

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION**

In re:

WELLMADE FLOOR COVERINGS
INTERNATIONAL, INC., *et al.*,¹

Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case No. 25-58764

(Jointly Administered)

**LABOR PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR RULE 2004 EXAMINATION
AND PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS BY DEBTORS AND ALLEN CHEN**

COMES NOW Creditors Yucong Liu, Cangen Han, Yixiang Zhang, and others (together, the "Labor Plaintiffs"),² by and through the undersigned counsel, and file this Motion for Rule 2004 Examination and for Production of Documents by the Debtors and Ming Chen a/k/a Allen Chen (the "Motion"), pursuant to Rule 2004 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure ("FRBP") and Rule 2004-1 of the Bankruptcy Local Rules ("BLR"). By way of the Motion, the Labor Plaintiffs

¹ The Debtors in these chapter 11 cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's federal tax identification number, include: Wellmade Industries MFR, N.A. LLC (1058) and Wellmade Floor Coverings International, Inc. (8425). The mailing address for the Debtors for purposes of these chapter 11 cases is: 1 Wellmade Drive, Cartersville, GA 30121.

² The full list of Labor Plaintiffs includes: Yucong Liu, Cangen Han, Yixiang Zhang, Nan Liu, Shuai Zhang, Yao Yan, Haitao Sun, Jiansheng Yin, Shengxiang Yu, Wen Chen, Shengda Yu, Shun Yu, Shunkui Wang, Jinchao Si, Jiagen Yang, Marianela Pina Yaguari, Yorman Ojeda Herrera, and Eglis Almarza Diaz.



seek the entry of an order, substantially in the form of the proposed order attached as **Appendix A** hereto, compelling (a) Debtors Wellmade Floor Coverings International, Inc. and Wellmade MFR. N.A. LLC (together, the “Debtors”) and (b) Allen Chen to each submit to an examination (“Rule 2004 exam”) by the Labor Plaintiffs as well as produce certain documents prior to that examination. (The Proposed Order differs slightly from the Court’s preferred format since the Debtors and Allen Chen have expressed that they will not submit to examination or provide documents voluntarily).

The examination and requested documents shall pertain to the Debtors’ acts, conduct, liabilities, financial condition, and other matters relevant to the administration of the Debtors’ estate and the formulation of a plan. FRBP 2004(b). In particular, given the imminent November 21, 2025 deadline for filing proofs of claim (ECF No. 222 (the “Bar Date Order”)), which specifically requires that claims include a monetary amount and substantiating evidence, the Labor Plaintiffs seek information on the following matters as part of this Motion: (1) the merits of the Labor Claimants’ wage and hour, trafficking, RICO, unjust enrichment, and other claims against Debtors, including the availability of relevant evidence; (2) the relative liability of various third-party staffing agencies for any harms to the Labor Claimants; (3) the appropriate damages owed to Labor Claimants pursuant to their claims, including the data to calculate disgorgement of profits and punitive

damages; (4) the appropriateness and desirability of proceeding via a class action mechanism; and (5) the existence, preservation, and search for evidence related to the Labor Claimants' claims.³

As set forth in the attached Notice of Rule 2004 Exam for Debtors (**Appendix B**) and for Allen Chen (**Appendix C**), each of which also includes a Schedule of Requested Documents to be Produced (the "Requests"), the Labor Plaintiffs request that the Rule 2004 exam of Debtors take place on November 10, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. (EST), the Rule 2004 exam of Allen Chen take place on November 11, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. (EST), and that the Debtors and Allen Chen each respond to the Requests by November 7, 2025 at 11:59 p.m. (EST), unless an alternate schedule is agreed to by the parties.

On October 26, 2025, Labor Plaintiffs sent a draft of this Motion to counsel for the Debtors and Allen Chen. After they each refused to consent to the proposed Rule 2004 exam, a meet and confer was held via Zoom on October 30, 2025. Despite Labor Plaintiffs offering to limit the scope of the request to information only pertaining to the Labor Plaintiffs (and not other similarly situated workers), to consent to any procedural safeguards that would be available if the discovery were

³ The Labor Claimants reserve their right to seek additional information pursuant to Rule 2004 or other discovery mechanisms at a later date. Only a subset of topics are sought through this Motion because of the upcoming proofs of claim deadline and so that Debtors may focus on preparing documents and information on the topics relevant to the proofs of claim.

propounded under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and to limit the initial request to only document requests (not a deposition) for the Debtors, neither the Debtors nor Allen Chen consented to the Motion. A more complete description of the meet and confer process is provided in the Certification under BLR 2004-1(a) attached to this Motion. (See **Appendix D**).

I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this Motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1408.

II. BACKGROUND

2. The Labor Plaintiffs hereby incorporate their prior pleadings in this matter, including ECF Nos. 171, 213, 218, and 242.

3. Debtors in this case are two related corporate entities, which along with numerous subsidiary and affiliated entities, are engaged in the production of flooring, including at a production facility located in Cartersville, Georgia (the “Cartersville Facility”). On August 4, 2025, the Debtors filed a voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code.

4. The Labor Plaintiffs are individuals who previously worked for Debtors at the Cartersville Facility. The Labor Plaintiffs are comprised of both Visa Workers, who were brought from China to work at the Cartersville Facility, as well

as Agency Workers, who were recruited while living in the United States by staffing agencies to work at the factory. (See ECF No. 170 ¶¶ 1–3.)

5. On May 27, 2025, the Labor Plaintiffs filed a Complaint in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, *Liu, et al. v. Wellmade Industries Mfr. N.A. LLC, et al.*, Case No. 4:25-cv-001340-WMR (the “District Court Litigation”). A copy of the Complaint has been filed at ECF No. 242, Ex. 2. The Complaint brings a collective action (opt-in) claim under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) for unpaid overtime on behalf of all individuals who worked at the Cartersville Facility for more than 40 hours in a workweek. The Complaint also brings class action claims, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, for Chinese nationals who worked at the Cartersville Facility for violations of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (“TVPA”), Georgia Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (“RICO”), Unjust Enrichment, and *Quantum Meruit*.

6. In the Complaint, the Labor Plaintiffs seek on behalf of themselves and other class or collective members: (a) economic damages, non-economic damages, punitive damages, and attorneys’ fees and costs for violations of the TVPA (Compl. ¶¶ 247–290); (b) compensatory damages, punitive damages, trebled damages, attorneys’ and experts’ fees and costs, and injunctive relief for violations of the Georgia RICO (Compl. ¶¶ 267–268); (c) disgorgement of ill-gotten gains, punitive damages, and attorneys’ fees and costs for unjust enrichment

(Compl. ¶¶ 276–279); and (d) recovery of the reasonable value of Labor Plaintiffs’ and class members’ labor, punitive damages, and attorneys’ fees and costs for *quantum meruit* (Compl. ¶¶ 287–290). Labor Plaintiffs and members of the FLSA collective also seek compensation for illegal deductions, unpaid overtime, an equal amount as liquidated damages, and attorneys’ fees and costs for violations of the FLSA (Compl. ¶¶ 266–267).

7. In addition to the Labor Plaintiffs, on information and belief, there are dozens of other Visa Workers and hundreds of other Agency Workers who were not paid overtime and may have been subjected to other labor abuses similar to those experienced by the Labor Plaintiffs. The Visa Workers and Agency Workers who may have claims against Debtors that fall within the FLSA collective or Rule 23 class pleaded in the Complaint are collectively referred to as “Labor Claimants.”

8. The District Court Litigation was stayed as to the Debtors because of the filing of the Petition that gave rise to this matter. At that time, the Debtors had not yet filed their answer in the District Court Litigation and no discovery had taken place.

9. On September 15, 2025, a Meeting of Creditors pursuant to Section 341 of the Bankruptcy Code (“Section 341 Meeting”) was held. During the Section 341 Meeting, in response to questions by the Labor Plaintiffs and others, Debtors’ Chief Restructuring Officer (“CRO”) repeatedly stated that they had little

knowledge of Debtors' operations, employment practices, interaction with staffing agencies, business dealings, or financial situation prior to the time when the CRO was retained. (The letter agreement retaining the CRO is dated July 3, 2025 (*see* ECF No. 103-3)). To the extent that the CRO answered any questions about past operations or the Debtors' relationships to other entities, the CRO stated that he was relying heavily on the knowledge of Allen Chen, an owner and officer of the Debtors who has been involved in Debtors' operations since at least 2001 and still serves as a consultant to the current management team.

10. On September 22, 2025, the Section 341 Meeting was resumed, but the CRO still was unable to answer questions on the aforementioned subjects.

11. On September 4, 2025, Debtors filed a motion seeking entry of an order setting a bar date for filing proofs of claim and for other relief (ECF No. 137 (the "Bar Date Motion")), to which the Labor Plaintiffs filed a Limited Opposition and several status reports (ECF Nos. 171, 213, 218).

12. In the context of litigating the Bar Date Motion, the Debtors purported to have no records concerning any of the Visa Workers, even including the Labor Plaintiffs who had filed the Complaint – some of whom worked at the Cartersville Facility for over two years. (*See e.g.*, ECF No. 218 ¶ 6).

