1	SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF NEW YORK: CIVIL TERM: PART 3	
2	_	ζ
3	In the Matter of the Inquiry of LETITIA JAMES, Attorney General of the State of	
4	New York,	
5	Petitioner,	
6	Pursuant to Article 23-A of the New York General Business Law in regard to the	
7	acts and practices of	
8	iFINEX INC., BFXNA inc., BFXWW INC.,	
9	TETHER HOLDINGS LIMITED, TETHER OPERATIONS LIMITED, TETHER LIMITED,	
10	TETHER INTERNATIONAL LIMITED,	
11	Respondents,	
12	in promoting the issuance, distribution, exchange, advertisement, negotiation, purchase, investment advices	гe
13 14	or sale of securities or commodities in or from New York State	ζ
15	Index No. 450545/2019 (Preliminary Injunction)	
16	May 16, 2019	
17	60 Centre Street New York, New York 10007	
18		
19	B E F O R E: HON. JOEL M. COHEN, Justice	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	OFFICE OF LETITIA JAMES Attorney General of the State of New York 28 Liberty Street
4	New York, New York 10005 BY: JOHN D. CASTIGLIONE, ESQ.
5	BRIAN M. WHITEHURST, ESQ. JOHANNA SKRZYPCZYK, ESQ.
6	Assistant Attorneys General
7	
8	MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP Attorneys for Respondents
9	101 Park Avenue New York, New York 10178-0060
10	BY: DAVID I. MILLER, ESQ. ZOE PHILLIPS, ESQ.
11	- and -
12	STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
13	1114 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036
14	BY: NINA S. THANAWALA, ESQ. CHARLES MICHAEL, ESQ.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N
2	THE COURT: Counsel, can you please state your
3	appearances.
4	MR. CASTIGLIONE: John Castiglione for the Office
5	of the Attorney General.
6	MR. WHITEHURST: Brian Whitehurst, Office of the
7	Attorney General.
8	MS. SKRZYPCZYK: Johanna Skrzypczyk, Office of
9	the Attorney General.
10	MR. MILLER: Good afternoon, your Honor.
11	David Miller from Morgan, Lewis & Bockius on
12	behalf of all respondents.
13	MR. MICHAEL: Good afternoon, your Honor.
14	Charles Michael from Steptoe & Johnson on behalf
15	of respondents.
16	MR. THANAWALA: Nina Thanawala, Steptoe & Johnson
17	on behalf the respondents.
18	MS. PHILLIPS: Zoe Phillips, Morgan, Lewis &
19	Bockius, on behalf of all respondents.
20	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
21	So I got the competing letters with respect to
22	the scope of the injunction, which were very helpful, and I
23	just wanted to go through a few things before I finalize
24	the order. Obviously I've been reading a lot of cases, a
25	lot of documents. It seems to me that the goal is to

2.

calibrate the injunction so that it, more or less, matches or at least correlates with the scope of the irreparable harm that the petitioners allege and takes into account the nature of the alleged violation.

The petitioner, Mr. Castiglione, very clearly and correctly said that the Attorney General's Office is not a regulator, so there is no general mandate in the Martin Act to maintain the financial stability of any given companies unless there is a statutory violation to pursue. That's something that bank regulators do. If a company is unstable and it causes risks to depositors, bank regulators have the authority to step in and ensure that capital ratios or other things are in order.

So the petitioner here, it seems to me, has to show why in this particular case instability or failure to have enough coverage in terms of dollars constitutes by itself a violation. That's not to say they haven't done that, but I think my point is that the injunction should essentially match with what the alleged violation is.

So let me start on the petitioner's side. And as I look through everything, it occurred to me that it wasn't 100 percent clear what the violation is. So a question that the respondents raise is that this is basically a disclosure problem, which, you know, they argue you don't really need an injunction or the injunction can be limited

1	to disclosure. So the question is, is it a disclosure
2	problem or is there an independent Martin Act problem with
3	dissipating assets?

So, hypothetically, if the respondents issued press releases and disseminated them broadly and said just so that everybody is aware, we're free to enter into transactions where we dissipate all of our dollar reserves, I'm assuming that the petitioners would say, well, it's not just about disclosure. But I want to understand, I guess, a little better what beyond disclosure constitutes the potential Martin Act violation.

MR. CASTIGLIONE: Certainly, your Honor.

So I think there's a couple of things and I'd like to clear up a little bit of what was said in the respondents' papers about what we're saying and I want to be very clear. There are certain elements to what we believed to have happened and we believe are in and of themselves, so to speak, Martin Act violations, but that's not to say that we don't believe the entire course of conduct acted as a fraud upon traders on the venue, the holders of tether and so forth.

But I think there are a couple of main points to get to what you're saying and to get to why we sought the injunctive relief that we did. The first, I think it's first to say, the company failed to disclose that it had

2.

call them misstatements or omissions regarding what a use of a venue or a holder of tether might have believed about the status of the funds, that they were perhaps not commingled, that they were actually being accounted for i	lost \$851 million, we believe, of corporate and client
of a venue or a holder of tether might have believed about the status of the funds, that they were perhaps not commingled, that they were actually being accounted for i	funds. So embedded in that, frankly, are a number of we'll
the status of the funds, that they were perhaps not commingled, that they were actually being accounted for i	call them misstatements or omissions regarding what a user
commingled, that they were actually being accounted for i	of a venue or a holder of tether might have believed about
	the status of the funds, that they were perhaps not
any sort of reasonable way.	commingled, that they were actually being accounted for in
	any sort of reasonable way.

The next -- I would say by at least mid to late 2018, the company knew that hundreds of millions of dollars that it had placed with a payment processor were effectively inaccessible to them. We cited some of the communications that lead us to understand that the company knew exactly the problem that it had and yet went out to the market and told the market untrue things about their ability to process withdrawal requests.

Then there's the next maybe key point here is that in November of 2018, the respondents attempted to cover up the loss by simply transferring 625, we believe, potential \$675 million, out of the Tether reserves to Bitfinex and that in and of itself constituted a violation of, among other things, the Martin Act insofar as it made the statements that the companies had been making about the backing of tether untrue as of that very moment.

It also shows that the company did, and potentially again, is willing to take the Tether cash

2.

reserves, put it in Bitfinex and then alienate it in some way that we don't understand, and that's partially I think what your Honor was getting at. The injunctive relief, we crafted it, we hope properly, to say to the company you may not take further transfers out of the Tether cash reserves over to Bitfinex.

Now, the companies, in our discussions both before and after we appeared before your Honor, said, well, hey, what your injunction seems to do is limit our ability to pay out tether holders who want to redeem their tethers, who come back with one tether and say give me my dollar back for my one tether. That wasn't our intention. In the order we essentially carved that out saying if there are legitimate holders of tether, unaffiliated holders of tether that say "I want my tether back just like you told me I was able to do," then they should be able to do that.

To the extent there are affiliated entities or perhaps Bitfinex itself that is holding this money that says we're going to redeem these tethers and get money out of the tether reserves, that's nothing more than a further transfer of the cash reserves over to the company.

THE COURT: That's the part that I want to just focus on. I think a couple of things you said are that they failed to disclose what they were doing, what they were all about, and that by, I think you said, by mid 2018,

2.

that the companies knew the dollars were not there and they had told the market different things in the past. So, just in and of itself, that sounds like something that could be cured in the same way that sometimes in an M&A transaction, usually in Delaware courts, sometimes here, the argument will be, well, you know, the shareholders are about to vote and the disclosures are insufficient and often times the relief there is more disclosure.

Now, the last thing you said is what kind of where I thought you were going to be going is that you can't cure something that already happened and so to the extent that tethers are in circulation, if the idea is that people made trades based on a certain understanding, future disclosure doesn't help those people.

MR. CASTIGLIONE: That is one part of it, your
Honor, yes. And I want to be clear and I want to speak
carefully because I don't want to speculate about things
that have not been discussed in our papers nor that they
may develop during our investigation. But I think there's
a core issue here of these companies seemingly moving large
amounts of money back and forth between the companies as it
suits them, and I think independent of any given
misstatement to the market at any given time, there is a
real question about the fundamental nature of this

2.

business. And, among other things, our investigation is attempting to determine, for instance, among other things, when and why were large blocks of tethers issued and redeemed by the companies and what connection did that have with, among other things, where some of this money was and was sent over time.

I just want to be clear. I think what we articulated in our papers are very clearly violations of the Martin Act and other New York laws, but I don't want to suggest that that is the core of what we're investigating here because a not -- excuse me -- a core or the only core.

THE COURT: And, again, just to parry this point one more time, is there anything inherently in the Martin Act that would prevent a company from exchanging funds with a related entity? I mean there are other statutes that might be violated by that. It may be a common law problem. But what about the Martin Act just standing in and of itself? Let's assume there had been no disclosure issues, right, just you had a company that was issuing something like tether and then they were doing, you know, unhealthy things, imprudent things that if you were a bank you would go after as a regulator. Is there anything about the Martin Act that would permit the Attorney General to say, "Hey, wait a minute. You're an issuer. You can't do imprudent things."

1	MR. CASTIGLIONE: In those terms, I don't believe
2	so, but the Martin Act, it doesn't just cover, it doesn't
3	say, for instance, material misrepresentations. It
4	prohibits any manipulative or fraudulent devices that may
5	act as a fraud or act to deceive investors. And so
6	standing here today, I don't know if I could cover every
7	situation where imprudent conduct might take place in a
8	company that would not render either something that they
9	had previously said untrue or would require them to
10	disclose something in order to, you know, same concept.
11	But, absolutely. I think there's every reason to believe
12	that a company could be doing all sorts of things behind
13	the scene that would be material to, for instance, a trader
14	on the venue or a holder of tether.
15	THE COURT: A couple other things and then I'll
16	give Mr. Miller a chance to respond.
17	There's a thread running through the papers, and
18	I take what you just said, that there's something about the
19	fact that the arrangement that you were concerned about
20	here went to a related entity and it confused me a little
21	because I would think that if dissipation of the assets
22	were a concern, why does it matter that it's going to a
23	related entity?
24	MR. CASTIGLIONE: I think a couple of what we
25	understand about some of these transfers is that there is

2.

potentially no paper trail, no deal documents. The money was simply taken out. That's not a situation that I think typically happened in most unrelated transactions. Money can go at anytime.

In some of the materials that we've submitted to your Honor, there was a line of credit transaction that was, you know, constructed with competent counsel and so forth. That didn't happen with the \$625 million transfer in November of 2018. The money was gone immediately.

We've asked and haven't received any information about what happened to that now, I believe, 700 or \$750 million that went over to Bitfinex. We understand it to be for liquidity issues. I don't know what that means. I can guess, but we don't know. The vast material we haven't gotten, so I think that's the core point.

Look, I think independent of that, there very much could be a situation where it would be material to an investor that one company is pulling the strings of the other, absolutely could be in and of itself, but I think for purposes of this injunction the key point is that the money just goes.

THE COURT: To follow along, I think, at least as

I understood it, that's what kind of makes this a scheme,

whereas just as a hypothetical, if Tether went out and said

I think buying another company would be a great use of our

1	capital, and totally at arm's length they bought a company
2	that, you know, you might say is imprudent, but it does
3	drain the company's assets, that by itself wouldn't be a
4	Martin Act violation, I assume, 'cause it's not a scheme;
5	it's with a third party.
6	MR. CASTIGLIONE: Certainly. In the typical
7	scenario where there are things like quarterly reports or
8	material events, things get disclosed, even if it's
9	technically after the time where a deal has happened,
10	that's when information gets absorbed by the market
11	immediately and there's a discussion as to whether it was
12	disclosed and how and so forth. Here there wasn't
13	disclosure of any of it at any time until
14	THE COURT: Well, the injunction we're talking
15	about here is another hundred-something million dollars,
16	so, you know, if the injunction is about what's about to
17	happen if you don't get the injunction, wouldn't the same
18	market process occur?
19	MR. CASTIGLIONE: Perhaps. We don't know
20	anything about what happened to the \$750 million going over
21	to Bitfinex, nothing. We haven't received any documents
22	about that or any other topic
23	THE COURT: That's not what the injunction
24	relates to. You have a claim that if what they did in the
25	past was fraudulent, you have various things that you can

<u> </u>	visit upon them. The question in front of me now is how do
2	I structure an injunction that gets at what you're
3	concerned about that would also be a Martin Act issue. So
<u>.</u>	I'm not sort of

MR. CASTIGLIONE: Your Honor, if there was a way to understand or to know that Bitfinex accessed the cash reserves of Tether in order to fulfill bona fide requests by individuals who wanted tethers for dollars, as they are entitled to, I don't see any inherent problem with that.

The issue is we have asked for information about are there -- have there been in the past and are there currently bona fide redemption requests, how many, are they being filled. We understand from the papers that nothing is amiss; everyone is getting filled. I don't know that to be true, but we can take it for what it's worth. We don't know that to be the case and I think, at the very least -- again and I think this is what your Honor was getting to before -- we should have checkpoints in this process to say does this injunction continue to make sense. But we don't have any information that would allow us to even make, to even really speculate, not that that's our job, to understand what happened to the money that already went over and what would happen to the next \$150 million.

THE COURT: So just in terms of charting the injunction, I think this discussion explains to me why the

1	language of the injunction focuses on transactions with
2	Bitfinex and other related entities as opposed to a much
3	broader one that says, you know, you can't spend any
4	dollars for anything. So if it's arm's length that is not
5	with a related entity, I think that's the scope of the
6	injunction that everybody agrees on.

Last couple of things and then I'll turn to Mr. Miller on your responses and then I have a few for you, too.

In terms of how the injunction is structured, again, as I said last time, I'm going to want to have some temporal -- at least initial temporal limit around it and your proposal is that the burden should be on the respondents to come to the court at some point before the expiration and explain why it should be essentially terminated.

Now, that would be unusual because typically the party seeking the enjoined conduct is the one that has to persuade the court why that's necessary, and on top of that, you're going to be in possession of information about your investigation. I'm not sure how they would know what the grounds would be to terminate the injunction at that stage.

So why would you flip the burden essentially upside down?

MR. CASTIGLIONE: I don't know if I would agree that the burden is flipped upside down. What we intended to do with the structure that we propose was to say our checkpoint for whether the injunction continues to make sense is whether we have the information necessary to evaluate, among other things, when and how the money would move, to whom it is going to, are there bona fide orders that, among other things, would suggest that the flow of tethers in and out are real.

production of materials. They are in the best position to know where they are. In terms of the materials they've produced that they have versus what we've requested, we don't know what they have. And so our intention was to say at the expiration of the injunction, you can put in papers that say we have completed the following and therefore it doesn't make sense to continue it. We get to respond. I'm not sure the burden really lies necessarily any heavier on one side than the other to say at that point that they have been compliant with the documents portion of the order and therefore the injunction no longer needs to go forward.

THE COURT: I would agree with you in certain circumstances. If you have an injunction out to a specific end date so that the order of the court is essentially indefinite, then the burden is on the enjoined party to

come in and explain why it should be terminated, whereas on its terms there is no natural termination point.

