

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND
EXCHANGE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

TREASURE ENTERPRISE LLC,
PATRICIA ENRIGHT GRAY and LARRY
ALLEN HOLLEY

No. 17-cv-10963
Hon. Marianne O. Battani

Defendants,

and

KINGDOM ASSET MANAGEMENT LLC
and CARLEEN RENEE HOLLY,

Relief Defendants

**MOTION FOR ORDER
AUTHORIZING FIRST DISTRIBUTION TO CREDITORS AND TO
CORRECT ALLOWED AMOUNT AS TO FIVE CREDITORS**

Patrick O’Keefe and O’Keefe and Associates Consulting, LLC (the “Receiver”), through their counsel, Jaffe, Raitt, Heuer & Weiss, P.C. file this Motion for Order Authorizing First Distribution to Creditors and to Correct Allowed Amount as to Five Creditors (the “Motion”), and in support thereof, state as follows:

Introduction

Through this Motion, the Receiver is seeking authority to make a first distribution of funds to the creditors holding Allowed Claims (as hereinafter defined) and to correct the Allowed Amount of five creditor’s claims.

ALL CREDITORS ARE ENCOURAGED TO READ THIS MOTION AND REVIEW THE ATTACHED EXHIBIT 1, WHICH SETS FORTH THE PROPOSED AMOUNT TO BE DISTRIBUTED WITH RESPECT TO EACH CREDITOR'S CLAIM, AS PART OF THIS INITIAL DISTRIBUTION.

EXHIBIT 1 CONTAINS A LIST OF ALL CREDITOR CLAIMS. THOSE CLAIMS THAT ARE NOTED AS "DISPUTED" IN THE "NAME" COLUMN ARE CLAIMS THAT HAVE NOT YET BEEN DETERMINED TO BE "ALLOWED CLAIMS" AND THEREFORE, ARE NOT ENTITLED TO A DISTRIBUTION AT THIS TIME (ALTHOUGH THOSE DISPUTED CREDITORS WITH A "PROPOSED CURRENT DISTRIBUTION" AMOUNT ON EXHIBIT 1 WILL HAVE THAT AMOUNT RESERVED FOR THEM, IN THE EVENT THEIR CLAIM IS LATER DEEMED TO BE AN "ALLOWED CLAIM" AND THEY ARE FOUND TO BE ENTITLED TO ALL OR PART OF THIS INITIAL DISTRIBUTION).

THOSE CREDITORS WHO HAVE AN "N/A" NOTED IN THE COLUMN CALLED "PERCENTAGE RETURN AFTER PROPOSED CURRENT DISTRIBUTION" HAVE PREVIOUSLY AGREED THAT THEY HAVE NO RIGHT TO ANY DISTRIBUTION FROM THE RECEIVERSHIP ESTATE AND HOLD NO "ALLOWED CLAIM."

THIS DISTRIBUTION ALLOWS THOSE CREDITORS WITH AN ALLOWED CLAIM WHO HAVE, TO DATE, RECEIVED LESS THAN AN OVERALL 7.28% RETURN ON THEIR INVESTMENT FROM TREASURE ENTERPRISE, LLC, TO RECEIVE A DISTRIBUTION TO BRING THEM UP TO A TOTAL 7.28% RETURN ON THEIR INVESTMENT.

IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT ADDITIONAL DISTRIBUTIONS WILL BE MADE. THEREFORE, THE FACT THAT A CREDITOR IS NOT RECEIVING A DISTRIBUTION, AT THIS TIME, DOES NOT MEAN IT WILL NOT RECEIVE A DISTRIBUTION AT A LATER DATE. ALSO, THOSE CREDITORS WHO ARE RECEIVING A DISTRIBUTION NOW, WILL RECEIVE AN ADDITIONAL DISTRIBUTION, IF AN ADDITIONAL DISTRIBUTION IS MADE.

CERTAIN CREDITORS LIKELY WILL RECEIVE NO DISTRIBUTION EVER. THOSE CREDITORS ARE CREDITORS WHO HAVE RECEIVED A FAR GREATER PERCENTAGE RETURN, FROM TREASURE ENTERPRISE, LLC, ALREADY, WITH RESPECT TO THEIR INVESTMENT.

EXHIBIT 1 ALSO CONTAINS CORRECTED ALLOWED AMOUNT FIGURES FOR FIVE CREDITOR'S CLAIMS, AS DETAILED BELOW.

Background

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Section 22 of the Securities Act [15 U.S.C. § 77v] and Section 27 of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78aa].
2. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to Section 27 of the Exchange Act [15 U.S.C. § 78aa].
3. Pursuant to this Court's *Sealed Order Appointing Receiver* [Docket No. 10] entered on March 28, 2017 (the "Receivership Order"), the Receiver was appointed over the defendants (the "Defendants").

4. Pursuant to Paragraph 7D of the Receivership Order, the Receiver was authorized to “use Receivership Property”¹ for the benefit of the Receivership Estate, **making payments and disbursements** and incurring expenses as may be necessary or advisable in the ordinary course of business in discharging his duties as Receiver.” *Id.* at ¶ 7D (emphasis added).

5. Pursuant to Paragraph 41 of the Receivership Order, the Receiver was authorized “to take all actions to manage, maintain, and/or wind-down business operations of the Receivership Estates, including **making legally required payments to creditors, employees, and agents of the Receivership Estates** and communicating with vendors, investors, governmental and regulatory authorities, and others, as appropriate.” *Id.* at 41 (emphasis added).

