YOUNG CONAWAY

WILMINGTON
RODNEY SQUARE

NEW YORK
ROCKEFELLER CENTER

CHARLOTTE
CARILLON TOWER

Allison S. Mielke
P 302.571.6565
amielke@ycst.com

September 24, 2026

FILED VIA CM/ECF

The Honorable Laurie Selber Silverstein
United States Bankruptcy Court
for the District of Delaware
824 N. Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

Re: *In re Leisure Investments Holdings LLC, et al.*
Case No. 25-10606 (LSS)

Dear Judge Silverstein:

The debtors and debtors in possession (collectively, the "**Debtors**") in the above-chapter 11 cases request a status conference at the Court's earliest convenience in connection with Your Honor's *Order (I) Enforcing (A) the Automatic Stay and (B) the Court's Order Compelling Debtors' Former Officers and Other Required Persons to Turn Over Records, and (II) Granting Related Relief* [Docket No. 205] (the "**Stay Enforcement Order**") entered on June 5, 2025. The Debtors submit further sanctions, including an injunction against Mr. Albor's further participation in these chapter 11 cases and issuance of a warrant for civil confinement, are necessary and appropriate to address Mr. Albor's ongoing contempt.

Mr. Albor continues to further interfere in direct and continued violation of the Stay Enforcement Order. The Debtors are in receipt of an email sent by Mr. Albor on September 18, 2026, purportedly as the "duly authorized legal representative of Controladora," to the purchaser of Dolphin Discovery Vallarta, Tresmare, S.A. de C.V. ("**Tresmare**"). In that email, Mr. Albor claims that the

purchase agreement cannot be performed and directs Tresmare to withhold payment otherwise due under the agreement. Copies of the original Spanish-language email and a machine-translated English version are attached hereto. Mr. Albor's actions directly contravene this Court's *Order (I) Approving Sale of Assets and Shares and Assignment of Rights of Dolphin Discovery Vallarta Free and Clear of Liens and Other Encumbrances, and (II) Granting Related Relief* [Docket No. 1493], entered on September 9, 2026, approving the Vallarta sale, and they further represent a continued and willful violation of the Stay Enforcement Order.

Further, Mr. Albor's correspondence to Tresmare contradicts assurances made by his counsel to this Court that Mr. Albor would cease communications purportedly on behalf of Controladora after the issuance of an order by the Tenth Civil Court of the Superior Court of Justice of Mexico City denying Mr. Albor's request to be recognized as an authorized representative of Controladora, suspending the legal effects of Mr. Albor's unauthorized shareholder resolutions, and finding that Mr. Albor had violated prior orders requiring Mr. Albor to refrain from holding himself out as a representative of the Debtors (see Exhibits A-C of *Notice of Filing of Mexican Court Orders Invalidating Alleged Shareholder Resolutions Published by Eduardo Albor Villanueva* [Docket No. 1467]).[1]

Finally, Mr. Albor has not only continued unauthorized communications purportedly on behalf of Controladora, but he has failed to abide by the *Order on Finding of Contempt* [Docket No. 1479] (the "**Contempt Order**") entered on September 4, 2026 by failing to make the required sanctions payment by September 18, 2026. Rather, Mr. Albor sought to pursue an appeal of the Contempt order on the final day to make such sanctions payment. The Debtors reserve all rights and remedies as against this meritless appeal, but Mr. Albor's defiant and continued refusal to comply with this Court's orders warrants other and further sanctions. The Court expressed its skepticism in its *Memorandum* [Docket No. 1478] that accompanied the Contempt Order that monetary sanctions would deter

[1] *See* Transcript of Show Cause Hearing at 37: 3-19 (August 31, 2026) (emphasis added): MR. PINKUS: . . . [Mr. Albor] felt under Mexican law that he was now the CEO again of the company and, therefore, he had a right and a duty to protect the company itself because he is now a shareholder, or he's now the CEO. So he had a duty to do so. Again, if it's in violation of your order, it would be a 10-day violation of your order because he no longer is in that position. So you do mention about curative and purging and things like that. The most recent order, even though we may not agree with it, and we don't have any proof that it was registered or anything like that, that it would act as a curative effect for his actions. So again, I – **THE COURT: You think that Mr. Albor is going to stop communicating with his employees? MR. PINKUS: I think if this gets registered with the court in Mexico and he's no longer in that position, he will.**

Mr. Albor from violating the Court's orders, which, unfortunately, appears to have been warranted skepticism.