Just in getting to what you said, I understand the point about discovery, although, you know, by that point you presumably would have some indication, you and the Special Referee, as to whether the production was complete. But, more importantly, I think you said at that point you will know more about what the concerns are. It's just a little unclear to see how the respondents would know what your concerns are. So it still seems, you know, if the injunction says this last X day unless somebody comes here and explains why that should be different, it just seems more natural for that to be the petitioner.

MR. CASTIGLIONE: Your Honor, part of our concern was we haven't received any materials from respondents for over a month now and with the process that they outlined, I think they said 30 days or 45, we would make a submission to the Court full stop and then what? I don't know if the argument about burden, I don't necessarily think that just because they put in their papers first we wouldn't have a burden necessarily. But I think the point is what's going to happen at the end of this process if we're going to put in a piece of paper that talks about how they did or didn't comply and then what? Does the order persist until they put in papers when they do and your Honor rules when.

2.

Clarity is what we're trying to go for and trying to be realistic about our ability to say anything frankly intelligent about what they've done in response to the 354 order, which right now is nothing.

THE COURT: Well, a couple of things there, I guess. You had a procedure with a letter of 14 days and then some sort of response. That process, which I think does make sense, could work as easily with the petitioner going first with a letter and I think at that time, if we do it that way with petitioner going first, I think the incomplete -- if the investigation is incomplete and there is some reason why it is, that would seem to me to be a potential argument why you can't stop it now because it wouldn't make sense to do that because all the things that led to the original in junction, none of it has been resolved.

You sort of anticipated my other two questions for you. First of all, why 90 days? Where did that come from?

MR. CASTIGLIONE: Based on conversations that we had with respondents about how long they believed it would take to them to produce substantially all of the materials in the 354 order. That seemed like a meaningful checkpoint. I don't know if they'll do that, but it seemed about right. I don't think this is an exact science. It

1	seemed about the right time. It's not too short to make it
2	unrealistic and therefore we're coming back to you saying
3	extend it, we need more time, nor is it so long that I
4	think it would cause concern that this investigation is not
5	proceeding, it is, and we want to demonstrate that.
6	THE COURT: Okay. And then the last question
7	before I turn it over to Mr. Miller or whoever on your
8	side. What is the status in front of the Special Referee
9	of the exchange of documents?
10	MR. CASTIGLIONE: Nothing, your Honor. So we go
11	back before him tomorrow. We have like I said a couple
12	of times, we haven't received anything from them for a
13	couple of weeks prior to even filing our order. We
14	understand there to have been a production in cue ready to
15	go out the door that didn't go out the door. We also
16	understand that it was their belief or maybe aspiration
17	that the items in our subpoenas could be responded to fully
18	by, I believe, tomorrow and so that's where we stand. We
19	have been asked to go back to the 354 order and identify
20	priorities. We've done that. They know generally what
21	they are. That's where we are.
22	THE COURT: Okay. That was a lot.
23	But, Mr. Miller, why don't you try to hit those
24	points and then I have a few for you.

25

MR. MILLER: Thank you, your Honor. I have a

1 number of points in response.

2.

First, I think the reason why this has been somewhat confusing in terms of what we just heard, your Honor, is because of your Honor's initial question, which goes to the heart of this, that the Martin Act is about disclosure. And as we noted on page 16 of our opening brief on April 30th, the Martin Act doesn't attempt to regulate particular features of a business. It's a disclosure approach, citing and quoted from Kerusa v. W 10 Z/515 Real Estate Partnership, 2009 Court of Appeals case, your Honor. And the theory is that if the risk of the investments are disclosed, then investors can engage in self-protection.

I don't want to get back into the facts of what was said and what we disclosed back in 2018 and what the respondents believed with respect to the money because we absolutely dispute everything that counsel for the Attorney General's Office just said, completely, categorically.

So this is about disclosure and it's why, your Honor, quite candidly, with all due respect, we still intend to argue this, that there should not be an injunction in the first place and we're reserving our rights on it, because everything has been disclosed. The Attorney General's Office cannot articulate an irreparable harm here, other than to say two things: one, that this

1	doesn't smell right, that it smacks of a fraudulent scheme
2	That doesn't mean they get an injunction, with all due
3	respect, your Honor, under the Martin Act. If we've shown
4	that this is disclosed and they haven't shown that it's
5	not, since the burden is on them, then they haven't made
6	the irreparable harm showing.
7	THE COURT: Isn't there I would say one of
8	their better arguments, if not the best, is, you know,
9	tether has been out there for a while, and taking their
10	allegations that it's in circulation based in part on an
11	understanding when your disclosure was, let's say, less
12	broad in terms of what the underpinning assets were, why
13	having made those disclosures, which have, let's say, been
14	improved, there's still a lot of people who bought and
15	trade and hold, perhaps, who bought and traded and held
16	based on the old disclosures.
17	So at that point aren't they correct that
18	well, you have to minimize how much your conduct is
19	inconsistent with the past disclosures.
20	MR. MILLER: But, your Honor, again, since we're
21	talking about tether, which is a stablecoin and redeemable
22	for a dollar, which tether
23	THE COURT: That's the whole point.
24	MR. MILLER: No, it's not, your Honor, because

25

what has happened since this order was disclosed, people

immediately -- there was a large redemption and people got
their money back. Everybody knows about this, your Honor.

It's been -- numerous articles have been written on the
Internet. There are a lot of people who have discussed it.

This is not some sort of confidential bit of information.

So tether holders now can redeem and get their dollar and
they choose not to.

So, again, since this is supposed to be about disclosure, and since this is supposed to be about them showing irreparable harm from nondisclosure, they are having trouble articulating why they need this injunction or why it should be of a length of time, other than to say we don't like the movements of funds between affiliated entities, which is why without waiving our objection entirely to the injunction, we actually agreed, as you saw in our letter, your Honor, that we agree to the language, again reserving our rights, which I want to get back to in a second, that the injunction can mention that there can't be the affiliated transaction equivalent to the line of credit. That's why we agreed to that, even though we think there's nothing wrong with it, especially since it's been disclosed.

The second point I was going to make with respect to the purported irreparable harm that they seem to be coming up here for their injunction is that they haven't

1	gotten documents. Putting a side the little factual, well,
2	they haven't gotten documents in the last month is because
3	of all this, your Honor, and we dispute jurisdiction, which
4	I'll get to in a moment, and I want to discuss something,
5	but I don't want to detract from my argument about what
6	we're going to say in front of the Special Referee
7	tomorrow. That's not a basis, your Honor, for an
8	injunction. They don't get to go ex-post. They don't get
9	to say, well, we have an injunction in place and we don't
10	want it lifted until we get our documents. The injunction
11	is supposed to be about irreparable harm without the
12	injunction. Irreparable harm doesn't equal them not
13	getting documents. It just doesn't. That's not what it is
14	under the law. And so that's the problem and why the
15	Attorney General's Office is having such troubling
16	articulating irreparable harm.

THE COURT: Well, just to pause there. So putting aside for a second the standard which you'll see in whatever order we issue hopefully soon, that the statute does sort of tie the two together and say if you're going to grant an information related relief to the Attorney General, which the Court has limited discretion about, at a bare minimum, the injunction is appertinent to that. So it doesn't take a lot of imagination to think that the idea was that they are linked, as they are obtaining information

they have some right to seek to maintain the status quo until they can get a handle on things.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, my response would be, with all due respect, the discovery that they're seeking here has no nexus to the preliminary injunction, which was based on an allegedly conflicted transaction and the nondisclosure of it. Again, if this is about, as it's supposed to be, about nondisclosure of a conflicted transaction, which now everybody knows about, why is a preliminary injunction even necessary in the first place, with all due respect, your Honor? And even if it is, what, if anything, does it have to do with the documents that have been requested in the document demand? It doesn't, your Honor, 'cause it has nothing to do with the disclosure of the conflicted transaction.

They can try to argue, your Honor, it's about us trying to find out where the money is. That doesn't have to do with the disclosure of the conflicted transaction, which has occurred. And it's a nice way for them to wrap it up so they can continue to get their injunction and hold it over the companies so they can get the documents they want, but that doesn't mean that they get to have the injunction or keep it and it doesn't mean they proved irreparable harm.

Another a few other things, your Honor, that I'd

	like to get to. And I don't know if your Honor wants me to								
	address this now, but, obviously, in our letter we noted a								
	number of problems with respect to the Attorney General's								
	language, including even though and I think your Honor								
	brought up earlier today the fact that the Office of Attorney General is not a regulator agree, except								
	they're trying to act that way here. Because they don't								
	like some of the investments, they don't know about what some investments the companies may make, they all of a								
	sudden now want to have restricted language that restricts								
it to cash or cash equivalents per their language, even									
	though, by the way, prior to the April 24th order, the								
	companies actually the tether actually did invest in								
	instruments beyond cash and cash equivalents, including								
	bitcoin, they bought bitcoin.								

So the Attorney General's Office wants to restrict it because they don't know or they haven't thought about it, they don't understand what the companies could be investing in, that is them acting as a regulator.

THE COURT: This may be a little beyond the issue, but it's just curious to me. Tether sounded to me like sort of the calm in the storm of cryptocurrency trading. And so if tether is backed by bitcoin, how is that consistent? If some of your assets are in a volatile currency that tether is supposed to somehow modulate, that

1	seems like it's playing into what they're saying.					
2	MR. MILLER: It's a small amount, by the way,					
3	your Honor. But the disclosures indicate, especially the					
4	disclosure of February 25th, demonstrate that tether is not					
5	just taking it in cash or cash equivalents. It does make					
6	other investments, including purchasing other assets.					
7	THE COURT: Is bitcoin a cash equivalent?					
8	MR. MILLER: No, your Honor. That's the other					
9	assets.					
10	But putting this aside, your Honor, the problem					
11	again is the fact that in their proposal, in their proposal					
12	with respect to the injunction, which we still dispute,					
13	they do they are trying to act like a regulator in					
14	restricting what these companies could do. The issue with					
15	respect to the application for the 354 order, respectfully,					
16	your Honor, was about a purported nondisclosure of a					
17	conflicted transaction. That's what was the basis for them					
18	to get the relief they received, and we dispute that, but					
19	we further dispute them now trying to broaden the					
20	injunction and the relief and peg the injunction based on					
21	their views of how these transactions or any transactions					
22	the company engages in should occur.					
23	One other point, your Honor, because I alluded to					
24	this, so I don't want to forget to mention it.					
25	Mr. Castiglione has mentioned the non-production of					

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

documents over the last month. I think our reliance on the affirmation that we filed with our order to show cause makes very clear that we were producing lots of documents, that we were constantly making productions on a weekly basis, that we were in frequent contact. I don't want to belabor our views of why they did what they did on April 24th, which I think we made pretty clear in our paperwork. But putting that aside, the fact that there have not been productions since they initiated this action is because of the fact, as we made clear, we made clear in our paperwork, we made clear to them, our productions were voluntary before they initiated this action. voluntarily cooperating, that's over, and if we have an order, we comply with it or we appeal it, which leads me to my next point, your Honor, and I wanted to make sure that we mention this, your Honor, since we didn't want your Honor to be blindsided that we're going to be raising it with the Special Referee tomorrow.

We intend next week to move to dismiss under the CPLR this entire special proceeding under the Martin Act for lack of jurisdiction. And, respectfully, your Honor, we're going to be requesting a stay, because otherwise if we have to produce documents, that moots the relief that we seek, and if your Honor, with all due respect, is unwilling to grant our motion for the stay, we are going to the

1	Appellate Division. So we're going to make that point to
2	the Special Referee tomorrow because, again, the era of us
3	producing documents when there was voluntary cooperation is
4	over. We'll comply with the orders or we'll appeal them
5	and get a resolution.

THE COURT: I'm not insulted by any of that, so you don't have to say "with all due respect." That's obviously your right.

A couple of questions for you before I let you go here. In the back and forth in the letters, at some point you sort of criticize the references in the Attorney General's proposed injunction to reserve funds, specifically when they said that payroll and the like should only come from non-reserve funds and there was a line that money is fungible and there's really no such thing. But your proposal also references dollar reserves being held by Tether. Are those not the same thing?

MR. MILLER: So, your Honor, were all due respect, our point on that issue is that Tether maintains funds that it obviously has received from customers, funds that it earns on its investments, and the point is that they are -- they're not in separate accounts and since money is fungible we can't say that this dollar came from this customer versus this dollar being earned from an investment. And this is not some sort of novel on its

1	face, fraudulent concept. This is true for many businesses
2	that have business accounts. And so ultimately, though,
3	the company does, of course, keep track of how much money
4	it owes customers versus how much it's earned from a
5	numbers standpoint, but our point was that they wanted in
6	their, I think, part two of the proposed injunction,
7	condition the payment of compensation and salaries based on
8	it coming from non-reserve funds.

Money is fungible, that's not going to be possible, and that seems to also indicate, again going back to "they're not a regulator but they're acting like one," where a business may have its own accounts where it knows how much money it owes to people and how much it's collecting or how much it's earning, and even if that's not a profitable enterprise doesn't mean it can't pay its employees.

THE COURT: Look, money is fungible, I get it, but it's actually a fact question and you can also have an account that you don't touch except for certain purposes.

I mean, some of this conversation sounded like the Social Security lockbox. I'm not sure it exists or what happens because it's all Treasury funds.

So is there an account of dollars that you -that the company has to maintain, let's say, a certain
percentage of coverage for the amount of circulating

1	tether?
2	MR. MILLER: I don't think so, your Honor. I
3	think there is a business account and there are accounts
4	that back the tether and accounts that it earns from
5	investments backing the tether, but I don't think they're
6	segregated in any way.
7	THE COURT: Just to get to the government's
8	concern, I think you both mentioned this. If in, the
9	course of business, your expenses go up and your
10	investments go down, does that mean, whether it's a
11	separate account or not, your relative percentage of
12	dollars to tether will just drop and there's no sort of
13	floor on how much money can go out the door?
14	MR. MILLER: Well, at an instantaneous point in
15	time that could be correct, but, again, since this company
16	is operating like a fractional reserve concept the bank
17	might have, this is not something new or novel. Obviously,
18	to the extent that the company has an incentive, of course,
19	to keep the reserves up, not only for the money it owes to
20	the customers, but in order for it to be a profitable
21	enterprise. It's not doing this as a nonprofit.
22	THE COURT: I kind of agree with you that you
23	start to get into the regulatory at that point.
24	MR. MILLER: Absolutely.
25	THE COURT: And I think what Mr. Castiglione said

1	I think is sensible, is that they can stop you or I can
2	stop you from doing sort of related party transactions or
3	something else that they can, you know, arguably say is
4	improper use of funds. It would be a different thing to
5	say I'm going to just put a hold on all of your
6	expenditures. So I get the point. So I guess you have
7	answered the question. There is no reserve. That's not a
8	thing. You know, there's not some untouchable segment of
9	the company's funds that is kept separate and it's all cash
10	within the enterprise and can be used either to have tether
11	transactions be redeemed or for anything else.
12	MR. MILLER: With all due respect, your Honor, I
13	take issue with there not being a reserve. There is a

MR. MILLER: With all due respect, your Honor, I take issue with there not being a reserve. There is a reserve from our perspective. It's not a lockbox, to use Vice President Al Gore's terminology, for that particular money, but, nevertheless, the point is that there are reserves because there are cash, cash equivalents, other assets and investments that back the tether.