The Proofs of Claim Submission Process

6. On October 6, 2017, the Court entered the *Order Granting Motion of Receiver to Establish Claims Procedure* [Docket No. 75] (the “Claims Procedure Order”).

7. Pursuant to the Claims Procedure Order, all known creditors of the Receivership Estates were provided with a Proof of Claim form and were advised to return their Proofs of Claim not later than December 15, 2017. In addition, pursuant to the Claims Procedure Order, notice of entry of the Claims Procedure Order and of the December 15, 2017 deadline was published in the Wall Street Journal and in the Flint Journal.

8. Per the Claims Procedure Order, any creditor who did not file a Proof of Claim by the bar date set forth in the Claims Procedure Order would not share in a distribution from the Receivership Estates. However, various Proofs of Claim were filed after the bar date set forth in the Claims Procedure Order, which are included on **Exhibit 1**.

¹ Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the meaning given to them in the Receivership Order.

Summary of the Proofs of Claim Filed

9. As a result of the dissemination of the Claims Procedure Order and the documents referenced therein to the creditors of the Receivership Estates and based on the publications made:

- (a) 179 Proofs of Claim were filed; of this number 165 relate to investments made and 14 relate to trade payables (such as professional fees, utility charges, building or HVAC maintenance, agreements to liquidate personal property, state taxes, insurance, or property management);
- (b) The total amount sought in the Proofs of Claim exceeds \$12,250,000 (inclusive of claimed unpaid interest and other damages);
- (c) Of the Proofs of Claim filed, less than \$600,000 is claimed to be secured by assets of the Receivership Estates;
- (d) According to the Proofs of Claim, approximately \$14,000,000, in total, is claimed to have been invested with the Defendants;
- (e) According to the Proofs of Claim, approximately \$1,700,000 was returned to various creditors, either as a return of principal or interest; however, a significant number of creditors either did not answer the question of how much was received or did not answer it with a specific dollar value;
- (f) Of the 165 investor creditors, approximately 87 indicated that they received some return on their investment (a payment toward principal or interest), while approximately 78 claimed to have never received any payment on their investment or did not answer the question, whether interest or principal; and
- (g) Of those investors who indicated that they received payment (whether as interest or principal), the percentage claimed as returned ranges from approximately 1% to over 100%.

The Claims Methodology Motion

10. The Receiver previously filed its *Motion for Approval of Claims Distribution Methodology* [Docket No. 70] (the “Claims Methodology Motion”), which was granted by the Court.

11. The Claims Methodology Motion established certain parameters to which the Receiver became bound to follow, in reviewing each creditor claim to determine its Allowed Amount. Specifically based on the *Order Granting Motion for Approval of Claims Distribution Methodology* [Docket No. 75] (the “Claims Methodology Order”), the following rules were established to govern the review of each creditor’s claim:

A. In determining the amount of each Allowed Claim related to a loan made, the Receiver was to review all funds loaned to, or invested with, a Defendant, by a creditor, and was to subtract from that all amounts received back by the creditor, whether principal or interest. This was known as the “A” portion of each claim.

B. Any profit that had been promised but not paid (fictitious profit, including promised interest) was to be excluded from the “A” portion of each claim and included in the “B” portion of each claim.

C. Also to be included in the “B” portion of each claim are claims are amounts sought for repayment of bank charges/fees, attorney fees, amounts prepaid for unperformed investment training, amounts owing for personal property given to the Defendants to liquidate and allegedly never liquidated, funds intended as charitable donations but diverted, and damages related to the sale, purchase or management of real property.

D. The “B” portion of each claim would also include IRS penalties for early withdrawal from a creditor’s IRA account, based on the Defendants’ failure to properly roll over the IRA account money into other IRA accounts, or based on the failure of Defendants to advise creditors that a penalty would be incurred for early withdrawal.

E. Until the “A” portion of each claim is paid in full, there is to be no distribution on the “B” portion of each claim. In this case there will be insufficient funds to pay the “A” portion of each Allowed Claim in full, so no distribution will be made on the “B” portion.

F. The Receiver is not obligated to pursue, through litigation, the recovery of money which creditors were previously paid, even if the creditor was paid in full. Instead, those payments, whether of principal or interest, will result in a reduction in a creditor’s claim amount.

G. Distributions to creditors are to be made under the “Rising Tide Method.” Under this distribution method, the goal is to assure that every creditor has received a minimal return on its investment. **As a result, not all creditors of the Receivership Estates will receive a distribution.** For example, if the total claims of the Receivership Estates are \$8,000,000 and the Receiver has \$800,000 to distribute, not all creditors would receive a 10% distribution. Certain creditors would receive a distribution of less than 10% of the funds to be distributed (those who received a greater percentage return of aggregate funds on their investment versus others), while other creditors would receive a distribution greater than 10% of the funds to be distributed. The exact cut-off percentage will not be known until all Allowed Claims are determined and all amounts available to be collected are collected.

H. The claims of general unsecured creditors are to be treated equally with the claims of investor creditors. General unsecured creditors are not to be subordinated to the payment of investor creditors.

