

1 STEVEN T. GUBNER – NV Bar No. 4624
2 JASON B. KOMORSKY – Bar No. 155677 – Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
3 SUSAN K. SEFLIN – CA Bar No. 213865 – Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
4 JESSICA S. WELLINGTON – CA Bar No. 324477 – Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*

5 BG LAW LLP
6 300 S. 4th Street, Suite 1550
7 Las Vegas, NV 89101
8 Telephone: (702) 835-0800
9 Facsimile: (866) 995-0215
10 Email: ssubner@bg.law
11 jkomorsky@bg.law
12 sseflin@bg.law
13 jwellington@bg.law

14 Attorneys for Chapter 11 Debtor
15 and Debtor in Possession

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

14 In re:
15 Front Sight Management LLC,
16
17 Debtor.

Case No. 22-11824-abl
Chapter 11

Hearing Date: September 1, 2022
Hearing Time: 9:30 a.m.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
**DECLARATION OF STEVEN T. GUBNER IN SUPPORT OF THE DEBTOR’S
OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO QUASH 2004 EXAMS AND SUBPOENAS
TO PRODUCE DOCUMENTS AND REQUEST FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER**

I, Steven T. Gubner, declare as follows:

1. I am the managing partner and founder of the law firm of BG Law LLP, bankruptcy
counsel for Front Sight Management LLC (the “Debtor”). I am an attorney duly licensed in and am
a member in good standing of the bar for the State of Nevada and am admitted to practice before all
courts of the State of Nevada, including the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of
Nevada.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration, except as to those
stated on information and belief. If called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the

1 facts stated herein under oath.

2 3. This declaration is submitted in support of the *Debtor's Opposition to the Motion to*
3 *Quash 2004 Exams and Subpoenas to Produce Documents and Request for a Protective Order* (the
4 "Opposition") filed concurrently herewith. Any capitalized term that is not defined in this
5 declaration has the same meaning ascribed to it in the Opposition.

6 4. Pursuant to the terms of the DIP financing, the Debtor must confirm a chapter 11
7 plan of reorganization no later than November 29, 2022.

8 5. By far the largest claim in the Debtor's case is the disputed secured claim held by
9 LVDF. As set forth in the Debtor's schedules [ECF No. 137] and numerous other pleadings, the
10 Debtor disputes the validity and amount of LVDF's claim and lien. The Debtor intends to file an
11 objection to LVDF's claim, however, the Debtor needs information and documents from the LVDF
12 Parties to properly assess the amount and validity of the claim and its treatment of the claim in the
13 Debtor's chapter 11 plan. The LVDF Parties have refused to produce any documents and have
14 refused to appear for Rule 2004 examinations despite the 2004 Orders and Subpoenas.

15 6. On July 15, 2022, my firm served the Subpoenas on counsel for the LVDF Parties
16 via email and United States mail.

17 7. Prior to July 18, 2022, counsel for the LVDF Parties did not notify me or any other
18 attorney at BG Law LLP that the LVDF Parties would not be willing to comply with the 2004
19 Orders.

20 8. Notwithstanding that the 2004 Motions were filed on July 7, 2022, and that the
21 topics of examination were disclosed in the LVDF 2004 Motion, on July 18, 2022, Brian Shapiro
22 contacted me to discuss several issues, including a request for a meet and confer regarding the
23 Subpoenas.

24 9. On July 20, 2022 at 8:00 a.m., Susan Seflin, Jessica Wellington and I attended a
25 meet and confer with Brian Shapiro and Andrea Champion regarding the Subpoenas.

26 10. At the meet and confer, counsel for the LVDF Parties represented that: (i) neither of
27 the LVDF Parties would be producing any documents in response to the Subpoenas; (ii) the Debtor,
28 *at its own expense*, could request production of the documents already produced in the state court

1 action from a third party vendor; (iii) neither of the LVDF Parties would be appearing for the
2 examinations as Dziubla already appeared for depositions in the state court action; and (iv) many of
3 the documents sought through the Subpoenas are protected from production based on the Protective
4 Orders, notwithstanding that the documents are sought in a federal court in connection with a claim
5 objection and plan confirmation.

