23-10322-jpm Doc 1737 Filed 07/18/25 Entered 07/18/25 16:02:05 Main Document Docket #1737 Date Filed: 07/18/2025

Kyle Ortiz Brian F. Shaughnessy Jennifer Sharret Andrew Citron

#### HERBERT SMITH FREEHILLS KRAMER (US) LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036 (212) 715-9100 (212) 715-8000

Counsel for Eletson Holdings

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
	x	
In re:	:	Chapter 11
ELETSON HOLDINGS INC.,1	: :	Case No. 23-10322 (JPM)
	: :	
Debtor.	:	
	X	

#### NOTICE OF FILING OF JUNE 18, 2025 HEARING TRANSCRIPT

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that a hearing was held before the Honorable John P. Mastando III, United States Bankruptcy Judge for the Southern District of New York, on June 18, 2025 at 9:00 AM. (Prevailing Eastern Time) (the "Hearing").

**PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE** that the Hearing transcript is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

**PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE** that all case filings can be viewed and/or obtained by: (i) accessing the Court's website <a href="www.nysb.uscourts.gov">www.nysb.uscourts.gov</a> or by (ii) contacting the Office of the Clerk of the Court at the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York.

2310322250718000000000001

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Prior to November 19, 2024, the Debtors in these cases were: Eletson Holdings Inc., Eletson Finance (US) LLC, and Agathonissos Finance LLC. On March 5, 2025, the Court entered a final decree and order closing the chapter 11 cases of Eletson Finance (US) LLC and Agathonissos Finance LLC. Commencing on March 5, 2025, all motions, notices, and other pleadings relating to any of the Debtors shall be filed in the chapter 11 case of Eletson Holdings Inc. The Debtor's mailing address is c/o Herbert Smith Freehills Kramer (US) LLP 1177 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036.

Dated: July 18, 2025 New York, New York

## HERBERT SMITH FREEHILLS KRAMER (US) LLP

/s/ Kyle Ortiz

Kyle J. Ortiz, Esq. Brian F. Shaughnessy, Esq. Jennifer Sharret, Esq. Andrew Citron, Esq. 1177 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036

Telephone: (212) 715-9100 Facsimile: (212) 715-8000

Email: kyle.ortiz@hsfkramer.com

brian.shaughnessy@hsfkramer.com Jennifer.sharret@hsfkramer.com Andrew.citron@hsfkramer.com

Counsel for Eletson Holdings Inc.

# **EXHIBIT A**

```
1
    UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
1
 2
    SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 3
 4
 5
    In the Matter of:
6
    ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., et al., Main Case No.
7
             Debtors.
                                            23-10322-jpm
8
9
10
11
                  United States Bankruptcy Court
12
                  One Bowling Green
13
                 New York, New York
14
15
                 June 18, 2025
                  9:11 AM
16
17
18
19
20
    B E F O R E:
21
    HON. JOHN P. MASTANDO, II
    U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE
22
23
24
    ECRO: MARIA
25
```

```
2
1
 2
    Doc# 1694 Notice of Agenda of Matters Scheduled for Hearing on
 3
    June 18, 2025 at 9:00 AM (Prevailing Eastern Time) Via Zoom for
 4
    Government (related document(s)1665, 1689, 1664, 1586, 1632,
 5
    1587) Document #: 1694
 6
7
    Notice of Adjournment of Hearing on Motion For Order Granting
    Reconsideration of the Courts March 25, 2025 Order (related
8
9
    document(s)1586) Document #: 1670
10
    Eletson Holdings Inc.'s Objection to Motion of Apargo Limited,
11
    Fentalon Limited, and Desimusco Trading Limited for
12
    Reconsideration of March 25, 2025 Order (related document(s)
13
    1586, 1587) Document #: 1664
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
3
1
 2
    Declaration of Jared C. Borriello, Esq. In Support of Eletson
 3
    Holdings Inc.'s Objection to Motion of Apargo Limited, Fentalon
    Limited, and Desimusco Trading Limited for Reconsideration of
 4
 5
    March 25, 2025 Order (Attachments: Exhibits 1-6) (related
6
    document(s)1664, 1586, 1587) Document #: 1665
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
    Transcribed by: Sharona Shapiro
20
    eScribers, LLC
21
    7227 North 16th Street, Suite #207
22
    Phoenix, AZ 85020
    (800) 257-0885
23
24
    operations@escribers.net
25
```

```
4
1
    A P P E A R A N C E S (All present by video or telephone):
 2
 3
    REED SMITH LLP
          Attorneys for Debtors
 4
 5
           599 Lexington Avenue
6
          New York, NY 10022
7
          LOUIS M. SOLOMON, ESQ.
8
    BY:
9
          ANDREW L. BUCK, ESQ.
10
          CHRISTOPHER M. LAUKAMG, ESQ.
11
          RICHARD SOLOW, ESQ.
12
13
14
    REED SMITH LLP
15
          Attorneys for Debtors
           10 South Wacker Drive
16
17
          40th Floor
18
          Chicago, IL 60606
19
20
    BY:
          MICHAEL B. GALIBOIS, ESQ.
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
5
1
 2
    REED SMITH LLP
 3
           Attorneys for Debtors
           1717 Arch Street
 4
 5
           Suite 3100
6
           Philadelphia, PA 19103
7
8
    BY:
          DEREK M. OSEI-BONSU, ESQ.
9
           JOSHUA M. PELES, ESQ.
10
11
12
    REED SMITH LLP
13
           Attorneys for Debtors
14
           1201 Market Street
15
           Wilmington, DE 19801
16
17
    BY: KEVIN W. COCKERHAM, ESQ.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
6
1
 2
    GOULSTON & STORRS
 3
          Attorneys for Eletson Holdings
 4
           One Post Office Square
 5
          Boston, MA 02494
6
7
    BY:
          JENNIFER FUREY, ESQ.
8
          NATHANIEL R. B. KOSLOF, ESQ.
9
10
    HERBERT SMITH FREEHILLS KRAMER NEW YORK LLP
11
12
          Attorneys for reorganized Eletson Holdings Inc.
13
          1177 Avenue of the Americas
          New York, NY 10036
14
15
          KYLE J. ORTIZ, ESQ.
16
    BY:
17
          BRIAN F. SHAUGHNESSY, ESQ.
18
          ANDREW CITRON, ESQ.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
7
1
 2
    DECHERT LLP
 3
           Attorneys for Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors
 4
           Three Bryant Park
 5
           1095 Avenue of the Americas
6
          New York, NY 10036
7
          STEPHEN D. ZIDE, ESQ.
8
    BY:
9
          DAVID A. HERMAN, ESQ.
          KARLI K. WADE, ESQ.
10
11
          OWEN HANEY, ESQ.
12
13
14
    GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
15
         Attorneys for Apargo Limited, Fentalon Limited,
         and Desimusco Trading Limited
16
17
         One Vanderbilt Avenue
18
         New York, NY 10017
19
20
    BY: HAL S. SHAFTEL, ESQ.
21
         ADAM KIRSCHBAUM, ESQ.
22
23
24
25
```

```
8
1
 2
    PERKINS COIE LLP
 3
           Attorneys for Wilmington Savings Fund Society, FSB
           1155 Avenue of the Americas
 4
 5
           22nd Floor
 6
          New York, NY 10036
 7
           TINA N. MOSS, ESQ.
8
    BY:
 9
10
    UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
11
           Office of the United States trustee
12
13
           One Bowling Green
           Suite 534
14
15
           New York, NY 10707
16
17
     BY: DANIEL RUDEWICZ, ESQ.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

# **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

	9
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. We're here on
3	case number 23-10322. Can I have appearances for the record,
4	please?
5	MR. ORTIZ: Good morning, Your Honor. Kyle Ortiz, of
6	HSF Kramer, for Eletson Holdings, joined on the line by my
7	partner, Brian Shaughnessy.
8	THE COURT: Good morning.
9	MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Good morning.
10	MR. SHAFTEL: Your Honor, good morning. Hal Shaftel
11	from the Greenberg Traurig firm. We are here on behalf of the
12	movants, Apargo, Fentalon, and Desimusco Trading.
13	THE COURT: Good morning.
14	MR. SHAFTEL: Good morning.
15	MR. HERMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. David Herman,
16	from Dechert, on behalf of the official committee of unsecured
17	creditors.
18	THE COURT: Good morning.
19	MR. HERMAN: Good morning.
20	MR. SOLOMON: Good morning, Your Honor. Lou Solomon,
21	from Reed Smith, at the Court's direction. We are here on
22	behalf of Provisional Holdings, and to the extent necessary,
23	Reed Smith.
24	THE COURT: Good morning.
25	MR. RUDEWICZ: Good morning, Your Honor, Daniel

## **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

10 Rudewicz on behalf of the United States Trustee. 1 2 THE COURT: Good morning. 3 MS. MOSS: Good morning, Your Honor. Tina Moss, 4 Perkins Coie, on behalf of Wilmington Savings Fund Society, 5 FSB, as indenture trustee. 6 THE COURT: Good morning. 7 Okay. Would movants like to begin? 8 MR. SHAFTEL: Please. Thank you, Your Honor. Hal 9 Shaftel from Greenberg Traurig. We appreciate the Court's availability this morning. 10 My clients, as the Court is aware, our three Cypriot 11 entities. We are styled the preferred shareholders because, in 12 the underlying arbitration before Justice Belen, they were 13 awarded the preferred equity, the preferred units in Eletson 14 15 Gas, or Gas, together with substantial compensatory and punitive damages, I believe, in excess of thirty million 16 dollars. 17 18 Nothing about that arbitration award has been 19 disturbed. It, of course, is being challenged, but it remains 20 extant today. I should say nothing about the award of the 21 preferred equity, or the findings that the preferred equity are held by my clients, has been disturbed. The district court did 22 make some adjustments to the damages calculations. 23 24 We are here seeking reconsideration of the Court's March 25 order, which clarified -- we, respectfully, believe 25

expanded -- a prior order from March 13th, which identified, as a prohibited action, a certain Greek confirmation -arbitration confirmation proceeding, nothing to do -- and this will be relevant in the chronology. Nothing to do with confirmation or recognition, one way or other, of the bankruptcy plan, but recognition or confirmation of the separate arbitration award as related to my clients. And that action in Greece was brought by the three Cypriot entities, what I'm calling the preferred shareholders, together with Eletson Gas.

We believe, as set forth in our papers, respectfully, that the Court erred, in two respects, in the March 25 order identifying or confirming that Greek proceeding as a prohibited action. It was based, we believe, on a mistaken premise about the nature, Your Honor, of that action, as well as a mistaken premise about the relationship of the parties to the Gas entity. We were not -- neither Gas nor the Cypriot entities were respondents on the motion. We don't believe the relevant full picture was presented to Your Honor with respect to those two categories or buckets of issues.

First, let me speak to the nature of that Greek action. And it relates to the confirmation, the arbitration confirmation proceeding that has been proceeding before Judge Liman for the last two years, since the better part of two years, since August of 2023.

#### **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

My clients have now intervened in that case to oppose the claims and arguments for vacatur. No one has ever questioned -- nobody has seriously questioned; I don't think they can -- that that proceeding before Judge Liman is consistent with and does no damage, or interference, or undercut in any way, the bankruptcy plan or the bankruptcy case. It is, in fact, a separate case. And indeed, both this Court, Your Honor, and Judge Liman has specifically recognized that that proceeding is consistent with the bankruptcy plan in the bankruptcy case.

Why is that relevant? The Greek proceeding, under the New York Convention, was the parallel proceeding to the New York case before Judge Liman, by extension, by necessity, if you will. To the extent the action before Judge Liman, which, of course it is, is consistent with and does no harm to the bankruptcy case, the bankruptcy plan, so too, by necessity, by extension, the Greek action, which was subject to the March 25 order.

We will get, and I will walk through the chronology as quickly as I can for the Court -- Judge Liman has issued an anti-suit injunction relating to the Greek proceeding. We have timely dismissed that case. But he did so on grounds wholly irrelevant -- wholly irrelevant to the bankruptcy case. In fact, he says as much in his decision, where he says he's expressing no view on the preferred shareholders' positions

with respect to the bankruptcy orders.

So how does the Greek proceeding get captured, I think, casually, even surreptitiously, in Your Honor's rulings on March 13th, and then followed by March 25? As the Court is aware, better than I, who arrived on the scene in your courtroom in April, there was what's, I guess, colloquially or commonly referred to as the third sanctions motion brought on February the 19th. My clients, the preferred shareholders, Gas, were not respondents or named in that motion. There were defined "violating parties". Neither my clients nor Gas were included.

And the initial focus, indeed, the entire focus of that motion was on foreign proceedings involving the recognition -- confirmation, recognition, objection to, opposition to the bankruptcy plan. That is the way the February 19th motion was teed up for the Court.

Later in February, on February 28th, followed by a March 3 revised proposed order, put into a list of nine other -- or nine, I guess in total -- actions, was the Greek arbitration proceeding, having nothing to do -- no different than the action before Judge Liman, having nothing to do with any prejudice, interference, burden on the bankruptcy plan.

Now, at that point, we were not -- still were not named as respondents on that motion, not identified as one of the violating parties. There was no discussion in either the

## **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

submissions, no discussion at oral argument before the Court on the 13th -- I should say the 12th of March, regarding the Greek proceeding. We do not believe a fair picture was presented to the Court about the nature of the Greek proceeding, and what it was about, and what, certainly, it was not about.

Now, after the inclusion -- and I believe it was provided ex parte -- of the Greek proceeding in the March 13th written order that the Court signed, there was follow-up correspondence between -- I believe, on behalf of the Provisional board, by Reed Smith and Eletson Holdings. I don't believe there was any formal motion to reconsider. But that correspondence then led to the Court's March 25 ruling, which for the first time was directed at Gas, which is an entity my clients believe, and as found in Justice Belen's determination, are the 100 percent holders of the preferred equity.

It was at that point that we have sought to have the Court reconsider the order. Now, as I mentioned before, Judge Liman has issued an anti-suit injunction against the Greek proceeding because he determined that it presented -- frankly, not so much that it interfered with, but presented a threat of interference with his jurisdiction over the arbitration award as the Court of primary jurisdiction under the New York Convention.

And as I referenced before, Your Honor, he specifically wrote in that anti-injunction junction order he

## **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