Analysis of the Proofs of Claim

12. The Receiver and its professionals reviewed and reconciled the various Proofs of Claim of record. In doing so, in addition to the Proofs of Claim, the Receiver had three other data sets from which to work. First, the Securities and Exchange Commission had obtained bank records of the Defendants for the time-period of August 1, 2011 through March 31, 2017, showing inflows and outflows of cash from the Defendants only (not affiliates), and categorized them by investor (the “SEC Records”). Second, the Defendants provided the Receiver with an investor list with stated debt amounts (the “Investor Lists”). Finally, the Receiver has reviewed investor files maintained by the Defendants (the “Investor Files”).

13. The claims review process included comparing the amounts asserted in the Proofs of Claim and the documentation attached thereto (i.e. check copies, bank statements, promissory notes, agreement, correspondences, handwritten summaries, etc.), with the SEC Records, the Investor Lists and the Investor Files.

14. Once that comparison was completed, the Receiver determined a proposed Allowed Amount for each creditor and mailed to each creditor a letter setting forth their proposed Allowed Amount and invited discussion with any creditor who had questions. In the letter, the Receiver included a listing of all deposits and withdrawals each creditor had made and received from Treasure Enterprise, LLC. Each letter also requested that any creditor wishing to dispute the proposed Allowed Amount of their claim contact the Receiver’s counsel by phone, email or regular mail within twenty one (21) days of the date of the letter.

15. As a result, the Receiver fielded many comments from creditors and reached resolution or never received any objection from the creditors whose “Amount of A Claim” are noted on **Exhibit 1**. Those creditors who have an “n/a” notation in the last column of **Exhibit 1**,

entitled “Percentage Return After Proposed Current Distribution” agreed with the Receiver that no amounts were owing to them, such that they would never receive a distribution.

16. Also set forth on **Exhibit 1** are creditors whose claims are still in dispute with the Receiver. Those claims are noted as “Disputed Claim-Distribution Withheld” in the column entitled “Name” on **Exhibit 1**.

The Claims Allowance Motion

17. The Receiver recently filed its *Motion for Approval of Allowed Claim Amounts for Purposes of Making Distributions to Creditors* [Docket No. 177], as amended by the *Amendment to Motion for Approval of Allowed Claim Amounts for Purposes of Making Distributions to Creditors* [Docket No. 181], which was heard by the Court on August 22, 2019 (collectively, the “*Allowed Claims Motion*”). The Court entered the *Order Granting Motion for Approval of Allowed Claim Amounts for Purposes of Making Distributions to Creditors* on October 2, 2019 [Docket No. 188], under which the “Amount of A Claim” of each of the claims set forth on **Exhibit 1** was approved (other than those noted as “Disputed Claim-Distribution Withheld”) (the “Allowed Claims Order”). Those noted as “Disputed Claim-Amount Withheld” are still unresolved.

Correction of Certain Errors and Resolution of Certain Claims on Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2

18. After entry of the Allowed Claims Order, five events have occurred, which have resulted in a modification of certain of the claims noted on **Exhibit 1**, as approved by the Allowed Claims Order.

19. With respect to the proposed Allowed Amount of Alice Bogan, **Exhibit 1** attached to the Allowed Claims Motion referenced her proposed Allowed Amount as \$46,000. The correct Allowed Amount is \$27,629.11, which is the amount communicated to Alice Bogan

pursuant to a letter to her dated March 29, 2019, to which no objection was received. Therefore, **Exhibit 1** attached hereto contains the corrected \$27,629.11 “Amount of A Claim” for Alice Bogan.

20. With respect to the proposed Allowed Amount of Monroe Sims, **Exhibit 1** attached to the Allowed Claims Motion referenced his proposed Allowed Amount as \$5,500. The correct “Amount of A Claim” is \$0.00, which is the amount communicated to Monroe Sims pursuant to a letter to him dated March 29, 2019, to which no objection was received. Therefore, **Exhibit 1** attached hereto contains the corrected “n/a” in the column entitled “Percentage Return After Proposed Current Distribution.”

21. With respect to the proposed Allowed Amount of Demario Tucker, **Exhibit 2** attached to the Allowed Claims Motion referenced his proposed Allowed Amount as “unknown.” At the time, no formal claim had been filed by him or his bankruptcy estate. Demario Tucker (and his bankruptcy trustee) failed to respond to inquiries by the Receiver and therefore, his claim has been designated on **Exhibit 1** attached hereto as “n/a” in the column entitled “Percentage Return After Proposed Current Distribution.”

22. With respect to the proposed Allowed Amount of Maxine Ellison, **Exhibit 2** attached to the Allowed Claims Motion referenced the amount claimed by her to be \$25,000 and the amount determined by the Receiver was stated to be \$14,500. After further diligence, it was determined that Maxine Ellison’s claim should be in the amount of \$24,500, to which Maxine Ellison has consented. Therefore, Maxine Ellison’s claim has been revised on **Exhibit 1** attached hereto, with an “Amount of A Claim” of \$24,500.

23. Subsequent to the filing of the Allowed Claims Motion, Janice Welch filed a claim for \$38,000. That claim amount has been verified by the Receiver and has been placed on

Exhibit 1, with an “Amount of A Claim,” in the Allowed Amount of \$38,000, with \$0.00 distribution, to date.

