

1 SANDRA W. LAVIGNA, Cal. Bar No. 117965
E-mail: lavignas@sec.gov
2 SARA D. KALIN, Cal. Bar No. 212156
E-mail: kalins@sec.gov

3 Attorneys for
4 U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
Rosalind R. Tyson, Regional Director
5 Michele W. Layne, Associate Regional Director
John W. Berry, Regional Trial Counsel
6 5670 Wilshire Boulevard, 11th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90036-3648
7 Telephone: (323) 965-3998
Facsimile: (323) 965-3908

8
9 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**
10 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

11 In re)

12 AMERICAN PACIFIC FINANCIAL)
13 CORPORATION,)

14 Debtor.)

Case No. BK-S-10-27855-BAM

Chapter 11

15)
16) **MOTION OF U.S. SECURITIES AND**
17) **EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR**
18) **PROTECTIVE ORDER**

19) Date:

) Time:

) Place: Foley Federal Building
) Courtroom 3
) 300 Las Vegas Blvd. South
) Las Vegas, NV 89101

20 **TO THE HONORABLE BRUCE A. MARKELL, UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE:**

21 The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission"), under Rule 26(c) of
22 the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and Rules 7026 and 9014 of the Federal Rules of
23 Bankruptcy Procedure, hereby moves the Court for the entry of a protective order preventing the
24 discovery served on the Commission by the Debtor, American Pacific Financial Corporation.

25 This Motion for Protective Order is based upon the following Memorandum of Points
26 and Authorities and the accompanying Declaration of Sara D. Kalin, staff attorney and counsel
27 for the Commission. Counsel for the parties have met and conferred in advance of the filing of
28 this Motion, and at the request of Debtor's counsel, a hearing on shortened time has been sought.

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

3 **The Commission's Ongoing, Non-Public Investigation of the Debtor**

4 The Debtor commenced this Chapter 11 case on September 21, 2010 with the filing of a
5 voluntary petition for Chapter 11 bankruptcy relief. On March 19, 2011, the Office of the United
6 States Trustee (the "U.S. Trustee") filed a motion to appoint a trustee, and on May 15, 2011,
7 Christopher R. Barclay (the "Trustee") was appointed as the Chapter 11 Trustee in this case.

8 Meanwhile, the Commission filed a proof of claim on March 1, 2011. *See* Commission's
9 Proof of Claim, filed March 1, 2011 (Claim No. 98). At the time, the Commission had
10 conducted a preliminary investigation of certain pre-petition transactions involving the Debtor.
11 That investigation is a non-public investigation, and is continuing to this day. The Commission
12 may ultimately file a civil enforcement action that may result in a judgment against the Debtor,
13 and thus filed its proof of claim to preserve any relief to which it may be entitled in this
14 proceeding. The Commission has no intention of revealing the results of this ongoing
15 investigation. *See* Declaration of Sara D. Kalin ("Kalin Decl.") at ¶ 2.

16 **The Commission's Statement in Support of the Trustee's**
17 **Motion to Convert the Case to Chapter 7 Liquidation**

18 The Commission is a statutory party-in-interest in this proceeding under Section 1109(a)
19 of the Bankruptcy Code. *See* 11 U.S.C. § 1109(a) ("The Securities and Exchange Commission
20 may raise and may appear and be heard on any issue in a case under this chapter"). In
21 addition, because the Commission has filed a proof of claim, it is also a party-in-interest under
22 Section 1109(b). Therefore, the Commission "may raise and may appear and be heard on *any*
23 issue" in this case. *Id.* § 1109(b) (emphasis added).

24 The Trustee recently filed a motion to convert this case into a Chapter 7 liquidation on
25 December 9, 2011 (the "Motion to Convert"). *See* Dkt. No. 446. In support of that motion, the
26 Trustee relied upon a second status report submitted by the Trustee on December 5, 2011, and
27 two Trustee declarations. *See* Dkt. Nos. 435, 435-1 and 447. The Motion to Convert is currently
28 scheduled to be heard on January 4, 2012.