THE COURT: But you said before if they're not in a segregated account, why couldn't you use that for other purposes?

MR. MILLER: Again, your Honor, to the extent that there is profit, certainly the company can do whatever, but even if there's not profit off this, the company could still pay its employees and then earn money

2.

to then put money back. And, again, the issue that we're
talking about here frankly relates to, you know, really
more of a hypothetical concern of what if literally tens of
thousands of tether holders decide on today, May 16, that
they want to redeem their tether at the same time, some of
them may be delayed. That's what this comes down to.

THE COURT: And that's a regulatory question of whether New York State government has some ability to say that tether isn't being run in the safest possible way. I get you on that and maybe really the disclosure issue is, is that investors know that that's, even if it's hypothetical, that that's something that could happen, that's your point, is that that's baked into the market.

MR. MILLER: And that's part of the issue here, because, again, to go to my first point when I stood up, your Honor asked a very good question: Isn't this supposed to be about disclosure under the Martin Act? And if not, what else is this about? And really what this has come down to is the Attorney General's Office making some arguments about it's a dirty enterprise that's being engaged in here that has nothing to do with the disclosure issue, which is where this is supposed to be about, but they don't want that to be what it's about because it's been disclosed; the conflicted transaction was disclosed.

And so, ultimately, again, this is why, your

Honor, I have to respectfully renew our request to vacate
the injunction. If your Honor is unwilling to do that, as
your Honor saw from our paperwork, they are really not only
trying to expand this injunction, but they're trying to act
as a regulator and that they cannot do.

THE COURT: I understand.

Last question, I guess, before I come back to the other side of the table, why 45 days? Where did that come from?

MR. MILLER: Fair question. So, your Honor, obviously the companies have an interest. If there is an injunction, it being that short a duration. We thought that something like two weeks to even 30 days, although we initially thought about 30 days and then reconsidered after discussion with the Attorney General's Office was too short.

Ninety days, whatever, holding this again, goes back to us thinking about it's their burden to show irreparable harm without this injunction. It makes no sense for all the reasons I've articulated, respectfully, your Honor, for such an injunction to be in place against our businesses for 90 days. So in an effort to be somewhat compromising, reserving all our rights, that's how we came up with 45.

THE COURT: Yes. And I assume the narrower the

2.

injunction, the less concern over how long its lasts and
the more onerous the injunction, the more concern over how
long it lasts, so both factors are at play there. And I
recognize it, if not arbitrary, there's no mathematical
formula for it.

I think another relevant point is that you also don't want to be coming in here every few weeks to fight about it. Then I become a regulator, which I am not interested in either. So the idea is to set up a process where the investigation goes forward. The injunction, I will tell you, I think it should be as narrow as possible, consistent with the claim for irreparable harm.

I think, as I said, the principle I'm going under is it should be broad enough to do what the government has argued to avoid irreparable harm, while at the same time not being any broader than necessary to hamstring the commercial activities of a company, and it should only last for a reasonable -- some end point because injunctions under Section 354 are kind of an odd beast in that most preliminary injunctions have a natural end point, usually a trial, and here you don't have that.

So anyway, the goal, from my perspective, is
to -- I understand you want there to be no injunction and
you reserve your rights on that, and just to be absolutely
clear, neither of you by submitting proposals are giving up

L	any rights either for a narrower or nonexistent injunction
2	on the respondents' part, or a broader one. So that's
3	where I'm headed is to try to make it broad enough to do
Ŀ	what the government needs, at least in my view, and not one
5	bit broader than that.

MR. MILLER: I appreciate that, your Honor, and given, assuming for the moment that an injunction would be appropriate, which respectfully obviously we disagree with --

THE COURT: Continuing objection recognized.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, your Honor.

Again, I think our proposal does exactly what you're trying to do, your Honor, namely to make such an injunction as narrow as possible, which is why we limited Injunction No. 1 or Clause 1, whatever you want to call it, to the conflicted, the allegedly conflicted transaction between the affiliates, including the line of credit, because we understand your Honor's point from back on May 6, that it can't just be an injunction that mentions the line of credit. It has to be any kind of affiliated loan transaction or a conflicted transaction, which is why we proposed that language, but we couldn't agree with the Office of the Attorney General because, again, they went beyond that to be a regulator.

THE COURT: Okay.

1 M	ΊR.	CASTIGLIONE:	Your	Honor,	if	I	could.
-----	-----	--------------	------	--------	----	---	--------

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. CASTIGLIONE: To be clear, what we set forth in our injunction that I think the dispute is about, the carve-outs that were essentially requested by the other side to allow them to continue business in what they call the ordinary course.

THE COURT: I am aware that they left out a reference to their terms and conditions, I think. One of the points which, when I read your letter, I was wondering if the injunction is -- if the breadth of it is determined by whatever they determine the terms and conditions are, that doesn't make a lot of sense, but I think the one that they proposed doesn't include a reference to terms and conditions, so that takes care of one of the things you were concerned with.

MR. CASTIGLIONE: I think that's right and I think there was some cross-drafting going on. But what we attempted to capture in our injunction was those elements of their business that they say needed to continue that were the existing injunction language from the original 354 order were unclear and at one point they said, "Well, under the terms of the original order, it's not clear that we can allow tether holders to redeem," which we said, okay, to the extent they're not affiliated entities that would

1 essentially evade the injunction, that seems appropriate.

2.

On subparagraph 2 with respect to compensation of individuals at the company out of the tether cash reserves, they said, "Well, wait a minute. We have people on payroll. Shouldn't people be allowed to get paid?" And so we attempted to craft language that would suggest that to the extent that there are regular and ordinary payments, sure.

What we were concerned about in that instance was we understand that the executives of the company get irregular lump-sum payments from these unsegregated accounts at non-periodic, put it that way, times and that we had a concern that that would be an evasion of the order. It doesn't have anything to do with what the Office of the Attorney General thinks should or what would be good to be done. It's what language can be crafted to ensure there's not an easy evasion of the language and you can see in both sub (1) and sub (2), there's an initial sentence in each one of those that I believe are the same or substantially the same in both proposed orders and so the dispute, to the extent there's much, I'm not sure there is, lies in the carve-outs essentially.

THE COURT: Let me ask you about paragraph two because I have been taking a little bit from both sides that I thought made sense. The first part of it prohibits

1	them from making any distribution or dividend to any		
2	principal, executive, employee, agent, investor or		
3	associate of Bitfinex and Tether maybe that should be		
4	"or Tether" and Tether from funds that have been loaned,		
5	extended, pledged or otherwise taken from the U.S. dollar		
6	reserves held by Tether. And I just at the moment I		
7	think even the carve-out doesn't I assume the carve-out		
8	for avoidance of doubt in addition to things like payments		
9	in the ordinary course, payroll, payments to vendors,		
10	consultants or contractors, that list should also include		
11	redemptions to well, redemptions generally, right?		
12	MR. CASTIGLIONE: Do you mean to say redemptions		
13	by the key for instance, the key executives of the		
14	company that may hold tether?		
15	THE COURT: Well, that's what I was kind of		
16	puzzling about is how do you phrase that. Let's assume		
17	somebody, some employee at one of the companies invests in		
18	tether, is the idea that that person could not redeem their		
19	tether?		
20	MR. CASTIGLIONE: I don't know whether that to be		
21	true, so I'm uncomfortable suggesting that that could be an		
22	easy evasion. Again, we have asked are there significant		
23	personal holdings and what are they by the key company		
24	executives. We don't know.		

25

So if someone has a hundred tethers and wants to

1	redeem them, that seems insignificant. If someone has 200
2	million tethers that they issued themselves and are
3	redeeming them as a way to get the money to themselves in
1	essentially abrogation of the order, yeah, I think that's a
5	big problem.

THE COURT: Again, let me just take your proposed language and make sure I understand it. From your -- I think this is your proposal, paragraph 2, as I have it, says: "Making any distribution or dividend to any principal, executive, employee, agent, investor or associate of Bitfinex and Tether." So you see what I mean by the "or," it would have to be somebody who, whatever that is, of both entities. Maybe that's what you mean, I guess, common ownership. I get you. That actually makes -- scratch what I said before.

All right. Let's start again. "Making any distribution or dividend to any principal, executive, employee, agent, investor or associate of Bitfinex and Tether." So the first part is common owners or common employees, right? And to those entities you cannot make any of those things from funds that have been loaned, extended or otherwise taken from the U.S. dollar reserves held by Tether.

So just start with that. The first sentence is basically about sending dividends and the like, which

certainly sound like outside the ordinary course, 2. extraordinary, however you want to put it, transactions to owners. And then the carve-out, which, I quess, you quys spent some time on, yours said: "The foregoing shall not preclude payments in the ordinary course of business. then you have a few examples and then you add "from non-reserve funds, " which obviously is a point of contention.

I was just curious, though, about a couple of things. The first part says, it includes "an investor of Bitfinex and Tether." Now, as I understand it, your view is that customers are investors, right? In other words, if you're an innocent whatever and you happen to trade in tether and you are on Bitfinex, aren't you an investor in both?

MR. CASTIGLIONE: Because there's the difference between the big T in Tether and the little T in tethers.

To the extent someone buys and sells tethers on the market, little T, they are -- we've call them investors, like someone who buys and sells Apple stock, I think is what they used in the papers, they hold tethers, they trade them in the market and goes back to the conversation we had before. Those individuals will presumably from time to time come to -- they're not employees of the company big T Tether or they don't invest -- Tether has investors,

1	meaning part owners of the company.		
2	THE COURT: Equity holders of the two companies.		
3	I wonder there's some potential confusion if you say		
4	"investor," even if it's an investor of the company I'm		
5	trying to think of a better word for that. I guess "equity		
6	investor."		
7	MR. CASTIGLIONE: Holder of equity, that's what		
8	we're trying to get at.		
9	THE COURT: Okay. And for the avoidance of doubt		
10	sentence, just harkening back to paragraph 1, you have a		
11	sentence that says: "This injunction," which is the		
12	arguably broader one, "does not restrain Tether's use of		
13	its U.S. dollar reserves to fulfill bona fide redemption		
14	requests by holders of tether, " in your case that are		
15	not in your draft, "that are not affiliated with		
16	respondents."		
17	So there, I guess, (a) what does "affiliated"		
18	mean? And why isn't that carve-out also something that		
19	should be in paragraph 2? In other words, in the list of		
20	things like payrolls or investment, I'm just trying to make		
21	sure.		
22	MR. CASTIGLIONE: I understand what you're		
23	saying. I think it goes back to the extent there are this		
24	group of individuals, employees, executives that trade		

25

tethers in the market, at a certain hypothetical level,

2.

their ability to redeem tethers like anyone else would seem
perhaps unconcerning. To the extent they are major
holders, who decide who, when and in what amount to issue
blocks of several hundred million tethers at a time, to the
extent those individuals will redeem from themselves the
cash reserves of tether, that appears to be a way to evade
either two or frankly one, to evade the order.

THE COURT: Well, the first sentence said they can't make a distribution or dividend to any of those people, so the workaround that you're suggesting is if some employee, if they wanted to give some employee 200 million of tether, they can't do that under the first sentence.

MR. CASTIGLIONE: I think that's right. I mean, one is attempting, I think it's fair to say, to stop a repeat of what happened in November of 2018 and two is attempting to stop and evasion of that and any dissipation or looting of the company by its executives who -- there doesn't appear to be anything to stop them from redeeming these tethers for themselves in blocks of tens or hundreds of millions of dollars. I think we were mostly in agreement with the other side the other day. It was how to phrase, actually, I think, at this point, talking about non-reserve funds.

THE COURT: I think it was just the reference to reserve fund. The other language is pretty well agreed.

2.

just want to make sure we were all on the same page that whatever the reference is to ordinary course of business in the second sentence of two, that that doesn't in any way cut into the carve-out in the first part of the injunction, which makes it clear that you can do redemptions.

MR. CASTIGLIONE: Your Honor, I don't think so, but what we have been trying to get at this issue by asking, among other things, who and when and under what circumstances have people been redeeming tethers over the relevant time period and we haven't gotten any information, perhaps their prerogative if they say not to give us any documents. They are subject to the court order. They voluntarily accepted service of our subpoenas and are now bound to produce under them and I don't think a motion under the CPLR changes that. That will get briefed.

But one point I did want to hit that Mr. Miller discussed with regards to -- I think it's all the same general question -- about it's unlikely, for instance, that tens of thousands of tethers could be redeemed at any point. They made the point in their opening papers that the largest tether redemption at any one time was \$24.2 million. So there is every reason to believe, because they've said it, that these redemptions happen fast and in large blocks and the individuals that are subject to this order are the only ones that determine whether or not

1	those redemption requests get filled.
2	The other issue and I hate to put too much on
3	your plate, your Honor in the last week or so, the
4	company has announced that it is going to redeem 1 billion
5	tethers, 1 billion tethers in exchange for a claim on the
6	company's ongoing gross profits, I believe.
7	MR. MILLER: Not accurate, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: All right.
9	MR. CASTIGLIONE: I'm reading from the initial
10	exchange offering of tokens by iFinex that they published
11	and it says: "We will redeem and have gotten commitments
12	for redemption of a billion tethers in ten days." And so
13	there's every reason to believe that the issuance and
14	redemptions of tethers has an immediate effect on the order
15	of hundreds of millions of dollars potentially in this
16	company and what we're trying to make sure is that the
17	order makes sense in light of the limited information we
18	have about what's going on in the company and where the
19	cash is going.
20	THE COURT: Okay. Just to tie up the language
21	thing on paragraph 2. From the government's perspective,
22	we changed the word investor to equity holder or equity
23	investor. Does anybody have a problem with that?
24	MR. CASTIGLIONE: No.

25

THE COURT: What would be your preference in

1	terms of how to describe an investor?	
2	MR. MILLER: Equity holder is fine.	
3	MR. CASTIGLIONE: Equity holder, your Honor.	
4	THE COURT: All right. Anything further?	
5	MR. MILLER: Yes, your Honor, if I may make just	
6	a couple quick points.	
7	As your Honor is crafting this injunction, we	
8	just want to make one point. I heard discussions from	
9	counsel on the other side about trying to coming up with a	
10	carve-out. Just to make something clear from our position,	
11	your Honor, this injunction is a carve-out. We don't have	
12	to specify the activities that we want to engage in. They	
13	have to specify what they need to enjoin. And, again, our	
14	position, as we articulated in our letter on May 6, is that	
15	what they are attempting to do is because they don't like	
16	the business, they don't like the way money is flowing,	
17	that they're trying to enjoin ordinary business activity.	
18	And, again, we're going to do what we need to do	
19	subject to your Honor's ruling, but based on what we have	
20	demonstrated to the Court through our briefing and the	
21	letters, it is clear that what the petitioners are trying	
22	to do here is they are trying to enjoin the operation of a	
23	business because they believe that there may be a	
24	fraudulent scheme. Their belief doesn't mean they get an	
25	injunction and it certainly doesn't warrant an injunction	

45

Proceedings

1	when, again, they have brought this action under 354,			
2	articulating in their application that this is about			
3	allegedly the nondisclosure of a conflicted affiliated			
4	transaction and I put "conflicted" in air quotes.			
5	So ultimately, your Honor, again we renew our			
6	application to vacate this injunction, but to the extent			
7	your Honor is going to craft language on this injunction, I			
8	think our letter of May 6 makes very clear what we view and			
9	what we believe is the right way to craft such an			
10	injunction to make sure that these companies can continue			
11	to operate in their ordinary course of business.			
12	And finally, with respect to the document issue,			
13	your Honor, we will be mentioning this to the Special			
14	Referee tomorrow. We will be filing an application next			
15	week and this is why at this point there have not been			
16	documents produced because, contrary to what			
17	Mr. Castiglione says, there is no jurisdiction here and so			
18	we will be making that application.			
19	THE COURT: Thank you very much.			
20	I'm going to issue my order promptly and I'll			
21	obviously entertain whatever submissions you feel			
22	appropriate. I assume you meant it was an application to			
23	me rather than the Special Master.			
24	MR. MILLER: Yes, your Honor. We're making a			

motion to your Honor.

