DOUGLAS M. MILLER (Cal. Bar No. 240398) 1 Email: millerdou@sec.gov DAVID S. BROWN (Căl. Bar No. 134569) 2 Email: browndav@sec.gov 3 Attorneys for Plaintiff 4 Securities and Exchange Commission 5 Joseph G. Sansone, Unit Chief (Market Abuse Unit) New York Regional Office 200 Vesey Street, Suite 400 New York, New York 10281 6 7 Kristina Littman, Unit Chief (Cyber Unit) 8 Headquarters 100 F Street, N.E. 9 Washington, District of Columbia 20549 10 Michele Wein Layne, Regional Director Amy J. Longo, Regional Trial Counsel 11 444 S. Flower Street, Suite 900 Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (323) 965-3998 Facsimile: (213) 443-1904 12 13 14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 15 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 16 **Western Division** 17 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE Case No. 2:18-cv-04315-DSF-JPR 18 COMMISSION, PLAINTIFF SECURITIES AND 19 **EXCHANGE COMMISSION'S NON-**Plaintiff, OPPOSITION TO SECOND INTERIM 20 FEE APPLICATION OF HOLLAND VS. & KNIGHT, LLP, AS COUNSEL TO RECEIVER, FOR ALLOWANCE OF 21 TITANIUM BLOCKCHAIN **COMPENSÁTION AND** INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES. 22 INC.; EHI INTERNETWORK AND **REIMBURSEMENT OF (Dkt. No. 103)** SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT, INC. 23 aka EHI-INSM, INC.; and MICHAEL September 13, 2021 Date: ALAN STOLLERY aka MICHAEL 1:30 p.m. Time: 24 STOLLAIRE, Place: Courtroom 7D Hon. Dales S. Fischer Judge: 25 Defendants. 26 27

28

## I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") does not oppose the Second Interim Fee Application of Holland & Knight, LLP ("Holland & Knight"), as Counsel to Receiver, for Allowance of Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses. (Dkt. No. 103.) After careful review, the work and fees appear to have been reasonable and necessary to the management of the receivership estate.

## II. LEGAL DISCUSSION

## A. The Court Has Discretion To Award Interim And Final Fees

The determination of the amount to be awarded to a receiver and his professionals is in the district court's sound discretion and should be "reasonable under the circumstances." In re Washington Public Power Supply Systems ("WPPSS") Sec. Litig., 19 F.3d 1291, 1296 (9th Cir.1994); In re San Vicente Medical Partners, Ltd., 962 F.2d 1402, 1409 (9th Cir. 1992) (trial court has discretion to determine reasonable compensation for receiver); SEC v. Byers, 590 F. Supp. 2d 637, 644 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) (same); SEC v. Striker Petroleum, LLC, Case No. 09-cv-2304-D, 2012 WL 685333, at \*2 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 2, 2012) ("The award of fees in a receivership is entrusted to the discretion of the district court.").

In general, a reasonable fee is assessed based on all circumstances surrounding the receivership. As the Supreme Court stated:

The compensation is usually determined according to the circumstances of the particular case, and corresponds with the degree of responsibility and business ability required in the management of the affairs intrusted to him, and the perplexity and difficulty involved in that management.

Stuart v. Boulware, 133 U.S. 78, 82 (1890). See also SEC v. Northshore Asset Mgmt., Case No. 05-civ-2192, 2009 WL 3122608, at \*3 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 29, 2009) (court may consider all factors involved in receivership including complexity of problems faced, benefits to receivership estate, quality of work performed, and time records presented (citations omitted)).

It is well established that not only the amount, but also the timing, of any award