1 Having the statutory right to be heard, the Commission has expressed its full support for
2 the Motion to Convert. On December 16, 2011, the Commission filed a Statement in Support of
3 the Chapter 11 Trustee's Motion to Convert Case from Chapter 11 to Chapter 7 (the "Statement
4 in Support"). *See* Dkt. No. 467. The *sole* purpose of this Statement in Support is to demonstrate
5 the Commission's endorsement of the Trustee's Motion to Convert and a conversion to Chapter
6 7 liquidation. *See id.* at 2:7-10.¹

7 The Commission's Statement in Support relies exclusively on the evidence gathered and
8 publicly presented to the Court by the Trustee and the U.S. Trustee. *See id.* at 2:17-23, 3:1-5:14.
9 For example, in its Statement in Support, the Commission explains that it believes that the
10 Trustee's and the U.S. Trustee's evidence suggests that the Debtor may have been grossly
11 mismanaged and may have engaged in fraud. *See id.* at 3:9-12. In describing the type of fraud
12 the Commission believes this evidence shows may have occurred, the Commission cites
13 specifically to the supporting papers of both the Trustee or the U.S. Trustee. *See, e.g., id.* at 4:4-
14 9 (noting "evidence gathered by Trustee suggests that the Debtor, under the control of Polhill,
15 also may have engaged in tax fraud," and citing Dkt. No. 435-1, Trustee's declaration, Second
16 Status Report at ¶ 20).

17 **The Debtor's Objection to the Commission's Statement in Support**

18 The Debtor, not surprisingly, does not agree with the Commission's view of the evidence
19 presented by the Trustee and the U.S. Trustee. Shortly after the Statement in Support was filed,
20 Ms. Kaaran Thomas, Debtor's counsel, contacted Commission counsel and demanded that the
21 Commission withdraw its Statement in Support. *See* Kalin Decl. at ¶ 4. Counsel for the Debtor
22 contended that the pleading was improper because the Commission allegedly based its Statement
23 in Support on evidence obtained in the Commission's on-going and non-public investigation.
24 *See id.* The Commission staff attorney clarified and confirmed for Debtor's counsel what the

25 ¹ The Commission has filed similar statements of support in the past. For example, when
26 the U.S. Trustee sought the appointment of a Chapter 11 trustee, the Commission expressly
27 endorsed the U.S. Trustee's motion. In support of the motion, the U.S. Trustee filed declarations
28 outlining multiple misrepresentations and omissions that had been made to investors by the
Debtor, Larry Polhill and other Debtor employees. *See* Dkt. No. 233. Based on these
evidentiary findings presented by the U.S. Trustee, the Commission filed a statement joining and
supporting the U.S. Trustee's motion. *See* Dkt. No. 246.

1 Statement in Support already stated – that the Commission supports the Trustee’s Motion to
2 Convert and that support is based wholly on the evidence gathered and presented by the Trustee
3 and the U.S. Trustee. *See id.*

4 Despite this confirmation, later that day, the Debtor filed *ex parte* papers with this Court
5 requesting a hearing to “consider the procedures which should govern” the Commission’s
6 Statement in Support. Dkt. No. 468 at ¶ 7. The Debtor argues that the Commission should be
7 forced to withdraw its pleading or instead file a “simple non-speaking ‘Joinder’” because the
8 Statement in Support contains “allegations” and other “incendiary statements” which “imply”
9 that the Commission “independently investigated . . . the Trustee’s conclusions” in the Trustee’s
10 Motion to Convert. *Id.* ¶¶ 2-3, 5.

11 The Commission filed its response to this request on December 21, 2011, confirming that
12 the Statement in Support is not based on anything other than the Trustee’s and the U.S. Trustee’s
13 evidentiary findings. *See* Dkt. No. 481.