13. On October 9, 2025, the Court issued an Order Setting a Bar Date for Filing Proofs of Claim and other related relief (ECF No. 222 (the “Bar Date Order”)), which set a bar date of November 21, 2025 for filing proofs of claim.

14. The Bar Date Order, which was primarily drafted by Debtors, requires that each proof of claim “must ... include a claim amount denominated in United States dollars, be signed under penalty of perjury, ... [and] include supporting documentation.” (ECF No. 222 ¶ 11) (emphasis added).

15. None of the Labor Plaintiffs have filed a proof of claim yet in this action, although they intend to do so prior to the bar date.

16. The Complaint alleges that Allen Chen—the brother of Zhu Chen a/k/a George Chen (“George Chen”) and father of Jiayi Chen a/k/a Morgan Chen (“Morgan Chen”), who were both arrested for labor trafficking at the Cartersville Facility—is a joint owner of the Debtors; that he ran the Cartersville Facility whenever George Chen was unable to or was away; and that he assumed primary responsibility for the Debtors’ operations after George Chen was arrested.

17. Allen Chen signed the Agreement with Aurora Management Partners Inc. in his capacity as “President” of each of the Debtor entities. (ECF No. 103-3).

18. Labor Plaintiffs are in possession of screen shots that show Allen Chen participated in WeChat groups with the Labor Plaintiffs and other Labor Claimants related to the operation.

19. Labor Plaintiffs specifically recall Allen Chen directing them to perform specific tasks at the Cartersville Facility.

20. Allen Chen is still receiving a salary of \$600,000 per year from the Debtors.

III. ARGUMENT

A. Good cause exists to grant Labor Plaintiffs' request for a Rule 2004 examination and related documents.

Rule 2004 provides that, “[o]n motion of any party in interest, the Court may order the examination of any entity.” FRBP 2004(a). As an initial matter, creditors in bankruptcy proceedings are parties in interest that have standing to seek a Rule 2004 examination. *See In re Tawfik*, No. 11-53590-MHM, 2011 WL 873444, at *1 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. Mar. 14, 2011) (granting creditor’s Rule 2004 motion for examination of and document production from debtors); *In re Hammond*, 140 B.R. 197, 201, 205 (S.D. Ohio 1992) (reversing bankruptcy court’s order quashing creditor’s Rule 2004 motion because a Rule 2004 exam “may be conducted by ‘any party in interest,’ including a creditor”) (quoting FRBP 2004(a)); *In re China Fishery*

Grp. Ltd., No. 16-11895, 2017 WL 3084397, at *5 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. July 19, 2017)) (same).

The permissible scope of a Rule 2004 examination is broad, as set forth in Rule 2004(b), which provides in relevant part:

“The examination...may relate only to the acts, conduct, or property or to the liabilities and financial condition of the debtor, or to any matter which may affect the administration of the debtor’s estate...[.]”

FRBP 2004(b)(1). In addition, in certain cases, the examination may cover “the operation of any business” and “any other matter relevant to the cases or to formulating a plan.” *Id.* 2004(b)(2).

Accordingly, the scope of examination under Rule 2004 extends to “any matter which may affect administration of the debtor’s estate,” and therefore allows for broad inquiry. *See, e.g., In the Matter of M4 Enterprises, Inc.*, 190 B.R. 471, 474 (Bankr. N.D.Ga. 1995) (Rule 2004 examinations can be legitimately in the nature of a “fishing expedition”); *In re Washington Mut., Inc.*, 408 B.R. 45, 49 (Bankr. D. Del. 2009) (“The scope of a Rule 2004 examination is unfettered and broad.”) (internal citations omitted); 9 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY, ¶ 2004.01[1] (Levin & Sommers, eds., 16th ed. 2023) (“The scope of Rule 2004 examination is exceptionally broad and the rule itself is ‘peculiar to bankruptcy law and procedure because it affords few of the procedural safeguards that an examination under Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure does.’ ... Examinations

under Rule 2004 ... have been compared to ‘a fishing expedition.’”) (internal citations omitted) (quoting *In re Table Talk*, 51 B.R. 143, 145 (Bankr. D. Mass. 1985)). The examination and documents requested through this Motion are thus proper and appropriate. The scope of the requested information concerns matters related to Debtors’ acts, conduct, liabilities, financial condition, business operations, and other matters affecting the administration of the Debtors’ estate.

Additionally, bankruptcy courts have explicitly noted that good cause to permit a Rule 2004 examination exists where it is “[1] necessary to establish the claim of the party seeking the examination, or [2] if denial of such request would cause the examiner undue hardship or injustice.” *In re Metiom, Inc.*, 318 B.R. 263, 268 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2004). For example, in considering the Rule 2004 motion of a creditor with significant claims, bankruptcy courts have concluded that it would be “impractical and unfair to prevent the potentially largest claimant from an investigation of the parameters of its claims and possible defenses”; that creditors’ claims “have an effect on the administration of the estate”; and that it is “not the debtors’ ... function to prevent discovery of a claim, but rather one of their functions as fiduciaries is to see that substantial justice is provided to all estate claimants.” *In re Drexel Burnham Lambert Grp., Inc.*, 123 B.R. 702, 712 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1991). Furthermore, the *Drexel* court recognized that permitting such discovery will enhance the overall efficiency of the bankruptcy: “The more

knowledge [creditor] has about its claims, the better it, [debtor], and the committees will be able to resolve the claims process in this case.” *Id.* at 712.

Labor Plaintiffs need to file their proofs of claim in less than one month, but they did not have an opportunity to do discovery in the District Court Litigation and they were not provided any meaningful information relevant to their claims as part of the Section 341 Meeting. The Bar Date Order specifically requires that a claim amount be provided and that supporting documentation for the claim be attached. The information requested through this Motion is therefore necessary to establish their claims and quantify their damages, as required by the proof of claim form. Labor Plaintiffs’ claims, as one of the largest creditors of Debtors, will undoubtedly impact the administration of the estate.

Labor Plaintiffs have repeatedly stated their intention to proceed on a collective and class basis, and the Eleventh Circuit permits creditors to file a class proof of claim. *In re Charter Co.*, 876 F.2d 866, 876 (11th Cir.1989). In order to determine whether it is appropriate or desirable to file a class proof of claim, the Labor Plaintiffs need information about the putative class, such as the number of potential class members, the commonality of their employment conditions, and the similarity of their legal claims against Debtors. *See* FRBP 7023 (incorporating Fed. R. Civ. P. 23)). As part of this analysis, the Labor Plaintiffs must also ascertain whether these individual Labor Claimants’ claims are of an amount and nature

such that resolving the claims collectively through the class action mechanism would be more efficient, or would permit “[p]ersons holding small claims, who absent class procedures might not prosecute them,” to pursue their claims “consistent with the goals of the [Bankruptcy Code].” *In re Charter Co.*, 876 F.2d at 871; see also *In re Taylor Bean & Whitaker Mortg. Corp.*, No. 3:09-BK-07047, 2010 WL 4025873, at **3-4 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. Sept. 27, 2010) (“The Court ... believes that an adversary proceeding is necessary to protect the employees’ rights, given the relatively small nature of their individual claims and the concern as expressed by the Eleventh Circuit in *In re Charter Co.* [...] that persons holding small claims may not prosecute their claims absent class procedures.”).

B. The pending proceeding rule does not preclude Labor Plaintiffs from seeking discovery in this bankruptcy proceeding, as the District Court Litigation is stayed and Labor Plaintiffs will agree to any necessary procedural safeguards.

The Debtors’ objection that the Labor Plaintiffs’ Rule 2004 motion is barred by the pending proceeding rule is unavailing. The primary purpose of the pending proceeding rule is to prevent parties in a pending litigation from using a Rule 2004 exam to circumvent the procedural safeguards that would exist if the discovery was sought through that litigation. See *In re Washington Mut., Inc.*, 408 BR at 51 (noting the “primary concern of courts [as to pending proceedings] is the use of Rule 2004 examinations to circumvent the safeguards and protections of the

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure” but granting motion for a Rule 2004 exam). However, in the instant case, the pending proceeding in question, i.e. the District Court Litigation, was stayed before the Debtors even filed an answer. Therefore, there is no way for the Labor Plaintiffs to seek discovery through that proceeding. There is also no adversary proceeding pending in the bankruptcy court through which the Labor Plaintiffs may request discovery. *In re Table Talk, Inc.*, 51 B.R. at 145 (granting request for Rule 2004 exam where no adversary proceeding had been commenced against the parties sought to be examined).⁴ And finally, even though the pending proceeding rule would not bar Labor Plaintiffs’ Rule 2004 motion, Labor Plaintiffs have even offered to permit the Debtors the same procedural safeguards that would exist if the discovery were conducted pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.⁵ See, e.g., *In the Matter of M4 Enterprises, Inc.*, 190

⁴ Although some bankruptcy courts have permitted a claimant’s Rule 2004 exam even where an adversary proceeding was already pending between the parties. *In re Drexel Burnham Lambert Grp., Inc.*, 123 B.R. at 705. See also *In the Matter of M4 Enterprises, Inc.*, 190 B.R. at 476–77 (existence of adversary proceeding or contested matter does not necessarily preclude a Rule 2004 examination). See also *In re Analytical Sys., Inc.*, 71 B.R. 408, 413 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. 1987) (“The fact that there is pending litigation between the parties is not relevant to a decision to allow a Rule 2004 examination. The law on this matter is clear that pending litigation ... against the person sought to be examined, and the possible use of [Rule 2004] testimony in that collateral litigation, is not sufficient for denying examination.”) (internal quotations omitted).