Bankruptcy courts derive their authority to impose restrictions on a party's participation in a bankruptcy case from their inherent power under 11 U.S.C. § 105(a), which allows courts to issue orders necessary to carry out the Bankruptcy Code, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a). Bankruptcy courts utilize the authority of section 105(a) to impose civil sanctions on parties for violations of court orders.[2] The Debtors submit that the Court should exercise that power and now impose further sanctions in response to Mr. Albor's continuing misconduct. As previously noted, the Court can, and in the Debtors' view should, exclude Mr. Albor from participation in further proceedings until he complies with this Court's orders.[3]

Further, the Court can, and in the Debtors' view should, exercise its inherent authority to issue a bench warrant for civil confinement, for which Mr. Albor may secure his release upon actual, non-falsified, compliance with the Court's prior orders.[4] Bankruptcy courts facing obstinate parties who fail to respond to less coercive sanctions, which is the case here, have found that given continued obstinance, and either the failure or unavailability of other sanctions, issuance of

---

[2] *In re Vaso Pharms., Inc.*, 514 B.R. 416, 421 (Bankr. D. Del. 2014); *EHT US1, Inc. v. EHT Asset Mgmt., LLC*, 633 B.R. 223, 232 (Bankr. D. Del. 2021).

[3] *See In re Fleming Companies, Inc.*, 444 B.R. 127, 136 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011) (finding that in the case of a party who repeatedly attempted to block and hinder efforts to conclude chapter 11 cases, had failed to comply with court orders, including orders requiring payment of sanctions, and had threatened to continue vexatious litigation, "the Court may issue an injunction to require litigants who have engaged in abusive, groundless, and vexatious litigation to obtain approval of the court before filing further complaints.") (citing *Zahl v. Harper*, No. 10-2021, 2010 WL 4948958, at *6 (3d Cir. Dec. 7, 2010); *In re Stimwave Techs., Inc*., No. 22-10541 (TMH), 2024 WL 717770 (Bankr. D. Del. Feb. 21, 2024), aff'd sub nom. *In re Stimwave Techs. Inc. Perryman v. Province, LLC*, No. 22-10541 (TMH), 2024 WL 4626221 (D. Del. Oct. 30, 2024) (holding that any proposed filings by the litigants and their related entities are subject to screening by the court before such filings would be permitted to occur); *In re Mo,* 650 B.R. 193, 221–25 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2023) (prohibiting further filings where vexatious litigant revisited resolved issues, evaded court orders, defied court's effort to impose restraint on proceedings, and created a confused and duplicative docket); *In re Kovalchick*, 371 B.R. 54, 60–62 (Bankr. M.D. Pa. 2006) (imposing a filing prohibition based on repeated proceedings, sanctions motions, recusal requests, and attempts to relitigate substantially the same disputes).

[4] *See* Order on Finding of Contempt, *Byju's Alpha, Inc.v. Camshaft Capital Fund, LP (In re Byju's Alpha, Inc.*), Adv. No. 24-50013, (Dkt. No. 80) (Bankr. D. Del. March 14, 2024) (holding that "[t]he Court will issue a separate bench warrant for civil confinement. Mr. Morton may secure his release upon compliance with the March 1 Order."). A copy of this order is attached hereto.

such a warrant for civil confinement is "the only alternative" and "the only appropriate sanction given [contemnor's] exhibited behavior."[5]

As Your Honor heard during the sale hearing held on September 9, 2026, the Debtors are operating with extremely limited liquidity, and Mr. Albor's continued interference further depletes the estates' already scarce resources and jeopardizes the welfare of the animals remaining in the Debtors' care. Moreover, Mr. Albor's persistent and vexatious filings, coupled with his ongoing disregard of this Court's orders governing his conduct, warrant his exclusion from further participation in these proceedings in light of his complete disregard and contempt of this Court and its orders.

Accordingly, the Debtors respectfully request the Court set a status conference to discuss these issues.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Allison S. Mielke
Allison S. Mielke

cc: Albor's Counsel (via electronic mail)

Enclosures: Letter sent by Mr. Albor to Tresmare, S.A. de C.V. (Spanish and machine-translated English) (Sept. 18, 2026).
Order on Finding of Contempt, *Byju's Alpha, Inc.v. Camshaft Capital Fund, LP (In re Byju's Alpha, Inc.)*, Adv. No. 24-50013, Dkt. No. 80 (Bankr. D.Del. March 14, 2024).