6 11. After the July 20, 2022, meet and confer had already begun, I received an email from
7 Ms. Champion detailing the requests that the LVDF Parties contend are subject to the Protective
8 Orders and are irrelevant to the Debtor's objection to LVDF's claim. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**
9 is a true and correct copy of the Champion Email.

10 12. At the meet and confer, I confirmed the basis for the Rule 2004 examinations is to
11 assist the Debtor in its preparation of a claim objection and treatment of LVDF's claim in the
12 Debtor's plan. Notwithstanding that such inquiry is proper under Rule 2004, counsel for the LVDF
13 Parties refused to re-consider any of their positions.

14 13. Although the LVDF parties proposed an expedited briefing schedule with respect to
15 its motion to quash, the proposed schedule prejudiced the Debtor as it provided the LVDF Parties
16 with several weeks to prepare its motion and only one week for the Debtor to respond. At the meet
17 and confer, I stated that the Debtor would agree to an expedited briefing schedule if the LVDF
18 Parties could commit to filing their motion prior July 29, 2022 (i.e., the date of production).
19 Counsel for the LVDF Parties could not commit to doing so.

20 14. On July 21, 2022, I caused a letter to be sent via email to Ms. Champion responding
21 to the Champion Email. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** is a true and correct copy of that letter.

22 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the
23 foregoing is true and correct.

24 Executed on this 18th day of August, 2022, at Woodland Hills, California.

25
26
27 
28 STEVEN T. GUBNER

EXHIBIT “1”

From: [Andrea Champion](#)
To: [Susan K. Seflin](#); [Steven T. Gubner](#)
Cc: [Brian Shapiro](#); [Jessica S. Wellington](#); [Lorie Januskevicius](#); [Julie Linton](#)
Subject: RE: Front Sight
Date: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 8:01:55 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from an external source.

Susie,

It is our understanding that the Debtor is utilizing the 2004 exam and subpoenas to estimate LVDF's claim for purposes of the Chapter 11 Plan. There is no need to go to any extensive litigation on such issue because the State Court previously made such estimation for purposes of the TRO and either the State Court and/or Bankruptcy Court will make a final determination as to the amount. In addition, all requests are in violation of pending proceeding rule as the amount of the claim is an issue in the adversary case.

In additional, the EB5 Parties (LVDF, Mr. Dziubla, Ms. Stanwood, Mr. Fleming, EB5IA, and EB5IC) have not only produced initial disclosures in the state action but they have also supplemented those disclosures 18 times and produced a total of approximately 32,007 documents. The EB5 Parties do not have any relevant, responsive documents in their possession custody and control that are subject to discovery or that are not already listed on a privilege and/or redaction log with limited exception (there may some additional loan statements that were issued after the Debtor filed for bankruptcy which we have no objection to providing). Debtor's subpoenas call for the re-production of the very same documents that have been produced in the State Action and of which Debtor is already in possession. Why do you need another copy of the documents previously produced? If there is a valid justification for the need for Debtor to receive yet another copy of the documents already in its possession, then we may be able to have our vendor provide the documents to your office so long as the costs to do so are borne by the Debtor.

In addition, because we have not received a copy of the executed Protective Order to date, we cannot have the vendor release any confidential documents to you until it is signed (your office previously agreed to be bound by the protective order and execute the same but to date, we have not received the executed protective order.