⁵ During the meet and confer process, Debtors cited several cases in support of their contention that the pending proceeding rule precluded Labor Plaintiffs’ request for a Rule 2004 exam; however, each of these cases is easily distinguished.

B.R. at 476–77 (permitting Rule 2004 examination but limiting the scope, capping the duration, and permitting objections based on privilege); *In re Analytical Sys., Inc.*, 71 B.R. at 412 (“the Court can provide any due process safeguards that are needed” for a Rule 2004 exam).

C. A Rule 2004 examination of a non-debtor third party is proper.

With regard to Allen Chen, it is well-established that non-debtor third parties may be subject to Rule 2004 examinations. *See* FRBP 2004(a) (“On motion of any party in interest, the court may order the examination of any entity.”) (emphasis added); *In re Golden Grove Pecan Farm*, 460 B.R. 349, 351 (Bankr. M.D. Ga. 2011) (“[N]ondebtor entities are proper targets of Rule 2004 examinations and for subpoenas demanding the production of documents.”). *See also In re Recoton Corp.*, 307 B.R. 751, 755 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2004) (“Any third party who has a relationship with a debtor may be subject to a Rule 2004 investigation.”); *In re*

In Akins, an adversary proceeding had already been commenced. *In re Akins*, No. ADV 13-1024, 2013 WL 6211809, at *1 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. Aug. 14, 2013). In *Sanomedics*, the outside litigation was ongoing and the party seeking a Rule 2004 exam had the option of requesting information directly from the other party in that litigation rather than using a Rule 2004 exam in the bankruptcy proceeding. *In re Sanomedics, Inc.*, 583 B.R. 796 (Bankr. S.D. Fla. 2018). In *Enron*, the Rule 2004 request was devoid of any detail concerning what information was being requested, and the entire effort seemed futile given the anticipated recovery for unsecured creditors. *In re Enron Corp.*, 281 B.R. 836 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2002). In *Washington Mutual*, the bankruptcy court granted the request for a Rule 2004 examination. 408 BR at 51.

Enron Corp., 281 B.R. 836, 840 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y) (“[I]n the proper context, the Court may [under Rule 2004] authorize the examination of third parties that possess knowledge of debtor's acts, conduct, liabilities or financial condition which relate to the administration of the bankruptcy estate.”); *In re Symington*, 209 B.R. 678, 690 (Bankr. D. Md. 1997) (“Discovery under Rule 2004 extends beyond the debtor to persons associated with him as well as to those persons who may have had business dealings with the debtor.”) (citing *Deloitte & Touche v. Hassett (In re CIS Corp.)*, 123 B.R. 488, 490 (S.D.N.Y. 1991)).

Given the level of Allen Chen’s involvement in the operations of the Debtors, and the fact that the CRO repeatedly stated during the Section 341 Meeting that he relies on Allen Chen for information about the Debtors’ pre-petition operations, it is appropriate in this circumstance to request that Allen Chen appear for an examination as well as produce any documents or ESI in his possession. Since Allen Chen was present at Wellmade during the time that the events giving rise to the Labor Plaintiffs’ claims transpired, he possesses extensive relevant information that the Debtors (represented by the CRO) simply lack.

Furthermore, numerous bankruptcy courts have held that the mere fact that information obtained in a Rule 2004 exam may be used against the witness in some manner does not provide any grounds to deny the examination. *See, e.g., In re Drexel Burnham Lambert Grp., Inc.*, 123 B.R. at 710-11 (“[I]t is no defense to the

production of information that an applicant for an examination seeks information to prosecute an action against the witness..."); *In re Table Talk, Inc.*, 51 B.R. at 145 (pending litigation against person sought to be examined under Rule 2004 and possible use of such testimony in collateral litigation is not sufficient reason for denying examination).

Accordingly, the examination and documents requested herein are squarely within the scope of Rule 2004, and given the impending bar date deadline, there is good cause to grant the Motion.

IV. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, Creditors respectfully request that the Court enter an order:

- a. Granting this Motion;
- b. Authorizing the Rule 2004 examination of Debtors and Allen Chen at the date and time specified or as mutually agreed;
- c. Directing Debtors and Allen Chen to produce the documents specified in the Schedule of Requested Documents to be Produced included in Appendices B and C hereto by the date specified or as mutually agreed;
- d. Authorizing the Labor Plaintiffs to issue subpoenas to compel the foregoing Rule 2004 examination and Document Production; and
- e. Granting such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted this day: October 31, 2025.

/s/ Aaron Halegua

Aaron Halegua*

New York Bar No. 4764163

AARON HALEGUA, PLLC

524 Broadway, 11th Floor

New York, New York 10012

Telephone: (646) 854-9061

ah@aaronhalegua.com

*Admitted pro hac vice

/s/ Daniel Werner

Daniel Werner

Georgia Bar No. 422070

dwyer@radfordscott.com

Elaine Woo

Georgia Bar No. 430956

ewoo@radfordscott.com

RADFORD SCOTT LLP

125 Clairemont Ave., Suite 380

Decatur, Georgia 30030

Telephone: (678) 271-0300

/s/ John-Patrick M. Fritz

John-Patrick M. Fritz*

California Bar No. 245240

LEVENE, NEALE, BENDER, YOO &
GOLUBCHIK L.L.P.

2818 La Cienega Ave.

Los Angeles, California 90034

Telephone: (310) 229-1234

jpf@lnbyg.com

*Admitted pro hac vice

Counsel for the Labor Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that all ECF participants registered in this case were served electronically with the foregoing Motion through the Court's ECF system at their respective email addresses registered with this Court. In addition, the U.S. Trustee, Committee, Debtors, and Allen Chen were provided notice via electronic mail.

Dated: October 31, 2025
New York, New York

/s/ Aaron Halegua
Aaron Halegua*
New York Bar No. 4764163
AARON HALEGUA, PLLC
524 Broadway, 11th Floor
New York, New York 10012
Telephone: (646) 854-9061
ah@aaronhalegua.com
*Admitted pro hac vice

Counsel for the Labor Plaintiffs

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION**

In re:

WELLMADE FLOOR COVERINGS
INTERNATIONAL, INC., *et al.*,

Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case No. 25-58764

(Jointly Administered)

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
EXAMINATIONS PURSUANT TO FED. R. BANKR. P. 2004**

The motion of Creditors Yucong Liu, Cangen Han, Yixiang Zhang, and others (together, the “Labor Plaintiffs”)¹ for an order authorizing (a) the

¹ The full list of Labor Plaintiffs includes: Yucong Liu, Cangen Han, Yixiang Zhang, Nan Liu, Shuai Zhang, Yao Yan, Haitao Sun, Jiangsheng Yin, Shengxiang Yu, Wen

examination of Debtors Wellmade Floor Coverings International, Inc. and Wellmade MFR. N.A. LLC (“Debtors”) pursuant to Rule 2004, and (b) the examination of Ming Chen a/k/a/ Allen Chen, a non-debtor third party, having been read and considered, it is

ORDERED that the Motion is **GRANTED** to permit the examination of Debtors in accordance with Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2004(b) and that the Debtors shall appear for examination by Movant on the topics set forth in the applicable Notice of Examination on Monday, November 10, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. (EST) at the offices of Radford Scott, LLP, 125 Clairemont Ave., Suite 380, Decatur, Georgia 30030, or via Zoom or a similar tele-videoconference service, or at such other mutually agreed time and place;

ORDERED that the Motion is **GRANTED** to permit the examination of Allen Chen in accordance with Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2004(b) and that Allen Chen shall appear for examination by Movant on Tuesday, November 11, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. (EST) at the offices of Radford Scott, LLP, 125 Clairemont Ave., Suite 380, Decatur, Georgia 30030, or via Zoom or a similar tele-videoconference service, or at such other mutually agreed time and place;

Chen, Shengda Yu, Shun Yu, Shunkui Wang, Jinchao Si, Jiagen Yang , Marianela Pina Yaguari, Yorman Ojeda Herrera, and Eglis Almarza Diaz.

ORDERED that Debtors and Allen Chen shall each produce to Labor Plaintiffs' counsel the documents requested in the relevant Schedule of Documents to be Produced included in Labor Plaintiffs' Notice of Rule 2004 Exam, attached to the Motion as Appendices B and C, on or before Friday, November 7, 2025 at 11:59 p.m. (EST);

ORDERED that the examination shall be conducted in accordance with the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure and the Local Rules of this Court;

ORDERED that Labor Plaintiffs may issue subpoenas to compel the foregoing Rule 2004 examination and production of documents; and it is further

ORDERED that this Court retains jurisdiction to resolve any disputes arising from or related to the implementation of this Order.