```
15
1
    expressed no view. It was not -- nothing about the order was
 2
    commenting on the bankruptcy court orders or my clients'
 3
    positions about the bankruptcy court orders.
             While the anti-suit injunction was premised -- and
 4
 5
    we've noticed an appeal; I respectfully disagree with it. But
    right or wrong, it was premised on a threat to Judge Liman's
 6
7
    jurisdiction in the separate nonbankruptcy case with respect to
 8
    reviewing the arbitration award. There is nothing about that
 9
    order, and more importantly, nothing about the Greek proceeding
    which undercuts, interferes, opposes the bankruptcy plan.
10
    why do we say that, Your Honor?
11
12
             THE COURT: Sorry. When was the Greek proceeding
    dismissed?
13
             MR. SHAFTEL: I believe Justice Liman's order was June
14
15
    the 2nd, so two or three days -- within two or three days, Your
16
    Honor. If you need a more precise date, of course we can get
    it for you.
17
18
             THE COURT: But was it dismissed, or stayed, or what
    was, sort of, the procedural --
19
20
             UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was withdrawn.
21
             MR. SHAFTEL: Yeah, in --
             THE COURT: It was withdrawn?
22
23
             MR. SHAFTEL: Yes, withdrawn with prejudice -- I mean,
24
    without prejudice, Your Honor. Without prejudice.
25
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
                                Thank you.
```

MR. SHAFTEL: And in fact, that is why we very much see the March 25 order as still live and relevant. Maybe the edge is not as imminent or as sharp. But we have noticed an appeal of the anti-suit injunction. Circumstances may change. We believe that we do have a right -- separate apart; we are outside the purview of the bankruptcy plan -- to pursue confirmation outside of the U.S. Here we're speaking about Greece specifically. And we are concerned that the March 25 order remains a lingering impediment, indeed, prohibition.

THE COURT: Well, you're not going to pursue that until the appeal of Justice Liman's decision is resolved, and assuming it's resolved in a way that you find favorable.

MR. SHAFTEL: Either the -- Your Honor, that's correct. Either the Second Circuit sees the picture the way we do, or somehow circumstances change. But we are abiding -- for the avoidance of any doubt, we are abiding by, have, and will continue to abide by the anti-suit injunction until it is lifted or somehow relevant circumstances change.

And just to spend a moment on the rationale. We are obviously a nondebtor. We have claims against -- this was the party to the underlying arbitration, Levona, a nondebtor, over who owns the preferred shares. We do not believe the intent of the plan was, we don't believe the bankruptcy plan could preclude or handcuff our rights on those separate contractual issues against the nondebtor.

## **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

And to the extent that reorganized Holdings references that they do, under the plan, have retained causes of action, we do no prejudice to those. I'm not -- my clients are not asserting those retained causes of action. We're not in the process -- or in Greece were in the process of opposing those retained causes of action. They sit in reorganized Holdings' pocket. They're not asserted.

So just as the action, the arbitration case was perfectly consistent with Your Honor's case, when it was at 500 Pearl Street, it also -- the parallel action was perfectly consistent, did no harm, when it was also, in a parallel proceeding, being prosecuted in Piraeus, Greece. There is no difference as related to the bankruptcy plan. Judge Liman did find a threat on the arbitration side.

So that is, I guess, the summary of where we believe the full picture in the Court erred with respect to the nature of the Greek proceeding.

I now want to turn to the second bucket of issues, if I may, Your Honor, and that relates to the relationship between the parties. Reorganized Holdings has a claim for these purposes -- I'm not here to dispute it -- that they own 100 percent of the common shares -- the common shares of Gas.

What was not presented in the motion practice, to Your

Honor -- in fact, nothing was presented about either the

Greek -- the nature of the Greek proceeding, and the focus, and

the actual claims being prosecuted there, or the distinction between the common shares, which we will place in reorganized Holdings' hands for these purposes, and the preferred equity, which was the subject matter of the arbitration.

And to the extent that the March 25 order is directed at Gas, and references Gas as not entitled to pursue the claims in Greece without the approval or consent of reorganized Holdings, we believe that is error. It overreads, misreads — and none of these facts were presented to Your Honor — the nature of the common equity vis—a—vis the preferred equity. During this period it's referred to — and we've included the relevant corporate governance documents in the submission to the Court, which the Court did not have beforehand on the underlying motion practice. We're in what's referred to as a (b)(2) period. It's before the redemption of the preferred equity. And the common shares lack economic or have de minimis economic rights, and more importantly, also de minimis

And we believe that, without drawing that distinction and recognizing that distinction, it is error to define that reorganized Holdings is required or has control over Gas. It may have control over the common shares, but the common shares are quite limited in terms of their corporate governance -- as well as economic rights -- but corporate governance rights at this point in time.

# **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

So we're in a world where we don't believe that the Court had the relevant record to be adjudicating the control or the authority of reorganized Holdings without taking into account this critical distinction between the preferred and the common.

So that leaves us in a world, Your Honor, where the arbitration award which reorganized Holdings diminishes as if it is a legal nullity -- it is not. And we submitted the cases. I cited the cases to the Court. It is a contractual right. Even reorganized Holdings' cases recognize that there's a doctrine where it is given an arbitration award, prejudgment, pre-confirmation, is given probative effect, probative weight, I believe, in the language of the cases.

So at this point, at the very least, the probative weight, the one thumb on the scale tips in favor of recognizing that the preferred equity, and hence the corporate governance rights attended to the preferred equity, are not in the hands of reorganized Holdings.

Or if you do want to pretend away, which we think would be legal error, if you do want to pretend away the significance, the weight, the probative weight, as the cases say, of the arbitration award, we live in a world where Justice Belen's status quo order is applicable. If we do not have finality with respect to the award, then Justice Belen's status quo order still should and does control.

# **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

And what he found in that, the Court recalls, is that the current -- the then current management, which happened to have been the same management of Gas, since it was incorporated in 2013, and remains the management today, have the decision-making authority and discretion to run the company.

So taking into account that, as I say, the only weight on the scale, evidentiary weight, is Justice Belen's findings about who is in control of the preferred equity and of corporate governance rights, or without that, then the status, the prior status quo injunction, all undercuts any claim by reorganized Holdings that somehow, presto, by magic, it suddenly has control, corporate governance, control over Gas.

So what does reorganized Holdings do in response?
They take, Your Honor, we think, entirely out of context,
references in various filings, including in the case before
Your Honor, where Gas is referenced as a "subsidiary". But I
say that because it's never defined in these references of
reorganized Holdings. But it is a subsidiary solely to the
extent that one's referring to the common shares. And at this
point in time, I think it's undeniable, those common shares
have extremely restricted, limited corporate governance as well
as economic rights. I think the economic rights may be,
obviously, less at play at this point.

So that is the substance of our motion. We believe that the Court was led, without giving what I'm describing as

the fuller picture, the comprehensive landscape here, to include the Greek proceeding, when it falls -- it substantively falls outside of what I believe this Court is focused on in terms of the bankruptcy plan.

Really, instead of engaging on the merits of most of that, or any of that, what reorganized Holdings spends pages and pages is our procedural issues that have no weight. I think I could address them guickly, Your Honor.

First, reorganized Holdings claims that our motion for reconsideration is untimely. It's not. If you apply the fourteen days for a 9024 motion, we are -- one can count the days on the calendar -- within those fourteen days.

We cite to the Court the case law that, to the extent March 25 clarified what to us was unclear prior, in terms of directing the order to Gas, or at Gas -- it does pick up the March 13th order -- frankly, I think it's a meaningless difference. The March 13th order was not directed at either Gas or the preferred shareholders, but we think we're facially timely.

And then the second bucket of procedural issues that reorganized Holdings focuses on is standing. And it's quite mangled in their papers. They, again, have pages on Constitutional case or controversy standing, prudential standing, real party-in-interest.

And just a couple of quick counters. This is not

about standing to bring claims for a court to decide whether there's a case or controversy to adjudicate a matter. We're, instead, in the realm of who has standing to object or seek reconsideration of an order under Rule 60 or 9024.

And there the test is -- and we cite the cases Grace v. Bank of Leumi, Gordon v. Livecchi, where the question is whether the party who was not a respondent, not a named party with respect to the order, whether that party, after the fact, has standing to seek reconsideration. And there the question is, is that party "sufficiently affected", whether that party significantly or has significant involvement with the subject matter of the order. And we think we clearly do. I'll put aside that we have 100 percent -- so we see it, so Justice Belen saw it -- of the preferred equity. We were copetitioners with Gas.

Judge Liman, indeed, in his anti-suit injunction, he also recognized that we are functionally equivalent to -- we, meaning the Cypriot preferred shareholders -- functionally equivalent, functionally in control, the same, substantially similar for these purposes.

So we think not only is it clear that we meet the standards for standing to reconsider, separate standards than what it means to present a case or controversy, a judicial case or controversy to the Court, but even if you were to apply standing, we have a direct interest in that Greek proceeding

being allowed to proceed. We are a copetitioner. Gas is an important, if not necessary, party to that proceeding.

So even under the, I think, inapplicable case or controversy standards that reorganized Holdings cites, we have standing. But certainly in terms of what standing means, to seek reconsideration, we don't believe there's any question about that.

For those reasons, we believe the March 25 order, in respect to the Greek arbitration proceeding, is wrong. And we, respectfully, ask the Court to modify and amend it accordingly. Subject to any questions the Court has, why don't I stop?

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Counsel. Let me see if anyone else would like to be heard first in support of the motion.

Okay. Would anyone like to be heard in opposition?

MR. ORTIZ: Good morning, Your Honor. Kyle Ortiz, of

HSF Kramer, for Holdings.

Your Honor, we're forty minutes past the hour. Let's start from the simplest place. The motion for reconsideration is brought by a party that claims it's not subject to the order, has no obligations under the order, and is complaining about inclusion of a proceeding that has been dismissed pursuant to an anti-suit injunction issued by the district court. Which all begs the question, Your Honor, why are we here today? This issue is moot. The proceedings in question

# **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

have been dismissed.

The purpose of the March 13th order was to ensure that that exact thing happened. It has happened, pursuant to a different order, but it happened. The Cypriots were not sanctioned under the order. Their potential alter egos were. And there's nothing left to do under the order with regard to the Greek arbitration confirmation proceedings.

Yet they press on, and for the same strategic reasons, Your Honor, that they have pressed multiple other issues since the effective date, to create delay and confusion, in the hopes of obtaining a ruling that they can use, or rather, Your Honor, misuse in foreign courts and before the courts in Texas.

And when I say "misuse", Your Honor, that is not hyperbole. Judge Liman has noted, in his written decisions, that submissions overseas by those purporting to represent Gas were "not a model of candor" with regard to the current posture of the bankruptcy proceedings, and that his rulings have been "consistently cited in foreign proceedings, often misleadingly".

Not to mention the fact, Your Honor, that you have seen that they continue to mislead foreign courts that confirmation requires recognition, despite Your Honor determining otherwise on multiple occasions. And they have continued to refuse to withdraw any of the proceedings they were ordered to withdraw, at least not pursuant to your order.

They appear to still be willing to honor court orders when there's something they want from that court. And that's despite daily increasing sanctions.

The main reason they appear to be continuing to press this motion, despite its obvious mootness, Your Honor, is they want a ruling that they can essentially use as a declaratory judgment to claim that they are the rightful owners of the preferred shares and that they rightfully control Gas. A motion for reconsideration is a wildly inappropriate way to try to accomplish what would essentially be a workaround the stay order and the confirmation order.

And even if you get past the utter mootness of it all, Your Honor, their entire argument starts from a false premise and requires the Court to ignore the context of the March 13th order and what was essentially Your Honor's first reconsideration ruling on March 25th.

It is well established in this circuit, Your Honor, that reconsideration is an extraordinary remedy, and that the burden is on the movant to demonstrate that the court overlooked controlling decisions or facts. It is not an opportunity to relitigate issues already decided or to get a second, or in this case, a third bite at the apple.

As the Second Circuit held in Nemaizer v. Baker,

"Movants must demonstrate exceptional circumstances to warrant
relief under Rule 60(b)". They must demonstrate Your Honor

clearly erred based on facts already in the record. It is not an opportunity, as we just heard today, to advance new facts, issues, or arguments not previously presented. They must prove clear error. They do not.

Indeed, Your Honor, their claims that Your Honor failed to consider certain arguments missed the mark because they failed to appreciate that the March 13th order was in the context of being the third order in furtherance of the confirmation order.

These issues they raise as warranting reconsideration are issues the Court has been addressing since the confirmation trial. And in that context, all of the issues they seek reconsideration for, claiming you failed to consider, you have considered multiple times, Your Honor. It is they who fail to appreciate what has been considered before.

Indeed, Your Honor, their argument starts from this conclusion, that you've heard so many times, that the Cypriots are somehow the undisputed owner of the preferred shares. As Your Honor is fully aware, that's far from disputed. Indeed, identical arguments that the preferred shares "unquestionably belonged to the Cypriot nominees", that's from confirmation. And arguments that Eletson Gas is outside the capital structure were made during confirmation and rejected, as part of the confirmation decision, in refusing to credit the collections contribution as new value.

#### **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

The Cypriots claiming that we don't support the notion that the Greek proceeding interferes with the plan and the confirmation order, again, Your Honor, this just ignores that the March 13th order is the third order in further support of the confirmation order.

Indeed, I doubt I need to remind Your Honor that a central issue of the entire Chapter 11 case was who would get the value of, or at least the right to seek the value of Gas. To say an effort to enforce an award, that would potentially remove that value from the reach of Holdings, does not interfere with the plan, is just wildly inconsistent with the record of these cases which Your Honor has carefully considered.

All of these issues relate back to confirmation in the Greek proceeding. It's just one element of an ongoing effort to interfere with implementation of the plan and unstayed confirmation order. Judge Liman recognized as much when he started his discussion of the foreign lawsuits, meaning the Greek and U.K. arbitration, in his anti-suit ruling, by stating, "The former shareholders of Holdings were not content with the bankruptcy court's decision rejecting their proposed plan of confirmation and confirming that of the petitioning creditors".

For Mr. Shaftel today to say that Judge Liman didn't really get into the plan at all, but he spent three pages

talking about it as a lead-up to the context, I think is just disingenuous. All of these arguments, concerning the effect of the award, were made originally at confirmation, and before that, for that matter.

And as the Cypriots themselves seem to now acknowledge, they, and the majority shareholders, and the principals themselves, are all one and the same. And these arguments have been made again and again and rejected again and again. These issues are unquestionably not issues Your Honor has overlooked. Rather, you've addressed them on multiple occasions.

And as the Second Circuit stated in Pastor v.

Partnership for Children's Rights, "A Rule 60(b) motion is properly denied where it seeks only to relitigate issues already decided".

Additionally, Your Honor, for the nominees to claim that our retained causes of action are distinct from the arbitration ignores that the only parties with standing to confirm the arbitration in the U.S., under Judge Liman's recent decision on intervention, where he denied intervention to seek confirmation by the Cypriots, but allowed them to intervene only to oppose vacatur, are Eletson Holdings and Eletson Corp., both entities that the control of vested with Holdings on the effective date, pursuant to sections 5.2C, 5.8, 5.10 of the plan, among other provisions.

#### **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

Mr. Shaftel's claim that the Greek proceeding is consistent with the plan, claiming that the New York action is consistent with the plan and does no harm to the case, so does the Greek court, that's another false premise, Your Honor. The New York proceeding impacts the plan unquestionably. Judge Liman didn't allow them to intervene to confirm the award because they have no standing. Only we, as Holdings and Corp., have standing. Controlling that action, as Holdings and Corp., is part of what we got under the plan. And interfering with that in Greece is interfering with the plan, which also gets, again, to the retained causes of actions. We have the right to enforce. They are trying to enforce on what we believe -- and Judge Liman indicated an agreement in, denying their intervention motion to confirm -- is ours.

They want to solely focus on Your Honor's comments on March 25th, while ignoring that those comments were made in response to an earlier informal motion to reconsider, brought by Reed Smith, and in the context of a seven-month effort to bring these parties, that they themselves are now arguing are all one and the same, into compliance with the confirmation order.

Some of these arguments have been made so many times. They keep pointing to the arbitration decision. But the Second Circuit has made clear that, until confirmed in a final judgment, an arbitration award is inoperative. Specifically,

Your Honor, the Second Circuit stated in D.H. Blair & Co. v.

Gottdiener, "Because arbitration awards are not self-enforcing,

they must be given a force and effect by being converted to

judicial orders by courts".

The fact that they were attempting to confirm the award in various jurisdictions demonstrates they are fully aware of this. And I say "were" because, again, those actions have since been dismissed.

So when they say Justice Belen's findings are undisturbed, first of all, it ignores that Judge Liman says he didn't confirm any findings. This is also a knowingly disingenuous argument and is an argument that has been made to Your Honor multiple times.

The discussion about the status quo is them wanting it both ways. If the status quo is still in place, then the four Levona directors were the directors when the arbitration was commenced, and the new directors, who were only put in place in 2024, in an effort to enforce, was a violation of your stay order.

But more importantly, it just requires us all to ignore Judge Liman's February 14th, 2025 decision, where he's, sua sponte, concerned about these very issues, made clear his confirmation is subject to the ongoing vacatur proceedings, in his recent June 2nd, 2025 decision, where he admonished them, Your Honor, for not specifically noting that the award is

subject to vacatur for fraud in their witness statement in the Greek proceedings, stating, "The witness statement is not a model of candor. It asserts that this court substantially confirmed the JAMS award, without adding the important caveat that those portions of the award that were confirmed were confirmed subject to resolution of the motion to vacate, and that there is substantial evidence to suggest the award was the product of fraud".

Judge Liman goes on, in discussing the witness statement, to note, "It recites that this Court granted Levona's leave to proceed with its motion to vacate without including the court's statements about the apparent strength of Levona's evidence that fraud was committed.

Tellingly, Your Honor, they wrote the reply to the objection, taking a very similar tact, calling our commentary regarding the strength of the evidence of fraud unfounded, after Judge Liman wrote those words and admonished them for downplaying the substantial evidence of fraud and pleadings.

And importantly, Your Honor, even if we lived in the world they put forth, the one that lacks candor, that there's no dispute that the Cypriots own the preferred shares, they still could not commence the Greek proceeding without violating the LLCA, because it requires the consent of Eletson Holdings' appointed director to retain counsel who, following confirmation and the change of control, that director is now

Len Hoskinson, not Vassilis Kertsikoff or Laskarina

Karastamati, which we discussed at length at the hearing on May

15th, Your Honor. They do not address that fact in any way in

the reply, and I didn't hear a response to that today.

It also, Your Honor, potentially violated the stay order. And we respectfully submit that the Court should put zero weight in any efforts in their pleadings to put this Court at ease saying they won't seek to enforce. In the reply papers, they cite their own response to Judge Liman, specifically Mr. Shaftel's response to Judge Liman, asking if he will enforce, and his response that he wouldn't without notice to this Court and or the bankruptcy court.

But he ignores, Your Honor, that Judge Liman found that response elusive. And there is a lengthy back-and-forth where Judge Liman tried to pin Mr. Shaftel to an answer, and he consistently evaded, so much so that Judge Liman went out of his way to note in his decision that "intervenors have likewise been elusive about their plans for the future proceedings in other jurisdictions", and that "intervenors have also been less than forthright in their representations to the Court regarding the purpose of those proceedings".

Indeed, Judge Liman was noting that he got little comfort from them insisting they'd come back to you, Your Honor, the bankruptcy court, before enforcement, when they were simultaneously insisting they're also not subject to the order

of the bankruptcy court enjoining enforcement.

Then, after going through their inconsistent arguments, Judge Liman concluded, "While intervenors have stated that the purpose of the proceeding is to put them in a position to execute, they have refused to indicate, one way or another, whether a second purpose is actually to execute so as to make the relief sought in the case meaningless".

He later went on to state, "The Court cannot accept intervenor's position that comity under the New York Convention requires Levona to play global Whac-a-Mole as intervenors and their affiliates race around the world to find a jurisdiction that will confirm the award before this Court can adjudicate the underlying question of fraud on the arbitrator".

That should all sound familiar to this Court, Your Honor, as they have made that same strategy with regard to their efforts to undermine confirmation. It is the same game of global Whac-a-Mole that the Cypriots and their affiliates, or as Judge Liman suggests, alter egos, continue to try to force Holdings to play, with a constantly evolving set of arguments, to avoid the consequences of the unstayed confirmation order.

In addition to their arguments being both moot and wrong, they do not appear to have standing to seek reconsideration in the first place. They claim to have an enforceable right under the award that they claim is

endangered, Your Honor. But Judge Liman has clearly found that they do not yet have an enforceable award because confirmation is subject to ongoing vacatur proceedings for fraud.

And the fact that they keep making that argument is why he, sua sponte, had to make that notation on February 14th. But more essentially, they are currently enjoined from bringing any such proceeding and have dismissed the Greek proceedings. So what right are they possibly concerned with?

There's nothing left to reconsider. The proceeding has been dismissed. The Cypriots were not sanctioned. What are we doing here? Their claims that they may bring actions, that I heard today, in the future, if successful on appeal, are conjectural and hypothetical.

And courts in this district have held that, "To demonstrate Constitutional standing, a party must establish an invasion of a legally protected interest that is concrete and particularized, and actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical". That's from Motors Liquidation 580 B.R. 319.

Despite them themselves arguing here, and in the district court, that the order never applied to them, even before the action in question was dismissed, they're attempting to bootstrap standing, and maybe responsibility, by claiming that the district court found that, as between Gas and the preferred shareholders, the parties-in-interest are the same.

It's a bit remarkable that they would make this

argument, as Judge Liman made that finding to say he can enjoin them both and sanction them both as well as the principals. But more importantly, they can't have it both ways. If they want to cite Judge Liman and argue that the real parties-in-interest are the same, they're clearly covered by the confirmation order, and all the subsequent orders, which gets you to March 13th, as the real parties-in-interest, that Judge Liman was saying they all are, is the three principals in various forms.

In fact, he made this very clear when he stated,
"Should contempt proceedings be brought for violations of this
injunction, the Court anticipates little difficulty in
concluding that Gas, Laskarina Karastamati, Vassilis
Kertsikoff, Vassilis Hadjieleftheriadis, Lassia Investment
Company, Family Unity Trust Company, Glafkos Trust Company" -which I'm sure Your Honor recognizes as the former majority
shareholders -- "are sufficiently in privity with, in active
concert with aiding or abetting intervenors" -- meaning the
Cypriots -- "to bring them within the range of the court's
contempt power.

That would bring the parties squarely within the confirmation order, and the March 13th order, which clearly covered the majority shareholders acting in ways that interfere with confirmation. And Your Honor's ruling is clearly correct as it stands.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

# **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

36

And I'm really not sure, Your Honor, that the folks at Greenberg, who admittedly are newer to these proceedings, have a broad enough context of the various implications of what they're arguing. But if they want to admit that the three principals, the former majority shareholders, and the Cypriot nominees, are all one and the same, by all means.

Indeed, as Judge Liman noted in his recent decision on the anti-suit injunction, "Even an entity or individual not named as a party, and not before the Court in personam, may be held in contempt of court when they have actual notice of an injunction, and are guilty of aiding or abetting, or acting in concert with a named defendant or the defendants privy in violating the injunction. The privity concept is restricted to persons so identified in interest, with those named in the decree that would be reasonable to conclude that their rights and interests have been represented and adjudicated in the original injunction proceeding. When an injunction has issued against a corporation, a subsidiary corporation, or an independent corporation, acting in active concert also may be bound by the order. In this vein, when a parent corporation transfers property to a subsidiary, in an attempt to circumvent an injunction, or the subsidiary aids, abets, or acts in concert with the parent, the decree is binding on the subsidiary". I omitted the internal citations from that quote, Your Honor.

#### **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

But lucky for them, that shouldn't apply because this issue is moot. But I do want to remind Your Honor that the original injunction here is the confirmation order, January 24th, January 29th, February 20th, February 27th, and March 13th rulings and orders are all orders in furtherance of the confirmation order, demonstrating not just the depth of their contempt, but also that all of these issues have been considered multiple times.

Simply, Your Honor, they cannot point to a controlling decision or fact that Your Honor overlooked. All of the items that they claim that you overlooked, the claim that Gas is not a subsidiary, their claim that there's no evidence that the Greek enforcement proceeding undermines the plan, that the LLCA does not require Holdings' consent, and there's many other elements of consent beyond the LLCA, and the Greek arbitration does not involve a key asset obtained under the plan ignores — again, the March 13th order was the third order in furtherance of the confirmation order, and that all of those issues have been addressed in the complete record many times.

Remarkably, Your Honor, we're a little over a week after Judge Liman issued his anti-suit ruling. What they are essentially asking you to do today is to issue a ruling, contrary to Judge Liman's ruling, on an issue that is completely moot. Respectfully, Your Honor, we urge you to decline to do so and deny the motion. Thank you, Your Honor.

38 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Counsel. 1 2 Would anyone else like to be heard in opposition to 3 the motion? Okay. Counsel, would you like to be heard in reply? 4 MR. SHAFTEL: Yes, please. Thank you, Your Honor. I 5 6 think what we just heard was, frankly, a disingenuous mixing 7 and matching of different cases, different motions, different parties. So I want to kind of unpack it in a very candid --8 9 notwithstanding my friend's commentary -- very candid way. First off, nobody on this motion is relitigating --10 motion for reconsideration is relitigating anything. We were 11 not -- neither the Cypriots, the preferred shareholders, nor 12 13 Gas were identified as a respondent or a violating party, putative violating party, up until the March 25 ruling, which 14 15 for the first time was directed at Gas. So there's no relitigation. The cases that 16 reorganized Holdings relies on are, when you have the same 17 party as serial "second bite at the apple" actors, that's not 18 19 the case here. We've never been heard on these issues 20 beforehand. 21 And to be very clear, there is nothing in the record, in the briefing, in the oral argument, on the 12th of March, 22 23 that described, discussed, addressed the particulars and the 24 specifics of the Greek arbitration action. It was dumped in a

pile of other actions, with different claims, different focal

25

points. And I think the record is, frankly, undeniable that the purpose and the aspects of the Greek arbitration proceeding were never addressed and presented before the Court -- before this Court until March 25, and the focus on Gas as a named party, there was no reason, as nonrespondents, for us to raise these issues before the Court.

Now, what is the relevance of all of this since the Greek action has been dismissed without prejudice? So I want to, again, address that. One item, by the way, is the potential for sanctions, which does remain real if reorganized Holdings or anybody is going to seek to impose sanctions based on March 25 or March 13. There is, as I described to the Court, I guess, a continuing or ongoing lingering prohibition in terms of actions which we do believe, and have noticed the appeal, are proper under the New York Convention and otherwise.

And in reaching the March 25 order, you want to -- we see the shoe very much, Your Honor, on the other foot, in terms of trying to use and misuse -- misuse, in the language of reorganized Holdings, sound bites and aspects taken out of context from judicial rulings.

We have, in March 25, the Court's comments about reorganized Holdings having to provide authorization or consent. And we do not believe that the Court was provided the facts and presented with the limited liability company agreement, the LLCA, to address the distinction between the

# **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

corporate governance rights, and the common shares, and whether reorganized Holdings -- we vigorously believe it does not -- would need to give consent as a common shareholder to either the now dismissed without -- withdrawn without prejudice Greek proceeding or, to the extent permissible, the future arbitration-related confirmation proceedings.

I heard conclusory statements. Well, of course, these foreign confirmation proceedings, the Greek proceeding, somehow interferes with the plan. I heard that as a conclusory sound bite. I've not heard any substance to it. It does no more interference than the case being prosecuted for two years, with everyone's blessing, at 500 Pearl Street before Judge Liman.

And in terms of the anti-suit injunction, I do believe Mr. Ortiz had made, frankly, a gross misstatement when he was describing Justice Liman complaining about strategies or potential purposes behind various foreign actions. That is a part of the decision, the anti-suit decision. And then Mr. Ortiz said, well, he was using this for context. I think that was Mr. Ortiz's words, context.

That commentary did not, okay, have anything to do with the Greek arbitration proceeding. That part of the decision was describing prior actions not involving the Cypriot entities, not involving the Cypriot entities, evidently addressing bankruptcy plan confirmation issues in Greece, Liberia, wherever -- I wasn't involved. This is the one part

41 where I will agree with Mr. Ortiz, some of that context outside 1 2 of the arbitration confirmation context, I am not, have no 3 reason to be expert on. But what I am expert on is Judge Liman, that anti-suit 4 injunction order was neither commenting on the bankruptcy 5 6 orders -- footnote 12, he states as much himself. And the 7 entire rationale of the decision relates to the interplay and the threat to his primary jurisdiction on the arbitration front 8 9 unrelated, as footnote -- footnote 12 states as much --10 unrelated to the bankruptcy plan. We do believe the March 25 order confirming the 11 inclusion of the Greek proceeding as a prohibited case, and in 12 particular, commenting that reorganized Holdings' consent or 13 approval would be necessary for that case, we believe was not 14 15 based on correct, factual, or legal particulars, and had not 16 been presented to the Court. Thank you, Counsel. 17 THE COURT: 18 MR. SHAFTEL: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Does anyone else wish to be heard? 19 20 The Court is prepared to rule. Pending before Okav. 21 the Court is the motion of Apargo Limited, Fentalon Limited, and Desimusco Trading Limited, for reconsideration of the March 22 23 25th, 2025 order. The motion is pending at docket 1587.

That objection is found at docket number

in response is Eletson Holdings Inc.'s objection to the motion

24

25

for reconsideration.

1664. And filed in reply is the reply memorandum in further support of the motion for reconsideration of the March 25th order. That is at docket number 1689.

On March 13th, this Court issued its order in further support of confirmation and consummation of the Court-approved plan of reorganization. That order is found at docket 1537. The order included Exhibit 1, which is entitled "Known Foreign Proceedings". And as we've heard, one of the listed proceedings was the petition for recognition of the arbitration award in order to be executable in Greece. That was listed on line 2 of Exhibit 1 at docket 1537.

Following the Court's entry of the March 13th order,
Reed Smith filed letters objecting to the March 13th order's
inclusion of the Greek arbitration confirmation proceeding.
The purported nominees did not raise any objection to the March
13th order until the instant motion was filed.

On March 25th, this Court rejected Reed Smith's arguments and ruled that the Greek arbitration confirmation proceeding was properly included in the March 13th order. See the March 25th hearing transcript.

On March 24th, a notice of appeal was filed by purported Provisional Eletson Holdings at docket number 1558, that notice and appeal "from each and every part" of this Court's March 13th order, at docket 1537, and from the March 12th oral decision, which is found at docket number 1536 and is

incorporated into the March 13th order.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On March 26th, a notice of appeal was filed by Lassia Investment Company, Glafkos Trust Company, and Family Unity Trust Company, the former majority shareholders of Eletson Holdings Inc., at docket 1563. That notice of appeal seeks to appeal "from each and every part" of this Court's March 13th order, at docket 1537, and the March 12th oral decision, at docket 1536, which is incorporated therein.

On June 2nd, 2025, the district Court issued its preliminary injunction, findings of fact, and conclusions of law, in case number 23-7331, in the Southern District of New In its preliminary injunction order, which is found at docket 407 in the district court case, the district court ordered the putative nominees, who are the intervenors in that case -- again, Apargo, Fentalon, and Desimusco, and their agents and employees and attorneys, and any person in active concert or participation with the intervenors, including Eletson Gas LLC, to take all steps necessary to dismiss the proceedings that had been initiated in Greece and the United Kingdom, seeking to confirm and/or enforce the arbitration award at issue in the district Court proceeding until the resolution of the district court action, the proceeding in Greece referred to as the same matter that is the subject of today's motion in this Court.

Counsel has indicated that that matter, the Greek

44

arbitration confirmation proceeding, has been dismissed without 1 2 prejudice. In the anti-suit injunction opinion, the district 3 court also found, "The Court has the power to enjoin the 4 purported nominees, their officers, agents, servants, employees 5 and attorneys, and other persons who are in an active concert or participation with the purported nominees. And should 6 7 contempt proceedings be brought for violations of this injunction, the Court anticipates little difficulty, including 8 9 that Gas, Laskarina Karastamati, Vassilis Kertsikoff, Vassilis Hadjieleftheriadis, Lassia Investment Company, Family Unity 10 Trust Company, and Glafkos Trust Company are sufficiently in 11 privity with, in active concert with aiding or abetting the 12 purported nominees to bring them within the range of the 13 14 court's contempt power". That's from the district court's 15 preliminary injunction findings of fact and conclusions of law in case 23-7331, at docket 413, dated June 2nd, 2025. 16 In In re Sabine, case number 16-2561, 2016 WL 4203551, 17 18 at \*6, the district court explained, "The filing of a 19 bankruptcy appeal 'confers jurisdiction on the appellate court 20 and divests the trial court of control over those aspects of 21 the case involved in the appeal'", close quote within the quote. The case there is citing In re Winimo, 270 B.R. 99, 105 22 23 (S.D.N.Y. 2001). See also In re Emergency Beacon, 58 B.R. 399, 24 402 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1986), parenthetical quote, ("Once a

notice of appeal is filed, no lower court should be able to

25

# **ELETSON HOLDINGS INC., ET AL.**

vacate or modify an order under appeal, not even a bankruptcy court attempting to eliminate the need for a particular appeal.")

The Sabine court went on to say, "Bankruptcy courts do not retain exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction with the district court over the subject matter of an appeal", In re Emergency Beacon, 58 B.R. 402, In re Adelphia Communications, 06-4983 2007 WL 4615604, at \*2 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 26, 2007). "But the bankruptcy courts do retain jurisdiction to decide issues different from those on appeal." That's the close block quote from the case. Again, that's at 2016 WL 4203551, at \*6.

This Court finds that, based on the notices of appeal that have been filed, at docket numbers 1558 and 1563, this Court is without jurisdiction to consider the motion for reconsideration filed by the purported nominees. Bankruptcy Rule 8008(a), entitled "Motion for Relief Filed When an Appeal Is Pending; Bankruptcy Court's Options", that rule provides, "If a party files a timely motion in the bankruptcy court for relief that the court lacks authority to grant, because an appeal has been docketed and is pending, the bankruptcy court may (1) defer considering the motion; (2) deny the motion; (3) state that it would grant the motion if the Court where the appeal is pending remands for that purpose; or (4) state that the motion raises a substantial issue", from Bankruptcy Rule 8008(a).

46

Here, again, based on the notices of appeal that have 1 been filed, at dockets 1558 and 1563, and based on the fact 2 3 that the district court has issued the preliminary injunction 4 order and the preliminary injunction findings of fact and conclusions of law enjoining the Greek arbitration confirmation 5 6 proceeding, as well as the apparent mootness of the issue 7 raised by the movants, this Court finds that it is appropriate for the Court to defer ruling on the instant motion for 8 9 reconsideration pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 8008(a)(1), pending the district court decision on the appeals. 10 11 Okay. Now, on a separate note, there are several other pending motions that the Court is in the process of 12 ruling on. So I'm going to ask counsel for Holdings, by the 13 close of business Friday, if you could file a letter providing 14 15 an update on the status of all of those proceedings that are referenced in the March 13th order and the proposed order 16 increasing sanctions; I think it's at docket 1629. And it 17 18 could be in a chart format or a letter, but something updating the Court on the status of all of those proceedings. 19 20 MR. ORTIZ: Good morning, Your Honor. Kyle Ortiz, of 21 HSF Cramer, for Eletson Holdings. We will be happy to do that, 22 Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Anything else for 24 today?

MR. ORTIZ:

Your Honor, Kyle Ortiz, with HSF Kramer,

25

for Holdings again.

Just very briefly, if I may, just some of the things that I want to put on your radar that are likely coming down the pipe in the coming month or so.

Your Honor, there have been a lot of damages caused by the refusal to comply with the confirmation order and further orders of the Court. There is a damages complaint, relating to those damages, that we will likely be getting filed in July. I promise you, Your Honor, we will not file it on July 4th or July 3rd.

On Microsoft, Your Honor, Microsoft did provide access, but after we got the domains and were in the process of understanding what was what, and making sure no critical systems would be impacted by shutting certain things down, the old owners used -- and I'm not tech savvy, but used a back door, so to speak, with a different service, to steal the domains back. So we may have another motion at some point related to those other services. We don't know if they're communicating with others using those domains, including potentially their lawyers, using those kind of, essentially, stolen domains.

Finally, Your Honor, we're exploring ways to induce compliance with the current ongoing contempts and sanctions, including up to whether warrants may be able to be issued.

So that's just some of what may be coming Your Honor's