Other Issues

- Identification of documents to a specific request – no requirement
- The State Court issued various protective orders that preclude Debtor from obtaining particular information from any of the EB5 Parties. A number of Debtors' document requests are in violation of those protective orders:
 - Dziubla SDT 5, 7, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 57, 58
 - LVDF SDT 6, 9, 10, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 46, 47,

49,50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 61 , 62, 65

- Other requests are potentially not subject to a protective order but are still irrelevant to estimation of the claims and/or vague and ambiguous
 - Dziubla SDT 43, 44, 51, 52, 55, 56, 61, 62
 - LVDF 21, 66, 67
- LVDF and Mr. Dziubla will dispute the 2004 exam orders because Debtor failed to advise the Court that Mr. Dziubla was fully questioned in his individual capacity and behalf of LVDF and the EB5 entities for a total of 7 days in the State Court Action. Notably, not only did Debtor use of its allowed deposition time with Mr. Dziubla, but it also requested additional time. The State Court granted a limited amount of additional time and then Debtor used that additional time. Debtor has received transcripts of all of that testimony.

If the parties are unable to agree on a resolution, then we should agree to a procedure to resolve any disputed issues with the Court. We propose:

- The parties enter into a Stipulation to stay discovery on 2004 exams and subpoenas pending the outcome of a hearing with the following briefing schedule:
 - Motion to be filed on or before July 29, 2022
 - Opposition Due on or before August 5, 2022
 - Reply Due on or before August 12, 2022
 - Potential Hearing Date – August 19, 2022

Andrea M. Champion, Esq.



6600 Amelia Earhart Ct., Suite C
Las Vegas, NV 89119

P (702) 805-8450

F (702) 805-8451

E achampion@joneslovelock.com

<https://www.joneslovelock.com/>

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail transmission (and/or the attachments accompanying it) may contain confidential information belonging to the sender which is protected by the attorney-client privilege. The information is intended only for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. Please promptly notify the sender by reply e-mail, and then destroy all copies of the transmission.

From: Susan K. Seflin <sseflin@bg.law>

Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 12:08 PM

To: Steven T. Gubner <sgubner@bg.law>

Cc: Brian Shapiro <brian@brianshapirolaw.com>; Andrea Champion <achampion@joneslovelock.com>; Jessica S. Wellington <jwellington@bg.law>

Subject: Re: Front Sight

Brian - will you be sending an agenda in advance of the call so that we have some direction on what you have an issue with? Also, can you give us some idea of what documents you think can't be produced because of the state

court protective order? Thank you. Susie

21650 Oxnard St., Suite 500
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

www.bg.law

Susan K. Seflin

Partner

(818) 827-9000 Main

(818) 827-9210 Direct / Text / Fax

sseflin@bg.law



[Susan K. Seflin](#)

The preceding e-mail message is subject to BG LAW's e-mail policies, which can be found at: <https://www.bg.law/web-disclaimer>

On Jul 18, 2022, at 7:02 PM, Steven T. Gubner <sgubner@bg.law> wrote:

Ok

From: Brian Shapiro <brian@brianshapirolaw.com>

Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 7:02 PM

To: Steven T. Gubner <sgubner@bg.law>; Susan K. Seflin <sseflin@bg.law>

Cc: Andrea Champion <achampion@joneslovelock.com>

Subject: RE: Front Sight

CAUTION: This email originated from an external source.

We just crossed emails, I will let Andi respond but 8-9 a.m wed works for me.

Brian D. Shapiro, Esq.

510 S. 8th Street

Las Vegas, NV 89101

(t) [702-386-8600](tel:702-386-8600); (f) [702-383-0994](tel:702-383-0994)

www.brianshapirolaw.com

www.myvegasbankruptcyattorney.com

FRAUD ALERT: If you receive an email from this office requesting that you wire or otherwise transfer funds, to protect yourself, please confirm the request and any corresponding instructions by telephone with this office before you initiate any transfer. Email accounts of attorneys, trustees, and other legal professionals are targets of cyber criminals that use information in an attempt to initiate fraudulent wire requests. It is recommended that you independently research our contact information to confirm instructions and do not rely on information contained in an email signature block.

This e-mail message is a confidential communication from the Law Office of Brian D. Shapiro, LLC and is intended only for the named recipient(s) above and may contain information that is a trade secret, proprietary, privileged or attorney work product. If you have received this message in error, or are not the named or intended recipient(s), please immediately notify the sender at [702.386.8600](tel:702.386.8600) and delete this e-mail message and any attachments from your workstation or network mail system.