SO ORDERED, this ____ day of _____, 2025

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Prepared and submitted by:

/s/ Aaron Halegua

Aaron Halegua*

New York Bar No. 4764163

AARON HALEGUA, PLLC

524 Broadway, 11th Floor

New York, New York 10012

Telephone: (646) 854-9061

ah@aaronhalegua.com

*Admitted pro hac vice

/s/ Daniel Werner

Daniel Werner

Georgia Bar No. 422070

dwerner@radfordscott.com

Elaine Woo

Georgia Bar No. 430956

ewoo@radfordscott.com

RADFORD SCOTT LLP

125 Clairemont Ave., Suite 380

Decatur, Georgia 30030

Telephone: (678) 271-0300

/s/ John-Patrick M. Fritz

John-Patrick M. Fritz*

California Bar No. 245240

LEVENE, NEALE, BENDER, YOO & GOLUBCHIK L.L.P.

2818 La Cienega Ave.

Los Angeles, California 90034

Telephone: (310) 229-1234

jpf@lnbyg.com

*Admitted pro hac vice

Counsel for the Labor Plaintiffs

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION**

In re:

WELLMADE FLOOR COVERINGS
INTERNATIONAL, INC., *et al.*,

Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case No. 25-58764

(Jointly Administered)

NOTICE OF RULE 2004 EXAMINATION

COMES NOW Creditors Yucong Liu, Cangen Han, Yixiang Zhang, and others (together, the “Labor Plaintiffs”),¹ by and through the undersigned counsel, who will examine Wellmade Floor Coverings International, Inc. and Wellmade Industries MFR. N.A. LLC (“Debtors”) under oath at a mutually agreeable date, time, and location, or absent such agreement, on Monday, November 10 at 9:00 a.m. (EST) at the offices of Radford Scott, LLP, 125 Clairemont Ave., Suite 380, Decatur, Georgia 30030, or via Zoom or a similar tele-videoconference service, and may continue from day to day until completed.

The examination is pursuant to Rule 2004 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure and Local Rule 2004-1 and will be taken before an officer authorized to

¹ The full list of Labor Plaintiffs includes: Yucong Liu, Cangen Han, Yixiang Zhang, Nan Liu, Shuai Zhang, Yao Yan, Haitao Sun, Jiansheng Yin, Shengxiang Yu, Wen Chen, Shengda Yu, Shun Yu, Shunkui Wang, Jinchao Si, Jiagen Yang, Marianela Pina Yaguari, Yorman Ojeda Herrera, and Eglis Almarza Diaz.

record the testimony. The scope of the examination shall be as described in Rule 2004. In particular, the Labor Plaintiffs intend to examine the Debtors on issues concerning:

(1) the merits of the Labor Plaintiffs' claims against Debtors as set forth in the Complaint filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, *Liu, et al. v. Wellmade Industries Mfr. N.A. LLC, et al.*, Case No. 4:25-cv-001340-WMR, including but not limited to the hours worked by Labor Plaintiffs, any compensation paid to them, the job duties performed by them, the existence of any records related thereto, recruiting workers from China to work at the Cartersville Facility, obtaining visas for workers at the Cartersville Facility, the confiscation of passports, worker housing provided by Debtors, injuries at the Cartersville Facility, the Visa Workers' employment agreements, and the ownership of handguns by Debtors' agents;

(2) the operations of the Debtors' business, including the respective roles of various individuals in those operations;

(3) the relative liability of the Debtors and various third-party staffing agencies for the Labor Plaintiffs' claims, including but not limited to the contractual arrangement between the Debtors and any such agencies, the actual division of responsibility, payments between Debtors and any such agencies, and the Debtors' and any such agencies' respective role in obtaining immigration visas for the workers;

(4) the appropriate damages due to the Labor Plaintiffs' for their claims, including but not limited to financial information necessary to calculate the disgorgement of profits derived from the Debtors' wrongdoing, punitive damages that would sufficiently punish and deter similar wrongdoing, and the cost of labor as a factor in the competitive advantage in the sale of Debtors' products;

(5) the appropriateness and desirability of proceeding on the Labor Plaintiffs' claims via a class action mechanism, including but not limited to the total number of workers similarly-situated to the Labor Plaintiffs as well as the terms and conditions of those workers' employment;

(6) the means by which Debtors communicated with the Labor Plaintiffs and those similarly-situated to them, including the use of both company and personal accounts and devices;

(7) the document retention policies of the Debtors, including but not limited to information about the documents requested as part of this Rule 2004 request as set forth below (the "Document Requests"); and

(8) the Debtors' search for documents in response to the below Document Requests.

Debtors are further requested to deliver to the undersigned counsel on or before Friday, November 7, 2025 at 11:59 p.m. (EST) all of the documents described in the attached Schedule of Documents to Be Produced.

Respectfully submitted this day: October 31, 2025

/s/ Aaron Halegua

Aaron Halegua*
New York Bar No. 4764163
AARON HALEGUA, PLLC
524 Broadway, 11th Floor
New York, New York 10012
Telephone: (646) 854-9061
ah@aaronhalegua.com
*Admitted pro hac vice

/s/ Daniel Werner

Daniel Werner
Georgia Bar No. 422070
dwerner@radfordscott.com
Elaine Woo
Georgia Bar No. 430956
ewoo@radfordscott.com
RADFORD SCOTT LLP
125 Clairemont Ave., Suite 380
Decatur, Georgia 30030
Telephone: (678) 271-0300

/s/ John-Patrick M. Fritz

John-Patrick M. Fritz*
California Bar No. 245240
LEVENE, NEALE, BENDER, YOO &
GOLUBCHIK L.L.P.
2818 La Cienega Ave.
Los Angeles, California 90034
Telephone: (310) 229-1234
jpf@lnbyg.com
*Admitted pro hac vice

Counsel for the Labor Plaintiffs

SCHEDULE OF REQUESTED DOCUMENTS TO BE PRODUCED

Instructions

1. You are required to obtain and furnish all information available to you and any of your representatives, divisions, employees, agents, brokers or servants and to obtain and furnish all information that is in your possession or under your control, or in the possession or under the control of any of your representatives, employees, agents or servants.

2. Each Request which seeks information relating in any way to communications from or within a business or corporate entity, is hereby designated to demand and should be construed to include all communications by and between representatives, employees, agents, brokers or servants of the business or corporate entity.

3. If any document responsive to these Requests is withheld based on a claim of privilege or other protection, for each such document: (i) identify the withheld document--including its general subject matter, its date, its author and its addressee; (ii) state the privilege or other grounds for withholding the document; and (iii) state the factual basis for the claim in sufficient detail so as to permit an adjudication of the validity of the claim.

4. If any documents requested herein have been lost or destroyed, the documents so lost or destroyed shall be identified by author, date and subject matter.

5. With respect to any document requested which was once in your possession, custody or control, but no longer is, please indicate the date the document ceased to be in your possession, custody or control, the manner in which it ceased to be in your possession, custody and control and the name and address of its present custodian.

6. All documents produced in response to this Request shall be produced in whole, notwithstanding that portions thereof may contain information not requested.

7. Unless otherwise indicated, each Request is to be construed as encompassing all documents that pertain to the stated subject matter and to events that transpired during the relevant period, as defined herein.

8. The relevant period for these Requests shall be from January 1, 2021 to the present.

Definitions

1. Terms not defined herein shall have their plain and ordinary meaning.

2. “Labor Plaintiffs” shall mean all individuals who have filed a Consent to Sue in the District Court Litigation, which presently includes: Yucong Liu, Cangen Han, Yixiang Zhang, Nan Liu, Shuai Zhang, Yao Yan, Haitao Sun, Jiansheng Yin, Shengxiang Yu, Wen Chen, Shengda Yu, Shun Yu, Shunkui Wang, Jinchao Si, Jiagen Yang, Marianela Pina Yaguari, Yorman Ojeda Herrera, and Eglis Almarza Diaz.

3. “Debtors” shall mean Wellmade Industries Mfr. N.A. LLC and Wellmade Floor Coverings International, Inc., as well as and their agents, employees, servants, representatives, officers, directors, affiliates, advisors, attorneys, predecessors and successors in interest and all other persons acting or purporting to act on Debtors’ behalf.

4. “Individual Defendants” shall mean Zhu Chen (a/k/a/ George Chen), Jiayi Chen (a/k/a Morgan Chen), Jian Jun Lu, and Ming Chen (a/k/a/ Allen Chen).

5. “District Court Litigation” shall mean the case filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, *Liu, et al. v. Wellmade Industries Mfr. N.A. LLC, et al.*, Case No. 4:25-cv-001340-WMR.

6. “Cartersville Facility” shall mean the factory operated by Debtors in Cartersville, Georgia.