of fees and expenses to a court-appointed receiver and the professionals employed by 1 2 the receiver are within the Court's sound discretion. See Drilling & Exploration Corp. 3 v. Webster, 69 F.2d 416, 418 (9th Cir. 1934). An award of interim fees may be 4 appropriate where a receiver or the professionals employed by the receiver "regularly 5 devote[] a portion of his time, either daily or weekly, to the administration of the estate[.]" In Re McGann Mfg. Co., 188 F.2d 110, 112 (3d Cir. 1951) (interim fees to 6 7 bankruptcy trustee or his counsel); see also In re Alpha Telcom, Inc., No. CV 01-1283-PA, 2006 WL 3085616, at \*3 (D. Ore. Oct. 27, 2006). Moreover, an award of 8 9 interim fees should be at a reduced rate below any final allowance. McGann, 188 F.2d 10 at 112; Lutheran Hospitals and Homes Society of America v. Duecy, 422 F.2d 200 (9th 11 Cir. 1970). As the Third Circuit recognized: Even where hardship . . . requires the award of interim fees, the allowances granted should be 'well below any possible final allowances,' both because 'overly generous' awards might encourage procrastination and because it is only at the conclusion of a 12 13 reorganization that the value of the services can be appropriately 14 measured. 15 In Re Imperial "400" National, Inc., 432 F.2d 232, 235 (3d Cir. 1970) (citing 16 17 *McGann*, 188 F.2d at 112). 18 Thus, the Court has discretion to make an interim fee award, in an amount it 19 deems appropriate, where a receiver and their professionals devote a substantial 20 amount of time to a case that may take some time to resolve. 21 III. **CONCLUSION** 22 The SEC does not oppose the interim payment of fees in this case, and supports 23 the request made in the Second Interim Fee Application of Holland & Knight. 24 Dated: August 17, 2021 Respectfully submitted, 25 /s/ Douglas M. Miller 26 Douglas M. Miller 27 Attorney for Plaintiff Securities and Exchange Commission

28

PROOF OF SERVICE 1 I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to this action. My business address is: 2 3 U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, 444 S. Flower Street, Suite 900, Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone No. (323) 965-3998; Facsimile No. (213) 443-1904. 4 5 On August 17, 2021, I caused to be served the document entitled **PLAINTIFF** SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION'S RESPONSE TO SECOND INTERIM FEE APPLICATION OF HOLLAND & KNIGHT, LLP, AS COUNSEL TO RECEIVER, FOR ALLOWANCE OF COMPENSATION AND 6 REIMBURSEMENT OF (Dkt. No. 103) on all the parties to this action addressed 7 as stated on the attached service list: 8 **OFFICE MAIL:** By placing in sealed envelope(s), which I placed for collection and mailing today following ordinary business practices. I am readily 9 familiar with this agency's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing; such correspondence would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on 10 the same day in the ordinary course of business. 11 ☐ PERSONAL DEPOSIT IN MAIL: By placing in sealed envelope(s), which I personally deposited with the U.S. Postal Service. Each such envelope was 12 deposited with the U.S. Postal Service at Los Angeles, California, with first class 13 postage thereon fully prepaid. **EXPRESS U.S. MAIL:** Each such envelope was deposited in a facility 14 regularly maintained at the U.S. Postal Service for receipt of Express Mail at Los 15 Angeles, California, with Express Mail postage paid. **HAND DELIVERY:** I caused to be hand delivered each such envelope to the 16 office of the addressee as stated on the attached service list. 17 UNITED PARCEL SERVICE: By placing in sealed envelope(s) designated by United Parcel Service ("UPS") with delivery fees paid or provided for, which I 18 deposited in a facility regularly maintained by UPS or delivered to a UPS courier, at Los Angeles, California. 19 **ELECTRONIC MAIL:** By transmitting the document by electronic mail to 20 the electronic mail address as stated on the attached service list. 21 **E-FILING:** By causing the document to be electronically filed via the Court's CM/ECF system, which effects electronic service on counsel who are registered with 22 the CM/ECF system. 23 **FAX:** By transmitting the document by facsimile transmission. The 24 transmission was reported as complete and without error. 25 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. 26 Date: August 17, 2021 /s/ Douglas M. Miller 27 Douglas M. Miller 28

SEC v. Titanium Blockchain Infrastructure Services, Inc., et al. United States District Court – Central District of California Case No. 2:18-cv-04315-DSF-JPR SERVICE LIST Andrew B. Holmes, Esq. (served by CM/ECF only) Patrick V. Chesney, Esq. (served by CM/ECF only) HOLMES, TAYLOR, SCOTT & JONES LLP The Oviatt Building 617 S. Olive Street, Suite 1200 Los Angeles, CA 90014
Email: abholmes@htsjlaw.com
Email: patrick.chesney@htsjlaw.com Attorney for Defendants Titanium Blockchain Infrastructure Services, Inc.; EHI Internetwork and Systems Management, Inc. aka EHI-INSM, Inc.; and Michael Alan Stollery aka Michael Stollaire Vince Farhat, Esq. (served by CM/ECF only) Kristina S. Azlin, Esq. (served by CM/ECF only) Holland & Knight LLF 400 S. Hope Street, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 Email: vince.farhat@hklaw.com Email: Kristina.azlin@hklaw.com Attorneys for Court-Appointed Receiver, Josias Dewey