25

1	THE COURT: Thank you very much. I appreciate
2	it.
3	MR. CASTIGLIONE: Thank you, your Honor.
4	MR. MILLER: Thank you, your Honor.
5	(proceedings concluded.)
6	* * *
7	CERTIFICATE
8	I, Debra Lynn Salzman, RMR, an Official
9	Court Reporter of the State of New York, do hereby
10	certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate
11	transcript of my stenographic notes.
12	Debra Salzman, SCR
13	
14	Debra Lynn Salzman, RMR Official Court Reporter
15	Official Court Reporter
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

\$	absolutely [5] 10/11 11/19	among [7] 6/21 9/1 9/2 9/5
\$150 [1] 13/23	19/17 29/24 33/24 absorbed [1] 12/10	15/6 15/8 42/8 amount [3] 25/2 28/25 41/3
\$150 million [1] 13/23	accepted [1] 42/13	amounts [1] 8/22
\$24.2 [1] 42/22	accessed [1] 13/6	announced [1] 43/4
\$24.2 million [1] 42/22	account [6] 4/3 28/19 28/23	another [4] 11/25 12/15 23/25
\$625 [1] 11/8 \$675 [1] 6/19	29/3 29/11 30/20 accounted [1] 6/6	33/6
\$675 million [1] 6/19	accounts [6] 27/22 28/2 28/12	answered [1] 30/7 anticipated [1] 17/17
\$750 [2] 11/11 12/20	29/3 29/4 36/12	any [35] 4/8 6/7 8/23 8/24
\$750 million [2] 11/11 12/20	accurate [2] 43/7 46/10	10/4 11/10 12/13 12/13 12/21
\$851 [1] 6/1	act [22] 4/7 5/2 5/11 5/18	12/22 13/9 13/20 14/3 15/18
\$851 million [1] 6/1	6/21 9/9 9/14 9/17 9/23 10/2 10/5 10/5 12/4 13/3 19/5 19/7	16/15 25/21 27/6 29/6 33/16 34/1 34/20 37/1 37/1 38/9 38/9
1	20/3 24/7 25/13 26/20 31/17	38/16 38/17 38/21 41/9 41/16
'cause [2] 12/4 23/14	32/4	42/3 42/10 42/11 42/19 42/21
0	acted [1] 5/20	anybody [1] 43/23
0060 [1] 2/9	acting [2] 24/19 28/11 action [3] 26/9 26/12 45/1	anyone [1] 41/1 anything [11] 9/13 9/22 12/20
1	activities [2] 33/17 44/12	14/4 17/2 18/12 23/12 30/11
	activity [1] 44/17	36/14 41/18 44/4
1 billion [2] 43/4 43/5	acts [1] 1/7	anytime [1] 11/4
10 [1] 19/9 100 percent [1] 4/22	actually [7] 6/6 21/15 24/13	anyway [1] 33/22
1000 percent [1] 4/22 10005 [1] 2/4	24/13 28/18 38/14 41/22 add [1] 39/6	appeal [2] 26/14 27/4 Appeals [1] 19/10
10007 [1] 1/17	addition [1] 37/8	appears [1] 41/18
10036 [1] 2/13	address [1] 24/2	appearances [1] 3/3
101 [1] 2/9 10178-0060 [1] 2/9	advertisement [1] 1/12	appeared [1] 7/8
1114 [1] 2/13	advice [1] 1/12 affiliated [8] 7/17 21/13	appears [1] 41/6 Appellate [1] 27/1
14 [1] 17/6	21/19 34/20 35/25 40/15 40/17	appertinent [1] 22/23
16 [3] 1/16 19/6 31/4	45/3	Apple [1] 39/20
2	affiliates [1] 34/17	application [6] 25/15 45/2
200 [1] 38/1	affirmation [1] 26/2	45/6 45/14 45/18 45/22
200 million [1] 41/11	after [4] 7/8 9/22 12/9 32/14 afternoon [3] 3/10 3/13 3/20	appreciate [2] 34/6 46/1 approach [1] 19/9
2009 [1] 19/10	again [26] 6/25 9/12 13/17	appropriate [3] 34/8 36/1
2018 [6] 6/9 6/17 7/25 11/9	14/11 20/20 21/8 21/17 23/7	45/22
19/15 41/15 2019 [2] 1/15 1/16	25/11 27/2 28/10 29/15 30/22	April [3] 19/7 24/12 26/7
23-A [1] 1/6	31/1 31/15 31/25 32/17 34/12 34/23 37/22 38/6 38/16 44/13	April 24th [2] 24/12 26/7 April 30th [1] 19/7
24th [2] 24/12 26/7	44/18 45/1 45/5	arbitrary [1] 33/4
25th [1] 25/4	against [1] 32/21	are [63]
28 [1] 2/3	agent [3] 37/2 38/10 38/18	aren't [2] 20/17 39/14
3	agree [6] 15/1 15/22 21/16 24/6 29/22 34/22	arguably [2] 30/3 40/12
30 [3] 16/17 32/13 32/14	agreed [3] 21/15 21/20 41/25	argue [3] 4/24 19/21 23/16 argued [1] 33/15
30th [1] 19/7	agreement [1] 41/21	argument [4] 8/5 16/19 17/13
354 [7] 17/3 17/23 18/19 25/15	agrees [1] 14/6	22/5
33/19 35/21 45/1	air [1] 45/4	arguments [2] 20/8 31/20
4	Al [1] 30/15 alienate [1] 7/1	arm's [2] 12/1 14/4 around [1] 14/12
45 [3] 16/17 32/8 32/24	all [28] 3/12 3/19 5/7 7/25	arrangement [1] 10/19
450545/2019 [1] 1/15	10/12 17/14 17/18 17/22 19/20	Article [1] 1/6
5	20/2 22/3 23/4 23/11 24/9	articles [1] 21/3
515 [1] 19/10	26/24 27/7 27/18 28/22 30/5 30/9 30/12 32/20 32/23 38/16	articulate [1] 19/24 articulated [3] 9/8 32/20
6	42/1 42/17 43/8 44/4	44/14
	allegations [1] 20/10	articulating [3] 21/11 22/16
60 [1] 1/16 625 [1] 6/18	allege [1] 4/3	45/2
7	alleged [2] 4/4 4/19	as [34] 4/20 5/20 6/21 6/23
	allegedly [3] 23/6 34/16 45/3 allow [3] 13/20 35/6 35/24	8/22 9/22 10/5 11/22 11/24 12/11 13/8 14/2 14/11 16/6
700 [1] 11/11	allowed [1] 36/5	17/8 19/6 21/15 22/25 23/7
9	alluded [1] 25/23	24/19 26/10 29/21 32/2 32/5
90 [2] 17/18 32/22	along [1] 11/22	33/11 33/11 33/13 34/14 34/14
A	already [2] 8/11 13/22 also [9] 6/24 13/3 18/15 27/16	38/3 38/8 39/11 44/7 44/14 aside [3] 22/18 25/10 26/8
	28/10 28/18 33/6 37/10 40/18	ask [1] 36/23
ability [5] 6/15 7/9 17/2 31/8 41/1	although [2] 16/4 32/13	asked [5] 11/10 13/10 18/19
able [2] 7/16 7/16	am [2] 33/8 35/8	31/16 37/22
about [68]	Americas [1] 2/13	asking [1] 42/8
abrogation [1] 38/4	amiss [1] 13/14	aspiration [1] 18/16
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

A	between [4] 8/22 21/13 34/17	40/14
	39/17	cases [1] 3/24
assets [8] 5/3 10/21 12/3	beyond [4] 5/10 24/14 24/20	cash [17] 6/25 7/5 7/21 13/6
20/12 24/24 25/6 25/9 30/18 Assistant [1] 2/6	34/24 BFXNA [1] 1/8	24/11 24/11 24/14 24/14 25/5 25/5 25/7 30/9 30/17 30/17
associate [3] 37/3 38/11 38/18		36/3 41/6 43/19
assume [6] 9/18 12/4 32/25	big [3] 38/5 39/17 39/24	CASTIGLIONE [7] 2/4 3/4 3/4
37/7 37/16 45/22	billion [3] 43/4 43/5 43/12	4/5 25/25 29/25 45/17
assuming [2] 5/8 34/7	bit [4] 5/14 21/5 34/5 36/24	categorically [1] 19/18
attempt [1] 19/7 attempted [3] 6/17 35/19 36/6	bitcoin [4] 24/15 24/15 24/23	cause [2] 18/4 26/2
attempted [3] 6/1/35/19 36/6 attempting [4] 9/2 41/14 41/16	25/7 Ritfiner [13] 6/20 7/1 7/6	
44/15	7/18 11/12 12/21 13/6 14/2	certain [6] 5/16 8/13 15/22
Attorney [19] 1/3 2/3 3/5 3/7	37/3 38/11 38/18 39/11 39/14	28/19 28/24 40/25
3/9 4/6 9/23 19/17 19/24 22/15		certainly [5] 5/12 12/6 30/23
22/21 24/3 24/6 24/16 27/11	blocks [4] 9/3 41/4 41/19	39/1 44/25
31/19 32/15 34/23 36/15 Attorneys [2] 2/6 2/8	42/24 BOCKIUS [3] 2/8 3/11 3/19	certify [1] 46/10 chance [1] 10/16
authority [1] 4/12	bona [4] 13/7 13/12 15/7 40/13	
Avenue [2] 2/9 2/13	both [8] 7/7 29/8 33/3 36/18	changes [1] 42/15
avoid [1] 33/15	36/20 36/24 38/13 39/15	CHARLES [2] 2/14 3/14
avoidance [2] 37/8 40/9	bought [4] 12/1 20/14 20/15	charting [1] 13/24
aware [2] 5/6 35/8	24/15 bound [1] 42/14	checkpoint [2] 15/4 17/24 checkpoints [1] 13/18
В	breadth [1] 35/11	choose [1] 21/7
back [22] 7/11 7/12 7/15 8/22	BRIAN [2] 2/5 3/6	circulating [1] 28/25
18/2 18/11 18/19 19/14 19/15	brief [1] 19/7	circulation [2] 8/12 20/10
21/2 21/17 27/10 28/10 29/4	briefed [1] 42/15	circumstances [2] 15/23 42/9
30/18 31/1 32/7 32/18 34/18 39/22 40/10 40/23	briefing [1] 44/20 broad [3] 20/12 33/14 34/3	cited [1] 6/11 citing [1] 19/9
backed [1] 24/23	broaden [1] 25/19	CIVIL [1] 1/1
backing [2] 6/23 29/5	broader [5] 14/3 33/16 34/2	claim [3] 12/24 33/12 43/5
baked [1] 31/13	34/5 40/12	Clarity [1] 17/1
bank [4] 4/10 4/11 9/21 29/16	broadly [1] 5/5	Clause [1] 34/15
bare [1] 22/23 based [8] 8/13 17/20 20/10	brought [2] 24/5 45/1 burden [9] 14/13 14/24 15/2	clear [17] 4/22 5/14 5/16 8/17 9/7 26/3 26/7 26/10 26/10
20/16 23/6 25/20 28/7 44/19	15/18 15/25 16/19 16/21 20/5	26/11 33/25 35/3 35/23 42/5
basically [2] 4/23 38/25	32/18	44/10 44/21 45/8
basis [3] 22/7 25/17 26/5	business [15] 1/6 9/1 19/8	clearly [2] 4/5 9/8
be [87] beast [1] 33/19	28/2 28/12 29/3 29/9 35/6	client [1] 6/1
because [31] 8/18 9/11 10/21	35/20 39/5 42/2 44/16 44/17 44/23 45/11	COHEN [1] 1/19 collecting [1] 28/14
14/17 16/20 17/13 17/14 19/4	businesses [2] 28/1 32/22	come [9] 7/11 14/14 16/1 17/18
19/16 19/23 20/24 22/2 24/7	buying [1] 11/25	27/14 31/18 32/7 32/8 39/24
24/17 25/23 26/10 26/22 27/2	buys [2] 39/18 39/20	comes [2] 16/11 31/6
28/22 30/17 31/15 31/23 33/18 34/18 34/23 36/24 39/16 42/23	C	coming [5] 18/2 21/25 28/8 33/7 44/9
44/15 44/23 45/16	calibrate [1] 4/1	commercial [1] 33/17
become [1] 33/8	call [4] 6/3 34/15 35/6 39/19	commingled [1] 6/6
been [25] 3/24 6/22 8/19 9/18	calm [1] 24/22	commitments [1] 43/11
13/11 15/20 17/15 18/14 18/19	came [2] 27/23 32/23	commodities [1] 1/13
19/2 19/23 20/9 20/13 21/3 21/3 21/21 23/13 26/9 31/24	can [26] 3/2 4/25 11/4 11/13 12/25 13/15 15/15 19/12 21/6	common [4] 9/16 38/14 38/19 38/19
36/24 37/4 38/21 42/7 42/9	21/18 23/2 23/16 23/20 23/21	communications [1] 6/12
45/15	28/18 29/13 30/1 30/1 30/3	companies [16] 4/8 6/22 7/7
before [13] 3/23 7/8 7/8 13/18	,,,,	8/1 8/21 8/22 9/4 23/21 24/9
14/14 18/7 18/11 26/12 27/9 30/19 32/7 38/15 39/23	42/5 45/10 can't [10] 8/11 9/24 14/3	24/13 24/18 25/14 32/11 37/17 40/2 45/10
behalf [4] 3/12 3/14 3/17 3/19	17/13 21/18 27/23 28/15 34/19	company [33] 4/10 5/25 6/9
behind [1] 10/12	41/9 41/12	6/12 6/24 7/4 7/21 9/14 9/19
being [9] 6/6 13/13 27/17	candidly [1] 19/20	10/8 10/12 11/18 11/25 12/1
27/24 30/13 31/9 31/20 32/12	cannot [3] 19/24 32/5 38/20	25/22 28/3 28/24 29/15 29/18
33/16 belabor [1] 26/6	capital [2] 4/12 12/1 capture [1] 35/19	30/23 30/25 33/17 36/3 36/10 37/14 37/23 39/24 40/1 40/4
belief [2] 18/16 44/24	care [1] 35/15	41/17 43/4 43/16 43/18
believe [14] 5/17 5/19 6/1	carefully [1] 8/18	company's [3] 12/3 30/9 43/6
6/18 10/1 10/11 11/11 18/18		compensation [2] 28/7 36/2
36/19 42/22 43/6 43/13 44/23	39/3 40/18 42/4 44/10 44/11	competent [1] 11/7
45/9 believed [4] 5/17 6/4 17/21	carve-out [7] 37/7 37/7 39/3 40/18 42/4 44/10 44/11	competing [1] 3/21 complete [1] 16/7
19/16	carve-outs [2] 35/5 36/22	complete [1] 16// completed [1] 15/16
best [2] 15/11 20/8	carved [1] 7/13	completely [1] 19/18
better [3] 5/10 20/8 40/5	case [4] 4/15 13/16 19/10	compliant [1] 15/20