24. Accordingly, the Receiver is requesting that the Allowed Amounts for the claims of Alice Bogan, Monroe Sims, Demario Tucker, Maxine Ellison and Janice Welch be amended to “Amount of A Claim” stated on **Exhibit 1**.

Proposed Initial Distributions

25. The Receiver is proposing to make an initial distribution in the aggregate amount of \$200,000 to certain of the creditors on **Exhibit 1**. The amount each creditor will receive is set forth on **Exhibit 1**, opposite their name. The initial distribution is based on the judicially approved “Amount of A Claim” along with the “Deposits” and “Withdrawals” agreed upon by each creditor, as part of the resolution of their respective claims.

26. As set forth on **Exhibit 1**, the initial distribution will allow those creditors who have received a distribution of less than 7.28 percent to receive a distribution to bring them up to a total 7.28 percent distribution. Not all creditors are receiving the same percentage distribution (in fact, very few creditors are receiving the same percentage) based on the application of the “Rising Tide” methodology.

27. This is the first distribution from the Receivership Estates. As additional properties are sold, one or more additional distributions will be made.

28. Creditors are encouraged to contact Julie Norton, at Jaffe, Raitt, Heuer & Weiss, P.C., 248-351-3000 or by email to jnorton@jaffelaw.com, with any questions related to this Motion or the proposed distribution to a given creditor.

Wherefore the Receiver requests that the Court grant the relief requested in the Motion, together with such other relief as the Court deems equitable and just.

Respectfully submitted by,

JAFFE RAITT HEUER & WEISS, P.C

Dated: November 4, 2019

By: /s/ Jay L. Welford
Jay L. Welford (P34471)
Counsel to the Receiver
27777 Franklin Road, Suite 2500
Southfield, MI 48034-8214
(248) 351-3000
jwelford@jaffelaw.com

EXHIBIT 1

Allowed Claims and Proposed Distribution Amount

[See attached]