From: Steven T. Gubner <sgubner@bg.law>
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 7:01 PM
To: Brian Shapiro <brian@brianshapirolaw.com>; Susan K. Seflin <sseflin@bg.law>
Cc: Andrea Champion <achampion@joneslovelock.com>
Subject: RE: Front Sight

How about 8 – 9 am wed I get on a plane to NY

Steven T. Gubner, Esq.
Managing Partner

(818) 827-9118 Direct / Text / Fax
(818) 571-4444 Cell
sgubner@bg.law

— Steven T. Gubner

Warner Center

21650 Oxnard St., Suite 500
Woodland Hills, CA 91367-4911
(818) 827-9000 Main
(818) 827-9090 Fax

Nevada Office

300 S. 4th Street, Suite 1550
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(702) 835-0800 Main
(866) 995-0215 Fax

Colorado Office

5445 DTC Parkway, Suite 825
Denver, CO 80111
(303) 835-1291 Main
(818) 827-9045 Fax

www.bg.law

The preceding e-mail message is subject to BG LAW's e-mail policies, which can be found at: <https://www.bg.law/web-disclaimer>

From: Brian Shapiro <brian@brianshapirolaw.com>
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 5:49 PM
To: Steven T. Gubner <sgubner@bg.law>; Susan K. Seflin <sseflin@bg.law>
Cc: Andrea Champion <achampion@joneslovelock.com>
Subject: RE: Front Sight

CAUTION: This email originated from an external source.

Dear Steve:

Thank you for chatting this afternoon. I just head from Andi and she has an appointment at 2:00 p.m. that may last all afternoon and I have an appointment at noon. I am unsure if tomorrow will work based upon your availability only tomorrow afternoon and Andi's conflict.

Did you say you are available Wednesday or were you heading to New York?

Brian D. Shapiro, Esq.
510 S. 8th Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(t) [702-386-8600](tel:702-386-8600); (f) [702-383-0994](tel:702-383-0994)
www.brianshapirolaw.com
www.myvegasbankruptcyattorney.com

FRAUD ALERT: If you receive an email from this office requesting that you wire or otherwise transfer funds, to protect yourself, please confirm the request and any corresponding instructions by telephone with this office before you initiate any transfer. Email accounts of attorneys, trustees, and other legal professionals are targets of cyber criminals that use information in an attempt to initiate fraudulent wire requests. It is recommended that you independently research our contact information to confirm instructions and do not rely on information contained in an email signature block.

This e-mail message is a confidential communication from the Law Office of Brian D. Shapiro, LLC and is intended only for the named recipient(s) above and may contain information that is a trade secret, proprietary, privileged or attorney work product. If you have received this message in error, or are not the named or intended recipient(s), please immediately notify the sender at [702.386.8600](tel:702.386.8600) and delete this e-mail message and any attachments from your workstation or network mail system.

From: Brian Shapiro <brian@brianshapirolaw.com>
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 5:14 PM
To: Steven T. Gubner <sgubner@bg.law>; Susan K. Seflin <sseflin@bg.law>
Cc: Andrea Champion <achampion@joneslovelock.com>; Brian Shapiro <brian@brianshapirolaw.com>
Subject: Front Sight

Dear Steve and Susie:

Please note that earlier today I left Steve a voicemail to discuss your recent subpoenas and 2004 exams. I understand the Court entered the ex parte request for an order for 2004 exams and you recently issued subpoenas. Please note that it is likely that all of the documents you have requested were provided to Front Sight within the State Court/Adversary Case and the principals have been previously deposed. Moreover, there are court orders preventing the disclosure of certain documents. As such, we would like to discuss this with you to see if we can reach an amicable resolution and/or agree to some procedure to address any disputes with the Court.