a	34/20	38/9 38/17 41/9
С	criticize [1] 27/11	dividend [4] 37/1 38/9 38/17
comply [3] 16/24 26/14 27/4	cross [1] 35/18	41/9
compromising [1] 32/23	cross-drafting [1] 35/18	dividends [1] 38/25
concept [3] 10/10 28/1 29/16	cryptocurrency [1] 24/22	Division [1] 27/1
concern [8] 10/22 16/14 18/4 29/8 31/3 33/1 33/2 36/13	cue [1] 18/14 cure [1] 8/11	do [33] 4/10 7/9 7/16 7/16 9/24 13/1 15/3 16/25 17/10
concerned [4] 10/19 13/3 35/16		17/14 17/24 23/12 23/14 23/18
36/9	curious [2] 24/21 39/9	25/13 25/14 30/23 31/21 32/2
concerns [2] 16/8 16/10	currency [1] 24/25	32/5 33/14 34/3 34/13 36/14
concluded [1] 46/5	currently [1] 13/12	37/12 37/16 41/12 42/5 44/15
condition [1] 28/7	customer [1] 27/24	44/18 44/18 44/22 46/9
conditions [3] 35/9 35/12	customers [4] 27/20 28/4 29/20	'
35/15 conduct [4] 5/20 10/7 14/18	39/12 cut [1] 42/4	documents [17] 3/25 11/1 12/21
20/18		15/20 18/9 22/1 22/2 22/10 22/13 23/12 23/21 26/1 26/3
confidential [1] 21/5	D	26/23 27/3 42/12 45/16
conflicted [11] 23/6 23/8	date [1] 15/24	does [14] 10/22 12/2 13/19
23/15 23/18 25/17 31/24 34/16	DAVID [2] 2/10 3/11	16/24 17/8 22/20 23/12 25/5
34/16 34/21 45/3 45/4	day [2] 16/11 41/21	28/3 29/10 34/12 40/12 40/17
confused [1] 10/20	days [9] 16/17 17/6 17/18 32/8	-
confusing [1] 19/3 confusion [1] 40/3	32/13 32/14 32/17 32/22 43/12 deal [2] 11/1 12/9	doesn't [23] 8/14 10/2 10/2 15/17 19/7 20/1 20/2 22/12
connection [1] 9/4	Debra [3] 46/8 46/12 46/14	22/13 22/24 23/13 23/17 23/22
consistent [2] 24/24 33/12	deceive [1] 10/5	23/23 28/15 35/13 35/14 36/14
constantly [1] 26/4	decide [2] 31/4 41/3	37/7 41/18 42/3 44/24 44/25
constituted [1] 6/20	Delaware [1] 8/5	doing [5] 7/24 9/20 10/12
constitutes [2] 4/16 5/10	delayed [1] 31/6	29/21 30/2
constructed [1] 11/7	demand [1] 23/13	dollar [10] 5/7 7/11 20/22
consultants [1] 37/10	demonstrate [2] 18/5 25/4 demonstrated [1] 44/20	21/6 27/16 27/23 27/24 37/5 38/22 40/13
contention [1] 39/8	depositors [1] 4/11	dollars [10] 4/16 6/9 8/1
continue [6] 13/19 15/17 23/20	describe [1] 44/1	12/15 13/8 14/4 28/23 29/12
35/6 35/20 45/10	determine [3] 9/2 35/12 42/25	41/20 43/15
continues [1] 15/4	determined [1] 35/11	don't [50]
Continuing [1] 34/10	detract [1] 22/5	done [4] 4/17 17/3 18/20 36/16
contractors [1] 37/10 contrary [1] 45/16	develop [1] 8/20 devices [1] 10/4	door [3] 18/15 18/15 29/13 doubt [2] 37/8 40/9
conversation [2] 28/20 39/22		down [5] 14/25 15/2 29/10 31/6
conversations [1] 17/20	16/23 17/18 24/13 26/6 26/6	31/19
cooperating [1] 26/13	32/8 42/16	draft [1] 40/15
cooperation [1] 27/3	didn't [4] 11/8 16/23 18/15	drafting [1] 35/18
core [6] 8/15 8/21 9/10 9/11	26/16	drain [1] 12/3
9/11 11/15 corporate [1] 6/1	difference [1] 39/16 different [3] 8/2 16/12 30/4	drop [1] 29/12 due [8] 19/20 20/2 23/4 23/11
correct [2] 20/17 29/15	dirty [1] 31/20	26/24 27/7 27/18 30/12
correctly [1] 4/6	disagree [1] 34/8	duration [1] 32/12
correlates [1] 4/2	disclose [3] 5/25 7/24 10/10	during [1] 8/20
could [16] 8/3 10/6 10/12	disclosed [10] 12/8 12/12	E
11/17 11/19 17/8 18/17 24/18	19/12 19/15 19/23 20/4 20/25	
25/14 29/15 30/25 31/12 35/1 37/18 37/21 42/19	21/22 31/24 31/24 disclosure [20] 4/24 5/1 5/1	each [1] 36/19 earlier [1] 24/5
couldn't [2] 30/20 34/22	5/9 5/10 8/8 8/14 9/18 12/13	earn [1] 30/25
counsel [4] 3/2 11/7 19/17	19/6 19/9 19/19 20/11 21/9	earned [2] 27/24 28/4
44/9	23/14 23/18 25/4 31/10 31/17	earning [1] 28/14
COUNTY [1] 1/1	31/21	earns [2] 27/21 29/4
couple [12] 5/13 5/22 7/23	disclosures [5] 8/7 20/13	easily [1] 17/8
10/15 10/24 14/7 17/5 18/11 18/13 27/9 39/9 44/6	20/16 20/19 25/3 discovery [2] 16/4 23/4	easy [2] 36/17 37/22 effect [1] 43/14
course [10] 5/19 28/3 29/9	discretion [1] 22/22	effectively [1] 6/11
29/18 35/7 37/9 39/1 39/5 42/2		effort [1] 32/22
45/11	discussed [3] 8/19 21/4 42/17	either [5] 10/8 30/10 33/9
court [11] 1/1 14/14 14/19	discussion [3] 12/11 13/25	34/1 41/7
15/24 16/18 19/10 22/22 42/12	32/15	elements [2] 5/16 35/19
44/20 46/9 46/14	discussions [2] 7/7 44/8 dismiss [1] 26/19	else [4] 30/3 30/11 31/18 41/1 embedded [1] 6/2
courts [1] 8/5 cover [3] 6/18 10/2 10/6	dismiss [1] 26/19 dispute [7] 19/17 22/3 25/12	employee [6] 37/2 37/17 38/10
coverage [2] 4/16 28/25	25/18 25/19 35/4 36/21	38/18 41/11 41/11
CPLR [2] 26/20 42/15	disseminated [1] 5/5	employees [5] 28/16 30/25
craft [3] 36/6 45/7 45/9	dissipate [1] 5/7	38/20 39/24 40/24
crafted [2] 7/4 36/16	dissipating [1] 5/3	end [4] 15/24 16/22 33/18
crafting [1] 44/7	dissipation [2] 10/21 41/16	33/20
credit [4] 11/6 21/20 34/17	distribution [5] 1/12 37/1	engage [2] 19/12 44/12

E	30/22 35/25 36/7 36/21 39/18 40/23 41/2 41/5 45/6	G
engaged [1] 31/21	extraordinary [1] 39/2	general [14] 1/3 1/6 2/3 2/6
engages [1] 25/22	F	3/5 3/7 3/9 4/7 9/23 22/22
enjoin [3] 44/13 44/17 44/22		24/6 34/23 36/15 42/18
enjoined [2] 14/18 15/25	face [1] 28/1	General's [9] 4/6 19/18 19/24
enough [3] 4/16 33/14 34/3	fact [6] 10/19 24/5 25/11 26/8 26/10 28/18	22/15 24/3 24/16 27/12 31/19 32/15
ensure [2] 4/12 36/16 enter [1] 5/6	factors [1] 33/3	generally [2] 18/20 37/11
enterprise [4] 28/15 29/21	facts [1] 19/14	get [36] 5/23 5/23 7/19 12/8
30/10 31/20	factual [1] 22/1	12/17 15/10 15/17 19/14 20/2
entertain [1] 45/21	failed [2] 5/25 7/24	21/6 21/17 22/4 22/8 22/8
entire [2] 5/19 26/20	failure [1] 4/15	22/10 23/2 23/20 23/21 23/22
entirely [1] 21/15	fair [2] 32/10 41/14	24/1 25/18 27/5 28/17 29/7
entities [6] 7/17 14/2 21/14	fast [1] 42/23	29/23 30/6 31/10 36/5 36/10
35/25 38/13 38/20 entitled [1] 13/9	features [1] 19/8 February [1] 25/4	38/3 38/14 40/8 42/7 42/15 43/1 44/24
entity [4] 9/15 10/20 10/23	February 25th [1] 25/4	gets [2] 12/10 13/2
14/5	feel [1] 45/21	getting [6] 7/3 8/15 13/14
equal [1] 22/12	few [6] 3/23 14/8 18/24 23/25	13/17 16/3 22/13
equity [7] 40/2 40/5 40/7	33/7 39/6	give [4] 7/11 10/16 41/11
43/22 43/22 44/2 44/3	fide [4] 13/7 13/12 15/7 40/13	42/11
equivalent [2] 21/19 25/7	fight [1] 33/7	given [4] 4/8 8/23 8/24 34/7
equivalents [4] 24/11 24/14	filed [1] 26/2	giving [1] 33/25
25/5 30/17	filing [2] 18/13 45/14	go [15] 3/23 9/22 11/4 15/21
era [1] 27/2	filled [3] 13/13 13/14 43/1 finalize [1] 3/23	17/1 18/10 18/15 18/15 18/19 22/8 27/9 29/9 29/10 29/13
especially [2] 21/21 25/3 ESQ [7] 2/4 2/5 2/5 2/10 2/10	finalize [1] 3/23 finally [1] 45/12	22/8 27/9 29/9 29/10 29/13 31/15
2/14 2/14		goal [2] 3/25 33/22
essentially [9] 4/19 7/13	find [1] 23/17	goes [6] 11/21 19/5 32/17
14/15 14/24 15/24 35/5 36/1	fine [1] 44/2	33/10 39/22 40/23
36/22 38/4	first [17] 5/24 5/25 16/20	going [30] 7/19 8/10 8/10
Estate [1] 19/10	17/9 17/10 17/18 19/2 19/22	10/22 12/20 14/11 14/20 15/7
evade [3] 36/1 41/6 41/7	23/10 31/15 36/25 38/19 38/24	16/21 16/22 17/9 17/10 21/23
evaluate [1] 15/6 evasion [4] 36/13 36/17 37/22	39/10 41/8 41/12 42/4 flip [1] 14/24	22/6 22/20 26/17 26/22 26/25 27/1 28/9 28/10 30/5 33/13
41/16	flipped [1] 15/2	35/18 43/4 43/18 43/19 44/18
even [15] 12/8 13/20 13/21	floor [1] 29/13	45/7 45/20
18/13 21/20 23/10 23/11 24/4	flow [1] 15/8	gone [1] 11/9
24/11 28/14 30/24 31/11 32/13	flowing [1] 44/16	good [5] 3/10 3/13 3/20 31/16
37/7 40/4	focus [1] 7/23	36/15
events [1] 12/8	focuses [1] 14/1	Gore's [1] 30/15
every [5] 10/6 10/11 33/7 42/22 43/13	follow [1] 11/22 following [1] 15/16	got [2] 3/21 21/1 gotten [5] 11/15 22/1 22/2
everybody [4] 5/6 14/6 21/2	foregoing [2] 39/4 46/10	42/10 43/11
23/9	forget [1] 25/24	government [3] 31/8 33/14 34/4
everyone [1] 13/14	formula [1] 33/5	government's [2] 29/7 43/21
everything [3] 4/21 19/17	forth [6] 5/21 8/22 11/8 12/12	grant [2] 22/21 26/25
19/23	27/10 35/3	great [1] 11/25
ex [1] 22/8	forward [2] 15/21 33/10	gross [1] 43/6
ex-post [1] 22/8	fractional [1] 29/16	grounds [1] 14/22
exact [1] 17/25 exactly [2] 6/13 34/12	frankly [4] 6/2 17/2 31/2 41/7 fraud [2] 5/20 10/5	group [1] 40/24 guess [9] 5/9 11/14 17/6 30/6
exactly [2] 6/15 34/12 examples [1] 39/6		32/7 38/14 39/3 40/5 40/17
except [2] 24/6 28/19		guys [1] 39/3
exchange [4] 1/12 18/9 43/5	free [1] 5/6	H
43/10	Irequent [1] 26/5	
exchanging [1] 9/14	front [3] 13/1 18/8 22/6	had [12] 5/25 6/10 6/13 6/22
excuse [1] 9/11	fulfill [2] 13/7 40/13	8/2 9/18 9/19 10/9 17/6 17/21
executive [3] 37/2 38/10 38/17 executives [5] 36/10 37/13	full [1]	36/13 39/22 hamstring [1] 33/16
37/24 40/24 41/17	fully [1] 18/1/ fund [1] 41/25	handle [1] 23/2
existing [1] 35/21	fundamental [1] 8/25	happen [7] 11/8 12/17 13/23
exists [1] 28/21	funds [16] 6/2 6/5 9/14 21/13	16/22 31/12 39/13 42/23
expand [1] 32/4	27/12 27/14 27/20 27/20 28/8	happened [9] 5/17 8/11 11/3
expenditures [1] 30/6	28/22 30/4 30/9 37/4 38/21	11/11 12/9 12/20 13/22 20/25
expenses [1] 29/9	39/7 41/23	41/15
expiration [2] 14/15 15/15	fungible [4] 27/15 27/23 28/9	happens [1] 28/21
explain [2] 14/15 16/1	28/17 further [4] 7/5 7/20 25/19	harkening [1] 40/10 harm [12] 4/3 19/25 20/6 21/10
explains [2] 13/25 16/12 extend [1] 18/3	14/4	21/24 22/11 22/12 22/16 23/24
extended [2] 37/5 38/22	future [1] 8/13	32/19 33/12 33/15
extent [12] 7/17 8/12 29/18	, -	has [26] 4/14 12/9 14/18 17/15
	I	