[5] *In re Tat*e, 521 B.R. 427, 448 (Bankr. S.D. Ga. 2014), citing *In re Frankel*, 192 B.R. 623,632 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1996); see also *In re 1990's Caterers Ltd.*, 531 B.R. 309, 320–21 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. 2015)("Having considered this serious matter in great detail, this Court concludes that there is no available lesser sanction than the coercive sanction of incarceration; given [contemnor's] conduct and his ignorance of prior monetary sanctions, it is extremely unlikely that any increased monetary sanctions would improve the likelihood of his compliance. He has exhibited a clear pattern of noncompliance and utter disregard for this Court's Orders, and the dignity of the judicial process.")

Greecher, Sean

From: *EDUARDO ALBOR dolphincancun@gmail.com*
Date: *September 18, 2026, at 2:03:50 p.m. GMT-6*
To: *marianapadillaa@gmail.com*
Cc: *jorge.quintanilladieck@gmail.com*
Subject: RE: NOTICE OF SUSPENSION OF CONTRACT WITH TRESMARE

MS. MARIANA PADILLA T
RESMARE, S.A. DE C.V.

Dear Ms. Padilla:

Pursuant to the provisions of Clause Thirteen of the Framework Agreement for the Sale of Assets, Shares, and Assignment of Rights dated July 16, 2026 (the "Agreement"), entered into between CONTROLADORA DOLPHIN, S.A. DE C.V. ("Controladora" or "CD"), as the prospective seller, and TRESMARE, S.A. DE C.V. ("Tresmare"), as the prospective buyer, I hereby, in my capacity as duly authorized legal representative of Controladora, formally bring the following matters to your attention:

1. Commercial Insolvency Proceedings and Rulings of the Eighth Collegiate Circuit Court.
By means of rulings issued in Case No. 393/2025, dated March 31 and September 3, 2026, the Eighth Collegiate Circuit Court set aside the withdrawal filed in connection with Controladora's petition for commercial insolvency proceedings (concurso mercantil), which was pending before the Second Federal District Court for Commercial Insolvency Matters under Case No. 1/2025, together with all consequences arising from the holding that Controladora had withdrawn such petition, and ordered that the proceedings and resolution of the motion concerning the company's corporate authority and representation be continued. As a result of these rulings, a substantial legal issue currently exists regarding the validity and/or reinstatement of the provisional injunctive measures (medidas cautelares) ordered as of January 28, 2025, within the commercial insolvency proceedings, including restrictions on the disposition and transfer of certain assets of Controladora. The impact of such measures on the transaction contemplated under the Agreement shall be determined in accordance with Mexican law and the status of the insolvency proceedings in Mexico.

2. Scope of the Order Issued by the Delaware Bankruptcy Court.
On September 9, 2026, the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware entered an order authorizing the transaction relating to Vallarta under United States bankruptcy law. However, such order has no binding effect on Mexican governmental authorities, nor does it eliminate or supersede any authorizations, consents, registrations, permits, notarial acts, or other requirements mandated under Mexican law; nor does it conclusively resolve the pending disputes in Mexico concerning corporate governance or corporate authority. Accordingly, the Delaware Order may be rendered null and void to the extent that Mexican courts determine that the relevant shareholders' meetings and unanimous resolutions (RUAs) are invalid and, consequently, that the persons who initiated the bankruptcy proceedings in Delaware lacked legitimate authority to do so.
Therefore, the Delaware Order does not, standing alone, constitute a determination that all transfers and acts contemplated under the Agreement may be consummated and take full legal effect in Mexico. A substantial legal issue accordingly remains outstanding with respect to whether the transaction may be validly consummated under Mexican law and, consequently, with respect to satisfaction of the condition precedent set forth in Clause Six of the Agreement.

3. Authority to Execute and Consummate the Transaction.
Since April 2025, a judicial dispute has persisted concerning the validity of the Unanimous Resolutions of the Shareholders of Controladora dated March 28, 2025, and, consequently, concerning the authority derived directly or indirectly therefrom to act on behalf of and in representation of Controladora.
This matter remains pending before the competent Mexican courts and may affect both the validity and enforceability of the Agreement and the authority of any persons purporting to perform the acts required for its consummation, including, without limitation, stock endorsements, corporate resolutions, amendments to corporate records and share registries, and all other instruments of transfer. Such dispute gives rise to material uncertainty as to the validity and enforceability of the Agreement.