Exhibit 1
Calculation of Amount to Distribute to Claimants
As of 10/24/19

						Total	
						\$ 200,000.00	
CLAIM NO.	NAME	AMOUNT OF A CLAIM	DEPOSITS	WITHDRAWALS	PERCENTAGE RETURN	PROPOSED CURRENT DISTRIBUTION	PERCENTAGE RETURN AFTER PROPOSED CURRENT DISTRIBUTION
1	Oneda Veronica Coombs	\$ 53,411.20	\$ 53,411.20	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 3,887.57	7.28%
8	Vernita Moore	\$ 32,217.59	\$ 32,217.59	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,344.98	7.28%
9	Peggy Jean Hughes	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 25,000.00	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,819.64	7.28%
18	Roger R. Williams	\$ 228,024.23	\$ 228,024.23	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 16,596.90	7.28%
21	Virginia Adams	\$ 46,000.00	\$ 46,000.00	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 3,348.14	7.28%
23	Terri Peaks	\$ 4,212.52	\$ 4,212.52	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 306.61	7.28%
24	Alissa Perry	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 363.93	7.28%
30	Dennis J. Sykes	\$ 29,604.75	\$ 29,604.75	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,154.80	7.28%
34	Karen McDaniel	\$ 4,297.89	\$ 4,297.89	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 312.82	7.28%
38	Curtis Wilburn	\$ 41,005.28	\$ 41,005.28	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,984.60	7.28%
47	Vanessa Ellis	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 4,500.00	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 327.54	7.28%
53	Brenda Lee Allen	\$ 2,049.76	\$ 2,049.76	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 149.19	7.28%
56	Brandon Jones	\$ 120,174.26	\$ 120,174.26	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 8,746.97	7.28%
57	Larry Davenport c/o Michael Clifford, Esq.	\$ 55,772.17	\$ 55,772.17	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 4,059.42	7.28%
61	Margaret Scott	\$ 8,917.31	\$ 8,917.31	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 649.05	7.28%
68	Demitrius Murchison	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 727.86	7.28%
70	Richard Lipscomb	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,091.79	7.28%
72	Angella Whitter	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 3,639.29	7.28%
73	Versie Cobb	\$ 20,332.58	\$ 20,332.58	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,479.92	7.28%
75	Alessia Perry	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 363.93	7.28%
78	Bisola Oyedele	\$ 64,776.46	\$ 64,776.46	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 4,714.80	7.28%
79	Kerri Ann Hodge	\$ 3,481.57	\$ 3,481.57	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 253.41	7.28%
80	Yonetta Renee Kendall	\$ 141,272.23	\$ 141,272.23	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 10,282.60	7.28%
82	Kennith R. Dunk	\$ 29,020.72	\$ 29,020.72	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,112.29	7.28%
88	Joan Merritt	\$ 6,922.34	\$ 6,922.34	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 503.85	7.28%
93	Carrole Althea Cameron	\$ 5,228.32	\$ 5,228.32	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 380.55	7.28%
96	Hyacinth McDonald	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 436.71	7.28%
115	Marie Solange Ceus	\$ 17,798.32	\$ 17,798.32	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,295.46	7.28%
119	Kenyetta Z. Golson	\$ 8,930.77	\$ 8,930.77	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 650.03	7.28%
127	Jacqueline Wood	\$ 128,786.04	\$ 128,786.04	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 9,373.78	7.28%
132	Gerald Francis	\$ 32,890.32	\$ 32,890.32	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 2,393.95	7.28%
134	Wanda Devon Wilson	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 500,000.00	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 36,392.85	7.28%
136	Michelle King	\$ 18,014.69	\$ 18,014.69	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,311.21	7.28%
137	Celquetti Easter	\$ 18,374.20	\$ 18,374.20	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 1,337.38	7.28%
140	Larry Campbell	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 3,639.29	7.28%
144	Linda Elizabeth Cheek	\$ 9,096.00	\$ 9,096.00	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 662.06	7.28%
149	Rodney Dennis	\$ 55,140.35	\$ 55,140.35	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 4,013.43	7.28%
150	Eileen Barron c/o Marcellous McZeal, Esq.	\$ 284,830.29	\$ 284,830.29	\$ -	0.00%	\$ 20,731.57	7.28%
31	Steamaster, Inc.	\$ 1,200.00			0.00%	\$ 87.34	7.28%
32	Jeremy R.M. Piper, PLC	\$ 13,715.00			0.00%	\$ 998.26	7.28%
35	Wm. Floyd Company	\$ 7,707.21			0.00%	\$ 560.97	7.28%
36	Mark Newman	\$ 3,177.50			0.00%	\$ 231.28	7.28%
37	Consumers Energy	\$ 53,017.46			0.00%	\$ 3,858.91	7.28%
77	Linnell & Associates, PLLC	\$ 4,014.60			0.00%	\$ 292.21	7.28%
117	Hertz Schram PC, Matthew Turchyn	\$ 2,492.90			0.00%	\$ 181.45	7.28%
130	Double T Services Inc.	\$ 1,640.00			0.00%	\$ 119.37	7.28%
138	Bobbie Kirby (DISPUTED CLAIM – DISTRIBUTION WITHHELD)	\$ 206,000.00	\$ 200,000.00		0.00%	\$ 14,993.85	7.28%
145	Waste Management	\$ 3,363.38			0.00%	\$ 244.81	7.28%
158	Allen Hope & Associates	\$ 2,563.60			0.00%	\$ 186.59	7.28%
161	State of Michigan (DISPUTED CLAIM – DISTRIBUTION WITHHELD)	\$ 7,325.71			0.00%	\$ 533.21	7.28%
162	Dee Cramer Inc.	\$ 2,633.62			0.00%	\$ 191.69	7.28%
169	CAD fx, Inc.	\$ 2,400.00			0.00%	\$ 174.69	7.28%
180	Janice Welch	\$ 38,000.00	\$ 38,000.00		0.00%	\$ 2,765.86	7.28%
10	Jeffery Anderson	\$ 91,784.45	\$ 92,484.45	\$ 700.00	0.76%	\$ 6,031.55	7.28%
163	Mary E. Colon	\$ 119,246.51	\$ 123,075.51	\$ 3,829.00	3.11%	\$ 5,129.14	7.28%
167	Nellie M. Willis/Macie Moore	\$ 2,880.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 120.00	4.00%	\$ 98.36	7.28%
129	John W. Jackson	\$ 52,400.00	\$ 55,000.00	\$ 2,600.00	4.73%	\$ 1,403.21	7.28%
74	Norma Beckford	\$ 96,324.93	\$ 101,152.59	\$ 4,827.66	4.77%	\$ 2,534.80	7.28%
86	Allen R. Thomas	\$ 46,771.80	\$ 49,248.30	\$ 2,476.50	5.03%	\$ 1,108.07	7.28%
17	Virginia Rubin (DISPUTED CLAIM – DISTRIBUTION WITHHELD)	\$ 73,372.51	\$ 78,372.51	\$ 5,000.00	6.38%	\$ 704.40	7.28%
90	Monnie Carter	\$ 233,333.36	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 16,666.64	6.67%	\$ 1,529.79	7.28%