н	importantly [1] 16/7 improper [1] 30/4	i
has [22] 19/2 19/23 20/9		i
20/25 22/22 23/5 23/14 23/19		i
25/25 27/20 28/24 29/18 31/8	12/2	
31/18 31/21 33/14 34/20 37/25	inaccessible [1] 6/11	
38/1 39/25 43/4 43/14	inc [3] 1/8 1/8 1/8	
hate [1] 43/2		i
have [72]	, , ,	i
haven't [12] 4/17 11/10 11/14	·	i
12/21 16/15 18/12 20/4 20/5		i
12/21 16/15 18/12 20/4 20/5 21/25 22/2 24/17 42/10 having [3] 20/13 21/11 22/15	_ · ·	i
having [3] 20/13 21/11 22/15 headed [1] 34/3	incomplete [2] 17/11 17/11 inconsistent [1] 20/19	1
heard [2] 19/3 44/8	indefinite [1] 15/25	
heart [1] 19/5	independent [3] 5/2 8/23 11/16	
heavier [1] 15/18	Index [1] 1/15	
held [4] 20/15 27/17 37/6	indicate [2] 25/3 28/10	
38/23	indication [1] 16/5	
help [1] 8/14	individuals [6] 13/8 36/3	
helpful [1] 3/22	39/23 40/24 41/5 42/24	
here [22] 4/14 6/16 8/5 8/21		i
9/11 10/6 10/20 12/12 12/15	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	i
9/11 10/6 10/20 12/12 12/15 16/12 19/25 21/25 23/5 24/7 27/10 31/2 31/14 31/21 33/7	22/21 22/25 42/10 43/17	
,,,,	•	i
33/21 44/22 45/17	inherently [1] 9/13	
hereby [1] 46/9	initial [4] 14/12 19/4 36/18	J
hey [2] 7/9 9/24 him [1] 18/11	43/9	_
hit [2] 18/11		J
hold [5] 20/15 23/20 30/5		j J
37/14 39/21	,	J
holder [6] 6/4 10/14 40/7	_	J
43/22 44/2 44/3		J
holders [10] 5/21 7/10 7/14		j
7/14 21/6 31/4 35/24 40/2		j
40/14 41/3	insofar [1] 6/21	
holding [2] 7/18 32/17		j
holdings [2] 1/9 37/23	instance [6] 9/2 10/3 10/13	
HON [1] 1/19	36/9 37/13 42/18	
Honor [68]	instantaneous [1] 29/14	
Honor's [3] 19/4 34/18 44/19 hope [1] 7/4	instruments [1] 24/14 insufficient [1] 8/7	
hopefully [1] 22/19	insulted [1] 27/6	
how [24] 12/12 13/1 13/12	intelligent [1] 17/3	
14/10 14/21 15/6 16/9 16/23	intend [2] 19/21 26/19	
17/21 20/18 24/23 25/21 28/3		J
28/4 28/13 28/13 28/14 29/13	intention [2] 7/12 15/14	K
32/23 33/1 33/2 37/16 41/21	interest [1] 32/11	т,
44/1		k
however [1] 39/2		k
hundred [3] 12/15 37/25 41/4		K
hundred-something [1] 12/15 hundreds [3] 6/9 41/19 43/15		k
hypothetical [4] 11/24 31/3	investigating [1] 9/10 investigation [6] 8/20 9/1	k
31/12 40/25	14/21 17/11 18/4 33/10	•
hypothetically [1] 5/4		k
		k
I	40/20	
I'd [2] 5/13 23/25	investments [8] 19/12 24/8	
I'll [4] 10/15 14/7 22/4 45/20	24/9 25/6 27/21 29/5 29/10	
I'm [16] 5/8 13/4 14/11 14/21	30/18	
15/17 27/6 28/21 30/5 33/13	investor [12] 11/18 37/2 38/10	
34/3 36/21 37/21 40/4 40/20	38/18 39/10 39/14 40/4 40/4	
34/3 36/21 37/21 40/4 40/20 43/9 45/20 I've [2] 3/24 32/20	40/6 43/22 43/23 44/1	
	investors [6] 10/5 19/12 31/11	
idea [4] 8/12 22/24 33/9 37/18	39/12 39/19 39/25	Ι
identify [1] 18/19 iFinex [2] 1/8 43/10	invests [1] 37/17	1
imagination [1] 22/24	[[1
immediate [1] 43/14	irreparable [12] 4/2 19/24 20/6 21/10 21/24 22/11 22/12	_
immediately [3] 11/9 12/11	22/16 23/24 32/19 33/12 33/15	
21/1	,,,,,,,	

is [170]

21/1

isn't [4] 20/7 31/9 31/16 40/18 issuance [2] 1/12 43/13 issue [17] 8/21 13/3 13/10 22/19 24/21 25/14 27/19 30/13 31/1 31/10 31/14 31/22 41/3 42/7 43/2 45/12 45/20 issued [3] 5/4 9/3 38/2 issuer [1] 9/24 issues [2] 9/18 11/13 issuing [1] 9/19 it [127] it's [43] 5/8 5/24 10/22 12/4 12/5 12/8 13/15 14/4 16/8 18/1 19/8 19/19 20/4 20/10 20/24 21/3 21/21 23/7 23/16 23/19 24/21 25/1 25/2 28/4 28/13 28/14 28/18 28/22 29/10 29/21 30/9 30/14 31/11 31/20 31/23 31/23 32/18 35/23 36/16 40/4 41/14 42/17 42/18 items [1] 18/17 its [9] 16/2 27/21 27/25 28/12 28/15 30/25 33/1 40/13 41/17 itself [7] 4/17 6/20 7/18 8/3 9/18 11/19 12/3

JAMES [2] 1/3 2/2 job [1] 13/21 JOEL [1] 1/19 JOHANNA [2] 2/5 3/8 JOHN [2] 2/4 3/4 JOHNSON [3] 2/12 3/14 3/16 junction [1] 17/15 jurisdiction [3] 22/3 26/21 45/17 just [42] 3/23 5/5 5/9 7/15 7/22 8/2 9/7 9/12 9/17 9/19 10/2 10/18 11/21 11/24 13/24 16/3 16/9 16/12 16/19 19/3 19/18 22/13 22/17 24/21 25/5 29/7 29/12 30/5 33/24 34/19 37/6 38/6 38/24 39/9 40/10 40/20 41/24 42/1 43/20 44/5 44/8 44/10 <u>Justice [1] 1/19</u>

ĸ

keep [3] 23/23 28/3 29/19 kept [1] 30/9 **Kerusa [1] 19/9** key [5] 6/16 11/20 37/13 37/13 37/23 kind [6] 8/9 11/23 29/22 33/19 34/20 37/15 knew [3] 6/9 6/13 8/1 know [36] 4/24 8/6 9/20 10/6 10/10 11/7 11/13 11/14 12/2 12/16 12/19 13/6 13/14 13/16 14/3 14/21 15/1 15/12 15/14 16/4 16/8 16/9 16/10 16/18 17/24 18/20 20/8 24/1 24/8 24/17 30/3 30/8 31/2 31/11 37/20 37/24 knows [3] 21/2 23/9 28/12

т.

lack [1] 26/21 language [14] 14/1 21/16 24/4 24/10 24/11 34/22 35/21 36/6 36/16 36/17 38/7 41/25 43/20 45/7

L	maintains [1] 27/19	11/1 11/3 11/9 11/21 13/22
	major [1] 41/2	15/6 19/16 21/2 23/17 27/15
large [4] 8/21 9/3 21/1 42/24 largest [1] 42/21	make [26] 13/19 13/20 15/4 15/17 16/17 17/8 17/14 18/1	27/23 28/3 28/9 28/13 28/17 29/13 29/19 30/16 30/25 31/1
last [10] 8/9 14/7 14/11 16/11		38/3 44/16
18/6 22/2 26/1 32/7 33/17 43/3		month [3] 16/16 22/2 26/1
lasts [2] 33/1 33/3 late [1] 6/8		moots [1] 26/23 more [11] 4/1 7/20 8/8 9/13
law [3] 1/6 9/16 22/14	makes [7] 11/23 26/3 32/19	16/7 16/8 16/13 18/3 31/3 33/2
laws [1] 9/9	38/15 42/5 43/17 45/8	33/2
lead [1] 6/12		MORGAN [3] 2/8 3/11 3/18
leads [1] 26/14 least [6] 4/2 6/8 11/22 13/16		most [2] 11/3 33/19 mostly [1] 41/20
14/12 34/4		motion [3] 26/25 42/14 45/25
led [1] 17/15		move [2] 15/7 26/19
left [1] 35/8 legitimate [1] 7/14	market [10] 6/14 6/14 8/2 8/24 12/10 12/18 31/13 39/18 39/22	
length [3] 12/1 14/4 21/12		MR [3] 3/4 3/10 3/16
less [3] 4/1 20/11 33/1	Martin [17] 4/7 5/2 5/11 5/18	
let [4] 4/20 27/9 36/23 38/6 let's [6] 9/18 20/11 20/13	6/21 9/9 9/13 9/17 9/23 10/2 12/4 13/3 19/5 19/7 20/3 26/20	
28/24 37/16 38/16	31/17	29/25 45/17
LETITIA [2] 1/3 2/2	Master [1] 45/23	Mr. Miller [5] 10/16 14/8 18/7
letter [7] 17/6 17/9 21/16 24/2 35/10 44/14 45/8	match [1] 4/19 matches [1] 4/1	18/23 42/16
letters [3] 3/21 27/10 44/21	matches [1] 4/1 material [5] 10/3 10/13 11/14	MS [1] 3/18 much [13] 11/17 14/2 20/18
level [1] 40/25	11/17 12/8	28/3 28/4 28/13 28/13 28/14
LEWIS [3] 2/8 3/11 3/18 Liberty [1] 2/3		29/13 36/21 43/2 45/19 46/1
lies [2] 15/18 36/22	16/15 17/22 mathematical [1] 33/4	my [13] 4/18 7/11 7/12 7/15 17/17 22/5 23/3 26/15 31/15
lifted [1] 22/10	matter [2] 1/3 10/22	33/22 34/4 45/20 46/11
light [1] 43/17	may [16] 1/16 7/4 8/20 9/16	N
like [26] 5/14 7/15 8/3 9/20 12/7 17/23 18/11 21/13 24/1	10/4 24/9 24/20 28/12 31/4 31/6 34/19 37/14 44/5 44/14	namely [1] 34/13
24/8 24/22 25/1 25/13 27/13		narrow [2] 33/11 34/14
28/11 28/20 29/16 32/13 37/8		narrower [2] 32/25 34/1
38/25 39/1 39/19 40/20 41/1 44/15 44/16		natural [3] 16/2 16/13 33/20 nature [2] 4/4 8/25
limit [2] 7/9 14/12		necessarily [3] 15/18 16/19
limited [8] 1/9 1/9 1/10	me [18] 3/25 4/14 4/20 4/21	16/21
4/25 22/22 34/14 43/17 line [5] 11/6 21/19 27/15	7/11 7/16 9/11 10/20 13/1 13/25 17/12 24/1 24/21 24/21	necessary [4] 14/19 15/5 23/10 33/16
34/17 34/20		need [5] 4/25 18/3 21/11 44/13
linked [1] 22/25	mean [13] 9/15 20/2 23/22	44/18
liquidity [1] 11/13 list [2] 37/10 40/19	23/23 28/15 28/20 29/10 37/12 38/11 38/13 40/18 41/13 44/24	needed [1] 35/20
literally [1] 31/3		negotiation [1] 1/12
little [9] 5/10 5/14 10/20		neither [1] 33/25
16/9 22/1 24/20 36/24 39/17 39/19		nevertheless [1] 30/16 new [18] 1/1 1/1 1/4 1/6 1/13
LLP [2] 2/8 2/12	mention [3] 21/18 25/24 26/16	1/17 1/17 2/3 2/4 2/4 2/9 2/9
loan [1] 34/21	mentioned [2] 25/25 29/8	2/13 2/13 9/9 29/17 31/8 46/9
loaned [2] 37/4 38/21 lockbox [2] 28/21 30/14	mentioning [1] 45/13 mentions [1] 34/19	next [6] 6/8 6/16 13/23 26/15 26/19 45/14
long [4] 17/21 18/3 33/1 33/3	·	nexus [1] 23/5
longer [1] 15/21	mid [2] 6/8 7/25	nice [1] 23/19
look [3] 4/21 11/16 28/17 looting [1] 41/17		NINA [2] 2/14 3/16 Ninety [1] 32/17
loss [1] 6/18		no [19] 1/15 4/7 9/18 11/1
lost [1] 6/1	10/16 14/8 18/7 18/23 42/16	11/1 15/21 16/2 20/24 23/5
	million [11] 6/1 6/19 11/8	25/8 27/15 29/12 30/7 32/19 33/4 33/23 34/15 43/24 45/17
21/4 22/24 35/13 lots [1] 26/3	11/11 12/15 12/20 13/23 38/2 41/4 41/11 42/22	33/4 33/23 34/15 43/24 45/17 non [6] 25/25 27/14 28/8 36/12
lump [1] 36/11	millions [3] 6/9 41/20 43/15	39/7 41/23
lump-sum [1] 36/11	•	non-periodic [1] 36/12
Lynn [2] 46/8 46/14		non-production [1] 25/25 non-reserve [4] 27/14 28/8
М	misrepresentations [1] 10/3	39/7 41/23
made [10] 6/21 8/13 20/5 20/13		nondisclosure [5] 21/10 23/7
26/7 26/10 26/10 26/11 36/25 42/20	misstatements [1] 6/3 modulate [1] 24/25	23/8 25/16 45/3 none [1] 17/15
main [1] 5/22	moment [4] 6/23 22/4 34/7 37/6	nonexistent [1] 34/1
maintain [3] 4/8 23/1 28/24	money [26] 7/18 7/19 8/22 9/5	nonprofit [1] 29/21