```
48
    way in the coming months just as part of our efforts to fully
1
 2
    implement the plan, unless, of course, remarkably, we all
 3
    finally get together and resolve this. So those are just some
    things we wanted to put on Your Honor's radar. They're kind
 4
 5
    of, I guess, a preview of coming events for the summer.
 6
             THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Counsel.
 7
             Does anyone else wish to be heard?
             MR. SHAFTEL: No, not for the preferred shareholders,
8
9
    Your Honor. Thank you.
             THE COURT:
                          Thank you, Counsel.
10
11
             Okay. We're adjourned then. Thank you everyone.
12
    Have a great day.
13
         (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 10:16 AM)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
49
1
 2
                                 INDEX
 3
    RULINGS:
                                                         PAGE LINE
    The Court defers the ruling on the
                                                         46
 4
                                                                  8
 5
    motion for reconsideration, pursuant
    to Bankruptcy Rule 8008(a)(1), pending
6
7
    the district court decision on the
    appeals.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
50
1
 2
                       CERTIFICATION
 3
    I, Sharona Shapiro, certify that the foregoing transcript is a
 4
 5
    true and accurate record of the proceedings.
6
7
     Sharona Shapiro
8
9
    Sharona Shapiro (CET-492)
10
    AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber
11
12
13
    eScribers
    7227 North 16th Street, Suite #207
14
15
    Phoenix, AZ 85020
16
17
    THE COURT: June 19, 2025
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