Exhibit 1
Calculation of Amount to Distribute to Claimants
As of 10/24/19

Total \$ 200,000.00

CLAIM NO.	NAME	AMOUNT OF A CLAIM	DEPOSITS	WITHDRAWALS	PERCENTAGE RETURN	PROPOSED CURRENT DISTRIBUTION	PERCENTAGE RETURN AFTER PROPOSED CURRENT DISTRIBUTION
106	Joyce Wiggins c/o Rachel Hawryle, Esq. Christenson & Fiederlein, PC	\$ 62,050.22	\$ 66,705.40	\$ 4,655.18	6.98%	\$ 200.02	7.28%
159	John Bailey	\$ 26,179.81	\$ 28,745.09	\$ 2,565.28	8.92%	\$ -	8.92%
101	Jimmie Robinson c/o Rachel Hawryle, Esq. Christenson & Fiederlein, PC	\$ 45,140.92	\$ 49,785.28	\$ 4,644.36	9.33%	\$ -	9.33%
19	Betty Knapp	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 55,323.92	\$ 5,323.92	9.62%	\$ -	9.62%
51	Jonitra Hunter	\$ 27,050.12	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 2,949.88	9.83%	\$ -	9.83%
12	Marlene James	\$ 13,500.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 1,500.00	10.00%	\$ -	10.00%
67	David McGowen	\$ 221,392.34	\$ 246,225.66	\$ 24,833.32	10.09%	\$ -	10.09%
124	Locquin Renea Bryant	\$ 34,437.90	\$ 38,487.88	\$ 4,049.98	10.52%	\$ -	10.52%
27	Genevieve Benson	\$ 32,337.03	\$ 37,337.03	\$ 5,000.00	13.39%	\$ -	13.39%
48	Claudia Russell	\$ 163,287.71	\$ 190,930.00	\$ 27,642.29	14.48%	\$ -	14.48%
102	Anges Lowery c/o Rachel Hawryle, Esq. Christenson & Fiederlein, PC	\$ 38,231.78	\$ 44,952.78	\$ 6,721.00	14.95%	\$ -	14.95%
16	Avis Otler	\$ 25,316.62	\$ 29,816.62	\$ 4,500.00	15.09%	\$ -	15.09%
33	Esta Whitsett	\$ 44,868.80	\$ 53,855.41	\$ 8,986.61	16.69%	\$ -	16.69%
118	Sandra L. Williams	\$ 212,877.67	\$ 257,197.67	\$ 44,320.00	17.23%	\$ -	17.23%
59	Charles Williams	\$ 29,735.94	\$ 36,252.75	\$ 6,516.81	17.98%	\$ -	17.98%
111	Carla R. Freeman	\$ 59,076.66	\$ 72,220.26	\$ 13,143.60	18.20%	\$ -	18.20%
143	Douglas W. Harrison	\$ 13,190.16	\$ 16,147.17	\$ 2,957.01	18.31%	\$ -	18.31%
7	Marilyn Leahy Poll	\$ 238,717.50	\$ 292,500.00	\$ 53,782.50	18.39%	\$ -	18.39%
125	Cassandra Oliver	\$ 44,576.99	\$ 55,146.64	\$ 10,569.65	19.17%	\$ -	19.17%
55	Donna L. Evans	\$ 19,032.08	\$ 23,625.96	\$ 4,593.88	19.44%	\$ -	19.44%
65	Emma Taylor	\$ 3,200.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 800.00	20.00%	\$ -	20.00%
107	Moses Brinson c/o Rachel Hawryle, Esq. Christenson & Fiederlein, PC	\$ 376,470.48	\$ 472,927.65	\$ 96,457.17	20.40%	\$ -	20.40%
165	Anthony Simmons	\$ 15,833.37	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 4,166.63	20.83%	\$ -	20.83%
81	Catherine and Nathaniel Washington	\$ 21,248.26	\$ 27,000.00	\$ 5,751.74	21.30%	\$ -	21.30%
22	Ann B. Jolly	\$ 91,251.64	\$ 116,099.62	\$ 24,847.98	21.40%	\$ -	21.40%
28	Sandra E. Henderson	\$ 78,503.68	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 21,496.32	21.50%	\$ -	21.50%
25	Betty Panky	\$ 133,565.59	\$ 174,507.92	\$ 40,942.33	23.46%	\$ -	23.46%
43	Thelma Mason	\$ 38,180.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 11,820.00	23.64%	\$ -	23.64%
39	Geraldine Wilburn	\$ 34,200.00	\$ 45,000.00	\$ 10,800.00	24.00%	\$ -	24.00%
109	Claudine Harris (DISPUTED CLAIM – D)	\$ 94,500.00	\$ 200,000.00	\$ 50,500.00	25.25%	\$ -	25.25%
174	Joseph Luckey	\$ 137,634.07	\$ 184,297.91	\$ 46,663.84	25.32%	\$ -	25.32%
40	Claresa L. Price	\$ 302,380.74	\$ 419,633.50	\$ 117,252.76	27.94%	\$ -	27.94%
92	Cyril L. Manning	\$ 182,171.37	\$ 254,595.33	\$ 72,423.96	28.45%	\$ -	28.45%
112	Beckie Hayes	\$ 48,134.84	\$ 68,449.08	\$ 20,314.24	29.68%	\$ -	29.68%
178	Maxine Ellison	\$ 24,500.00	\$ 35,000.00	\$ 10,500.00	30.00%	\$ -	30.00%
151	Robert and Ruth Rodgers	\$ 11,425.77	\$ 16,425.77	\$ 5,000.00	30.44%	\$ -	30.44%
173	Alvin Burt	\$ 6,800.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 3,200.00	32.00%	\$ -	32.00%
84	Leroy Azard	\$ 15,269.11	\$ 22,557.73	\$ 7,288.62	32.31%	\$ -	32.31%
146	Gary and June Thompson	\$ 291,830.89	\$ 431,545.25	\$ 139,714.36	32.38%	\$ -	32.38%
42	Shirley Rae McIntosh	\$ 133,803.57	\$ 200,000.00	\$ 66,196.43	33.10%	\$ -	33.10%
120	Marsha Griggs	\$ 215,100.00	\$ 322,700.00	\$ 107,600.00	33.34%	\$ -	33.34%
66	J. Russell Patterson	\$ 44,888.65	\$ 68,863.51	\$ 23,974.86	34.82%	\$ -	34.82%
175	Ednaly Sangle c/o Ronald J. Sommers, as Ch. 7 Trustee	\$ 193,002.74	\$ 299,253.00	\$ 106,250.26	35.51%	\$ -	35.51%
14	Zachary Sheely (DISPUTED CLAIM – D)	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 330,000.00	\$ 118,000.00	35.76%	\$ -	35.76%
123	Evelyn L. Patterson	\$ 63,500.00	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 36,500.00	36.50%	\$ -	36.50%
46	Yvette Denise Marshall	\$ 12,382.88	\$ 19,693.69	\$ 7,310.81	37.12%	\$ -	37.12%
44	Opal Jean Long	\$ 12,500.30	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 7,499.70	37.50%	\$ -	37.50%
13	Cora Jean Woods	\$ 31,100.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 18,900.00	37.80%	\$ -	37.80%
147	Diane P. Washington	\$ 32,581.90	\$ 54,759.90	\$ 22,178.00	40.50%	\$ -	40.50%
41	Isadore Price	\$ 45,869.37	\$ 78,340.41	\$ 32,471.04	41.45%	\$ -	41.45%
104	Reuben Lowery c/o Rachel Hawryle, Esq. Christenson & Fiederlein, PC	\$ 77,190.00	\$ 136,316.52	\$ 59,126.52	43.37%	\$ -	43.37%
176	Leona R. Harrell	\$ 79,948.61	\$ 143,323.35	\$ 63,374.74	44.22%	\$ -	44.22%
97	Edward Bogan	\$ 78,367.65	\$ 142,050.05	\$ 63,682.40	44.83%	\$ -	44.83%
49	Grace Udo	\$ 34,744.69	\$ 63,426.63	\$ 28,681.94	45.22%	\$ -	45.22%
131	Portia Bearyman Fair	\$ 15,456.17	\$ 28,771.76	\$ 13,315.59	46.28%	\$ -	46.28%
128	Vennette L. Lott	\$ 25,897.84	\$ 49,965.00	\$ 24,067.16	48.17%	\$ -	48.17%