14 **The Debtor’s Discovery Requests**

15 Meanwhile, on the afternoon of December 16, 2011, the Debtor served document
16 requests and interrogatories on the Commission. *See id.* ¶ 5, Exs. A, B. The Debtor’s seven
17 interrogatories ask the Commission to identify “each fact that led to [the Commission’s]
18 agreement with the Trustee’s allegations.” *See id.* Ex. A at 2-3. In turn, seven of the ten
19 document requests seek “[a]ll Documents that [e]vidence or support” the Commission’s response
20 to these interrogatories. *See id.* Ex. B at 4 (doc. request nos. 4-10). The other three document
21 requests seek all of the Commission’s communications with the Trustee and any creditor for the
22 past twelve months. *See id.* (doc. request nos. 1-3).

23 Later, during a December 20, 2011 telephonic conference call with various parties
24 discussing discovery-related issues regarding the Motion to Convert, counsel for the Commission
25 informed Debtor’s counsel that a Commission staff attorney would attend the upcoming
26 depositions of Mr. Polhill and Marilyn Donegan. *See id.* at ¶ 6. Upon hearing this, Debtor’s
27 counsel informed Commission counsel that the Debtor would also be serving the Commission
28 with a notice of deposition. *See id.* That notice was delivered the next day. *See id.* ¶ 6, Ex. C.

1 The Debtor's notice of deposition on the Commission seeks two depositions – the
2 deposition of the Commission "custodian of record" and the deposition of a Commission
3 attorney "most knowledgeable" of the delineated topics in the notice. *See id.* Ex. C. These
4 topics include the "SEC's investigation leading to the assertions made in the SEC Pleading," the
5 "facts supporting the assertions made in the SEC Pleading," and communications with the
6 Trustee, the Creditors' Committee and any creditors in this case. *Id.* at p. 2 of attachment.

7 The deposition notice also calls for the production of document in addition to those
8 requested in the earlier document requests. *See id.* at p. 1 of attachment. The document requests
9 seek, among other things, "all transcripts of testimony taken by the SEC" and "all notes of off-
10 the-record interviews the SEC has conducted." *Id.* They also request documents relating to
11 various assertions in the Commission's Statement in Support, and communications with the
12 Trustee and any creditors in this case. *See id.*

13 **Meet and Confer Efforts**

14 The Commission has informed Debtor's counsel that it does not believe that these
15 discovery requests are warranted. On December 21, 2011, making a good faith attempt to confer
16 with the Debtor and resolve this dispute without having to involve the Court, the Commission
17 staff spoke with Debtor's counsel. *See id.* ¶ 7. The Commission staff reiterated its position that
18 the Statement in Support relies only on evidence presented by the Trustee and U.S. Trustee, and
19 not on the independent investigation of the Commission. *See id.* ¶ 8. Because the parties did not
20 come to an agreement on the call, the Commission staff informed Debtor's counsel that it
21 intended to file the instant motion. *See id.* ¶ 9. At the Debtor's request, the Commission is
22 simultaneously filing with this motion a request to have the motion heard on shortened time.

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28

1 **ARGUMENT**

2 The Debtor's discovery requests served on the Commission in connection with the
3 Commission's Statement in Support of the Trustee's Motion to Convert are unfounded and
4 burdensome harassment, and seek the production of privileged and work product protected
5 materials related to the Commission's ongoing but non-public law enforcement investigation of
6 the Debtor and related persons. The Commission should not have to respond to them, and
7 respectfully requests that the Court enter a protective order barring this discovery.