<b>Eletson Holdings</b>	F	Pg 54 of 64		June 18, 2025
	address (4)	ANDREW (1)	arbitrator (1)	43:21
*	21:8;32:3;39:9,25	6:18	33:13	awarded (1)
	addressed (4)	anticipates (2)	Arch (1)	10:14
*2 (1)	28:10;37:19;38:23;	35:12;44:8	5:4	awards (1)
45:8	39:3	anti-injunction (1)	argue (1)	30:2
*6 (2)	addressing (2)	14:25	35:4	aware (4)
44:18;45:11	26:11;40:24	anti-suit (14)	arguing (3)	10:11;13:5;26:19;
	Adelphia (1)	12:21;14:18;15:4;	29:19;34:19;36:4	30:7
$\mathbf{A}$	45:7	16:4,17;22:16;23:23;	argument (8)	away (2)
A	adjourned (1)	27:19;36:8;37:21;	14:1;25:13;26:16;	19:19,20
abets (1)	48:11	40:13,17;41:4;44:2	30:12,12;34:4;35:1;	,
36:22	adjudicate (2)	Apargo (4)	38:22	В
abetting (3)	22:2;33:12	7:15;9:12;41:21;	arguments (12)	
35:18;36:11;44:12	adjudicated (1)	43:15	12:2;26:3,6,20,22;	b2 (1)
abide (1)	36:16	apart (1)	28:2,8;29:22;33:3,20,	18:15
16:17	adjudicating (1)	16:5	22;42:18	back (4)
abiding (2)	19:2	apparent (2)	around (1)	27:14;32:23;47:15,
16:15,16	adjustments (1)	31:12;46:6	33:11	17
able (2)	10:23	appeal (21)	arrived (1)	back-and-forth (1)
44:25;47:24	admit (1)	15:5;16:4,11;34:12;	13:5	32:14
	36:4	39:15;42:21,23;43:2,	aside (1)	Baker (1)
accept (1) 33:8	admittedly (1)	5,6;44:19,25;45:1,3,6,	22:13	25:23
33.0	36:2	10,12,16,20,23;46:1	aspects (3)	Bank (1)
access (1)	admonished (2)	appeal' (1)	39:2,19;44:20	22:6
47:12	30:24;31:17	44:21	asserted (1)	Bankr (1)
accomplish (1)	advance (1)	appeals (1)	17:7	44:24
25:10	26:2	46:10	asserting (1)	bankruptcy (36)
accordingly (1)	affected (1)	appear (3)	17:4	11:6;12:6,6,9,10,16,
23:10	22:10	25:1,4;33:23	asserts (1)	16,23;13:1,15,22;
account (2)	affiliates (2)	appearances (1)	31:3	15:2,3,10;16:6,23;
19:4;20:6	33:11,17	9:3	asset (1)	17:13;21:4;24:17;
acknowledge (1)	again (14)	appellate (1)	37:16	27:21;32:12,24;33:1;
20.0	21:22;27:3;28:8,8,	44:19	assuming (1)	40:24;41:5,10;44:19;
acting (3)	8,9;29:11;30:7;37:17;	apple (2)	16:12	45:1,4,9,15,17,18,20,
35:23;36:11,19	39:9;43:15;45:11;	25:22;38:18	attempt (1)	24;46:9
action (20)	46:1;47:1	applicable (1)	36:21	based (7)
11:2,8,14,15,22;	against (4)	19:23	attempting (3)	11:14;26:1;39:11;
12.11,17,13.21,17.2,	14:18;16:20,25;	applied (1)	30:5;34:21;45:2	41:15;45:12;46:1,2
4,6,8,10;28:17;29:2,8;	36:18	34:20	attended (1)	Beacon (2)
34:21;38:24;39:8;	agents (2)	apply (3)	19:17	44:23;45:7
73.22	43:16;44:4	21:10;22:24;37:1	Attorneys (9)	beforehand (2)
actions (8)	agree (1)	appointed (1)	5:3,13;6:3,12;7:3,	18:13;38:20
13.17,27.11,30.7,	41:1	31:24	15;8:3;43:16;44:5	begin (1)
34:11;38:25;39:14;	agreement (2)	appreciate (3)	August (1)	10:7
10.10,22	29:13;39:25	10:9;26:7,15	11:25	begs (1)
active (5)	aiding (3)	appropriate (1)	authority (3)	23:24
33.17,30.17,43.10,	35:18;36:11;44:12	46:7	19:3;20:5;45:19	behalf (6)
44:5,12	aids (1)	approval (2)	authorization (1)	9:11,16,22;10:1,4;
actors (1)	36:22	18:7;41:14	39:22	14:9
38:18	allow (1)	April (1)	availability (1)	behind (1)
acts (1)	29:6	13:6	10:10	40:16
36:22	allowed (2)	arbitration (36)	Avenue (4)	Belen (2)
actual (3)				10:13;22:14
18:1;34:17;36:10	23:1;28:21	10:13,18;11:3,7,22;	6:13;7:5,17;8:4	
actually (1)	alter (2)	13:20;14:21;15:8;	avoid (1)	Belen's (5)
33:6	24:5;33:18	16:21;17:8,14;18:4;	33:20 avoidance (1)	14:14;19:23,24;
ADAM (1)	amend (1)	19:7,11,22;23:9;24:7;	avoidance (1)	20:7;30:9
7:21	23:10	27:19;28:18,19;	16:16	belonged (1)
adding (1)	Americas (3)	29:23,25;30:2,16;	award (23)	26:21
	6:13;7:5;8:4	37:15;38:24;39:2;	10:18,20;11:7;	better (2)
31:4	a a a (1)		1/11/11/21/21/11/11/11	1 1 1 1 / 1 1 / 1 5
31:4 addition (1)	among (1)	40:21;41:2,8;42:9,14,	14:21;15:8;19:7,11,	11:24;13:5
31:4	28:25	18;43:20;44:1;46:5	22,24;27:9;28:3;29:6,	beyond (1)
31:4 addition (1)				