I am generally available tomorrow after 2:00 p.m. but unsure when Andi is available. Can you let me

know if either of you are available to discuss tomorrow afternoon and if so, a convenient time?

I await your response.

Brian D. Shapiro, Esq.
510 S. 8th Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(t) [702-386-8600](tel:702-386-8600); (f) [702-383-0994](tel:702-383-0994)
www.brianshapirolaw.com
www.myvegasbankruptcyattorney.com

FRAUD ALERT: If you receive an email from this office requesting that you wire or otherwise transfer funds, to protect yourself, please confirm the request and any corresponding instructions by telephone with this office before you initiate any transfer. Email accounts of attorneys, trustees, and other legal professionals are targets of cyber criminals that use information in an attempt to initiate fraudulent wire requests. It is recommended that you independently research our contact information to confirm instructions and do not rely on information contained in an email signature block.

This e-mail message is a confidential communication from the Law Office of Brian D. Shapiro, LLC and is intended only for the named recipient(s) above and may contain information that is a trade secret, proprietary, privileged or attorney work product. If you have received this message in error, or are not the named or intended recipient(s), please immediately notify the sender at [702.386.8600](tel:702.386.8600) and delete this e-mail message and any attachments from your workstation or network mail system.

EXHIBIT “2”



300 S. 4th Street, Suite 1550
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(702) 835-0800 Main
(866) 995-0215 Fax
www.bg.law

Steven T. Gubner
(818) 827-9118 Direct
(818) 827-9090 Direct Fax
sgubner@bg.law

July 21, 2022

VIA EMAIL

Andrea Champion
Jones Lovelock
660 Amelia Earhart Ct., Suite C
Las Vegas, NV 89119
achampion@joneslovelock.com

**Re: Front Sight Management LLC Ch. 11 BK 22-11824
Our File No. 5890.002**

Dear Ms. Champion:

This correspondence is in response to your letter dated July 20, 2022 (the “Letter”), regarding the subpoenas issued to your clients on July 15, 2022, by our office in accordance with the bankruptcy court orders entered on July 14, 2022 [ECF Nos. 260 and 261] (together, the “2004 Orders”) granting the Debtor’s *ex parte* motions for orders directing the examinations of the person most knowledgeable (“PMK”) of LVDF and Mr. Dziubla pursuant to Rule 2004 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (“Rule 2004”).

At our meet and confer conference call on July 20, 2022, you represented that: (i) neither LVDF nor Mr. Dziubla would be producing any documents in response to the Subpoenas notwithstanding the 2004 Orders¹; (ii) the Debtor, *at its own expense*, could request production of the documents already produced in the state court action from a third party vendor despite LVDF and Mr. Dziubla being commanded to produce documents pursuant to properly issued subpoenas and the 2004 Orders; (iii) neither LVDF nor Mr. Dziubla would be appearing for the Rule 2004 examinations as Mr. Dziubla already appeared for depositions in the state court action—regardless of the 2004 Orders requiring an appearance and despite the fact that the Debtor is entitled to seek a Rule 2004 examination of parties asserting claims against the estate; (iv) many of the documents sought through the Subpoenas are protected from production based on protective orders entered by the state court, notwithstanding that the documents are sought in a federal court in connection with the extent and validity of your client’s claim with respect to

¹ We note that LVDF filed several motions for Rule 2004 examinations of the Debtor and non-debtor related parties and of several banks [ECF Nos. 68-78] requesting documents that were already produced in the underlying state court action, which motions were granted by the Court [ECF Nos. 91-100].



July 21, 2022

Page 2

both a claim objection and a claim estimation motion for plan confirmation purposes — and not in connection with the adversary proceeding; and (v) LVDF and Mr. Dziubla intend to file a motion to quash the Subpoenas by July 29, 2022. The very fact that you proposed a briefing schedule that allowed your client more than two weeks to prepare the anticipated motion to quash notwithstanding that time is of the essence does not evidence good faith. Additionally, while you allotted your client two weeks to prepare the motion, you seek to afford the Debtor a mere week to respond, which is severely prejudicial to our client. Nevertheless, I did offer to agree to an expedited briefing schedule if you could commit to filing the motion to quash prior to July 29, 2022. You could not commit to doing so. Accordingly, as I stated on the conference call, we could not agree to your proposed briefing schedule as it is not in the best interest of our client and the current bankruptcy schedule.