7. “Staffing Agent” or “Staffing Agency” shall mean any individual or entity, including any affiliate or subsidiary, who assisted in recruiting, employing, paying, or supervising any individual to perform work at the Cartersville Facility, including but not limited to at least the following:

- a. Jiangsu Yuanmei Bamboo and Wood Industry Co., Ltd.;
- b. The Tigereye International Trading Co., Ltd.;
- c. Globalone Supply LLC;
- d. Nanjing Yuanmei Bamboo Materails Application Research Institute Co., Ltd.;
- e. Nanjing Huyu Import & Export Co., Ltd.;

- f. Faven LLC;
- g. Danny Herazo Chacuto;
- h. Starwin Service Inc.;
- i. Fusheng Lean Services Inc.;
- j. OSM;
- k. Jiefeng Deng;
- l. Jiawei Shi;
- m. Rong Qi;
- n. Top Gun Staffing Inc.; and/or
- o. Total Talent Search Group.

8. “Labor Claimants” shall mean any individual who performed work at the Cartersville Facility, whether hired directly by Debtors or paid through a Staffing Agency, and therefore includes all Visa Workers and Agency Workers.

9. “Visa Workers” shall mean any Labor Claimant who worked at the Cartersville Facility while in the United States pursuant to a business, work, or other visa.

10. “Agency Workers” shall mean any Labor Claimant who worked at the Cartersville Facility but was recruited or paid by a Staffing Agency.

11. The term “Document” or “Documents” as used herein shall mean all forms of documents or electronically stored information (“ESI”), including but not limited to all writings, correspondence (in the form of facts, ideas, inquiries, or otherwise, sent or received, including but not limited to any oral or electronic correspondence), computer records, photographs and videos, video-recording, audio-recording, records of meetings and conferences, records of conversations and telephone calls, e-mail, WeChat messages, SMS messages, messages on Facebook Messenger, WhatsApp messages, QQ messages, or other electronic communications, that is in your actual or constructive possession, custody or control, or the existence of which you have knowledge. The term “document” or “documents” as used herein shall also include each copy that is not identical to the original and the preliminary drafts of any document or working paper related thereto.

12. The term “communication” as used herein shall mean the transmission of information (in the form of facts, ideas, inquiries or otherwise).

13. Unless otherwise indicated, the “Relevant Period” shall refer to the period of time between January 1, 2021 and the present.

Document Requests

Wage and Hour, Forced Labor, and Class Issues

1. All Documents concerning the dates and hours worked by the Labor Claimants, including but not limited to time sheets, electronic data, and pay records or invoices with this information.
2. All Documents concerning any salaries, wages, bonuses, reimbursements, or other compensation paid by Debtors, or on behalf of Debtors, to the Labor Claimants.
3. All Documents concerning any deductions made from the wages or salaries paid to any of the Labor Claimants.
4. All Documents concerning the job duties performed by the Labor Claimants.
5. Documents sufficient to show the total number and identity of all Visa Workers at all times during the Relevant Period.
6. Documents sufficient to show the total number and identity of all Agency Workers at all times during the Relevant Period.
7. All Documents concerning the facial recognition system used at the Cartersville Facility, including data collected as to all individuals who entered or left the factory.
8. All Documents concerning any time-keeping system for workers used at the Cartersville Facility, including data collected as to all individuals who entered the factory.
9. All Documents exhibiting the quantity and identity of any individuals who resided at housing owned by or rented by the Debtors during the Relevant Period.
10. Documents sufficient to show the hours worked and wages paid to Debtors' direct employees at the Cartersville Facility for each position.
11. All Documents concerning Debtors' confiscation, possession, or retention of any Labor Claimant's passport, including but not limited to any police reports related to such passports.

12. All Documents concerning workplace safety issues at the Cartersville Facility, including any OSHA investigation or findings, any injuries sustained by workers at the Cartersville Facility, and workers' compensation insurance policies and records.

Agency Relationships

13. All Documents concerning the Debtors' relationship with any Staffing Agency, including any contracts, agreements, understandings, memorandums, or communications between them.

14. All Documents concerning the individuals who worked at the Cartersville Facility.

15. All invoices or similar documents tendered by any Staffing Agency to Debtors, including accompanying time sheets, work records, or other evidence of work performed.

16. All Documents concerning any payment or transfer of anything of value between Debtors and any Staffing Agency.

17. All Documents concerning the terms under which Visa Workers would provide labor to the Debtors.

18. All Documents concerning the terms under which Agency Workers would provide labor to the Debtors.

19. Any contracts or agreements between Debtors and any Visa Workers or Agency Workers.

20. All Documents concerning any payments made directly by Debtors to any Visa Worker or Agency Worker.

21. All Documents concerning any immigration applications, determinations, or communications regarding any of the Labor Claimants, including documents in the possession of Davis Wright Tremaine or any other agent of Debtors.

22. All Documents concerning any payments made by Debtors to Davis Wright Tremaine.

Company Financials

23. Documents sufficient to show the quarterly and/or annual revenue, expenses, and profits of Debtors during the Relevant Period.

24. Documents sufficient to show all compensation paid by Debtors to each of the Individual Defendants during the Relevant Period, including salary, wages, expense allowances or reimbursements, distributions, returns of principal, or payments to any related parties.

Company Policies and Communications

25. All Documents concerning the Debtors' document retention policies.

26. All Documents exhibiting communications between the Debtors and any of the Visa Workers.

27. All Documents exhibiting communications between the Debtors and any of the Agency Workers.

28. All Documents concerning any WeChat groups in which any of Debtors' direct employees, Visa Workers, and/or Agency Workers participated at any point during the Relevant Period.

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION**

In re:

WELLMADE FLOOR COVERINGS
INTERNATIONAL, INC., *et al.*,

Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case No. 25-58764

(Jointly Administered)

NOTICE OF RULE 2004 EXAMINATION

COMES NOW Creditors Yucong Liu, Cangen Han, Yixiang Zhang, and others (together, the “Labor Plaintiffs”),¹ by and through the undersigned counsel, who will examine Ming Chen a/k/a Allen Chen under oath at a mutually agreeable date, time, and location, or absent such agreement, on Tuesday, November 11 at 9:00 a.m. (EST) at the offices of Radford Scott, LLP, 125 Clairemont Ave., Suite 380, Decatur, Georgia 30030, or via Zoom or a similar tele-videoconference service, and may continue from day to day until completed.

The examination is pursuant to Rule 2004 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure and Local Rule 2004-1 and will be taken before an officer authorized to record the testimony. The scope of the examination shall be as described in Rule

¹ The full list of Labor Plaintiffs includes: Yucong Liu, Cangen Han, Yixiang Zhang, Nan Liu, Shuai Zhang, Yao Yan, Haitao Sun, Jiansheng Yin, Shengxiang Yu, Wen Chen, Shengda Yu, Shun Yu, Shunkui Wang, Jinchao Si, Jiagen Yang, Marianela Pina Yaguari, Yorman Ojeda Herrera, and Eglis Almarza Diaz.

2004. In particular, the Labor Plaintiffs intend to examine Allen Chen on issues concerning:

(1) the merits of the Labor Plaintiffs' claims against Debtors as set forth in the Complaint filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, *Liu, et al. v. Wellmade Industries Mfr. N.A. LLC, et al.*, Case No. 4:25-cv-001340-WMR, including but not limited to the hours worked by Labor Plaintiffs, any compensation paid to them, the job duties performed by them, the existence of any records related thereto, recruiting workers from China to work at the Cartersville Facility, obtaining visas for workers at the Cartersville Facility, the confiscation of passports, worker housing provided by Debtors, injuries at the Cartersville Facility, the Visa Workers' employment agreements, and the ownership of handguns by Debtors' agents;

(2) the operations of the Debtors' business, including the respective roles of various individuals (including Allen Chen's family members) in those operations;

(3) the relative liability of the Debtors and various third-party staffing agencies for the Labor Plaintiffs' claims, including but not limited to the contractual arrangement between the Debtors and any such agencies, the actual division of responsibility, payments between Debtors and any such agencies, and

the Debtors' and any such agencies' respective role in obtaining immigration visas for the workers;

(4) the appropriate damages due to the Labor Plaintiffs' for their claims, including but not limited to financial information necessary to calculate the disgorgement of profits derived from the Debtors' wrongdoing, punitive damages that would sufficiently punish and deter similar wrongdoing, and the cost of labor as a factor in the competitive advantage in the sale of Debtors' products;

(5) the appropriateness and desirability of proceeding on the Labor Plaintiffs' claims via a class action mechanism, including but not limited to the total number of workers similarly-situated to the Labor Plaintiffs as well as the terms and conditions of those workers' employment;

(6) the means by which Debtors communicated with the Labor Plaintiffs and those similarly-situated to them, including the use of both company and personal accounts and devices;

(7) the document retention policies of the Debtors, including but not limited to information about the documents requested as part of this Rule 2004 request as set forth below; and

(8) Allen Chen's search for documents in response to the below requests.

Allen Chen is further requested to deliver to the undersigned counsel on or before Friday, November 7, 2025 at 11:59 p.m. (EST) all of the documents described in the attached Schedule of Documents to Be Produced.