Eletson Holdings	ſ	Pg 55 of 64		June 18, 2025
36:23	11:9;31:15	citations (1)	comments (3)	confirm (7)
bit (1)	Can (9)	36:24	29:15,16;39:21	28:19;29:6,14;30:5,
34:25	9:3;12:4,20;15:16;	cite (4)	committed (1)	11;33:12;43:20
bite (3)	21:11;24:11;25:6;	21:13;22:5;32:9;	31:13	confirmation (45)
25:22;38:18;40:10	33:12;35:1	35:4	Committee (2)	11:2,3,5,6,22,23;
bites (1)	candid (2)	cited (2)	7:3;9:16	13:14;16:7;24:7,22;
39:19	38:8,9	19:9;24:18	common (12)	25:11;26:9,11,21,23,
Blair (1)	candor (3)	cites (1)	17:22,22;18:2,10,	24;27:3,5,14,17,22;
30:1	24:16;31:3,20	23:4	16,22,22;19:5;20:19,	28:3,21;29:20;30:23;
blessing (1)	capital (1)	citing (1)	20;40:1,3	31:25;33:16,21;34:2;
40:12	26:22	44:22	commonly (1)	35:6,22,24;37:3,6,18;
block (1)	captured (1)	CITRON (1)	13:7	40:6,8,24;41:2;42:5,
45:10	13:2	6:18	communicating (1)	14,18;44:1;46:5;47:6
board (1)	carefully (1)	claim (10)	47:19	confirmed (4)
14:10	27:12	17:20;20:10;25:7;	<b>Communications (1)</b>	29:24;31:4,5,6
bootstrap (1)	case (35)	28:16;29:1;33:24,25;	45:7	confirming (3)
34:22	9:3;12:1,7,7,10,13,	37:11,11,12	company (11)	11:13;27:22;41:11
Boston (1)	16,22,23;15:7;17:8,9;	claiming (4)	20:5;35:15,15,15;	confusion (1)
6:5	20:15;21:13,23;22:2,	26:13;27:1;29:2;	39:24;43:3,3,4;44:10,	24:10
both (7)	23,23;23:3;25:22;	34:22	11,11	conjectural (2)
12:7;28:23;30:15;	27:7;29:3;33:7;38:19;	claims (10)	compensatory (1)	34:13,17
33:22;35:2,2,3	40:11;41:12,14;	12:2;16:20;18:1,6;	10:15	consent (7)
bound (1)	43:11,13,15;44:16,17,	21:9;22:1;23:20;26:5;	complaining (2)	18:7;31:23;37:14,
36:20	21,22;45:11	34:11;38:25	23:21;40:15	15;39:23;40:3;41:13
Bowling (1)	cases (9)	clarified (2)	complaint (1)	consequences (1)
8:13	19:9,9,10,13,21;	10:25;21:14	47:7	33:20
BR (4)	22:5;27:12;38:7,16	clear (6)	complete (1)	consider (3)
34:18;44:22,23;	casually (1)	22:21;26:4;29:24;	37:19	26:6,13;45:14
34.16,44.22,23, 45:7	13:3	30:22;35:10;38:21		considered (4)
			completely (1) 37:24	
BRIAN (2)	categories (1) 11:20	clearly (6) 22:12;26:1;34:1;		26:14,15;27:13; 37:8
6:17;9:7			compliance (2) 29:20;47:23	
briefing (1)	caused (1)	35:5,22,24		considering (1)
38:22	47:5	clients (8)	comply (1)	45:21
briefly (1)	causes (5)	10:11,22;11:7;12:1;	47:6	consistent (7)
47:2	17:2,4,6;28:17;	13:8,10;14:14;17:3	comprehensive (1)	12:5,9,15;17:9,11;
bring (6)	29:11	clients' (1)	21:1	29:2,3
22:1;29:19;34:11;	caveat (1)	15:2	concept (1)	consistently (2)
35:19,21;44:13	31:4	close (3)	36:13	24:18;32:16
bringing (1)	central (1)	44:21;45:10;46:14	concerned (3)	constantly (1)
34:6	27:7	Co (1)	16:8;30:22;34:8	33:19
broad (1)	certain (3)	30:1	concerning (1)	Constitutional (2)
36:3	11:2;26:6;47:14	COCKERHAM (1)	28:2	21:23;34:15
brought (6)	certainly (2)	5:17	concert (7)	consummation (1)
11:8;13:7;23:20;	14:5;23:5	COIE (2)	35:18;36:12,19,23;	42:5
29:17;35:11;44:7	challenged (1)	8:2;10:4	43:17;44:5,12	contempt (6)
Bryant (1)	10:19	collections (1)	conclude (1)	35:11,20;36:10;
7:4	change (4)	26:24	36:15	37:7;44:7,14
bucket (2)	16:4,15,18;31:25	colloquially (1)	concluded (2)	contempts (1)
17:18;21:20	Chapter (1)	13:6	33:3;48:13	47:23
buckets (1)	27:7	comfort (1)	concluding (1)	content (1)
11:20	chart (1)	32:23	35:13	27:20
burden (2)	46:18	coming (5)	conclusion (1)	context (12)
13:22;25:19	Children's (1)	47:3,4,25;48:1,5	26:17	20:14;25:14;26:8,
business (1)	28:13	comity (1)	conclusions (3)	12;28:1;29:18;36:3;
46:14	chronology (2)	33:9	43:10;44:15;46:5	39:20;40:18,19;41:1,
-	11:4;12:19	commence (1)	conclusory (2)	2
C	Circuit (6)	31:22	40:7,9	continue (3)
	16:14;25:17,23;	commenced (1)	concrete (1)	16:17;24:21;33:18
calculations (1)	28:12;29:24;30:1	30:17	34:16	continued (1)
10:23	Circumstances (4)	commentary (3)	concurrent (1)	24:24
calendar (1)	16:4,15,18;25:24	31:15;38:9;40:20	45:5	continuing (2)
21:12	circumvent (1)	commenting (3)	confers (1)	25:4;39:13
calling (2)	36:21	15:2;41:5,13	44:19	contractual (2)
cannig (2)	JU.41	13.4,71.3,13	77.17	Contractual (2)

	1	<b>-</b>		June 18, 2025
16:24;19:9	21,22,24;44:3,3,8,18,	DE (3)	Desimusco (4)	district (17)
contrary (1)	19,20,25;45:2,4,6,12,	5:15;18:16,17	7:16;9:12;41:22;	10:22;23:23;34:14,
37:23	14,18,19,20,22;46:3,	Debtors (2)	43:15	20,23;43:9,11,13,13,
contribution (1)	7,8,10,12,19,23;47:7;	5:3,13	despite (4)	21,22;44:2,14,18;
26:25	48:6,10	Dec (1)	24:22;25:3,5;34:19	45:6;46:3,10
control (12)	Court-approved (1)	45:8	determination (1)	disturbed (2)
18:21,22;19:2,25;	42:5	DECHERT (2)	14:14	10:19,22
20:8,12,12;22:19;	courtroom (1)	7:2;9:16	determined (1)	divests (1)
25:8;28:23;31:25;	13:6	decide (2)	14:19	44:20
44:20	courts (7)	22:1;45:9	determining (1)	docket (15)
controlling (3)	24:12,12,21;30:4;	decided (2)	24:23	41:23,25;42:3,6,11,
25:20;29:8;37:9	34:14;45:4,9	25:21;28:15	DH (1)	22,24,25;43:5,7,8,13;
controversy (5)	Court's (14)	decision (18)	30:1 difference (2)	44:16;45:13;46:17
21:23;22:2,23,24; 23:4	9:21;10:9,24;14:12; 27:21;31:12;35:19;	12:24;16:11;26:24; 27:21;28:20;29:23;	17:13;21:17	docketed (1) 45:20
Convention (4)	39:21;42:12,24;43:6;	30:21,24;32:17;36:7;	different (9)	dockets (1)
12:12;14:23;33:9;	44:14,14;45:17	37:10;40:17,17,22;	13:20;24:4;38:7,7,	46:2
39:15	covered (2)	41:7;42:25;43:7;	7,25,25;45:10;47:16	doctrine (1)
converted (1)	35:5,23	46:10	difficulty (2)	19:11
30:3	Cramer (1)	decision- (1)	35:12;44:8	documents (1)
copetitioner (1)	46:21	20:4	diminishes (1)	18:12
23:1	create (1)	decisions (2)	19:7	dollars (1)
copetitioners (1)	24:10	24:14;25:20	direct (1)	10:17
22:14	credit (1)	declaratory (1)	22:25	domains (4)
Corp (3)	26:24	25:6	directed (4)	47:12,17,19,21
28:22;29:7,8	Creditors (3)	decline (1)	14:13;18:5;21:17;	door (1)
corporate (9)	7:3;9:17;27:23	37:25	38:15	47:16
18:12,18,23,24;	critical (2)	decree (2)	directing (1)	doubt (2)
19:16;20:9,12,21; 40:1	19:4;47:13 <b>current (4)</b>	36:15,23 <b>defendant (1)</b>	21:15 <b>direction (1)</b>	16:16;27:6 <b>down (2)</b>
corporation (4)	20:2,2;24:16;47:23	36:12	9:21	47:3,14
36:18,18,19,20	currently (1)	defendants (1)	director (2)	downplaying (1)
correspondence (2)	34:6	36:12	31:24,25	31:18
14:9,12	Cypriot (8)	defer (2)	directors (3)	drawing (1)
Counsel (9)	10:11;11:8,17;	45:21;46:8	30:16,16,17	18:19
23:12;31:24;38:1,4;	22:18;26:21;36:5;	define (1)	disagree (1)	dumped (1)
41:17;43:25;46:13;	40:22,23	18:20	15:5	38:24
48:6,10	Cypriots (10)	defined (2)	discretion (1)	During (2)
count (1)	24:4;26:17;27:1;	13:10;20:17	20:5	18:11;26:23
21:11	28:5,21;31:21;33:17;	delay (1)	discussed (2)	
counters (1)	34:10;35:19;38:12	24:10	32:2;38:23	E
21:25	D	demonstrate (4)	discussing (1)	
<b>couple (1)</b> 21:25	И	25:19,24,25;34:15 demonstrates (1)	31:9 <b>discussion (4)</b>	<b>earlier (1)</b> 29:17
course (5)	daily (1)	30:6	13:25;14:1;27:18;	ease (1)
10:19;12:15;15:16;	25:3	demonstrating (1)	30:14	32:8
40:7;48:2	damage (1)	37:6	disingenuous (3)	economic (5)
COURT (109)	12:5	denied (2)	28:2;30:12;38:6	18:16,17,24;20:22,
9:2,8,13,18,24;10:2,	damages (5)	28:14,20	dismiss (1)	22
6,11,22;11:12;12:8,	10:16,23;47:5,7,8	deny (2)	43:18	edge (1)
20;13:4,16;14:1,4,8,	DANIEL (2)	37:25;45:21	dismissed (12)	16:3
17,22;15:2,3,12,18,	8:17;9:25	denying (1)	12:22;15:13,18;	effect (3)
22,25;16:10;17:16;	date (3)	29:13	23:22;24:1;30:8;34:7,	19:12;28:2;30:3
18:13,13;19:2,9;20:1,	15:16;24:10;28:24	<b>DEPARTMENT (1)</b>	10,21;39:8;40:4;44:1	effective (2)
25;21:3,13;22:1,24;	dated (1)	8:11	dispute (2)	24:10;28:24
23:10,11,12,24;25:1,	44:16 DAVID (2)	depth (1)	17:21;31:21	effort (4)
2,14,19;26:11;29:4;	DAVID (2)	37:6	disputed (1)	27:9,15;29:18;
31:3,10;32:6,7,12,12, 20,24;33:1,8,12,14;	7:9;9:15 day (1)	DEREK (1) 5:8	26:19 <b>distinct (1)</b>	30:18 efforts (3)
34:20,23;35:12;36:9,	48:12	described (2)	28:17	32:7;33:16;48:1
10;38:1;39:3,4,6,13,	days (5)	38:23;39:12	distinction (5)	egos (2)
23;41:16,17,19,20,21;	15:15,15;21:11,12,	describing (3)	18:1,19,20;19:4;	24:5;33:18
42:4,17;43:9,13,13,	12	20:25;40:15,22	39:25	either (6)
, .,, , ,	i .	, ,——	T .	· /