The purpose of the Debtor’s *ex parte* motions for orders directing the examinations of the PMK of LVDF and Mr. Dziubla pursuant to Rule 2004 [ECF Nos. 245 and 246] (the “2004 Motions”) is to assist the Debtor in determining if there is any undisputed portion of LVDF’s asserted claim in connection with the treatment of the claim in the Debtor’s chapter 11 plan of reorganization, and in connection with the Debtor’s anticipated claim estimation motion and objection to claim. We confirmed the basis for the Rule 2004 examinations at our meet and confer conference call on July 20, 2022 – that the testimony and documents sought in connection with the 2004 Motions is to assist the Debtor in its preparation of a claim estimation motion and an objection to claim. The scope of the documents and testimony sought is a proper inquiry for a Rule 2004 examination and your clients have no basis to disregard the 2004 Orders. As explained by the bankruptcy court in *In re Washington Mut., Inc.*, 408 B.R. 45, 49–50 (Bankr. D. Del. 2009):

Rule 2004(a) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure states that “[o]n motion of any party in interest, the court may order the examination of any entity.” The scope of a Rule 2004 examination is “unfettered and broad.” *In re Bennett Funding Group, Inc.*, 203 B.R. 24, 28 (Bankr.N.D.N.Y.1996).

The examination ... may relate only to the acts, conduct, or property or to the liabilities and financial condition of the debtor, or to any matter which may affect the administration of the debtor's estate. [Additionally, in a] case under chapter 11 ... the examination may also relate to the operation of any business and the desirability of its continuance, the source of any money or property acquired or to be acquired by the debtor for purposes of consummating a plan and the consideration given or offered



July 21, 2022

Page 3

therefor, and any other matter relevant to the case or to the formulation of a plan.

Fed. R. Bankr.P. 2004(b). A Rule 2004 examination “is commonly recognized as more in the nature of a ‘fishing expedition.’” *Bennett Funding*, 203 B.R. at 28. The purpose of the examination is to enable the trustee to discover the nature and extent of the bankruptcy estate. *In re Drexel Burnham Lambert Group, Inc.*, 123 B.R. 702, 708 (Bankr.S.D.N.Y.1991). Legitimate goals of Rule 2004 examinations include “discovering assets, examining transactions, and determining whether wrongdoing has occurred.” *In re Enron Corp.*, 281 B.R. 836, 840 (Bankr.S.D.N.Y.2002). There are, however, limits to the use of Rule 2004 examinations. *Id.* “It may not be used for ‘purposes of abuse or harassment’ and it ‘cannot stray into matters which are not relevant to the basic inquiry.’” *In re Table Talk, Inc.*, 51 B.R. 143, 145 (Bankr.D.Mass.1985) (quoting *In re Mitco, Inc.*, 44 B.R. 35, 36 (Bankr.E.D.Wis.1984)).

Washington Mut., 408 B.R. at 49–50. While you claim that the requests in the properly issued subpoenas are in violation of the pending proceeding rule, “[t]he prohibition on use of Rule 2004 examinations once an adversary proceeding or litigation in another forum is commenced, however, has an exception best expressed by the court in *Bennett Funding*: ‘[d]iscovery of evidence *related* to the pending proceeding must be accomplished in accord with more restrictive provisions of [the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure], while *unrelated* discovery should not be subject to those rules simply because there is an adversary proceeding pending.’” 203 B.R. at 29 (emphasis in original).” *Washington Mut.*, 408 B.R. at 51. See also *In re Int’l Fibercom, Inc.*, 283 B.R. 290, 292 (Bankr. D. Ariz. 2002) (“Consequently when the Rule 2004 examination relates not to the pending adversary litigation, but to another matter, the ‘pending proceeding’ rule does not apply”); *In re M4 Enters., Inc.*, 190 B.R. 471, 475 n. 4 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. 1995) (finding that the 2004 examination did not relate to the pending adversary proceeding and thus the ‘pending proceeding’ rule did not apply).