8 **I. THE DEBTOR'S DISCOVERY REQUESTS ARE UNJUSTIFIED, SEEK**
9 **IRRELEVANT INFORMATION AND IMPOSE AN UNDUE BURDEN ON THE**
10 **COMMISSION**

11 Under Rule 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which governs discovery in
12 this contested hearing, a party may ask the Court "for good cause" to "issue an order to protect a
13 party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense." FED.
14 R. CIV. P. 26(c); *see also* FED. R. BANKR. P. 7026, 9014. Rule 26(c) "was enacted as a safeguard
15 for the protection of parties and witnesses in view of the broad discovery rights authorized in
16 Rule 26(b)." *U.S. v. Columbia Broadcasting Sys., Inc.*, 666 F.2d 364, 368-69 (9th Cir. 1982).

17 Thus, protective orders limiting or barring discovery may be granted if the discovery sought is:

18 unreasonably cumulative or duplicative, or is obtainable from some other
19 source that is more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive, or that
20 the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely
21 benefit, taking into account the needs of the case, the amount in
22 controversy, the parties' resources, the importance of the issues at stake in
23 the litigation, and the importance of the proposed discovery in resolving
24 the issues.

25 *G.K. Las Vegas Ltd. P'ship v. Simon Property Group, Inc.*, 2007 WL 119148, at *4 (D. Nev. Jan.
26 9, 2007); *see also Moon v. SCP Pool Corp.*, 232 F.R.D. 633, 637 (C.D. Cal. 2005) (quoting
27 *Travelers Indem. Co. v. Metro. Life Insur. Co.*, 228 F.R.D. 111, 113 (D. Conn. 2005)) (courts
28 balance six factors to determine whether discovery constitutes "undue burden:" (1) the relevance
of the information requested; (2) the need of the party for production; (3) the breadth of the
request for production; (4) the time period covered by the request; (5) the particularity with

1 which the request describes the requested production; and (6) the burden imposed); Moore's
2 Federal Practice § 45.32 (3d ed. 2008).

3 Here, the Debtor's discovery requests easily fit within this type of unwarranted discovery
4 for which protective orders are intended to prevent.

5 As a threshold matter, the Debtor is expressly seeking this discovery on a false premise.
6 It contends that the Commission has supported the Trustee's Motion to Convert on the basis of
7 the Commission's own, independent investigation. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. No. 468, Debtor's *Ex Parte*
8 Request for Hearing, at ¶¶ 3-4. However, as the Commission staff has repeatedly made clear to
9 Debtor's counsel, and as made clear in the Statement in Support, in the Commission's Response
10 to the Debtor's request for an expedited hearing and again in this instant motion, the
11 Commission's Statement in Support is based *only* on the Trustee and the U.S. Trustee's findings.
12 The Commission's stated positions with respect to Chapter 7 conversion has nothing to do with
13 the Commission's non-public, ongoing law enforcement investigation of the Debtor and related
14 persons. The Debtor's efforts to pierce into that privileged investigation is a fishing expedition
15 that should not be allowed. *See Rivera v. NIBCO, Inc.*, 364 F.3d 1057, 1072 (9th Cir. 2004)
16 (courts "need not condone the use of discovery to engage in 'fishing expedition[s]"); *In re*
17 *Goodwin*, 194 B.R. 214, 226 (9th Cir. 1996) (affirming bankruptcy court's denial of discovery
18 because debtor-appellants "were simply engaging in a fishing expedition" in contested matter).²

19 Moreover, the very nature of the Debtor's specific discovery requests demonstrate the
20 need to bar them with a protective order.

21 First, the Debtor's seven interrogatories, its document requests 4 through 10, and the first
22 seven document requests listed in the deposition notice seek documents or information regarding
23 the factual basis for the Commission's positions stated in its Statement of Support. *See Kalin*
24 Decl. Ex. A at 2-3, Ex. B at 4, Ex. C at attachment, p. 1. But as explained repeatedly to Debtor's
25 counsel, the Commission relied exclusively on the findings of the Trustee and the U.S. Trustee

26
27 ² Because the Trustee's Motion to Convert is a contested matter under Rule 9014 of the
28 Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, Rule 26 governs discovery here. *See FED. R. BANKR. P.*
7026, 9014. Therefore, Rule 2004, which may permit broader discovery, does not apply. In any
event, the Debtor never sought permission to seek the discovery, as Rule 2004 would require.