Eletson Holdings	I	June 18, 2025		
13:25;16:13,14;	22:17,19	expressing (1)	filing (1)	11:11;31:20
17:24;21:17;40:3	erred (3)	12:25	44:18	forthright (1)
element (1)	11:12;17:16;26:1	extant (1)	filings (1)	32:20
27:15	error (4)	10:20	20:15	forty (1)
elements (1)	18:8,20;19:20;26:4	extension (2)	final (1)	23:18
37:15	<b>ESQ</b> (16)	12:13,17	29:24	<b>found</b> (10)
Eletson (15)	5:8,9,17;6:7,8,16,	extent (7)	finality (1)	14:14;20:1;32:13;
6:3,12;9:6;10:14;	17,18;7:8,9,10,11,20,	9:22;12:14;17:1;	19:24	34:1,23;41:25;42:6,
11:10;14:10;26:22;	21;8:8,17	18:5;20:19;21:13;	Finally (2)	25;43:12;44:3
28:22,22;31:23;	essentially (6)	40:5	47:22;48:3	four (1)
41:24;42:22;43:4,18;	25:6,10,15;34:6;	extraordinary (1)	<b>find</b> (3)	30:15
46:21	37:22;47:20	25:18	16:12;17:14;33:11	fourteen (2)
eliminate (1)	establish (1)	extremely (1)	finding (1)	21:11,12
45:2	34:15	20:21	35:1	frankly (5)
else (5)	established (1)		findings (7)	14:19;21:16;38:6;
23:13;38:2;41:19;	25:17	$\mathbf{F}$	10:21;20:7;30:9,11;	39:1;40:14
46:23;48:7	evaded (1)		43:10;44:15;46:4	fraud (7)
elusive (2)	32:16	facially (1)	finds (2)	31:1,8,13,16,18;
32:14,18	even (9)	21:18	45:12;46:7	33:13;34:3
Emergency (2)	13:3;19:10;22:24;	fact (15)	firm (1)	FREEHILLS (1)
44:23;45:7	23:3;25:12;31:19;	12:7,24;16:1;17:24;	9:11	6:11
employees (2)	34:20;36:8;45:1	22:8;24:20;30:5;32:3;	First (9)	Friday (1)
43:16;44:4	events (1)	34:4;35:10;37:10;	11:21;14:13;21:9;	46:14
endangered (1)	48:5	43:10;44:15;46:2,4	23:13;25:15;30:10;	friend's (1)
34:1	everyone (2)	facts (5)	33:24;38:10,15	38:9
enforce (7)	9:2;48:11	18:9;25:20;26:1,2;	Floor (1)	front (1)
27:9;29:12,12;	everyone's (1)	39:24	8:5	41:8
30:18;32:8,11;43:20	40:12	factual (1)	focal (1)	FSB (2)
enforceable (2)	evidence (5)	41:15	38:25	8:3;10:5
33:25;34:2	31:7,13,16,18;	fail (1)	focus (5)	full (2)
enforcement (3)	37:12	26:14	13:12,12;17:25;	11:19;17:16
32:24;33:1;37:13	evidentiary (1)	failed (3)	29:15;39:4	fuller (1)
engaging (1)	20:7	26:6,7,13	focused (1)	21:1
21:5	evidently (1)	fair (1)	21:3	fully (3)
enjoin (2)	40:23	14:3	focuses (1)	26:19;30:6;48:1
35:1;44:3	evolving (1)	falls (2)	21:21	functionally (3)
enjoined (1)	33:19	21:2,3	folks (1)	22:17,18,19
34:6	ex (1)	false (2)	36:1	Fund (2)
enjoining (2)	14:7	25:13;29:4	followed (2)	8:3;10:4
33:1;46:5	exact (1)	familiar (1)	13:4,17	FUREY (1)
enough (1)	24:3	33:14	following (2)	6:7
36:3	exceptional (1)	Family (3)	31:24;42:12	further (4)
ensure (1)	25:24	35:15;43:3;44:10	follow-up (1)	27:4;42:1,4;47:6
24:2	excess (1)		14:8	
entire (4)	10:16	far (1) 26:19		furtherance (3) 26:8;37:5,17
` ,			foot (1)	
13:12;25:13;27:7;	exclusive (1)	favor (1)	39:17	future (3)
41:7	45:5	19:15	footnote (3)	32:18;34:12;40:5
entirely (1)	executable (1)	favorable (1)	41:6,9,9	G
20:14	42:10	16:12	force (2)	G
entities (6)	execute (2)	February (8)	30:3;33:19	(4)
10:12;11:8,17;	33:5,6	13:8,16,17,17;	foreign (8)	game (1)
28:23;40:23,23	Exhibit (2)	30:21;34:5;37:4,4	13:13;24:12,18,21;	33:16
entitled (3)	42:7,11	Fentalon (4)	27:18;40:8,16;42:7	Gas (32)
18:6;42:7;45:16	expanded (1)	7:15;9:12;41:21;	formal (1)	10:15,15;11:10,16,
entity (3)	11:1	43:15	14:11	17;13:9,10;14:13;
11:17;14:13;36:8	expert (2)	file (2)	format (1)	17:22;18:6,6,21;20:3,
entry (1)	41:3,4	46:14;47:9	46:18	12,16;21:15,15,18;
42:12	explained (1)	Filed (12)	former (4)	22:15;23:1;24:15;
equity (13)	44:18	41:23;42:1,13,16,	27:20;35:16;36:5;	25:8;26:22;27:8;
10:14,21,21;14:15;	exploring (1)	21;43:2;44:25;45:13,	43:4	34:23;35:13;37:11;
	47:22	15,16;46:2;47:8	forms (1)	38:13,15;39:4;43:18;
18:3,10,10,16,18;				
18:3,10,10,16,18; 19:16,17;20:8;22:14 equivalent (2)	expressed (1)	files (1) 45:18	35:9 forth (2)	44:9

	1	2y 56 01 04		June 18, 2025
29:10;35:6		19;27:3,6,12;28:9,16;	23:3	interest (4)
given (3)	TT	29:4;30:1,13,25;	inappropriate (1)	22:25;34:16;35:5;
19:11,12;30:3	H	31:14,19;32:3,5,13,	25:9	36:14
giving (1)	II - 12 - 1 - 64 12 - (2)	24;33:15;34:1;35:16;	Inc (2)	interests (1)
20:25	Hadjieleftheriadis (2)	36:1,25;37:2,9,10,20,	6:12;43:5	36:16
Glafkos (3)	35:14;44:10	24,25;38:5;39:17;	include (1)	interfere (3)
35:15;43:3;44:11	HAL (3) 7:20;9:10;10:8	41:18;46:20,22,25;	21:2	27:11,16;35:23
global (2)	handcuff (1)	47:5,9,11,22;48:9	included (4)	interfered (1)
33:10,17	16:24	Honor's (7)	13:11;18:11;42:7,	14:20
goes (1)	hands (2)	13:3;17:9;25:15;	19	interference (4)
31:9	18:3;19:17	29:15;35:24;47:25;	including (6)	12:5;13:22;14:21;
Good (18)	HANEY (1)	48:4	20:15;31:12;43:17;	40:11
9:2,5,8,9,10,13,14,	7:11	hopes (1)	44:8;47:19,24	interferes (3)
15,18,19,20,24,25;	happened (4)	24:10	inclusion (4)	15:10;27:2;40:9
10:2,3,6;23:16;46:20	20:2;24:3,3,4	Hoskinson (1)	14:6;23:22;41:12;	interfering (2)
Gordon (1)	happy (1)	32:1	42:14	29:9,10
22:6	46:21	hour (1)	inconsistent (2)	internal (1)
Gottdiener (1)	harm (3)	23:18	27:11;33:2	36:24
30:2	12:15;17:11;29:3	HSF (4)	incorporated (3)	interplay (1)
GOULSTON (1)	hear (1)	9:6;23:17;46:21,25	20:3;43:1,8	41:7
6:2	32:4	hyperbole (1)	increasing (2)	intervene (2)
governance (9)	heard (15)	24:14 hypothetical (2)	25:3;46:17 Inc's (1)	28:21;29:6 intervened (1)
18:12,18,23,24; 19:16;20:9,12,21;	23:13,15;26:2,17;	hypothetical (2) 34:13,18	41:24	12:1
40:1	34:12;38:2,4,6,19;	34.13,10	indeed (10)	intervenors (7)
Grace (1)	40:7,9,10;41:19;42:8;	I	12:7;13:12;16:9;	32:17,19;33:3,10;
22:5	48:7	-	22:16;26:5,16,19;	35:18;43:14,17
grant (2)	hearing (2) 32:2;42:20	identical (1)	27:6;32:22;36:7	intervenor's (1)
45:19,22	held (4)	26:20	indenture (1)	33:9
granted (1)	10:22;25:23;34:14;	identified (4)	10:5	intervention (3)
31:10	36:10	11:1;13:24;36:14;	independent (1)	28:20,20;29:14
great (1)	hence (1)	38:13	36:19	into (6)
48:12	19:16	identifying (1)	indicate (1)	13:18;19:3;20:6;
Greece (10)	HERBERT (1)	11:13	33:5	27:25;29:20;43:1
11:8;16:8;17:5,12;	6:11	ignore (2)	indicated (2)	invasion (1)
18:7;29:10;40:24;	HERMAN (4)	25:14;30:21	29:13;43:25	34:16
42:10;43:19,23	7:9;9:15,15,19	ignores (5)	individual (1)	Investment (3)
<b>Greek (42)</b> 11:2,13,21;12:11,	himself (1)	27:3;28:18;30:10;	36:8	35:14;43:3;44:10
17,21;13:2,19;14:2,4,	41:6	32:13;37:16 ignoring (1)	induce (1) 47:22	involve (1) 37:16
7,18;15:9,12;17:17,	holders (1)	29:16	informal (1)	involved (2)
25,25;21:2;22:25;	14:15	imminent (2)	29:17	40:25;44:21
23:9;24:7;27:2,15,19;	Holdings (38)	16:3;34:17	initial (1)	involvement (1)
29:1,4;31:2,22;34:7;	6:3,12;9:6,22; 14:10;17:1,20;18:8,	impacted (1)	13:12	22:11
37:13,15;38:24;39:2,	21;19:3,7,18;20:11,	47:14	initiated (1)	involving (3)
8;40:4,8,21;41:12;	13,18;21:6,9,21;23:4,	impacts (1)	43:19	13:13;40:22,23
42:14,18;43:25;46:5	17;27:10,20;28:22,	29:5	injunction (25)	irrelevant (2)
Green (1)	23;29:7,8;33:19;	impediment (1)	12:21;14:18;15:4;	12:23,23
8:13	38:17;39:11,19,22;	16:9	16:4,17;20:10;22:16;	issue (8)
GREENBERG (4)	40:2;41:24;42:22;	implement (1)	23:23;35:12;36:8,11,	23:25;27:7;37:2,22,
7:14;9:11;10:9;	43:5;46:13,21;47:1	48:2	13,17,17,22;37:3;	23;43:21;45:24;46:6
36:2	Holdings' (6)	implementation (1)	40:13;41:5;43:10,12;	issued (9)
gross (1)	17:6;18:3;19:10;	27:16	44:2,8,15;46:3,4	12:20;14:18;23:23;
40:14	31:23;37:14;41:13	implications (1)	inoperative (1)	36:17;37:21;42:4;
grounds (1) 12:22	Honor (77)	36:3	29:25 insisting (2)	43:9;46:3;47:24 issues (22)
guess (5)	9:5,10,15,20,25;	important (2) 23:2;31:4	insisting (2) 32:23,25	11:20;16:25;17:18;
13:6,19;17:15;	10:3,8;11:15,19;12:8;	23:2;31:4 importantly (5)	instant (2)	21:7,20;24:9;25:21;
39:13;48:5	14:24;15:11,16,24;	15:9;18:17;30:20;	42:16;46:8	26:3,10,11,12;27:14;
guilty (1)	16:13;17:19,24;18:9;	31:19;35:3	instead (2)	28:9,9,14;30:22;37:7,
36:11	19:6;20:14,16;21:8;	impose (1)	21:5;22:3	18;38:19;39:6;40:24;
	23:16,18,24;24:9,11, 13,20,22;25:1,5,13,	39:11	intent (1)	45:9
	13,20,22;25:1,3,13, 17,25;26:5,5,14,16,	inapplicable (1)	16:22	item (1)
-	17,23,20.3,3,14,10,	.,		
Min II Sovint®		oSoribore IIC		(5) given item

	I	1	1	Julie 10, 202
39:9	kind (3)	32:2	LLCA (4)	mean (1)
items (1)	38:8;47:20;48:4	lengthy (1)	31:23;37:13,15;	15:23
37:10	Kingdom (1)	32:14	39:25	meaning (3)
37.10				
<b>T</b>	43:20	less (2)	LLP (6)	22:18;27:18;35:18
J	KIRSCHBAUM (1)	20:23;32:19	5:2,12;6:11;7:2,14;	meaningless (2)
	7:21	letter (2)	8:2	21:16;33:7
JAMS (1)	knowingly (1)	46:14,18	lot (1)	means (3)
31:4	30:11	letters (1)	47:5	22:23;23:5;36:6
January (2)	Known (1)	42:13	Lou (1)	meet (1)
37:3,4	42:7	Leumi (1)	9:20	22:21
JENNIFER (1)	KOSLOF (1)	22:6	lower (1)	memorandum (1)
6:7	6:8	Levona (3)	44:25	42:1
joined (1)	KRAMER (4)	16:21;30:16;33:10	lucky (1)	mention (1)
9:6	6:11;9:6;23:17;	Levona's (2)	37:1	24:20
JOSHUA (1)	46:25	31:11,13		mentioned (1)
5:9	<b>KYLE</b> (5)	liability (1)	$\mathbf{M}$	14:17
Judge (38)	6:16;9:5;23:16;	39:24		merits (1)
11:23;12:4,8,13,14,	46:20,25	Liberia (1)	MA (1)	21:5
20;13:21;14:17;15:6;	10.20,23	40:25	6:5	Microsoft (2)
17:13;22:16;24:14;	L	lifted (1)	magic (1)	47:11,11
27:17,24;28:19;29:5,	L	16:18	20:11	million (1)
	lock (1)	likely (2)		10:16
13;30:10,21;31:9,17;	lack (1)		main (1)	
32:9,10,13,15,16,22;	18:16	47:3,8	25:4	minimis (2)
33:3,18;34:1;35:1,4,	lacks (2)	likewise (1)	majority (5)	18:16,17
7;36:7;37:21,23;	31:20;45:19	32:17	28:6;35:16,23;36:5;	minutes (1)
40:12;41:4	landscape (1)	Liman (35)	43:4	23:18
judgment (3)	21:1	11:24;12:4,8,13,14,	making (3)	mislead (1)
19:12;25:7;29:25	language (2)	20;13:21;14:18;	20:5;34:4;47:13	24:21
judicial (3)	19:13;39:18	17:13;22:16;24:14;	management (3)	misleadingly (1)
22:23;30:4;39:20	Laskarina (3)	27:17,24;29:6,13;	20:2,3,4	24:19
July (3)	32:1;35:13;44:9	30:10;31:9,17;32:9,	mangled (1)	misreads (1)
47:8,9,10	Lassia (3)	10,13,15,16,22;33:3,	21:22	18:8
junction (1)	35:14;43:2;44:10	18;34:1;35:1,4,8;	many (4)	missed (1)
14:25	last (1)	36:7;37:21;40:12,15;	26:17;29:22;37:14,	26:6
June (4)	11:24	41:4	19	misstatement (1)
15:14;30:24;43:9;	Later (2)	Liman's (6)	March (52)	40:14
44:16	13:17;33:8	15:6,14;16:11;	10:25;11:1,12;	mistaken (2)
jurisdiction (9)	law (4)	28:19;30:21;37:23	12:17;13:4,4,18;14:2,	11:14,15
14:21,22;15:7;	21:13;43:11;44:15;	Limited (9)	7,12;16:2,8;18:5;	misuse (4)
33:11;41:8;44:19;	46:5	7:15,15,16;18:23;	21:14,16,17;23:8;	24:12,13;39:18,18
45:5,9,14	lawsuits (1)	20:21;39:24;41:21,	24:2;25:14,16;26:7;	mixing (1)
jurisdictions (2)	27:18	21,22	27:4;29:16;35:7,22;	38:6
30:6;32:19	lawyers (1)	line (2)	37:4,17;38:14,22;	model (2)
JUSTICE (11)	47:20	9:6;42:11	39:4,12,12,16,21;	24:16;31:3
8:11;10:13;14:14;	lead-up (1)	lingering (2)	41:11,22;42:2,4,12,	modify (2)
15:14;16:11;19:22,	28:1	16:9;39:13	13,15,17,19,20,21,24,	23:10;45:1
24;20:7;22:13;30:9;	least (3)	Liquidation (1)	24;43:1,2,6,7;46:16	moment (1)
40:15	19:14;24:25;27:8	34:18	mark (1)	16:19
	leave (1)	<b>list</b> (1)	26:6	month (1)
K	31:11	13:18	Market (1)	47:4
	leaves (1)	listed (2)	5:14	months (1)
Karastamati (3)	19:6	42:8,10	matching (1)	48:1
32:2;35:13;44:9	led (2)	little (4)	38:7	moot (4)
KARLI (1)	14:12;20:25	32:22;35:12;37:20;	matter (7)	23:25;33:22;37:2,
7:10	left (2)	44:8	18:4;22:2,12;28:4;	24
keep (2)	24:6;34:9	live (2)	43:23,25;45:6	mootness (3)
29:23;34:4	legal (3)	16:2;19:22	may (13)	25:5,12;46:6
Kertsikoff (3)	19:8,20;41:15	Livecchi (1)	16:4;17:19;18:22;	more (7)
32:1;35:14;44:9	legally (1)	22:6	20:22;32:2;34:11;	15:9,16;18:17;
KEVIN (1)	34:16	lived (1)	36:9,19;45:21;47:2,	30:20;34:6;35:3;
5:17	Len (1)	31:19	17,24,25	40:10
key (1)	32:1	LLC (1)	Maybe (2)	morning (19)
37:16	length (1)	43:18	16:2;34:22	9:2,5,8,9,10,13,14,
				,