The Rule 2004 examinations relate to the Debtor’s anticipated objection to LVDF’s disputed claim and the treatment of LVDF’s claim under the Debtor’s plan. The purpose of the Rule 2004 examinations is not to harass LVDF or Mr. Dziubla, but rather to examine the transaction between LVDF and the Debtor and to determine whether there was any wrongdoing on LVDF’s behalf. This is undoubtedly a proper basis for a Rule 2004 examination, and the Debtor is entitled to conduct such examination. See *In re Enron Corp.*, 281 B.R. at 840. There is simply not a basis for LVDF or Mr. Dziubla to claim that they do not have to comply with the 2004 Orders because of the removed action. In addition, as stated in the 2004 Motions, it is our understanding that the discovery in the removed action has concluded. Thus, even if the pending proceeding rule applied (which it does not), the Debtor would not be able to obtain the



July 21, 2022

Page 4

documents it needs to properly assess LVDF's disputed claim through the removed action. Further, whether Mr. Dziubla appeared for depositions in the state court action is completely irrelevant to his duties to comply with the 2004 Orders.

Additionally, with regard to the protective orders previously entered by the state court, they are not applicable to a Rule 2004 examination in the bankruptcy case. Moreover, the state court found that the investors' identities and investment information were not germane to the Debtor's claims in that action. That same analysis does not apply to the Debtor's objection to LVDF's claim and the claim estimation motion. LVDF is not a traditional lender, and it did not lend its own funds to the Debtor. The funds loaned to the Debtor were from the investors and LVDF acted merely as an intermediary. Essentially, the real parties in interest are the investors and, as such, the Debtor is entitled to information regarding their immigration status and their investment in order to properly assess the validity of LVDF's disputed claim. Further to this point, LVDF affirmatively represented that it had sufficient financial resources (i.e., investors) to commit to a \$75 million loan. The discovery sought is designed to test the veracity of LVDF's representations. The existence of sufficient investors and, specifically, foreign investors, goes to LVDF's claims of default and calculations based thereon (such as default interest). For example, LVDF claims that the Debtor took actions that placed LVDF's foreign investors immigration status at risk. We are certainly entitled to test this theory that LVDF believes supports its claim against the Debtor. We understand that LVDF claims merely ministerial defaults. We are entitled to test those claims of default especially given that we have seen no evidence of any material defaults, including the fact that the Debtor was not in default of any payment obligations through the fall of 2021. Indeed, we note that the adversary proceeding does not even include a breach of contract claim against the Debtor (and, thus, is not encompassed in the adversary proceeding). Further, the majority of the document requests do not, contrary to your assertions, implicate the protective orders entered by the state court. While we disagree as to the applicability of the protective orders entered in the state court, your client could have offered to produce the documents with the investors' personal identifying information redacted, subject to attorneys' eyes only and/or under a protective order. However, your clients have not offered to do so. Instead, they have chosen to take actions that appear designed to delay the Debtor's case.

Notwithstanding that the 2004 Motions were filed on July 7, 2022, and that the topics of examination were disclosed in the LVDF 2004 Motion and that neither LVDF nor Mr. Dziubla filed an opposition to the 2004 Motions, you waited almost two weeks to raise any issues regarding the Rule 2004 examinations and before you attempted to meet and confer. You certainly would have known prior to July 20, 2022, that your clients did not intend on complying in any manner whatsoever with the 2004 Orders. Your client's actions will cause a delay in this case for at least 30 days (but likely more), which affects the Debtor's ability to timely confirm its chapter 11 plan and it increases the interest accruing on the DIP financing and the administrative expenses of the estate. Indeed, your clients' actions have caused actual damage and harm to the estate.