1 for every position presented by the Commission in its Statement in Support. This is clear from
2 the Statement in Support itself, as it specifically cites all of the evidence relied upon by the
3 Commission in issuing the Statement in Support. Thus, all of the information and documents
4 requested by these discovery requests is easily obtainable and, in fact, is already available to the
5 Debtor since the Trustee's and the U.S. Trustee's evidentiary support for the Commission's
6 position are all publicly filed. *See* Dkt. Nos. 435 (Trustee's second status report), 435-1 (Trustee
7 declaration), 447 (Trustee declaration), 233 (U.S. Trustee motion to appoint Ch. 11 trustee);
8 *Mulvey v. Chrysler Corp.*, 106 F.R.D. 364, 366 (D.R.I. 1985) (under Rule 26(b)(2), court can
9 "limit discovery if it determines that the discovery sought is obtainable from other sources, that
10 is, those that are more convenient and less burdensome"); *Ginena v. Alaska Airlines, Inc.*, 2011
11 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 116656, at 7 (D. Nev. Oct. 6, 2011).

12 Second, the remaining document requests seek wholly irrelevant information. In
13 particular, the requests for production nos. 1 through 3, and the document request nos. 8 through
14 11 listed in the deposition notice seek communications for the last twelve months between the
15 Commission on the one hand, and creditors or the Trustee on the other. *See* Kalin Decl. Ex. B at
16 4, Ex. C at p. 1 of attachment. But, as discussed above, the Commission's non-public
17 investigation has nothing to do with its Statement in Support of the Trustee's Motion to Convert.
18 That Statement in Support relied exclusively on the Trustee's and the U.S. Trustee's findings.

19 The Debtor's document requests seeking communications between the Commission and
20 the Trustee are also readily obtainable from another source. The documents sought by these
21 requests – request for production no. 3 and the eighth request for documents in the deposition
22 notice – are all being satisfied by discovery served by the Debtor on the Trustee. *See* Kalin Decl.
23 ¶¶ 5-6, 10, Ex. B at 4, Ex. C at p. 1 of attachment, Ex. D (Trustee's responses to Mr. Polhill's
24 discovery requests at 5-6). They are therefore already available from another source – the
25 Trustee. *See Mulvey*, 106 F.R.D. at 366; *Ginena*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 116656, at *7.
26 Moreover, to the extent the Debtor is just seeking these communications to understand the basis
27 of the Commission's positions in its Statement of Support, again the basis for these positions is
28 found in the Trustee's and the U.S. Trustee's publicly-filed documents.

1 Third, the deposition notice is unwarranted and should be quashed. The notice seeks
2 testimony regarding the Commission's own non-public investigation. *See id.* Ex. C at p. 2 of
3 attachment. As discussed above, the Commission's investigation is not the basis for its support
4 of the Trustee's Motion to Convert. Therefore, testimony regarding this law enforcement
5 investigation is irrelevant. Moreover, as discussed below, this testimony is privileged and work
6 product protected.

7 Finally, the Debtor's document requests impose a significant and unnecessary burden on
8 the Commission. In particular, the requests for production nos. 1 through 3, and the document
9 request nos. 8 through 11 listed in the deposition notice seek communications for the last twelve
10 months between the Commission on the one hand, and creditors or the Trustee on the other. *See*
11 *Kalin Decl.* Ex. B at 4, Ex. C at p. 1 of attachment. Multiple Commission attorneys, as well as
12 support staff, would be required to comb through emails and documents in this case to determine
13 which were responsive and non-privileged. This would take considerable time and effort, and all
14 due to the Debtor's misguided notion that the Commission's Statement in Support was based on
15 evidence other than that cited in that pleading.