				June 10, 2023
15,18,19,20,24,25;	26:2,25;29:2,5;30:17;	37:16	25:11,11,15;26:7,8,9;	
10:2,3,6,10;23:16;	33:9;39:15;43:11	obtaining (1)	27:3,4,4,5,17;29:21;	P
46:20	newer (1)	24:11	30:19;32:6,25;33:21;	P
MOSS (3)	36:2	obvious (1)	34:20;35:6,22,22;	D. (4)
8:8;10:3,3	nine (2)	25:5	36:20;37:3,6,17,17,	PA (1)
most (1)	13:18,19	obviously (2)	18;39:16;41:5,11,23;	5:6
21:5	nobody (2)	16:20;20:23	42:3,4,6,7,10,12,16,	pages (4)
motion (40)	12:3;38:10			21:6,7,22;27:25
		occasions (2)	19,24;43:1,7,12;45:1;	papers (3)
11:18;13:7,9,13,16,	nominees (9)	24:23;28:11	46:4,16,16;47:6	11:11;21:22;32:9
24;14:11;17:23;	26:21;28:16;36:6;	off (1)	ordered (2)	parallel (3)
18:14;20:24;21:9,11;	42:15;43:14;44:4,6,	38:10	24:25;43:14	12:12;17:10,11
23:14,19;25:5,9;	13;45:15	Office (2)	orders (10)	parent (2)
28:13;29:14,17;31:6,	nonbankruptcy (1)	6:4;8:12	13:1;15:2,3;25:1;	36:20,23
11;37:25;38:3,10,11;	15:7	officers (1)	30:4;35:6;37:5,5;	parenthetical (1)
41:21,23,24;42:2,16;	nondebtor (3)	44:4	41:6;47:7	44:24
43:24;45:14,16,18,21,	16:20,21,25	Official (2)	order's (1)	Park (1)
21,22,24;46:8;47:17	none (1)	7:3;9:16	42:13	7:4
motions (2)	18:9	often (1)	original (2)	part (9)
38:7;46:12	nonrespondents (1)	24:18	36:17;37:3	11:24;26:23;29:9;
Motors (1)	39:5	old (1)	originally (1)	40:17,21,25;42:23;
34:18	nor (3)	47:15	28:3	43:6;48:1
movant (1)	11:17;13:10;38:12	omitted (1)	<b>ORTIZ</b> (12)	parte (1)
25:19	notation (1)	36:24	6:16;9:5,5;23:16,	14:7
movants (4)	34:5	Once (1)	16;40:14,18;41:1;	participation (2)
9:12;10:7;25:24;	note (3)	44:24	46:20,20,25,25	43:17;44:6
46:7	31:10;32:17;46:11	One (17)	Ortiz's (1)	particular (2)
much (8)	noted (2)	6:4;7:17;8:13;11:5;	40:19	41:13;45:2
12:24;14:20;16:1;	24:14;36:7	12:2;13:24;19:15;	OSEI-BONSU (1)	particularized (1)
27:17;32:16;39:17;	notice (7)	21:11;27:15;28:7;	5:8	
41:6,9	32:12;36:10;42:21,	29:20;31:20;33:5;	others (1)	34:17
multiple (6)	23;43:2,5;44:25	36:6;39:9;40:25;42:8	47:19	particulars (2)
24:9,23;26:14;	noticed (3)	one's (1)	otherwise (2)	38:23;41:15
28:10;30:13;37:8	15:5;16:3;39:14	20:19	24:23;39:15	parties (8)
must (5)	notices (2)	ongoing (5)	ours (1)	11:16;13:10,25;
25:24,25;26:3;30:3;	45:12;46:1	27:15;30:23;34:3;	29:14	17:20;28:18;29:19;
34:15	noting (2)	39:13;47:23	out (3)	35:21;38:8
54.13	30:25;32:22	only (7)	20:14;32:16;39:19	parties-in- (1)
N	notion (1)	20:6;22:21;28:14,	outside (5)	35:4
	27:1	18,22;29:7;30:17	16:6,7;21:3;26:22;	parties-in-interest (2)
				34:24;35:7
named (7)	notwithstanding (1)	opinion (1)	41:1	partner (1)
13:9,24;22:7;36:9,	38:9	44:2	over (8)	9:7
12,14;39:4	nullity (1)	opportunity (2)	14:21;16:21;18:21,	Partnership (1)
NATHANIEL (1)	19:8	25:21;26:2	22;20:12;37:20;	28:13
6:8	number (7)	oppose (2)	44:20;45:6	party (15)
nature (6)	9:3;41:25;42:3,22,	12:1;28:22	overlooked (4)	16:21;22:7,7,8,10,
11:15,21;14:4;	25;43:11;44:17	opposes (1)	25:20;28:10;37:10,	10;23:2,20;34:15;
17:16,25;18:10	numbers (1)	15:10	11	36:9;38:13,14,18;
necessary (4)	45:13	opposing (1)	overreads (1)	39:5;45:18
9:22;23:2;41:14;	NY (5)	17:5	18:8	party-in-interest (1)
43:18	6:14;7:6,18;8:6,15	opposition (3)	overseas (1)	21:24
necessity (2)		13:15;23:15;38:2	24:15	past (2)
12:13,16	O	Options (1)	OWEN (1)	23:18;25:12
need (4)		45:17	7:11	Pastor (1)
15:16;27:6;40:3;	object (1)	oral (4)	own (3)	28:12
45:2	22:3	14:1;38:22;42:25;	17:21;31:21;32:9	Pearl (2)
neither (4)	objecting (1)	43:7	owner (1)	17:10;40:12
11:17;13:10;38:12;	42:13	order (77)	26:18	PELES (1)
41:5	objection (5)	10:25;11:1,12;	owners (2)	5:9
Nemaizer (1)	13:14;31:15;41:24,	12:18;13:18;14:8,17,	25:7;47:15	Pending (7)
25:23	25;42:15	25;15:1,9,14;16:2,9;	owns (1)	41:20,23;45:17,20,
NEW (17)	obligations (1)	18:5;19:23,25;21:15,	16:22	23;46:9,12
6:11,14;7:6,18;8:6,	23:21	16,17;22:4,8,12;23:8,		
15;12:12,12;14:22;	obtained (1)	21,21;24:2,4,5,6,25;		percent (3)
	(1)			14:15;17:22;22:13

			T	June 18, 2023
perfectly (2)	31:5	48:5	39:22;47:11	raised (1)
17:9,10	position (2)	previously (1)	provided (2)	46:7
period (2)	33:5,9	26:3	14:7;39:23	raises (1)
18:11,15	positions (2)	primary (2)	provides (1)	45:24
PERKINS (2)	12:25;15:3	14:22;41:8	45:17	range (2)
8:2;10:4	possibly (1)	principals (4)	providing (1)	35:19;44:13
permissible (1)	34:8	28:7;35:2,8;36:5	46:14	rather (2)
40:5	Post (1)	prior (4)	Provisional (3)	24:11;28:10
	6:4	11:1;20:10;21:14;	9:22;14:10;42:22	rationale (2)
person (1) 43:16		40:22		
	posture (1)		provisions (1)	16:19;41:7
personam (1)	24:16	privity (3)	28:25	re (5)
36:9	potential (3)	35:17;36:13;44:12	prudential (1)	44:17,22,23;45:6,7
persons (2)	24:5;39:10;40:16	privy (1)	21:23	reach (1)
36:14;44:5	potentially (3)	36:12	punitive (1)	27:10
petition (1)	27:9;32:5;47:20	probative (4)	10:16	reaching (1)
42:9	power (3)	19:12,13,14,21	purported (6)	39:16
petitioning (1)	35:20;44:3,14	procedural (3)	42:15,22;44:4,6,13;	real (4)
27:22	practice (2)	15:19;21:7,20	45:15	21:24;35:4,7;39:10
Philadelphia (1)	17:23;18:14	proceed (2)	purporting (1)	Really (3)
5:6	pre- (1)	23:1;31:11	24:15	21:5;27:25;36:1
pick (1)	19:11	proceeding (46)	purpose (6)	realm (1)
21:15	precise (1)	11:3,13,23,23;12:4,	24:2;32:21;33:4,6;	22:3
picture (5)	15:16	9,11,12,21;13:2,20;	39:2;45:23	reason (3)
11:19;14:3;16:14;	preclude (1)	14:3,4,7,19;15:9,12;	purposes (4)	25:4;39:5;41:3
17:16;21:1	16:24	17:12,17,25;21:2;	17:21;18:3;22:20;	reasonable (1)
pile (1)	pre-confirmation (1)	22:25;23:2,9,22;27:2,	40:16	36:15
38:25	19:12	15;29:1,5;31:22;33:4;	pursuant (5)	reasons (2)
<b>pin</b> (1)	preferred (28)	34:7,9;36:17;37:13;	23:23;24:3,25;	23:8;24:8
32:15	10:12,14,14,21,21;	39:2;40:5,8,21;41:12;	28:24;46:9	recalls (1)
pipe (1)	11:9;12:25;13:8;	42:14,19;43:21,22;	pursue (3)	20:1
47:4	14:15;16:22;18:3,10,	44:1;46:6	16:6,10;18:6	recent (3)
Piraeus (1)	15,18;19:4,16,17;	proceedings (23)	purview (1)	28:19;30:24;36:7
17:12	20:8;21:18;22:14,18;	13:13;23:25;24:7,	16:6	recites (1)
place (5)	25:8;26:18,20;31:21;	17,18,24;30:23;31:2;	put (9)	31:10
18:2;23:19;30:15,	34:24;38:12;48:8	32:18,21;34:3,7;	13:18;22:12;30:17;	recognition (6)
17;33:24	prejudice (8)	35:11;36:2;40:6,8;	31:20;32:6,7;33:4;	11:5,6;13:14,14;
plan (31)	13:22;15:23,24,24;	42:8,9;43:19;44:7;	47:3;48:4	24:22;42:9
11:6;12:6,9,16;	17:3;39:8;40:4;44:2	46:15,19;48:13	putative (2)	recognize (1)
13:15,22;15:10;16:6,	preliminary (5)	process (4)	38:14;43:14	19:10
23,23;17:2,13;21:4;	43:10,12;44:15;	17:5,5;46:12;47:12		recognized (3)
27:2,11,16,22,25;	46:3,4	product (1)	Q	12:8;22:17;27:17
28:25;29:2,3,5,9,10;	premise (4)	31:8		recognizes (1)
37:13,16;40:9,24;	11:14,16;25:13;	prohibited (3)	quick (1)	35:16
41:10;42:6;48:2	29:4	11:2,13;41:12	21:25	recognizing (2)
plans (1)	premised (2)	prohibition (2)	quickly (2)	18:20;19:15
32:18	15:4,6	16:9;39:13	12:20;21:8	reconsider (5)
play (3)	prepared (1)	promise (1)	quite (2)	14:11,17;22:22;
20:23;33:10,19	41:20	47:9	18:23;21:21	29:17;34:9
pleadings (2)	present (1)	proper (1)	<b>quo</b> (5)	reconsideration (18)
31:18;32:7	22:23	39:15	19:23,25;20:10;	10:24;21:10;22:4,9;
please (3)	presented (11)	properly (2)	30:14,15	23:6,19;25:9,16,18;
9:4;10:8;38:5	11:19;14:3,19,20;	28:14;42:19	quote (5)	26:10,13;33:24;
pocket (1)	17:23,24;18:9;26:3;	property (1)	36:24;44:21,22,24;	38:11;41:22,25;42:2;
17:7	39:3,24;41:16	36:21	45:10	45:15;46:9
point (8)	press (2)	proposed (3)	_	record (7)
13:23;14:16;18:25;	24:8;25:4	13:18;27:21;46:16	R	9:3;19:2;26:1;
19:14;20:20,23;37:9;	pressed (1)	prosecuted (3)		27:12;37:19;38:21;
47:17	24:9	17:12;18:1;40:11	race (1)	39:1
pointing (1)	presto (1)	protected (1)	33:11	redemption (1)
29:23	20:11	34:16	radar (2)	18:15
	pretend (2)	prove (1)	47:3;48:4	<b>REED</b> (8)
points (1)				
points (1) 39:1 portions (1)	19:19,20 preview (1)	26:3 provide (2)	raise (3) 26:10;39:5;42:15	5:2,12;9:21,23; 14:10;29:18;42:13,17