our [47] plate [1] 43/3 N out [24] 6/13 6/19 7/5 7/10 play [1] 33/3 not [70] 7/13 7/19 11/2 11/24 15/9 playing [1] 25/1 noted [2] 19/6 24/2 15/23 18/15 18/15 20/9 23/17 please [1] 3/2 pledged [1] 37/5 notes [1] 46/11 29/13 35/8 36/3 37/7 37/7 39/3 nothing [8] 7/20 12/21 13/13 40/18 42/4 44/10 44/11 point [41] 4/18 6/16 9/12 17/4 18/10 21/21 23/14 31/21 outlined [1] 16/16 11/15 11/20 14/14 15/10 15/19 novel [2] 27/25 29/17 outs [2] 35/5 36/22 16/2 16/4 16/5 16/8 16/21 November [3] 6/17 11/9 41/15 outside [1] 39/1 20/17 20/23 21/23 25/23 26/15 now [15] 7/7 8/9 11/11 13/1 over [15] 7/6 7/21 9/6 11/12 27/1 27/10 27/19 27/21 28/5 29/14 29/23 30/6 30/16 31/13 14/17 16/16 17/4 17/13 21/6 12/20 13/23 16/16 18/7 23/21 23/9 24/2 24/10 25/19 39/11 26/1 26/13 27/4 33/1 33/2 42/9 31/15 33/6 33/18 33/20 34/18 42/13 owes [3] 28/4 28/13 29/19 35/22 39/7 41/22 42/16 42/20 number [3] 6/2 19/1 24/3 own [1] 28/12 42/20 44/8 45/15 numbers [1] 28/5 owners [3] 38/19 39/3 40/1 points [5] 5/22 18/24 19/1 numerous [1] 21/3 ownership [1] 38/14 35/10 44/6 portion [1] 15/20 position [3] 15/11 44/10 44/14 21/14 34/10 objection [2] page [2] 19/6 42/1 possession [1] 14/20 obtaining [1] 22/25 paid [1] 36/5 possible [4] 28/10 31/9 33/11 obviously [9] 3/24 24/2 27/8 paper [2] 11/1 16/23 34/14 27/20 29/17 32/11 34/8 39/7 papers [10] 5/15 8/19 9/8 post [1] 22/8 10/17 13/13 15/15 16/20 16/25 45/21 potential [4] 5/11 6/19 17/13 occur [2] 12/18 25/22 39/21 42/20 40/3 occurred [2] 4/21 23/19 paperwork [3] 26/8 26/11 32/3 potentially [3] 6/25 11/1 odd [1] 33/19 paragraph [5] 36/23 38/8 40/10 43/15 off [1] 30/24 40/19 43/21 practices [1] 1/7 offering [1] 43/10 OFFICE [14] 2/2 3/4 3/6 3/8 Park [1] 2/9 preclude [1] 39/5 parry [1] 9/12 preference [1] 43/25 part [13] 1/1 7/22 8/16 16/14 4/6 19/18 19/24 22/15 24/5 preliminary [4] 1/15 23/5 24/16 31/19 32/15 34/23 36/14 20/10 28/6 31/14 34/2 36/25 23/10 33/20 38/19 39/10 40/1 42/4 Official [2] 46/8 46/14 prerogative [1] 42/11 often [1] 8/7 partially [1] 7/2 President [1] 30/15 okay [6] 18/6 18/22 34/25 particular [3] 4/15 19/8 30/15 press [1] 5/5 35/24 40/9 43/20 Partnership [1] 19/10 presumably [2] 16/5 39/23 old [1] 20/16 party [4] 12/5 14/18 15/25 pretty [2] 26/7 41/25 omissions [1] 6/3 30/2 prevent [1] 9/14 one [26] 7/11 7/12 8/16 9/13 past [4] 8/2 12/25 13/11 20/19 previously [1] 10/9 11/18 14/3 14/18 15/19 19/25 principal [3] 37/2 38/10 38/17 principle [1] 33/13 pause [1] 22/17 20/7 25/23 28/11 34/2 34/4 pay [3] 7/10 28/15 30/25 35/9 35/13 35/15 35/22 36/19 payment [2] 6/10 28/7 prior [2] 18/13 24/12 payments [5] 36/7 36/11 37/8 priorities [1] 18/20 37/17 40/12 41/7 41/14 42/16 42/21 44/8 37/9 39/5 problem [10] 4/24 5/2 5/2 6/13 onerous [1] 33/2 payroll [3] 27/13 36/5 37/9 9/16 13/9 22/14 25/10 38/5 ones [1] 42/25 payrolls [1] 40/20 43/23 ongoing [1] 43/6 peg [1] 25/20 problems [1] 24/3 only [7] 9/11 15/10 27/14 procedure [1] 17/6 people [11] 8/13 8/14 20/14 29/19 32/3 33/17 42/25 20/25 21/1 21/4 28/13 36/4 proceeding [2] 18/5 26/20 opening [2] 19/6 42/20 36/5 41/10 42/9 proceedings [1] 46/5 operate [1] 45/11 per [1] 24/11 process [7] 6/15 12/18 13/18 operating [1] 29/16 percent [1] 4/22 16/16 16/22 17/7 33/9 operation [1] 44/22 percentage [2] 28/25 29/11 processor [1] 6/10 OPERATIONS [1] 1/9 perhaps [6] 6/5 7/18 12/19 produce [3] 17/22 26/23 42/14 opposed [1] 14/2 20/15 41/2 42/11 produced [2] 15/13 45/16 period [1] 42/10 order [29] 3/24 4/13 7/13 producing [2] 26/3 27/3 10/10 13/7 15/20 15/24 16/24 periodic [1] 36/12 production [4] 15/11 16/6 17/4 17/23 18/13 18/19 20/25 permit [1] 9/23 18/14 25/25 22/19 24/12 25/15 26/2 26/14 persist [1] 16/24 productions [3] 26/4 26/9 29/20 35/22 35/23 36/14 38/4 person [1] 37/18 26/11 41/7 42/12 42/25 43/14 43/17 personal [1] 37/23 profit [2] 30/23 30/24 profitable [2] 28/15 29/20 45/20 perspective [3] 30/14 33/22 orders [3] 15/7 27/4 36/20 43/21 profits [1] 43/6 ordinary [8] 35/7 36/7 37/9 persuade [1] 14/19 prohibits [2] 10/4 36/25 39/1 39/5 42/2 44/17 45/11 petitioner [6] 1/5 4/5 4/14 promoting [1] 1/12 original [3] 17/15 35/21 35/23 16/13 17/8 17/10 promptly [1] 45/20 other [34] 4/13 6/21 9/1 9/2 petitioner's [1] 4/20 properly [1] 7/4 9/5 9/9 9/15 10/15 11/19 12/22 petitioners [3] 4/3 5/8 44/21 proposal [6] 14/13 25/11 25/11 14/2 15/6 15/8 15/19 17/17 PHILLIPS [3] 2/10 3/18 3/18 27/16 34/12 38/8 19/25 21/12 23/25 25/6 25/6 proposals [1] 33/25 phrase [2] 37/16 41/22 25/8 25/23 30/17 30/20 32/8 piece [1] 16/23 propose [1] 15/3 35/5 39/12 40/19 41/21 41/21 place [5] 10/7 19/22 22/9 proposed [6] 27/12 28/6 34/22 41/25 42/8 43/2 44/9 23/10 32/21 35/14 36/20 38/6 otherwise [3] 26/22 37/5 38/22 placed [1] 6/10 protection [1] 19/13

P	34/24	14/11 16/3 16/7 16/17 18/11
	regulators [2] 4/10 4/11	19/15 19/18 27/13 29/25 30/19
proved [1] 23/23 published [1] 43/10	regulatory [2] 29/23 31/7 related [7] 9/15 10/20 10/23	33/13 35/22 35/24 36/4 38/15 39/4 41/8 42/23
pulling [1] 11/18	14/2 14/5 22/21 30/2	salaries [1] 28/7
	relates [2] 12/24 31/2	sale [1] 1/13
purchasing [1] 25/6	relative [1] 29/11	Salzman [3] 46/8 46/12 46/14
purported [2] 21/24 25/16 purposes [3] 11/20 28/19 30/21	releases [1] 5/5 relevant [2] 33/6 42/10	same [10] 8/4 10/10 12/17 27/17 31/5 33/15 36/19 36/20
Pursuant [1] 1/6	reliance [1] 26/1	42/1 42/17
·		saw [2] 21/15 32/3
put [11] 7/1 15/15 16/20 16/22		say [36] 4/17 5/8 5/19 5/25
16/25 30/5 31/1 36/12 39/2 43/2 45/4	render [1] 10/8	6/8 7/4 7/11 7/15 9/23 10/3 12/2 13/18 15/3 15/14 15/16
putting [4] 22/1 22/18 25/10	renew [2] 32/1 45/5 repeat [1] 41/15	15/19 17/2 19/25 20/7 20/11
I= -	Reporter [2] 46/9 46/14	20/13 21/12 22/6 22/9 22/20
puzzling [1] 37/16	reports [1] 12/7	27/7 27/23 28/24 30/3 30/5
Q	request [1] 32/1 requested [3] 15/13 23/13 35/5	31/8 35/20 37/12 40/3 41/14
quarterly [1] 12/7	requesting [1] 26/22	saying [6] 5/15 5/23 7/13 18/2
	requests [5] 6/15 13/7 13/12	25/1 40/23
13/1 18/6 19/4 28/18 30/7 31/7		says [8] 7/19 14/3 16/11 38/9
31/16 32/7 32/10 42/18 questions [2] 17/17 27/9	require [1] 10/9	39/10 40/11 43/11 45/17
quick [1] 44/6	reserve [11] 27/12 27/14 28/8 29/16 30/7 30/13 30/14 33/24	scenario [1] 12/7 scene [1] 10/13
quite [1] 19/20	39/7 41/23 41/25	scheme [4] 11/23 12/4 20/1
quo [1] 23/1	reserves [15] 5/7 6/19 7/1 7/5	•
quoted [1] 19/9 quotes [1] 45/4		science [1] 17/25
	30/17 36/3 37/6 38/22 40/13 41/6	scope [3] 3/22 4/2 14/5 SCR [1] 46/12
R	reserving [3] 19/22 21/17	scratch [1] 38/15
raise [1] 4/23	32/23	second [4] 21/18 21/23 22/18
raising [1] 26/17 rather [1] 45/23	resolution [1] 27/5	42/3
ratios [1] 4/13	resolved [1] 17/16 respect [16] 3/21 19/16 19/20	Section [1] 33/19 securities [1] 1/13
read [1] 35/10	-	Security [1] 28/21
reading [2] 3/24 43/9		see [5] 13/9 16/9 22/18 36/17
ready [1] 18/14 real [3] 8/25 15/9 19/10	30/12 36/2 45/12	38/11
realistic [1] 17/2	respectfully [5] 25/15 26/21 32/1 32/20 34/8	seek [2] 23/1 26/24 seeking [2] 14/18 23/4
really [8] 4/25 13/21 15/18		seem [3] 17/12 21/24 41/1
27/15 31/2 31/10 31/18 32/3		seemed [3] 17/23 17/24 18/1
reason [5] 10/11 17/12 19/2 42/22 43/13	respondents [15] 1/11 2/8 3/12	
reasonable [2] 6/7 33/18	3/15 3/17 3/19 4/23 5/4 6/17 14/14 16/9 16/15 17/21 19/16	seems [9] 3/25 4/14 7/9 16/10 16/13 25/1 28/10 36/1 38/1
reasons [1] 32/20	40/16	segment [1] 30/8
received [6] 11/10 12/21 16/15	respondents' [2] 5/15 34/2	segregated [2] 29/6 30/20
18/12 25/18 27/20 recognize [1] 33/4	response [4] 17/3 17/7 19/1	self [1] 19/13
l	23/3 responses [1] 14/8	self-protection [1] 19/13 sells [2] 39/18 39/20
reconsidered [1] 32/14	restrain [1] 40/12	sending [1] 38/25
redeem [11] 7/10 7/19 21/6	restrict [1] 24/17	sense [9] 13/19 15/5 15/17
31/5 35/24 37/18 38/1 41/1	restricted [1] 24/10	17/8 17/14 32/20 35/13 36/25
41/5 43/4 43/11 redeemable [1] 20/21	restricting [1] 25/14 restricts [1] 24/10	43/17 sensible [1] 30/1
redeemed [3] 9/4 30/11 42/19	right [16] 9/19 17/4 17/25	sent [1] 9/6
redeeming [3] 38/3 41/18 42/9	18/1 20/1 23/1 27/8 35/17	sentence [7] 36/18 38/24 40/10
redemption [6] 13/12 21/1 40/13 42/21 43/1 43/12	37/11 38/16 38/20 39/12 41/13	40/11 41/8 41/12 42/3
redemptions [6] 37/11 37/11	43/8 44/4 45/9 rights [5] 19/23 21/17 32/23	separate [3] 27/22 29/11 30/9 service [1] 42/13
37/12 42/5 42/23 43/14	33/24 34/1	set [2] 33/9 35/3
Referee [6] 16/6 18/8 22/6	risk [1] 19/11	several [1] 41/4
26/18 27/2 45/14 reference [4] 35/9 35/14 41/24	risks [1] 4/11	shall [1] 39/4
reference [4] 35/9 35/14 41/24 42/2	RMR [2] 46/8 46/14 rules [1] 16/25	shareholders [1] 8/6 short [3] 18/1 32/12 32/16
references [2] 27/11 27/16	ruling [1] 44/19	should [18] 4/18 7/16 13/18
regard [1] 1/6	run [1] 31/9	14/13 14/15 16/1 16/12 19/21
	running [1] 10/17	21/12 25/22 27/14 33/11 33/14
regards [1] 42/17 regular [1] 36/7	S	33/17 36/15 37/3 37/10 40/19 Shouldn't [1] 36/5
regulate [1] 19/8	safest [1] 31/9	show [3] 4/15 26/2 32/18
	said [28] 4/6 5/5 5/14 7/8	showing [2] 20/6 21/10
24/19 25/13 28/11 32/5 33/8	7/23 7/25 8/9 10/9 10/18 11/24	shown [2] 20/3 20/4