16 Therefore, the Debtor's discovery requests on the Commission are unjustified and
17 unnecessarily burdensome. They seek irrelevant information that can instead be readily found on
18 the Court's public docket or from the Trustee. A protective order under Rule 26(b) is thus
19 warranted.

20 **II. THE DEBTOR'S DISCOVERY REQUESTS SEEK PRIVILEGED MATERIAL**

21 In addition, the Debtor's discovery requests also seek material from the Commission that
22 is clearly privileged. The law enforcement privilege in particular allows the government to
23 withhold:

24 (1) information pertaining to "law enforcement techniques and
25 procedures," ... (2) information that would undermine "the confidentiality
26 of sources," ... (3) information that would endanger "witness and law
27 enforcement personnel," ... (4) information that would undermine "the
28 privacy of individuals involved in an investigation," ... or (5) information
that would seriously impair "the ability of a law enforcement agency to
conduct future investigations."

1 *FTC v. Timeshare Mega Media & Mktg. Group*, 2011 U.S. Dist. Lexis 140666, at *12 (Dec. 7,
2 2011) (citing *In re the City of New York*, 607 F.3d 923, 948 (2d Cir. 2010)). The purpose of the
3 law enforcement privilege is to “prevent disclosure of law enforcement techniques and
4 procedures, to preserve the confidentiality of sources, to protect witness and law enforcement
5 personnel, to safeguard the privacy of individuals involved in an investigation, and otherwise to
6 prevent interference with an investigation.” *In re Dep’t of Investigation of the City of New York*,
7 856 F.2d 481, 483-84 (2d. Cir. 1988).

8 Likewise, the work product doctrine bars disclosure of a party’s deliberative process in an
9 anticipation of litigation. The doctrine protects “written statements, private memoranda and
10 personal recollections prepared or formed by an adverse party’s counsel in the course of his legal
11 duties.” *Hickman v. Taylor*, 329 U.S. 495, 510 (1947); *see also* FED. R. CIV. PROC. 26(b)(3)(A)
12 (work product doctrine protects against disclosure of documents and tangible things “prepared in
13 anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for another party or by or for that other party’s
14 representative”); *Joseph v. Las Vegas Metro. Police Dep’t*, 2011 Dist. LEXIS 28510, at *2-3 (D.
15 Nev. March 8, 2011).

16 Both the law enforcement privilege and the work product doctrine would preclude much,
17 if not all, of what the Debtor seeks. This is especially true for the Debtor’s notice of deposition.
18 That notice seeks testimony regarding the “SEC’s investigation,” the “identity of witnesses,” and
19 “communications with investors ... of the Debtor.” Kalin Decl. Ex. C at p. 2 of attachment.
20 Clearly, the deposition of a staff attorney involved in the investigation of the Debtor is not
21 subject to disclosure. *See In re Bilzerian*, 258 B.R. 846, 848 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 2001) (protective
22 order issued to bar debtor’s deposition notice of Commission attorney regarding Commission’s
23 investigation of debtor). The Commission is also allowed to withhold the identity of its
24 witnesses and its communications with those witnesses under the law enforcement privilege and
25 the work product doctrine. *See, e.g., S.E.C. v. Rosenfeld*, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13996, at *7
26 (granting motion for protective order and quashing notice of deposition of Commission based, in
27 part, on law enforcement privilege); *S.E.C. v. Strauss*, 2009 LEXIS 101227, at *8-10 (S.D.N.Y.
28 Oct. 28 , 2009) (motion to compel S.E.C. to disclose witness identities denied); *In re MTI*

1 *Technology Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13015 (C.D. Cal. 2002) (identity of
2 witnesses interviewed by attorneys protected by work product doctrine).