Respectfully submitted this day: October 31, 2025

/s/ Aaron Halegua

Aaron Halegua*

New York Bar No. 4764163

AARON HALEGUA, PLLC

524 Broadway, 11th Floor

New York, New York 10012

Telephone: (646) 854-9061

ah@aaronhalegua.com

*Admitted pro hac vice

/s/ Daniel Werner

Daniel Werner

Georgia Bar No. 422070

dwyer@radfordscott.com

Elaine Woo

Georgia Bar No. 430956

ewoo@radfordscott.com

RADFORD SCOTT LLP

125 Clairemont Ave., Suite 380

Decatur, Georgia 30030

Telephone: (678) 271-0300

/s/ John-Patrick M. Fritz

John-Patrick M. Fritz*

California Bar No. 245240

LEVENE, NEALE, BENDER, YOO &

GOLUBCHIK L.L.P.
2818 La Cienega Ave.
Los Angeles, California 90034
Telephone: (310) 229-1234
jpf@lnbyg.com
*Admitted pro hac vice

Counsel for the Labor Plaintiffs

SCHEDULE OF REQUESTED DOCUMENTS TO BE PRODUCED

Instructions

1. You are required to obtain and furnish all information available to you and any of your representatives, divisions, employees, agents, brokers or servants and to obtain and furnish all information that is in your possession or under your control, or in the possession or under the control of any of your representatives, employees, agents or servants.

2. Each Request which seeks information relating in any way to communications from or within a business or corporate entity, is hereby designated to demand and should be construed to include all communications by and between representatives, employees, agents, brokers or servants of the business or corporate entity.

3. If any document responsive to these Requests is withheld based on a claim of privilege or other protection, for each such document: (i) identify the withheld document--including its general subject matter, its date, its author and its addressee; (ii) state the privilege or other grounds for withholding the document; and (iii) state the factual basis for the claim in sufficient detail so as to permit an adjudication of the validity of the claim.

4. If any documents requested herein have been lost or destroyed, the documents so lost or destroyed shall be identified by author, date and subject matter.

5. With respect to any document requested which was once in your possession, custody or control, but no longer is, please indicate the date the

document ceased to be in your possession, custody or control, the manner in which it ceased to be in your possession, custody and control and the name and address of its present custodian.

6. All documents produced in response to this Request shall be produced in whole, notwithstanding that portions thereof may contain information not requested.

7. Unless otherwise indicated, each Request is to be construed as encompassing all documents that pertain to the stated subject matter and to events that transpired during the relevant period, as defined herein.

8. The relevant period for these Requests shall be from January 1, 2021 to the present.

Definitions

1. Terms not defined herein shall have their plain and ordinary meaning.

2. "Labor Plaintiffs" shall mean all individuals who have filed a Consent to Sue in the District Court Litigation, which presently includes: Yucong Liu, Cangen Han, Yixiang Zhang, Nan Liu, Shuai Zhang, Yao Yan, Haitao Sun, Jiansheng Yin, Shengxiang Yu, Wen Chen, Shengda Yu, Shun Yu, Shunkui Wang, Jinchao Si, Jiagen Yang, Marianela Pina Yaguari, Yorman Ojeda Herrera, and Eglis Almarza Diaz.

3. "Debtors" shall mean Wellmade Industries Mfr. N.A. LLC and Wellmade Floor Coverings International, Inc., as well as and their agents, employees, servants, representatives, officers, directors, affiliates, advisors, attorneys, predecessors and successors in interest and all other persons acting or purporting to act on Debtors' behalf.

4. "Individual Defendants" shall mean Zhu Chen (a/k/a/ George Chen), Jiayi Chen (a/k/a Morgan Chen), Jian Jun Lu, and Ming Chen (a/k/a/ Allen Chen).

5. "District Court Litigation" shall mean the case filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, *Liu, et al. v. Wellmade Industries Mfr. N.A. LLC, et al.*, Case No. 4:25-cv-001340-WMR.

6. “Cartersville Facility” shall mean the factory operated by Debtors in Cartersville, Georgia.

7. “Staffing Agent” or “Staffing Agency” shall mean any individual or entity, including any affiliate or subsidiary, who assisted in recruiting, employing, paying, or supervising any individual to perform work at the Cartersville Facility, including but not limited to at least the following:

- a. Jiangsu Yuanmei Bamboo and Wood Industry Co., Ltd.;
- b. The Tigereye International Trading Co., Ltd.;
- c. Globalone Supply LLC;
- d. Nanjing Yuanmei Bamboo Materails Application Research Institute Co., Ltd.;
- e. Nanjing Huyu Import & Export Co., Ltd.;
- f. Faven LLC;
- g. Danny Herazo Chacuto;
- h. Starwin Service Inc.;
- i. Fusheng Lean Services Inc.;
- j. OSM;
- k. Jiefeng Deng;
- l. Jiawei Shi;
- m. Rong Qi;
- n. Top Gun Staffing Inc.; and/or
- o. Total Talent Search Group.

8. “Labor Claimants” shall mean any individual who performed work at the Cartersville Facility, whether hired directly by Debtors or paid through a Staffing Agency, and therefore includes all Visa Workers and Agency Workers.

9. “Visa Workers” shall mean any Labor Claimant who worked at the Cartersville Facility while in the United States pursuant to a business, work, or other visa.

10. “Agency Workers” shall mean any Labor Claimant who worked at the Cartersville Facility but was recruited or paid by a Staffing Agency.

11. The term “Document” or “Documents” as used herein shall mean all forms of documents or electronically stored information (“ESI”), including but not limited to all writings, correspondence (in the form of facts, ideas, inquiries, or otherwise, sent or received, including but not limited to any oral or electronic

correspondence), computer records, photographs and videos, video-recording, audio-recording, records of meetings and conferences, records of conversations and telephone calls, e-mail, WeChat messages, SMS messages, messages on Facebook Messenger, WhatsApp messages, QQ messages, or other electronic communications, that is in your actual or constructive possession, custody or control, or the existence of which you have knowledge. The term “document” or “documents” as used herein shall also include each copy that is not identical to the original and the preliminary drafts of any document or working paper related thereto.

12. The term “communication” as used herein shall mean the transmission of information (in the form of facts, ideas, inquiries or otherwise).

13. Unless otherwise indicated, the “Relevant Period” shall refer to the period of time between January 1, 2021 and the present.

14. The terms “you,” “your” and “yourself” as used herein, shall mean and refer to Ming Chen (a/k/a/ Allen Chen) and his agents, employees, servants, representatives, officers, directors, affiliates, advisors, attorneys, predecessors and successors in interest and all other persons acting or purporting to act on his behalf.

Document Requests

Wage and Hour, Forced Labor, and Class Issues

1. All Documents concerning the dates and hours worked by the Labor Claimants, including but not limited to time sheets, electronic data, and pay records or invoices with this information.

2. All Documents concerning any salaries, wages, bonuses, reimbursements, or other compensation paid by Debtors, or on behalf of Debtors, to the Labor Claimants.

3. All Documents concerning any deductions made from the wages or salaries paid to any of the Labor Claimants.

4. All Documents concerning the job duties performed by the Labor Claimants.

5. Documents sufficient to show the total number and identity of all Visa Workers at all times during the Relevant Period.

6. Documents sufficient to show the total number and identity of all Agency Workers at all times during the Relevant Period.

7. All Documents concerning the facial recognition system used at the Cartersville Facility, including data collected as to all individuals who entered or left the factory.

8. All Documents concerning any time-keeping system for workers used at the Cartersville Facility, including data collected as to all individuals who entered the factory.

9. All Documents exhibiting the quantity and identity of any individuals who resided at housing owned by or rented by the Debtors during the Relevant Period.

10. Documents sufficient to show the hours worked and wages paid to Debtors' direct employees at the Cartersville Facility for each position.

11. All Documents concerning Debtors' confiscation, possession, or retention of any Labor Claimant's passport, including but not limited to any police reports related to such passports.

12. All Documents concerning workplace safety issues at the the Cartersville Facility, including any OSHA investigation or findings, any injuries sustained by workers at the Cartersville Facility, and workers' compensation insurance policies and records.

Agency Relationships

13. All Documents concerning the Debtors' relationship with any Staffing Agency, including any contracts, agreements, understandings, memorandums, or communications between them.

14. All Documents concerning the individuals who worked at the Cartersville Facility.

15. All invoices or similar documents tendered by any Staffing Agency to Debtors, including accompanying time sheets, work records, or other evidence of work performed.

16. All Documents concerning any payment or transfer of anything of value between Debtors and any Staffing Agency.

17. All Documents concerning the terms under which Visa Workers would provide labor to the Debtors.

18. All Documents concerning the terms under which Agency Workers would provide labor to the Debtors.

19. Any contracts or agreements between Debtors and any Visa Workers or Agency Workers.

20. All Documents concerning any payments made directly by Debtors to any Visa Worker or Agency Worker.

21. All Documents concerning any immigration applications, determinations, or communications regarding any of the Labor Claimants, including documents in the possession of Davis Wright Tremaine or any other agent of Debtors.

22. All Documents concerning any payments made by Debtors to Davis Wright Tremaine.

Company Financials

23. Documents sufficient to show the quarterly and/or annual revenue, expenses, and profits of Debtors during the Relevant Period.

24. Documents sufficient to show all compensation paid by Debtors to each of the Individual Defendants during the Relevant Period, including salary, wages, expense allowances or reimbursements, distributions, returns of principal, or payments to any related parties.