July 21, 2022

Page 5

It is regrettable that we could not come to a resolution of these issues during the meet and confer conference call. I am not used to practicing in such a manner and usually engage in a meet and confer to resolve problems—not create new ones. However, your clients’ actions and your repeated aggressive stance in this case suggest that your clients are simply interested in seeing the Debtor fail rather than working towards a consensual resolution of disputes. We will be taking appropriate action in the bankruptcy court to enforce the 2004 Orders, and, as I stated on the meet and confer conference call, we reserve the right to seek sanctions in the form of actual damages and attorneys’ fees against LVDF and Mr. Dziubla for their failure to comply with the 2004 Orders and the properly issued subpoenas.

Sincerely,



STEVEN T. GUBNER
Managing Partner

STG:jsw

cc: Susan Sefflin (i/o)
Brian Shapiro brian@brianshapirolaw.com
Robert LeHane rlehane@kelleydrye.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I declare that I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. I am employed in the County of Los Angeles and my business address is 21650 Oxnard Street, Suite 500, Woodland Hills, California 91367.

On August 18, 2022, I served the following document:

DECLARATION OF STEVEN T. GUBNER IN SUPPORT OF THE DEBTOR'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO QUASH 2004 EXAMS AND SUBPOENAS TO PRODUCE DOCUMENTS AND REQUEST FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL

Those designated "[NEF]" on the Court docket were served with the Notice by the Court via Electronic Mail, as follows:

- **JASON BLUMBERG** Jason.blumberg@usdoj.gov
- **CHAPTER 11 - LV** USTPRegion17.lv.ecf@usdoj.gov
- **DAWN M. CICA** dcica@carlyoncica.com, nrodriguez@carlyoncica.com;crobertson@carlyoncica.com;dmcica@gmail.com;dcica@carlyoncica.com;tosteen@carlyoncica.com;3342887420@filings.docketbird.com
- **WILLIAM C DEVINE** william@devine.legal, courtney@devine.legal;devinewr72773@notify.bestcase.com
- **THOMAS H. FELL** tfell@fennemorelaw.com, clandis@fennemorelaw.com;CourtFilings@fennemorelaw.com
- **PHILIP S. GERSON** Philip@gersonnvlaw.com
- **STEVEN T GUBNER** sgubner@bg.law, ecf@bg.law
- **BART K. LARSEN** BLARSEN@SHEA.LAW, 3542839420@filings.docketbird.com
- **NICOLE E. LOVELOCK** nlovelock@joneslovelock.com, ljanuskevicius@joneslovelock.com
- **EDWARD M. MCDONALD** edward.m.mcdonald@usdoj.gov
- **TRACY M. O'STEEN** tosteen@carlyoncica.com, crobertson@carlyoncica.com;nrodriguez@carlyoncica.com;ccarlyon@carlyoncica.com
- **TERESA M. PILATOWICZ** tpilatowicz@gtg.legal, bknotices@gtg.legal
- **SAMUEL A. SCHWARTZ** saschwartz@nvfirm.com, ecf@nvfirm.com;schwartzsr45599@notify.bestcase.com;eanderson@nvfirm.com;samid@nvfirm.com
- **SUSAN K. SEFLIN** sseflin@bg.law
- **BRIAN D. SHAPIRO** brian@brianshapirolaw.com, kshapiro@brianshapirolaw.com;6855036420@filings.docketbird.com
- **STRETTO** ecf@cases-cr.stretto-services.com, aw01@ecfcbis.com,pacerpleadings@stretto.com
- **U.S. TRUSTEE - LV - 11** USTPRegion17.lv.ecf@usdoj.gov
- **JESSICA S. WELLINGTON** jwellington@bg.law

I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed August 18, 2022, at Woodland Hills, California.

/s/ Jessica Studley
JESSICA STUDLEY