3 The Debtor's document requests also seek protected materials. For instance, the
4 document requests accompanying the deposition notice ask the Commission to produce "all
5 transcripts of testimony taken by the SEC," and "all notes of off-the-record interviews the SEC
6 has conducted." Kalin Decl. Ex. C at p. 1 of attachment. Similarly, the Debtor seeks any
7 communications with investors and other creditors of the Debtor. *See id.* Ex. B at 4 (doc.
8 requests nos. 1-2, Ex. C at p. 1 of attachment (doc. requests nos. 9-11). These documents are
9 unquestionably privileged and protected. *See FTC*, 2011 U.S. Dist. Lexis 140666, at *12;
10 *Rosenfeld*, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13996, at *7; *Strauss*, 2009 LEXIS 101227, at *8-10.

11 In sum, the Commission's ongoing investigation is not public, and it is important for the
12 Commission to keep it that way. Indeed, the Commission has been careful to state its positions
13 with respect to the Motion to Convert so as not to reveal any of the results of its investigation,
14 and to rely solely on the findings of the Trustee and the U.S. Trustee. Responding to these
15 discovery requests would interfere with the Commission's current investigation, and seek
16 information that would reveal the Commission's deliberative process and investigative strategies.

17 CONCLUSION

18 Therefore, the Commission respectfully requests that the Court enter a protective order
19 prohibiting the Debtor from seeking the documents, information and testimony that it seeks from
20 the Commission in the Debtor's discovery requests attached as Exhibits A, B and C to the
21 accompanying Declaration of Sara D. Kalin, Esq.

22
23 Date: December 22, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

24
25 /s/ Sandra W. Lavigna

Sandra W. Lavigna

Sara D. Kalin

Attorneys for

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On December 22, 2011, I caused to be served the following document **MOTION OF U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER**. The document was served by the following means to the persons as noted on the attached service list as printed from the Court's ECF filing system. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: December 22, 2011

/s/ Sandra W. Lavigna
Sandra W. Lavigna

1 **Mailing Information for Case 10-27855-bam**

2 **Electronic Mail Notice List**

3 The following is the list of **parties** who are currently on the list to receive email notice/service
4 for this case.

- 5 • **ATHANASIOS E. AGELAKOPOULOS** athanasios.agelakopoulos@usdoj.gov
- 6 • **KELLY J. BRINKMAN** kbrinkman@gouldpatterson.com
- 7 • **LOUIS M. BUBALA** lbubala@armstrongteasdale.com,
bsalinas@armstrongteasdale.com
- 8 • **JONATHAN S. DABBIERI** dabbieri@sullivanhill.com,
hill@sullivanhill.com;hawkins@sullivanhill.com;vidovich@sullivanhill.com;roberts@su
9 llivanhill.com;stein@sullivanhill.com;benoit@sullivanhill.com;ggarcia@sullivanhill.com
- 10 • **JASON C. FARRINGTON** jason@corylaw.us, angie@corylaw.us
- 11 • **PHILIP S. GERSON** banknv@rocgd.com, mburgener@rocgd.com
- 12 • **KENT L. IVEY** iveynet@earthlink.net, katie@ivey4law.com
- 13 • **EDWARD M. MCDONALD** edward.m.mcdonald@usdoj.gov
- 14 • **SARAH D. MOYED** moyeds@sec.gov
- 15 • **CHRISTINE A ROBERTS** roberts@sullivanhill.com,
hill@sullivanhill.com;vidovich@sullivanhill.com;stephens@sullivanhill.com;stein@sulli
16 vanhill.com;calderone@sullivanhill.com;manning@sullivanhill.com;iriarte@sullivanhill.
17 com;millerick@sullivanhill.com;benoit@sullivanhill.com;ggarcia@sullivanhill.com
- 18 • **MARTHA E. ROMERO** robertg@mromerolawfirm.com
- 19 • **LENARD E. SCHWARTZER** bkfilings@s-mlaw.com
- 20 • **BRIAN D. SHAPIRO** bshapiro@brianshapirolaw.com,
ecf@brianshapirolaw.com;brianshapiroesq@yahoo.com;bshapiro@brianshapirolaw.com;
21 candice@brianshapirolaw.com;jessie@brianshapirolaw.com
- 22 • **ELIZABETH E. STEPHENS** stephens@sullivanhill.com,
calderone@sullivanhill.com;vidovich@sullivanhill.com;roberts@sullivanhill.com;hill@s
23 ullivanhill.com;Manning@sullivanhill.com;stein@sullivanhill.com;iriarte@sullivanhill.c
24 om;benoit@sullivanhill.com;ggarcia@sullivanhill.com
- 25 • **KAARAN E. THOMAS** kthomas@mcdonaldcarano.com,
mmorton@mcdonaldcarano.com
- 26 • **U.S. TRUSTEE - LV - 11** USTPRegion17.lv.ecf@usdoj.gov
- 27 • **BLAINE T WELSH** blaine.welsh@usdoj.gov,
eunice.jones@usdoj.gov;sue.knight@usdoj.gov;mary.booker@usdoj.gov;doriayn.olivarra
28 @usdoj.gov
- **LISA M WILTSHIRE** lwiltshire@mcdonaldcarano.com,
cstuchell@mcdonaldcarano.com;lstewart@mcdonaldcarano.com
- **RYAN J. WORKS** rworks@mcdonaldcarano.com, kbarrett@mcdonaldcarano.com