Company Policies and Communications

25. All Documents concerning the Debtors' document retention policies.

26. All Documents exhibiting communications between the Debtors and any of the Visa Workers.

27. All Documents exhibiting communications between the Debtors and any of the Agency Workers.

28. All Documents concerning any WeChat groups in which any of Debtors' direct employees, Visa Workers, and/or Agency Workers participated at any point during the Relevant Period.

Individual Documents

29. Documents sufficient to identify any and all email accounts, telephone numbers, WeChat accounts, or other social media accounts used by You, including personal or company accounts, during the Relevant Period to conduct any affair related to the operations or business of the Debtors.

30. All Documents concerning any WeChat or other messages exchanged between You and the other Individual Defendants concerning any aspect of the Debtors' operations during the Relevant Period.

31. All Documents concerning any WeChat or other messages exchanged between You and any Staffing Agency concerning any aspect of the Debtors' operations during the Relevant Period.

32. All Documents concerning WeChat groups in which You participated and direct employee of Debtors, any Visa Worker, or any Agency Worker participated during the Relevant Period.

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION

In re:

WELLMADE FLOOR COVERINGS
INTERNATIONAL, INC., *et al.*,

Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case No. 25-58764

(Jointly Administered)

CERTIFICATION UNDER BLR 2004-1(a)

I, AARON HALEGUA, hereby declare:

1. I am submitting this Certification in support of the *Labor Plaintiffs' Motion for Rule 2004 Examination and Production of Documents by Debtors and Allen Chen* (the "Motion").¹

2. My law firm, together with Radford Scott LLP, represents the Labor Plaintiffs in this matter.

3. On October 26, 2025, I sent an email to counsel for Debtors and counsel for Allen Chen stating that the Labor Plaintiffs intend to seek examinations of and production of documents from Debtors as well as Allen Chen, pursuant to Rule 2004 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure ("FRBP") and Rule 2004-1 of the Bankruptcy Local Rules ("BLR"). I specified that the scope of these

¹ The defined terms used herein shall have the same meaning as in the Motion, unless otherwise noted. All times stated herein are in Eastern Standard Time, unless otherwise noted.

examinations and document requests is limited to topics related to the Proofs of Claim that need to be filed by November 21, 2025. My email attached drafts of the motions that would be filed seeking permission to conduct the Rule 2004 exams if the Debtors or Allen Chen did not consent, including the Notice detailing the topics for the examination and specific documents that would be requested. I noted the time sensitivity of filing our motion, and therefore provided several time slots on October 27, 2025 for a meet and confer if necessary.

4. Despite the Labor Plaintiffs' willingness to make themselves available for a meet and confer on October 27, 28, or 29, the Debtors stated that they would not be available until October 30, 2025. Since Debtors had three days to prepare for the meet and confer, I requested that Debtors send any objections to our Rule 2004 requests via email in advance of the meet and confer.

5. Counsel for Allen Chen responded to Labor Plaintiffs stating that they anticipated joining the meet and confer scheduled for October 30, 2025. As this seemed to imply that Allen Chen was not consenting to the Rule 2004 exam, I similarly requested that they provide any objections by Allen Chen in writing in advance of the meet and confer.

6. On October 29, 2025 at 8:19 p.m., Debtors emailed Labor Plaintiffs confirming that Debtors would not consent to the proposed Rule 2004 examinations, and outlining Debtors' two main objections—that the pending proceeding rule precluded the Rule 2004 exam, and that Labor Plaintiffs were not

entitled to discovery of putative class members. Debtors stated that they may also have additional objections.

7. I did not receive any written objections from counsel for Allen Chen prior to the meet and confer by the parties.

8. On October 30, 2025 at 9:30 a.m., counsel for Debtors, Creditors, and Allen Chen met and conferred pursuant to BLR 2004-1(a) via Zoom. Debtors were represented by four attorneys from Greenberg Traurig, LLP (John Elrod, Allison McGregor, Rick Bold, and Steven Rosenwasser); Allen Chen was represented by Neal Weinrich and Chad Dunham of Berman Fink Van Horn PC; and the Labor Plaintiffs were represented by myself, Elaine Woo, and J.P. Fritz.

9. The substance of the meet and confer is summarized in the emails that I sent to counsel for Debtors and counsel for Allen Chen memorializing the Zoom call, which are attached as **Exhibit 1** (email to Debtors) and **Exhibit 2** (email to Allen Chen).

10. To summarize, however, during the meet and confer, Labor Plaintiffs offered to limit the scope of their requests to information only pertaining to the Labor Plaintiffs (and not other similarly situated workers), to consent to any procedural safeguards that would be available if the discovery were propounded under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and to limit the initial request to only document requests (not a deposition) for the Debtors. Nonetheless, neither the Debtors nor Allen Chen agreed to any form of discovery. Debtors stated that they

would consider producing the “paystubs” in their possession for the Labor Plaintiffs in exchange for the Labor Plaintiffs not pursuing any other aspects of their Rule 2004 exam or document requests. At the time of the Zoom call, Debtors did not know what wage records they possessed for the Labor Plaintiffs or their contents.

11. As of the filing of this Motion, I have not received any response from Allen Chen’s counsel stating that he disagrees with the representations in my emails memorializing the call. On the morning of October 31, 2025, Debtors provided their response to my email, which is attached as **Exhibit 3**.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
Executed in New York, New York on the 31st day of October, 2025.

/s/ Aaron Halegua

Aaron Halegua
Attorney for Labor Plaintiffs

Exhibit 1



Wellmade - Motions for Rule 2004 Exams of Debtors and Allen Chen

Aaron Halegua <ah@aaronhalegua.com>

Thu, Oct 30, 2025 at 4:17 PM

To: ElrodJ@gtlaw.com

Cc: Allison.McGregor@gtlaw.com, dwerner@radfordscott.com, ewoo@radfordscott.com, mm@aaronhalegua.com, angie@aaronhalegua.com, JPF@lnbyg.com, Rick.Bold@gtlaw.com, Steven.Rosenwasser@gtlaw.com

Dear John,

I am writing to memorialize the meet and confer that took place this morning among counsel for the Labor Plaintiffs ("Plaintiffs"), the Debtors, and counsel for Allen Chen to discuss the Plaintiffs' proposed motions for Rule 2004 examinations of the Debtors and of Allen Chen.

During the call, we discussed the Debtors' objections to the Rule 2004 examination, including objections based on the pending proceeding doctrine, that Plaintiffs should not obtain information regarding individuals they do not currently represent, and that certain materials requested in the proposed Rule 2004 examination are privileged or otherwise inappropriate.

Plaintiffs explained that the requested information is necessary to prepare their proofs of claim by the bar date and to more accurately calculate the damages owed, including disgorgement of profits to which Plaintiffs may be entitled under the Georgia RICO statute. Plaintiffs further noted that case law supports the use of Rule 2004 examinations by creditors to obtain information relevant to their claims.

Plaintiffs also expressed the view that the pending proceeding doctrine does not preclude a Rule 2004 examination in this instance, and the cases previously cited by Debtors are procedurally distinguishable. Plaintiffs explained that due to the automatic stay in place, Plaintiffs are not able to pursue any discovery in the District Court litigation (which is barely a pending matter because the stay came into effect before any answer was filed by Debtors) or any other forum. Plaintiffs also offered to afford the Debtor all protections available for discovery conducted under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure if the Rule 2004 exam proceeds. Plaintiffs further indicated a willingness to limit the scope of the examination to information concerning the Plaintiffs themselves, excluding other members of the putative class, and even to limit the motion to document requests only, reserving deposition testimony for later if necessary.

In response, the Debtors stated that because Plaintiffs have already filed a complaint in the District Court—and that filing is governed by Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Plaintiffs must already possess sufficient information to file their proofs of claim and therefore do not require additional discovery. Regarding damages, the Debtors argued that Plaintiffs could file "unliquidated" claims and thus discovery was unnecessary. Plaintiffs acknowledged that while they do have some information, significant materials—such as time sheets, wage

payment records, agreements with staffing agencies, and the Debtors' financial records—are solely in the Debtors' possession and are necessary for Plaintiffs' expert to calculate disgorgement of profits. Plaintiffs asked whether Debtors would agree not to object to the Plaintiffs' proofs of claim since Debtor believed that Plaintiffs already possess all relevant information, but Debtors did not agree and stated that they believed Plaintiffs' claims lacked merit.

The Debtors ultimately offered to provide only the “paystubs” they have for the Plaintiffs, in exchange for Plaintiffs foregoing the remaining document requests and the examination contemplated by the Rule 2004 motion. When Plaintiffs sought clarification, it became apparent that the Debtors were uncertain about the specific records they possess regarding wage payments. Plaintiffs stated that if they could review a redacted sample of those records, they would consider the proposal, though it was unlikely that such documents alone would be sufficient. The Debtors stated that they would not consider producing any other documents. Plaintiffs made clear that they do not intend to delay filing their motion, and therefore, if the Debtors wish for Plaintiffs to consider their proposal, the redacted sample should be provided today.

