court 9 of the result of the auction (i.e., the highest bid) and seek entry of an order confirming the sale. Earnest money deposits provided by bidders who are 10 unsuccessful will be promptly returned to them. In the event no prospective 11 12 purchasers qualify themselves to bid by the Bid Qualification Deadline, the Receiver will notify the Court and seek entry of an order approving the sale to Buyer. 13 V. 14 CONCLUSION 15 For the reasons discussed above, the Receiver requests (a) approval of the sale of the Camino Degrazia Property to Buyer (or Buyer's designee) pursuant to the 16 17 Agreement attached to the Freitag Declaration as Exhibit A, and (b) authority to take 18 all steps necessary to close the sale, with the net sale proceeds after all third-party 19 payments are made from escrow going to the receivership estate. 20 Dated: November 10, 2020 ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE 21 MALLORY & NATSIS LLP 22 By: s/Edward G. Fates 23 DAVID R. ZARO EDWARD G. FATES 24 NORMAN M. ASPIS Attorneys for Receiver 25 KRISTÅ FREITAG 26

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

27

28

904009.01/SD -12-