Manual Notice List

The following is the list of **parties** who are **not** on the list to receive email notice/service for this case (who therefore require manual noticing/service). You may wish to use your mouse to select and copy this list into your word processing program in order to create notices or labels for these recipients.

ARMSTRONG TEADDALE, LLP
C/O LOUIS M. BUBALA III, ESQ.
50 W. LIBERTY ST., STE 950
RENO, NV 89501

JOE BACA
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
201 NORTH E STREET, SUITE 102
SAN BERNADINO, CA 92415

CHRISTOPHER R BARCLAY
POB 26099
SANTA ANA, CA 92799

CAROL ESQUIVEL

ANNETTE GIRD
POB 2452
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667

DONALD GIRD
POB 2452
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667

RICHARD A. HALL
BOTTOMLINE LAWYERS, A PROFESSIONAL CORP.
PO BOX 237
AUBURN, CA 95604

MICHAEL J. HEYMAN
K&L GATES LLP
10100 SANTA MONICA BLVD., 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

JAMES P. HILL
SULLIVAN HILL LEWIN REZ & ENGEL
550 WEST C ST., STE 1500
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

CAROL KURTZ

1 **DONALD KURTZ**

2 ,

3 **MCDONALD CARANO WILSON, LLP**

4 2300 WEST SAHARA AVENUE

5 SUITE 1000

6 LAS VEGAS, NV 89102

7 **MCGOVERN & GREENE LLP**

8 ,

9 **WILLIAM MUDD**

10 25182 MONTE VERDE DR

11 LAGUNA NIGUEL, CA 89101

12 **GRANT NOESKE**

13 8206 STARR GRASS DRIVE, #404

14 MADISON, WI 53719

15 **ASHLEY L RUIZ**

16 ROMERO LAW FIRM

17 6516 BRIGHT AVE.

18 WHITTIER, CA 90601

19 **JEFFREY A. SCHWAB**

20 ABELMAN, FRAYNE & SCHWAB

21 666 THIRD AVENUE

22 NEW YORK, NY 10017

23 **KIMBERLY SOTO**

24 18992 BAKER RD

25 BEND, OR 97702

26 **SULLIVAN HILL LEWIN REZ & ENGEL**

27 228 SOUTH FOURTH STREET, FIRST FLOOR

28 LAS VEGAS, NV 89101

29 [Creditor List](#)

30 Click the link above to produce a complete list of **creditors** only.

31 [Mailing Matrix](#)

32 Click on the link above to produce a list of **all** creditors and **all** parties in the case. User may sort
33 in columns or raw data format.