S	still [5] 16/10 19/20 20/14
shows [1] 6/24	25/12 30/25 stock [1] 39/20
side [8] 4/20 15/19 18/8 22/1	stook [1] 39/20
32/8 35/6 41/21 44/9	stop [7] 16/18 17/13 30/1 30/2
sides [1] 36/24	41/14 41/16 41/18
significant [1] 37/22 simply [2] 6/18 11/2	storm [1] 24/22 Street [2] 1/16 2/3
since [10] 20/5 20/20 20/25	strings [1] 11/18
21/8 21/9 21/21 26/9 26/16	structure [2] 13/2 15/3
27/22 29/15	structured [1] 14/10
situation [3] 10/7 11/2 11/17 SKRZYPCZYK [2] 2/5 3/8	sub [2] 36/18 36/18 subject [3] 42/12 42/24 44/19
smacks [1] 20/1	submission [1] 16/17
small [1] 25/2	submissions [1] 45/21
smell [1] 20/1	submitted [1] 11/5
so [75] Social [1] 28/20	submitting [1] 33/25
some [29] 6/11 7/1 9/5 10/25	subparagraph [1] 36/2 subpoenas [2] 18/17 42/13
11/5 14/11 14/14 16/5 17/7	substantially [2] 17/22 36/20
17/12 21/5 23/1 24/8 24/9	such [5] 22/15 27/15 32/21
24/24 27/10 27/25 28/20 30/8 31/5 31/8 31/19 33/18 35/18	34/13 45/9
37/17 39/4 40/3 41/10 41/11	sudden [1] 24/10 suggest [3] 9/10 15/8 36/6
somebody [3] 16/11 37/17 38/12	suggesting [2] 37/21 41/10
somehow [1] 24/25	suits [1] 8/23
someone [4] 37/25 38/1 39/18 39/20	sum [1] 36/11 supposed [7] 21/8 21/9 22/11
something [15] 4/10 8/3 8/11	23/8 24/25 31/16 31/22
9/19 10/8 10/10 10/18 12/15	SUPREME [1] 1/1
22/4 29/17 30/3 31/12 32/13	sure [12] 14/21 15/18 26/15
40/18 44/10 something new [1] 29/17	28/21 35/2 36/8 36/21 38/7 40/21 42/1 43/16 45/10
sometimes [2] 8/4 8/5	T
somewhat [2] 19/3 32/22	
soon [1] 22/19 sort [11] 6/7 13/4 17/7 17/17	table [1] 32/8 take [9] 6/25 7/5 10/7 10/18
21/5 22/20 24/22 27/11 27/25	13/15 17/22 22/24 30/13 38/6
29/12 30/2	taken [3] 11/2 37/5 38/22
sorts [1] 10/12	takes [2] 4/3 35/15
sought [1] 5/23 sound [1] 39/1	taking [3] 20/9 25/5 36/24 talking [4] 12/14 20/21 31/2
sounded [2] 24/21 28/20	41/22
sounds [1] 8/3	talks [1] 16/23
speak [2] 5/18 8/17 special [8] 16/6 18/8 22/6	technically [1] 12/9 tell [1] 33/11
26/18 26/20 27/2 45/13 45/23	temporal [2] 14/12 14/12
specific [1] 15/23	ten [1] 43/12
specifically [1] 27/13 specify [2] 44/12 44/13	tens [3] 31/3 41/19 42/19 TERM [1] 1/1
specify [2] 44/12 44/13 speculate [2] 8/18 13/21	terminate [1] 14/22
spend [1] 14/3	terminated [2] 14/16 16/1
spent [1] 39/4	termination [1] 16/2 terminology [1] 30/15
stability [1] 4/8 stablecoin [1] 20/21	terms [13] 4/16 10/1 13/24
stage [1] 14/23	14/10 15/12 16/2 19/3 20/12
stand [1] 18/18	35/9 35/12 35/14 35/23 44/1
standard [1] 22/18 standing [2] 9/17 10/6	tether [62] Tether's [1] 40/12
standpoint [1] 28/5	tethers [21] 7/10 7/19 8/12
start [4] 4/20 29/23 38/16	9/3 13/8 15/9 37/25 38/2 39/17
38/24 state [7] 1/1 1/3 1/13 2/3 3/2	39/18 39/21 40/25 41/1 41/4 41/19 42/9 42/19 43/5 43/5
31/8 46/9	43/12 43/14
statements [1] 6/22	than [7] 7/20 15/19 19/25
status [3] 6/5 18/8 23/1 statute [1] 22/19	21/12 33/16 34/5 45/23
statute [1] 22/19 statutes [1] 9/15	THANAWALA [3] 2/14 3/16 3/16 Thank [6] 18/25 34/11 45/19
statutory [1] 4/9	46/1 46/3 46/4
stay [2] 26/22 26/25	that [321]
stenographic [1] 46/11 step [1] 4/12	that's [44] 4/9 4/17 5/18 7/2 7/20 7/22 11/2 11/15 11/23
STEPTOE [3] 2/12 3/14 3/16	12/10 12/23 13/21 14/5 14/19
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

18/18 18/21 20/23 21/20 22/7 22/13 22/14 25/8 25/17 26/13 27/7 28/9 28/14 30/7 31/6 31/7 31/11 31/12 31/13 31/13 31/14 31/20 32/23 34/2 35/17 37/15 30/2 38/4 38/13 40/7 41/13 their [26] 6/14 7/10 16/20 18/16 20/8 20/9 21/2 21/6 21/25 23/20 24/11 25/11 25/11 25/21 28/6 31/5 32/18 35/9 35/20 37/18 41/1 42/11 42/20 44/24 45/2 45/11 them [26] 5/5 6/3 6/11 8/23 10/9 13/1 17/22 18/12 20/5 21/9 22/12 23/19 24/19 25/17 25/19 26/11 27/4 31/6 35/6 37/1 38/1 38/3 39/19 39/21 41/18 42/14 themselves [5] 5/18 38/2 38/3 41/5 41/19 then [22] 6/16 7/1 7/16 9/20 10/15 14/7 14/8 15/25 16/18 16/24 17/7 18/6 18/24 19/12 20/5 30/25 31/1 32/14 33/8 39/3 39/6 39/6 theory [1] 19/11 there [61] there's [20] 5/13 6/16 8/20 10/11 10/17 10/18 12/11 20/14 21/21 27/15 29/12 30/8 30/24 33/4 36/17 36/18 36/21 39/16 40/3 43/13 therefore [3] 15/16 15/21 18/2 these [9] 7/19 8/21 10/25 25/14 25/21 36/11 41/19 42/23 45/10 they [109] they'll [1] 17/24 they're [12] 23/4 24/7 25/1 27/22 28/11 28/11 29/5 30/19 32/4 35/25 39/24 44/17 they've [3] 15/12 17/3 42/23 thing [6] 8/9 27/16 27/17 30/4 30/8 43/21 things [33] 3/23 4/13 5/13 6/14 6/21 7/23 8/2 8/18 9/1 9/2 9/5 9/21 9/21 9/25 10/12 10/15 12/7 12/8 12/25 14/7 15/6 15/8 17/5 17/14 19/25 23/2 23/25 35/15 37/8 38/21 39/10 40/20 42/8 think [69] thinking [1] 32/18 thinks [1] 36/15 third [1] 12/5 this [74] those [13] 8/14 10/1 18/23 20/13 27/17 35/19 36/19 38/20 38/21 39/23 41/5 41/9 43/1 though [5] 21/20 24/4 24/12 39/17 28/2 39/9 thought [5] 8/10 24/17 32/12 32/14 36/25 thousands [2] 31/4 42/19 thread [1] 10/17 through [4] 3/23 4/21 10/17 44/20 tie [2] 22/20 43/20 time [19] 8/24 9/6 9/13 12/9 12/13 14/11 17/9 18/1 18/3 21/12 29/15 31/5 33/15 39/4 39/23 39/24 41/4 42/10 42/21 time come [1] 39/24

T	unrelated [1]
	unsegregated
times [3] 8/7 18/12 36/12	unstable [1]
today [3] 10/6 24/5 31/4	until [4] 12/
together [1] 22/20	23/2
tokens [1] 43/10	untouchable [1
told [3] 6/14 7/15 8/2	untrue [3] 6/
tomorrow [6] 18/11 18/18 22/7	unusual [1] 1
26/18 27/2 45/14	unwilling [2]
too [4] 14/9 18/1 32/15 43/2	up [13] 5/14
top [1] 14/19	24/5 29/9 29/
topic [1] 12/22	33/9 33/25 43
totally [1] 12/1	upon [2] 5/20
touch [1] 28/19	upside [2] 14
track [1] 28/3	us [6] 6/12 1
trade [4] 20/15 39/13 39/21	32/18 42/11
40/24	use [5] 11/25
traded [1] 20/15	40/12
trader [1] 10/13	used [2] 30/1
traders [1] 5/20	user [1] 6/3
trades [1] 8/13	usually [2] 8
trading [1] 24/23	v
trail [1] 11/1	
transaction [13] 8/4 11/6	vacate [2] 32
21/19 23/6 23/9 23/15 23/18	various [1] 1
25/17 31/24 34/16 34/21 34/21	vast [1] 11/1
45/4	vendors [1] 3
transactions [8] 5/7 11/3 14/1	venue [3] 5/2
25/21 25/21 30/2 30/11 39/2	versus [3] 15
transcript [1] 46/11	very [12] 3/2
transfer [2] 7/21 11/8 transferring [1] 6/18	9/8 11/16 13/
	45/8 45/19 46
transfers [2] 7/5 10/25 Treasury [1] 28/22	Vice [1] 30/1
trial [1] 33/21	view [3] 34/4 views [2] 25/
trouble [1] 21/11	
troubling [1] 22/15	violated [1] violation [8]
true [4] 13/15 28/1 37/21	4/19 4/22 5/1
46/10	violations [2]
try [3] 18/23 23/16 34/3	visit [1] 13/
trying [18] 17/1 17/1 23/17	volatile [1]
24/7 25/13 25/19 32/4 32/4	voluntarily [2
34/13 40/5 40/8 40/20 42/7	voluntary [2]
43/16 44/9 44/17 44/21 44/22	vote [1] 8/6
turn [2] 14/7 18/7	
two [10] 17/17 19/25 22/20	W
28/6 32/13 36/23 40/2 41/7	wait [2] 9/24
41/15 42/3	waiving [1] 2
typical [1] 12/6	want [32] 5/9
typically [2] 11/3 14/17	7/22 8/17 8/1
υ	14/11 18/5 19
<u> </u>	22/5 22/10 23
U.S [3] 37/5 38/22 40/13	26/5 26/16 31
ultimately [3] 28/2 31/25 45/5	33/23 34/15 3
unaffiliated [1] 7/14	44/8 44/12
unclear [2] 16/9 35/22	wanted [5] 3/
uncomfortable [1] 37/21	28/5 41/11
unconcerning [1] 41/2	wants [3] 24/
under [13] 20/3 22/14 26/19	warrant [1] 4
26/20 31/17 33/13 33/19 35/22	was [44] 5/14

U.S [3] 37/5 38/22 40/13
ultimately [3] 28/2 31/25 45/
unaffiliated [1] 7/14
unclear [2] 16/9 35/22
uncomfortable [1] 37/21
unconcerning [1] 41/2
under [13] 20/3 22/14 26/19
26/20 31/17 33/13 33/19 35/22
41/12 42/8 42/14 42/15 45/1
underpinning [1] 20/12
understand [19] 5/9 6/12 7/2
10/25 11/12 13/6 13/13 13/22
16/3 18/14 18/16 24/18 32/6
33/23 34/18 36/10 38/7 39/11
40/22
understanding [2] 8/13 20/11
understood [1] 11/23
unhealthy [1] 9/20
unless [2] 4/9 16/11
unlikely [1] 42/18
unrealistic [1] 18/2

11/3 [1] 36/11 4/11 /13 16/24 22/10 11 30/8 /14 6/23 10/9 14/17 26/24 32/2 6/18 21/25 23/20 /19 31/15 32/24 3/20 44/9 0 13/1 4/25 15/2 13/20 23/16 27/2 5 30/4 30/14 30/20 10 39/21 8/5 33/20 2/1 45/6 12/25

14 37/9 20 6/4 10/14 5/13 27/24 28/4 22 4/5 5/16 6/23 /16 26/3 31/16 6/1 15 4 39/11 45/8 /21 26/6 9/16 4/4 4/9 4/17 11 6/20 12/4 5/18 9/8 /1 24/24 21 26/13 42/13 26/12 27/3

4 36/4 21/14 9 5/15 7/10 7/15 17 8/18 9/7 9/9 9/14 21/17 22/4 3/22 24/10 25/24 1/5 31/23 33/7 39/2 42/1 42/16 /23 13/8 26/15 /1 24/16 37/25 44/25 5/14 7/3 7/16 9/5 9/6 9/19 11/2 11/6 11/7 11/9 12/11 will [11] 8/6 16/8 29/12 33/11 12/25 13/5 13/17 15/3 15/14 16/6 16/15 18/16 18/22 19/15 20/11 20/25 21/1 21/23 22/25 23/5 25/16 25/17 27/3 27/14 28/5 31/24 32/15 35/10 35/18 35/19 36/9 37/15 39/9 41/21 41/24 42/21 45/22 wasn't [3] 4/21 7/12 12/12 way [18] 6/7 7/2 8/4 13/5 15/10 17/10 23/19 24/7 24/12 25/2 29/6 31/9 36/12 38/3 41/6 42/3 44/16 45/9

we [125] we'll [3] 6/2 27/4 27/4 we're [19] 5/6 5/15 7/19 9/10 12/14 16/22 17/1 18/2 19/22 20/20 22/6 26/17 26/22 27/1 31/1 40/8 43/16 44/18 45/24 we've [6] 11/5 11/10 15/13 18/20 20/3 39/19 week [3] 26/19 43/3 45/15 weekly [1] 26/4 weeks [3] 18/13 32/13 33/7 well [16] 5/8 7/8 8/6 12/14 17/5 20/18 22/1 22/9 22/17 29/14 35/22 36/4 37/11 37/15 41/8 41/25 went [6] 6/13 10/20 11/12 11/24 13/22 34/23 were [27] 3/22 6/5 6/6 6/10 7/24 7/25 8/1 8/10 9/3 9/20 9/21 10/19 10/22 20/12 26/3 26/4 26/5 26/11 26/12 27/18 35/5 35/16 35/21 35/22 36/9 41/20 42/1 what [99] what's [3] 12/16 16/21 43/18 whatever [9] 22/19 30/24 32/17 34/15 35/12 38/12 39/13 42/2 45/21 when [13] 9/3 12/10 15/6 16/25 16/25 20/11 27/3 27/13 31/15 35/10 41/3 42/8 45/1 where [19] 5/7 8/10 9/5 10/7 11/17 12/7 12/9 15/12 17/18 18/18 18/21 23/17 28/12 28/12 31/22 32/8 33/10 34/3 43/18 whereas [2] 11/24 16/1 whether [8] 12/11 15/4 15/5 16/6 29/10 31/8 37/20 42/25 which [31] 3/22 4/24 17/4 17/7 19/4 20/13 20/21 20/22 21/14 21/17 22/3 22/18 22/22 23/5 23/9 23/19 25/12 26/7 26/14 31/22 33/8 34/8 34/14 34/21 35/10 35/24 38/25 39/3 39/7 40/11 42/5 while [2] 20/9 33/15 WHITEHURST [2] 2/5 3/6 who [12] 7/10 7/11 13/8 20/14 20/15 21/4 38/12 39/20 41/3 41/3 41/17 42/8 whoever [1] 18/7 whole [1] 20/23 whom [1] 15/7 why [31] 4/15 5/23 9/3 10/22 13/25 14/15 14/19 14/24 16/1 16/12 17/12 17/13 17/18 18/23 19/2 19/19 20/12 21/11 21/12 21/14 21/20 22/14 23/9 26/6 30/20 31/25 32/8 34/14 34/21 40/18 45/15 39/23 41/5 42/15 43/11 45/13 45/14 45/18 willing [1] 6/25 withdrawal [1] 6/15 within [1] 30/10 without [3] 21/14 22/11 32/19 wonder [1] 40/3 wondering [1] 35/10 word [2] 40/5 43/22 words [2] 39/12 40/19 work [1] 17/8 workaround [1] 41/10

W worth [1] 13/15 would [40] 5/8 6/8 9/14 9/21 9/23 10/8 10/9 10/13 10/21 11/17 11/25 13/3 13/20 13/23 14/17 14/21 14/22 14/24 15/1 15/6 15/8 15/10 15/22 16/5 16/9 16/17 17/12 17/21 18/4 20/7 23/3 30/4 34/7 35/25 36/6 36/13 36/15 38/12 41/1 43/25 wouldn't [4] 12/3 12/17 16/20 17/14 wrap [1] 23/19 written [1] 21/3 wrong [1] 21/21 Y 38/4 yeah [1] yes [4] 8/17 32/25 44/5 45/24 yet [1] 6/13 YORK [17] 1/1 1/1 1/4 1/6 1/13 1/17 1/17 2/3 2/4 2/4 2/9 2/9 2/13 2/13 9/9 31/8 46/9 you [104]

you'll [1] 22/18 you're [10] 5/23 8/15 9/24 13/2 14/20 22/20 34/13 39/13 40/22 41/10 your [98] yours [1] 39/4

\mathbf{z}

Z/515 [1] 19/10 ZOE [2] 2/10 3/18