Exhibit 1
Calculation of Amount to Distribute to Claimants
As of 10/24/19

Total \$ 200,000.00

CLAIM NO.	NAME	AMOUNT OF A CLAIM	DEPOSITS	WITHDRAWALS	PERCENTAGE RETURN	PROPOSED CURRENT DISTRIBUTION	PERCENTAGE RETURN AFTER PROPOSED CURRENT DISTRIBUTION
6	Sarah Harris	\$ 32,122.41	\$ 62,143.89	\$ 30,021.48	48.31%	\$ -	48.31%
58	Harvey and Anita Hammett	\$ 845.06	\$ 1,645.06	\$ 800.00	48.63%	\$ -	48.63%
26	Ethel Shaw	\$ 36,680.44	\$ 71,905.36	\$ 35,224.92	48.99%	\$ -	48.99%
91	Precious Faith Church of God in Christ	\$ 10,308.80	\$ 21,000.00	\$ 10,691.20	50.91%	\$ -	50.91%
113	Yvonne E. Craiger	\$ 9,526.42	\$ 19,526.42	\$ 10,000.00	51.21%	\$ -	51.21%
15	Gregory Lamar Mitchell	\$ 11,650.06	\$ 23,915.24	\$ 12,265.18	51.29%	\$ -	51.29%
110	Carolyn Cordeiro	\$ 64,360.06	\$ 134,975.00	\$ 70,614.94	52.32%	\$ -	52.32%
157	Shirley Clark	\$ 25,107.01	\$ 55,950.79	\$ 30,843.78	55.13%	\$ -	55.13%
62	Monther Fahed Hawa	\$ 75,715.33	\$ 170,000.00	\$ 94,284.67	55.46%	\$ -	55.46%
29	Arthur Mark (DISPUTED CLAIM – DISTRICT COURT)	\$ 441,878.47	\$ 999,682.19	\$ 557,803.72	55.80%	\$ -	55.80%
139	Debra Charlisa Hills	\$ 27,645.50	\$ 63,225.09	\$ 35,579.59	56.27%	\$ -	56.27%
54	Levoid Price	\$ 140,858.11	\$ 340,000.00	\$ 199,141.89	58.57%	\$ -	58.57%
45	Meagan Pinkney	\$ 90,630.45	\$ 221,175.00	\$ 130,544.55	59.02%	\$ -	59.02%
64	Carolyn Taylor Williams	\$ 16,800.00	\$ 42,219.00	\$ 25,419.00	60.21%	\$ -	60.21%
133	Roslyn D. Ballard	\$ 7,963.58	\$ 20,071.37	\$ 12,107.78	60.32%	\$ -	60.32%
76	Michelle Scott c/o Patrick J. Malloy III	\$ 221,924.86	\$ 566,226.64	\$ 344,301.78	60.81%	\$ -	60.81%
126	Karen Yvette McGlory	\$ 26,920.49	\$ 69,746.49	\$ 42,826.00	61.40%	\$ -	61.40%
87	Tyree W. Williams	\$ 30,263.48	\$ 80,000.00	\$ 49,736.52	62.17%	\$ -	62.17%
154	Clyde and Barbara Jones	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 7,500.00	62.50%	\$ -	62.50%
148	Larry Jefferson	\$ 10,734.80	\$ 30,297.39	\$ 19,562.59	64.57%	\$ -	64.57%
52	John Brown	\$ 17,868.07	\$ 56,676.04	\$ 38,807.97	68.47%	\$ -	68.47%
135	Annie Davis	\$ 4,385.76	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 10,614.24	70.76%	\$ -	70.76%
114	Edmond and Tawana Parker	\$ 35,812.18	\$ 123,164.49	\$ 87,352.31	70.92%	\$ -	70.92%
89	Leroy Spence	\$ 28,266.69	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 71,733.31	71.73%	\$ -	71.73%
2	Charolene Finley	\$ 12,289.46	\$ 45,600.00	\$ 33,310.54	73.05%	\$ -	73.05%
116	Darna Hughes	\$ 25,093.39	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 74,906.61	74.91%	\$ -	74.91%
99	Alice Bogan	\$ 27,629.11	\$ 139,379.11	\$ 111,750.00	80.18%	\$ -	80.18%
20	Madeline Mills	\$ 14,772.33	\$ 78,500.00	\$ 63,727.67	81.18%	\$ -	81.18%
85	Rose M. Noble	\$ 10,755.03	\$ 60,755.03	\$ 50,000.00	82.30%	\$ -	82.30%
164	Susie Martin	\$ 4,250.00	\$ 24,443.10	\$ 20,193.10	82.61%	\$ -	82.61%
156	Danita Woodhouse	\$ 5,309.43	\$ 32,256.75	\$ 26,947.32	83.54%	\$ -	83.54%
4	William and Melinda Jones	\$ 8,881.14	\$ 56,438.17	\$ 47,557.03	84.26%	\$ -	84.26%
152	Denise Williams	\$ 5,700.51	\$ 65,700.51	\$ 60,000.00	91.32%	\$ -	91.32%
100	Shirley A. Sutton	\$ 2,127.83	\$ 40,740.26	\$ 38,612.43	94.78%	\$ -	94.78%
5	Mary Kahi/Kohi	\$ 2,589.69	\$ 49,986.50	\$ 47,396.81	94.82%	\$ -	94.82%
63	Irene Hamlett	\$ 1,076.35	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 23,923.65	95.69%	\$ -	95.69%
121	Alvin Murphy	\$ 3,552.21	\$ 137,219.75	\$ 133,667.54	97.41%	\$ -	97.41%
153	Charles E. Williams	\$ 1,038.46	\$ 45,539.51	\$ 44,501.05	97.72%	\$ -	97.72%
50	Mattie Thornton	\$ -	\$ 17,880.00	\$ 17,960.00	100.45%	\$ -	100.45%
3	Reginald H Coleman	\$ -	\$ 40,715.69	\$ 41,358.63	101.58%	\$ -	101.58%
155	Simone Wofford	\$ -	\$ 71,822.40	\$ 73,098.80	101.78%	\$ -	101.78%
168	Brenda Jean Cardwell	\$ -	\$ 120,505.20	\$ 155,483.94	129.03%	\$ -	129.03%
60	Viola Drane	\$ -			n/a*	\$ -	n/a*
69	Felicee Murchison	\$ -			n/a*	\$ -	n/a*
83	Mitchell & Mary Atkinson	\$ -			n/a*	\$ -	n/a*
141	New Life World Outreach	\$ -			n/a*	\$ -	n/a*
166	Vanessa Jones	\$ -			n/a*	\$ -	n/a*
170	Progressive Commercial	\$ -			n/a*	\$ -	n/a*
171	Marlon Johnson	\$ -			n/a*	\$ -	n/a*
172	Monroe Sims	\$ -			n/a*	\$ -	n/a*
177	Demario Tucker	\$ -			n/a*	\$ -	n/a*