		T		June 10, 202.
referenced (3)	remind (2)	13:18	16:14;17:18;21:20;	6:17;9:7,9
14:24;20:16;46:16	27:6;37:2	right (8)	25:22,23;28:12;	shoe (1)
references (4)	remove (1)	15:6;16:5;19:10;	29:23;30:1;33:6;	39:17
17:1;18:6;20:15,17	27:10	27:8;29:11;33:25;	38:18	shutting (1)
referred (4)	reorganization (1)	34:8;38:1	sections (1)	47:14
13:7;18:11,14;	42:6	rightful (1)	28:24	side (1)
43:23	reorganized (24)	25:7	seek (9)	17:14
referring (1)	6:12;17:1,6,20;	rightfully (1)	22:3,9;23:6;26:12;	signed (1)
20:19	18:2,7,21;19:3,7,10,	25:8	27:8;28:20;32:8;	14:8
refusal (1)	18;20:11,13,18;21:6,	rights (12)	33:23;39:11	significance (1)
47:6	9,21;23:4;38:17;	16:24;18:17,18,24,	seeking (2)	19:21
refuse (1)	39:10,19,22;40:2;	24;19:17;20:9,22,22;	10:24;43:20	significant (1)
24:24	41:13	28:13;36:15;40:1	seeks (2)	22:11
refused (1)	reply (6)	RUDEWICZ (3)	28:14;43:5	significantly (1)
33:5	31:14;32:4,8;38:4;	8:17;9:25;10:1	seem (1)	22:11
refusing (1)	42:1,1	Rule (8)	28:5	similar (2)
26:24	represent (1)	22:4;25:25;28:13;	sees (1)	22:20;31:15
regard (3)	24:15	41:20;45:16,17,24;	16:14	simplest (1)
24:6,16;33:15	representations (1)	46:9	self-enforcing (1)	23:19
regarding (3)	32:20	ruled (1)	30:2	Simply (1)
14:2;31:16;32:20	represented (1)	42:18		37:9
	36:16		separate (7) 11:7;12:7;15:7;	simultaneously (1)
rejected (3)		<b>ruling (12)</b> 14:12;24:11;25:6,		32:25
26:23;28:8;42:17	require (1)		16:5,24;22:22;46:11	
rejecting (1)	37:14	16;27:19;35:24;	serial (1)	sit (1)
27:21	required (1)	37:21,22,23;38:14;	38:18	17:6
relate (1)	18:21	46:8,13	seriously (1)	SMITH (8)
27:14	requires (5)	rulings (4)	12:3	5:2,12;6:11;9:21,
related (3)	24:22;25:14;30:20;	13:3;24:17;37:5;	servants (1)	23;14:10;29:18;42:13
11:7;17:13;47:18	31:23;33:10	39:20	44:4	<b>Smith's (1)</b>
relates (3)	resolution (2)	run (1)	service (1)	42:17
11:22;17:19;41:7	31:6;43:22	20:5	47:16	Society (2)
relating (2)	resolve (1)		services (1)	8:3;10:4
12:21;47:7	48:3	S	47:18	solely (2)
relationship (2)	resolved (2)		set (2)	20:18;29:15
11:16;17:19	16:11,12	Sabine (2)	11:11;33:19	Solomon (2)
relevance (1)	respect (7)	44:17;45:4	seven-month (1)	9:20,20
39:7	11:19;13:1;15:7;	same (12)	29:18	somehow (5)
relevant (7)	17:16;19:24;22:8;	20:3;22:19;24:8;	several (1)	16:15,18;20:11;
11:4,18;12:11;16:2,	23:9	28:7;29:20;33:15,16;	46:11	26:18;40:8
18;18:12;19:2	respectfully (6)	34:24;35:5;36:6;	SHAFTEL (16)	Sorry (1)
relief (4)	10:25;11:11;15:5;	38:17;43:23	7:20;9:10,10,14;	15:12
25:25;33:7;45:16,	23:10;32:6;37:24	sanction (1)	10:8,9;15:14,21,23;	sort (1)
19	respects (1)	35:2	16:1,13;27:24;32:15;	15:19
relies (1)	11:12	sanctioned (2)	38:5;41:18;48:8	sought (2)
38:17	respondent (2)	24:5;34:10	Shaftel's (2)	14:16;33:7
relitigate (2)	22:7;38:13	sanctions (6)	29:1;32:10	sound (3)
25:21;28:14	respondents (3)	13:7;25:3;39:10,11;	shareholder (1)	33:14;39:19;40:9
relitigating (2)	11:18;13:9,24	46:17;47:23	40:3	Southern (1)
38:10,11	response (8)	Savings (2)	shareholders (14)	43:11
relitigation (1)	20:13;29:17;32:4,9,	8:3;10:4	10:12;11:9;13:8;	speak (2)
38:16	10,11,14;41:24	savvy (1)	21:18;22:18;27:20;	11:21;47:16
remain (1)	responsibility (1)	47:15	28:6;34:24;35:17,23;	SPEAKER (1)
39:10	34:22	saw (1)	36:5;38:12;43:4;48:8	15:20
remains (3)	restricted (2)	22:14	shareholders' (1)	speaking (1)
10:19;16:9;20:4	20:21;36:13	saying (2)	12:25	16:7
remands (1)	retain (3)	32:8;35:8	shares (14)	specifically (6)
45:23	31:24;45:5,9	scale (2)	16:22;17:22,22;	12:8;14:25;16:8;
remarkable (1)	retained (5)	19:15;20:7	18:2,16,22,22;20:19,	29:25;30:25;32:10
34:25	17:2,4,6;28:17;	scene (1)	20;25:8;26:18,20;	specifics (1)
Remarkably (2)	29:11	13:5	31:21;40:1	38:24
37:20;48:2	reviewing (1)	SDNY (3)	sharp (1)	spend (1)
	TOTIONING (I)			
	15.8	44.23 24.45.8	16.3	16.19
remedy (1) 25:18	15:8 revised (1)	44:23,24;45:8 <b>Second (10)</b>	16:3 SHAUGHNESSY (3)	16:19 <b>spends (1)</b>

21:6	strategy (1)		trial (2)	26:20;28:9;29:5
pent (1)	33:15	T	26:12;44:20	unrelated (2)
27:25	Street (4)	-	tried (1)	41:9,10
oonte (2)	5:4,14;17:10;40:12	tact (1)	32:15	Unsecured (2)
30:22;34:5	strength (2)	31:15	Trust (6)	7:3;9:16
quare (1)	31:12,16		35:15,15;43:3,4;	unstayed (2)
6:4	structure (1)	talking (1)	44:11,11	27:16;33:20
uarely (1)	26:22	28:1	trustee (3)	untimely (1)
35:21		tech (1)		21:10
	styled (1)	47:15	8:12;10:1,5	l l
andards (3)	10:12	teed (1)	try (2)	up (4)
22:22,22;23:4	sua (2)	13:16	25:9;33:18	13:16;21:15;38:14;
anding (16)	30:22;34:5	Tellingly (1)	trying (2)	47:24
21:21,23,24;22:1,3,	subject (12)	31:14	29:12;39:18	update (1)
9,22,25;23:5,5;28:18;	12:17;18:4;22:11;	terms (7)	turn (1)	46:15
29:7,8;33:23;34:15,	23:11,20;30:23;31:1,	18:23;21:4,14;23:5;	17:18	updating (1)
22	6;32:25;34:3;43:23;	39:14,17;40:13	two (7)	46:18
ands (1)	45:6	test (1)	11:12,20,24,24;	urge (1)
35:25	submission (1)	22:5	15:15,15;40:11	37:24
art (1)	18:12	Texas (1)	, ,	use (3)
23:19	submissions (2)	` '	U	24:11;25:6;39:18
arted (1)	14:1;24:15	24:12		used (2)
27:18	submit (1)	therein (1)	UK (1)	47:15,15
arts (2)	32:6	43:8	27:19	using (3)
		third (5)		
25:13;26:16	submitted (1)	13:7;25:22;26:8;	unclear (1)	40:18;47:19,20
ate (3)	19:8	27:4;37:17	21:14	utter (1)
33:8;45:22,23	subsequent (1)	thirty (1)	undeniable (2)	25:12
ated (4)	35:6	10:16	20:20;39:1	-7
28:12;30:1;33:4;	subsidiary (7)	threat (4)	under (16)	V
35:10	20:16,18;36:18,21,	14:20;15:6;17:14;	12:11;14:22;17:2;	
atement (3)	22,24;37:12	41:8	22:4;23:3,21;24:5,6;	vacate (3)
31:1,2,10	substance (2)	Three (8)	25:25;28:19;29:9;	31:6,11;45:1
tatements (2)	20:24;40:10	7:4;10:11;11:8;	33:9,25;37:16;39:15;	vacatur (5)
31:12;40:7	substantial (4)	15:15,15;27:25;35:8;	45:1	12:2;28:22;30:23;
STATES (5)	10:15;31:7,18;		undercut (1)	31:1;34:3
8:11,12;10:1;41:6,9	45:24	36:4	12:6	value (4)
tating (2)	substantially (2)	thumb (1)	undercuts (2)	26:25;27:8,8,10
27:20;31:2	22:19;31:3	19:15	15:10;20:10	Vanderbilt (1)
		timely (3)		
tatus (8)	substantively (1)	12:22;21:19;45:18	underlying (4)	7:17
19:23,24;20:9,10;	21:2	times (6)	10:13;16:21;18:14;	various (5)
30:14,15;46:15,19	successful (1)	26:14,17;29:22;	33:13	20:15;30:6;35:9;
ay (3)	34:12	30:13;37:8,19	undermine (1)	36:3;40:16
25:10;30:18;32:5	suddenly (1)	TINA (2)	33:16	Vassilis (5)
ayed (1)	20:12	8:8;10:3	undermines (1)	32:1;35:13,14;44:9
15:18	sufficiently (3)	tips (1)	37:13	9
eal (1)	22:10;35:17;44:11	19:15	undisputed (1)	vein (1)
47:16	suggest (1)	today (9)	26:18	36:20
TEPHEN (1)	31:7		undisturbed (1)	vested (1)
7:8	suggests (1)	10:20;20:4;23:25;	30:10	28:23
eps (1)	33:18	26:2;27:24;32:4;	unfounded (1)	view (2)
43:18	Suite (2)	34:12;37:22;46:24	31:16	12:25;15:1
43.16 ill (6)	5:5;8:14	today's (1)	UNIDENTIFIED (1)	
		43:24		vigorously (1)
13:23;16:2;19:25;	summary (1)	together (3)	15:20	40:2
25:1;30:15;31:22	17:15	10:15;11:9;48:3	UNITED (4)	violated (1)
olen (1)	summer (1)	total (1)	8:11,12;10:1;43:19	32:5
47:21	48:5	13:19	units (1)	violating (6)
op (1)	support (5)	Trading (3)	10:14	13:10,25;31:22;
23:11	23:13;27:1,4;42:2,5	7:16;9:12;41:22	Unity (3)	36:13;38:13,14
TORRS (1)	sure (3)	transcript (1)	35:15;43:3;44:10	violation (1)
6:2	35:16;36:1;47:13	42:20	unless (1)	30:18
rategic (1)	surreptitiously (1)		48:2	violations (2)
24:8	13:3	transfers (1)	unpack (1)	35:11;44:7
rategies (1)	systems (1)	36:21	38:8	vis-a-vis (2)
0 , ,	47:14	TRAURIG (3)	unquestionably (3)	18:10,18
40:15		7:14;9:11;10:9	LUHUUCSHOHADIV (5)	10.10.10

		. 9 0 . 0. 0 .		June 18, 2025
	21.17.40.10	1201 (1)	20.21.24.41.22.	45:8
	31:17;40:19	1201 (1)	30:21,24;41:23;	
${f W}$	workaround (1)	5:14	43:9;44:16	4th (1)
	25:10	12th (4)	20th (1)	47:9
WADE (1)	world (5)	14:2;38:22;42:25;	37:4	
7:10	19:1,6,22;31:20;	43:7	22nd (1)	5
walk (1)	33:11	13 (1)	8:5	
12:19	written (2)	39:12	23-10322 (1)	5.10 (1)
	14:8;24:14	13th (23)	9:3	28:24
warrant (1)	wrong (3)	11:1;13:4;14:2,7;	23-7331 (2)	5.2C (1)
25:24				
warranting (1)	15:6;23:9;33:23	21:16,17;24:2;25:14;	43:11;44:16	28:24
26:10	wrote (3)	26:7;27:4;35:7,22;	24th (2)	5.8 (1)
warrants (1)	14:25;31:14,17	37:5,17;42:4,12,13,	37:4;42:21	28:24
47:24		16,19,24;43:1,6;46:16	25 (16)	500 (2)
way (12)	$\mathbf{Y}$	14th (2)	10:25;11:12;12:17;	17:9;40:12
11:5;12:6;13:15;		30:21;34:5	13:4;14:12;16:2,8;	534 (1)
	years (3)	1536 (2)	18:5;21:14;23:8;	8:14
16:12,14;25:9;32:3,	11:24,25;40:11	42:25;43:8	38:14;39:4,12,16,21;	58 (2)
17;33:5;38:9;39:9;				
48:1	YORK (14)	1537 (4)	41:11	44:23;45:7
ways (4)	6:11,14;7:6,18;8:6,	42:6,11,24;43:7	25th (6)	580 (1)
30:15;35:3,23;	15;12:12,13;14:22;	1558 (3)	25:16;29:16;41:23;	34:18
47:22	29:2,5;33:9;39:15;	42:22;45:13;46:2	42:2,17,20	
week (1)	43:12	1563 (3)	26 (1)	6
		43:5;45:13;46:2	45:8	•
37:20	$\mathbf{Z}$	<b>1587</b> (1)	26th (1)	60 (1)
weight (8)	L			60 (1)
19:13,15,21,21;	(4)	41:23	43:2	22:4
20:6,7;21:7;32:7	zero (1)	15th (1)	270 (1)	60b (2)
Whac-a-Mole (2)	32:7	32:3	44:22	25:25;28:13
33:10,17	ZIDE (1)	16-2561 (1)	27th (1)	
what's (2)	7:8	44:17	37:4	8
13:6;18:14		1629 (1)	28th (1)	
	0	46:17	13:17	8008a (2)
Whereupon (1)	· ·	1664 (1)	29th (1)	45:16,25
48:13	02404 (1)			
wherever (1)	02494 (1)	42:1	37:4	8008a1 (1)
40:25	6:5	1689 (1)	2nd (4)	46:9
wholly (2)	06-4983 (1)	42:3	15:15;30:24;43:9;	
12:22,23	45:8	1717 (1)	44:16	9
wildly (2)		5:4		
25:9;27:11	1	19103 (1)	3	9024 (2)
		5:6		21:11;22:4
willing (1)	1 (2)	19801 (1)	3 (2)	
25:1	1 (3)	5:15	13:18;45:21	99 (1)
Wilmington (3)	42:7,11;45:21		1	44:22
5:15;8:3;10:4	10:16 (1)	1986 (1)	3100 (1)	
Winimo (1)	48:13	44:24	5:5	
44:22	100 (3)	19th (2)	319 (1)	
wish (2)	14:15;17:21;22:13	13:8,16	34:18	
41:19;48:7	10017 (1)		399 (1)	
	7:18	2	44:23	
withdraw (2)	10036 (3)	_	3rd (1)	
24:24,25	6:14;7:6;8:6	2 (2)	47:10	
withdrawn (4)			47.10	
15:20,22,23;40:4	105 (1)	42:11;45:21	4	
within (6)	44:22	2001 (1)	4	
15:15;21:12;35:19,	10707 (1)	44:23		
21;44:13,21	8:15	2007 (2)	4 (1)	
Without (16)	1095 (1)	45:8,8	45:23	
15:24,24;18:7,19;	7:5	2013 (1)	402 (2)	
	11 (1)	20:4	44:24;45:7	
19:3;20:9,25;31:4,11,	27:7	2016 (2)	*	
22;32:11;39:8;40:4,4;			407 (1)	
44:1;45:14	1155 (1)	44:17;45:11	43:13	
witness (3)	8:4	2023 (1)	413 (1)	
31:1,2,9	1177 (1)	11:25	44:16	
WL (3)	6:13	2024 (1)	4203551 (2)	
44:17;45:8,11	12 (2)	30:18	44:17;45:11	
	41:6,9	2025 (5)	4615604 (1)	
words (2)	, , ,			