Case 8	:23-cv-00855-JWH-KES	Document 285 #:5105	Filed 09/30/24	Page 1 of 5	Page ID
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10					
11	SECURITIES AND E COMMISSION,	XCHANGE	Case No. 8:2	23-cv-00855-J	WH-KESx
12	Plaintiff,		ORDER RE	GARDING	OCED
13	v.		APPLICAT	OS UNOPPO IONS FOR I	PAYMENT
14	INTEGRATED NAT	IONAL	OF EXPEN	SES [ECF N	URSEMENT los. 234 &
15	RESOURCES, INC WEEDGENICS, ROLF MAX HIRSCH		235]		
16 17	"MAX BERGMAN PATRICK EARL WIL				
18	Defendan	ts, and			
19	WEST COAST DEVE	I ODMENIT			
20	WEST COAST DEVE LLC, INR CONSU (WYOMING ENT	LTING LLC			
21	OCEANS 19 INC	, ,			
22	AUTOBAHN PERFO ONE CLICK GENER INC	AL MEDIA			
23	OPUS COLLECTIVE JOHN ERIC FRANCO				
24	INR-CA INVESTMEN	ŃT HOLDINGS	,		
25	MICHAEL DELGAD TOTAL SOLUTION	Ο,			
26	CONSTRUCTION BAGPIPE HOLDING	I LLC, S LLC.			
27	BAGPIPE MULTIME TYLER CAMPBELL.	DĪĀ LLC,			
28					

INR CONSULTING LLC
(CALIFORNIA ENTITY),
HIDDEN SPRINGS HOLDINGS
GROUP LLC, and
ALEXANDRIA PORTER BOVEE aka
"AIA MONTGOMERY,"

Relief Defendants.

5

22

Before the Court are the Receiver's two unopposed Applications for Payment of Fees and Reimbursement of Expenses.¹ The Court concludes that these matters are appropriate for resolution without a hearing. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; L.R. 7-15. After considering the Applications and the lack of opposition, the Court **GRANTS** the Receiver's unopposed Applications.

In May 2023, the SEC filed a Complaint seeking a preliminary injunction against Defendants Integrated National Resources Inc. dba WeedGenics ("INR"), Rolf Max Hirschmann aka "Max Bergmann", and Patrick Earl Williams (collectively, "Defendants") and various Relief Defendants, including Alexandria Porter Bovee, West Coast Development LLC, INR Consulting LLC (Wyoming Entity), Oceans 19 Inc., Autobahn Performance LLC, One Click General Media Inc., and Opus Collective (collectively, "Relief Defendants"), and seeking the appointment of a permanent receiver over INR and the entity-Relief Defendants.² On the same day, the SEC filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities, as well as supporting declarations and exhibits, seeking the same relief initially on a temporary basis via a Temporary Restraining Order ("TRO").³ Three days later, the Court entered the TRO.⁴

In June 2023, the Court granted the preliminary injunction and issued orders (1) freezing Defendants' and Relief Defendants' assets; (2) appointing Freitag as Permanent Receiver; (3) requiring accountings from Defendants and

Receiver's Appl. for Payment of Fees and Reimbursement of Expenses (the "<u>Third Interim Application</u>") [ECF No. 234]; Receiver's Appl. for Payment of Fees and Reimbursement of Expenses (the "<u>Third Interim Fee Application</u>") [ECF No. 235].

See Compl. (the "Complaint") [ECF No. 1].

SEC's Mem. of P. & A.; Supporting Declarations [ECF Nos. 4-10.]

⁴ TRO & Orders [ECF No. 17].

Relief Defendants; and (4) prohibiting the destruction of documents.⁵ Since it issued those initial orders, the Court has issued many follow-on orders variously extending and adjusting the scope of the TRO and PI.⁶ Ultimately, the parties stipulated to, and the Court issued, judgment as to Defendant INR and Relief Defendants.⁷

Freitag filed her instant Applications for Reimbursement.⁸ The Third Interim Application covers the period from October 1 through December 31, 2023, and it seeks the approval of \$138,837.75 in fees and \$18,733.10 in expenses incurred by Freitag, as well as an order authorizing her to pay, on an interim basis, 80% of the fees incurred (\$111,070.20) and 100% of the expenses incurred (\$18,733.10).⁹ The Third Interim Fee Application covers the same period, and it seeks the approval of \$83,751.30 in fees and \$8,788.71 in expenses incurred by Frietag's general counsel, Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP ("Allen Matkins"), as well as an order authorizing Freitag to pay, on an interim basis, 80% of those fees (\$67,001.04) and 100% of those expenses (\$8,788.71).¹⁰ No party objected to either Application.

⁵ Prelim. Inj. With Respect to Certain Defs. & Relief Defs. & Orders [ECF No. 33].

See id. at n.4.

⁷ See Stipulation for J. as to Def. INR [ECF No. 230]; Stipulation for J. as to Relief Defs. [ECF No. 231]; J. as to Def. INR [ECF No. 237]; J. as to Relief Defs. [ECF No. 238].

⁸ Third Interim Application; Third Interim Fee Application.

⁹ Third Interim Application 5:10-14.

Third Interim Fee Application 5:11-15.

2 3

1

4 5

6

7 8

9 *10*

12

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

Because no party objected to either Application and the fees and costs in each appear well documented and reasonable, 11 the Court GRANTS those two Applications.

I. DISPOSITION

For the reasons set forth above, the Court hereby **ORDERS** as follows:

- The Receiver's two Applications for Reimbursement are 1. **GRANTED.**
- 2. The Receiver's fees and costs for the Third Application Period are ALLOWED and APPROVED, on an interim basis, in the amounts of \$138,837.75 and \$18,733.10.
- The Receiver is **AUTHORIZED** and **DIRECTED** to pay herself 3. \$111,070.20 in fees and \$18,733.10 in costs from assets of the receivership estate, which amount reflects an interim payment of 80% of the allowed fees and 100% of the allowed costs.
- Allen Matkins' fees and costs for the Third Application Period are ALLOWED and APPROVED, on an interim basis, in the amounts of \$83,751.30 and \$8,788.71, respectively.
- The Receiver is **AUTHORIZED** and **DIRECTED** to pay Allen 5. Matkins \$67,001.04 in fees and \$8,788.71 in costs from assets of the receivership estate, which amounts reflect an interim payment of 80% of the allowed fees and 100% of the allowed costs.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 30, 2024

TES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹¹ See Third Interim Application; Third Interim Fee Application.