\$ 200,000.00

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN**

UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND
EXCHANGE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

TREASURE ENTERPRISE LLC,
PATRICIA ENRIGHT GRAY and LARRY
ALLEN HOLLEY

No. 17-cv-10963
Hon. Marianne O. Battani

Defendants,

and

KINGDOM ASSET MANAGEMENT LLC
and CARLEEN RENEE HOLLY,

Relief Defendants

**BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER
AUTHORIZING FIRST DISTRIBUTION TO CREDITORS AND TO
CORRECT ALLOWED AMOUNT AS TO FIVE CREDITORS**

Patrick O’Keefe and O’Keefe and Associates Consulting, LLC (the “Receiver”), through their counsel, Jaffe, Raitt, Heuer & Weiss, P.C. rely on the facts and law set forth in the Motion for Order Authorizing First Distribution to Creditors and to Correct Allowed Amount as to Five Creditors (the “Motion”), in support of the Motion.

Respectfully submitted by,

JAFFE RAITT HEUER & WEISS, P.C

Dated: November 4, 2019

By: /s/ Jay L. Welford
Jay L. Welford (P34471)
Counsel to the Receiver
27777 Franklin Road, Suite 2500
Southfield, MI 48034-8214
(248) 351-3000
jwelford@jaffelaw.com

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN**

UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND
EXCHANGE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

TREASURE ENTERPRISE LLC,
PATRICIA ENRIGHT GRAY and LARRY
ALLEN HOLLEY

No. 17-cv-10963
Hon. Marianne O. Battani

Defendants,

and

KINGDOM ASSET MANAGEMENT LLC
and CARLEEN RENEE HOLLEY,

Relief Defendants

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE REGARDING MOTION AND BRIEF
FOR ORDER AUTHORIZING FIRST DISTRIBUTION TO CREDITORS**

I hereby certify that a copy of the Motion for Order Authorizing First Distribution to Creditors and Brief in Support of Motion for Order Authorizing First Distribution to Creditors were served upon all counsel of record on November 4, 2019 using the Court's CM/ECF filing system.

/s/ Deon M. Goldberg