If I have mischaracterized any part of our discussion, please let me know your specific disagreements by the end of today. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Aaron Halegua

[Quoted text hidden]

Exhibit 2



Wellmade - Motions for Rule 2004 Exams of Debtors and Allen Chen

Aaron Halegua <ah@aaronhalegua.com>

Thu, Oct 30, 2025 at 4:19 PM

To: Neal Weinrich <NWeinrich@bfvlaw.com>

Cc: Kenneth Winkler <KWinkler@bfvlaw.com>, Daniel Werner <dwerner@radfordscott.com>, Elaine Woo <ewoo@radfordscott.com>, Madeleine McKenzie <mm@aaronhalegua.com>, Angie Liao <angie@aaronhalegua.com>, "John-Patrick M. Fritz" <JPF@lnbyg.com>, "Chad W. Dunham" <cdunham@bfvlaw.com>

Dear Neal,

I am writing to memorialize the meet and confer that took place this morning among counsel for the Labor Plaintiffs ("Plaintiffs"), the Debtors, and yourself, as counsel for Allen Chen, to discuss the Plaintiffs' proposed motions for Rule 2004 examinations of the Debtors and of Mr. Chen.

During the call, you stated that you take the same position as the Debtors with respect to the Rule 2004 examination of Mr. Chen. You stated that Plaintiffs do not need the requested information because they already have sufficient information to file a proof of claim and can file an unliquidated claim. Therefore, you believe that the request is "improper." You also stated that you were unsure whether Mr. Chen possesses any information beyond what the Debtors would provide. Plaintiffs responded that, because Mr. Chen was at Wellmade since the company's inception and during the period when Plaintiffs were employed there (unlike the CRM), Mr. Chen likely has information that the Debtors do not. I do not believe you responded to this point.

I also asked whether there were any conditions or modifications to our Rule 2004 examination requests that might allow you to agree to some form of discovery involving your client. You stated that there were not.

If I have mischaracterized any part of our discussion, please let me know your specific disagreements by the end of today. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Aaron Halegua

[Quoted text hidden]

Exhibit 3



Aaron Halegua <aaron.halegua@gmail.com>

RE: Wellmade - Motions for Rule 2004 Exams of Debtors and Allen Chen

Steven.Rosenwasser@gtlaw.com <Steven.Rosenwasser@gtlaw.com>

Fri, Oct 31, 2025 at 5:24 AM

To: ah@aaronhalegua.com, ElrodJ@gtlaw.com

Cc: Allison.McGregor@gtlaw.com, dwerner@radfordscott.com, ewoo@radfordscott.com, mm@aaronhalegua.com, angie@aaronhalegua.com, JPF@lnbyg.com, Rick.Bold@gtlaw.com

Aaron,

Thank you for your email below. As you know, we have a lengthy discussion on these issues. We do not think it is appropriate to now go through each side's arguments in writing. It is inefficient and unnecessary. For that reason, we do not intend to, and will not, address each of your points below. The fact that we do not address a particular point does *not* mean we agree with your characterization of our position and you should not represent your email as accurately reflecting our discussions.

I think it is fair to state that we had a lengthy discussion on the issues and we materially disagreed with your positions. As a threshold matter, the Rule 2004 examinations you are seeking to take are barred under the pending proceeding doctrine.

Further, the information you have indicated you seek in the Rule 2004 examinations is not information needed to file a proof of claim, but rather information you want for purposes of your (stayed) litigation. That is improper.

Moreover, I explained, in detail, why the topics of the proposed Rule 2004 examination are improper. Among other things, they (1) seek attorney-client privileged or work product information; (2) seek legal opinions and conclusions about class certification and other legal issues; and (3) are overly broad and do not allow us to sufficiently prepare a witness (for example, most topics say "including but not limited to" which does not provide the requisite specificity).

While we disagreed with your positions for the reasons set forth above and many others, we indicated that we *might* be willing to provide you with pay stubs and/or timesheets for the named plaintiffs only if such information is reasonably available and you agree not to seek any of the Rule 2004 examinations or other documents. John Elrod is working on this issue and will follow up shortly.

Thanks,

Steven

Steven J. Rosenwasser
Shareholder

Greenberg Traurig, LLP
Terminus 200
3333 Piedmont Road NE | Suite 2500 | Atlanta, GA 30305
T +1 678.553.7388 | F 678.553.7313
rosenwassers@gtlaw.com | www.gtlaw.com | [View GT Biography](#)

From: Aaron Halegua <ah@aaronhalegua.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2025 4:18 PM
To: Elrod, John (Shld-ATL-RSS) <ElrodJ@gtlaw.com>
Cc: McGregor, Allison J. (Assoc-ATL-RSS) <Allison.McGregor@gtlaw.com>;
dwyer@radfordscott.com; ewoo@radfordscott.com; mm@aaronhalegua.com;
angie@aaronhalegua.com; JPF@lnbyg.com; Bold, Rick (Shld-ATL-LT) <Rick.Bold@gtlaw.com>;
Rosenwasser, Steven J. (Shld-ATL-LT) <Steven.Rosenwasser@gtlaw.com>
Subject: Re: Wellmade - Motions for Rule 2004 Exams of Debtors and Allen Chen

Dear John,

I am writing to memorialize the meet and confer that took place this morning among counsel for the Labor Plaintiffs ("Plaintiffs"), the Debtors, and counsel for Allen Chen to discuss the Plaintiffs' proposed motions for Rule 2004 examinations of the Debtors and of Allen Chen.

During the call, we discussed the Debtors' objections to the Rule 2004 examination, including objections based on the pending proceeding doctrine, that Plaintiffs should not obtain information regarding individuals they do not currently represent, and that certain materials requested in the proposed Rule 2004 examination are privileged or otherwise inappropriate.

Plaintiffs explained that the requested information is necessary to prepare their proofs of claim by the bar date and to more accurately calculate the damages owed, including disgorgement of profits to which Plaintiffs may be entitled under the Georgia RICO statute. Plaintiffs further noted that case law supports the use of Rule 2004 examinations by creditors to obtain information relevant to their claims.

Plaintiffs also expressed the view that the pending proceeding doctrine does not preclude a Rule 2004 examination in this instance, and the cases previously cited by Debtors are procedurally distinguishable. Plaintiffs explained that due to the automatic stay in place, Plaintiffs are not able to pursue any discovery in the District Court litigation (which is barely a pending matter because the stay came into effect before any answer was filed by Debtors) or any other forum. Plaintiffs also offered to afford the Debtor all protections available for discovery conducted under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure if the Rule 2004 exam proceeds. Plaintiffs further indicated a willingness to limit the scope of the examination to information concerning the Plaintiffs themselves, excluding other members of the putative class,

and even to limit the motion to document requests only, reserving deposition testimony for later if necessary.

In response, the Debtors stated that because Plaintiffs have already filed a complaint in the District Court—and that filing is governed by Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—Plaintiffs must already possess sufficient information to file their proofs of claim and therefore do not require additional discovery. Regarding damages, the Debtors argued that Plaintiffs could file “unliquidated” claims and thus discovery was unnecessary. Plaintiffs acknowledged that while they do have some information, significant materials—such as time sheets, wage payment records, agreements with staffing agencies, and the Debtors’ financial records—are solely in the Debtors’ possession and are necessary for Plaintiffs’ expert to calculate disgorgement of profits. Plaintiffs asked whether Debtors would agree not to object to the Plaintiffs’ proofs of claim since Debtor believed that Plaintiffs already possess all relevant information, but Debtors did not agree and stated that they believed Plaintiffs’ claims lacked merit.

The Debtors ultimately offered to provide only the “paystubs” they have for the Plaintiffs, in exchange for Plaintiffs foregoing the remaining document requests and the examination contemplated by the Rule 2004 motion. When Plaintiffs sought clarification, it became apparent that the Debtors were uncertain about the specific records they possess regarding wage payments. Plaintiffs stated that if they could review a redacted sample of those records, they would consider the proposal, though it was unlikely that such documents alone would be sufficient. The Debtors stated that they would not consider producing any other documents. Plaintiffs made clear that they do not intend to delay filing their motion, and therefore, if the Debtors wish for Plaintiffs to consider their proposal, the redacted sample should be provided today.

If I have mischaracterized any part of our discussion, please let me know your specific disagreements by the end of today. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Aaron Halegua

On Wed, Oct 29, 2025 at 8:19 PM <ElrodJ@gtlaw.com> wrote:

Aaron –

The Debtors do not consent to the proposed Rule 2004 exams for several reasons, as outlined below.

First, the motions violate the pending proceeding rule. As you know, your clients commenced litigation prior to the filing of the Debtors’ bankruptcy cases. This forecloses Rule 2004 discovery.

Under the pending proceeding rule, once a separate matter has been commenced (whether in an adversary proceeding, a contested matter, or, like here, a non-bankruptcy forum such as a federal district court), discovery should be made pursuant to the discovery rules applicable to the separate proceeding, and not through Rule 2004. See *Akins v. Akins (In re Akins)*, 2013 Bankr. LEXIS 5061, *3 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. 2013) (“This Court has long held that the application of the Federal Rules of