4. Risk to Tresmare Arising from Payment of the Total Purchase Price.

We consider it particularly important to bring to your attention that the foregoing circumstances may materially affect Tresmare's ability to obtain, in Mexico, valid title to and the full exercise of the rights pertaining to the shares, assets, and other rights that are the subject matter of the Agreement.
Pursuant to the terms of the Agreement, Tresmare is required to remit the Total Purchase Price of U.S. $2,000,000.00, and Controladora is not obligated to deliver possession, titles, endorsements, assignments, or any other instruments of transfer until such price has been paid in full and such funds are available. Furthermore, certain acts, registrations, and authorizations necessary to give full effect to the transaction in Mexico may only be carried out or initiated following Closing. Moreover, given that the Provisional Injunctive Measures (PIMs) dated June 28, 2025, remain in full force and effect, and for so long as the legal issues described above regarding the commercial insolvency proceedings, the injunctive measures, and the authority to dispose of Controladora's assets and shares remain unresolved, there exists a material risk that Tresmare would remit the U.S. $2,000,000.00 without any certainty that it will be able to validly acquire in Mexico all of the shares, assets, and rights contemplated under the Agreement, be recognized as the legitimate holder thereof, or fully exercise the corresponding corporate, economic, administrative, and operational rights.
The Delaware Order does not eliminate this risk, as such order expressly preserves the requirements of Mexican law and the actions of Mexican governmental authorities.

Accordingly, given that a Mexican court order prohibiting the sale of assets remains in full force and effect, and that the legitimate representation and authority of Controladora remains the subject of pending litigation, the Agreement cannot be performed, the consideration contemplated thereunder cannot be delivered, and no payment whatsoever may be received from your principal.

Controladora and the undersigned, acting pursuant to duly granted authority, expressly reserve all rights, claims, actions, and defenses available under Mexican law and all other applicable legislation.

This communication is made in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement and supersedes any and all prior communications that contradict, in whole or in part, the information set forth herein.

We would appreciate your confirming receipt of this communication by the same means, and we remain available to address any questions or requests for clarification regarding the content hereof.

Respectfully yours,
Eduardo Albor
Legal Representative Controladora Dolphin, S.A. de C.V.

De: EDUARDO ALBOR <dolphincancun@gmail.com>
Fecha: 18 de septiembre de 2026 a las 2:03:50 p.m. GMT-6
Para: marianapadillaa@gmail.com
Cc: jorge.quintanilladieck@gmail.com
Asunto: RV: AVISO DE SUSPENSION DE CONTRATO CON TRES MARE

SRA. MARIANA PADILLA
TRESMARE, S.A. DE C.V.

Estimada Sra. Padilla:

De conformidad con lo establecido en la Cláusula Décima Tercera del Contrato Marco de Compraventa de Activos, Acciones y Cesión de Derechos de fecha 16 de julio de 2026 (el "Contrato"), celebrado entre CONTROLADORA DOLPHIN, S.A. DE C.V. ("Controladora" o "CD"), como promitente vendedora, y TRESMARE, S.A. DE C.V. ("Tresmare"), como promitente compradora, por este medio y en mi carácter de apoderado legal de Controladora me permito hacer formalmente de su conocimiento lo siguiente:

1. Concurso Mercantil y resoluciones del Octavo Tribunal Colegiado.

Mediante resoluciones dictadas dentro del expediente 393/2025, de fechas 31 de marzo y 3 de septiembre de 2026, el Octavo Tribunal Colegiado de Circuito dejó insubsistente el desistimiento presentado respecto de la solicitud de Concurso Mercantil de Controladora, tramitada ante el Juzgado Segundo de Distrito en Materia de Concursos Mercantiles bajo el expediente 1/2025, así como las consecuencias derivadas de haberse tenido a Controladora por desistida, y ordenó continuar la tramitación y resolución del incidente relativo a la autoridad y representación de la sociedad. Como consecuencia de dichas resoluciones, existe actualmente una cuestión jurídica sustancial respecto de la vigencia y/o restablecimiento de las medidas cautelares decretadas desde el 28 de enero de 2025 dentro del Concurso Mercantil, entre las cuales se encuentran restricciones a la disposición y transmisión de determinados activos de Controladora. La incidencia de dichas medidas sobre la operación contemplada en el Contrato deberá determinarse conforme al derecho mexicano y el estado del proceso de insolvencia en Mexico.

2. Alcance de la Orden dictada en Delaware.
El 9 de septiembre de 2026, la Corte de Quiebras de los Estados Unidos para el Distrito de Delaware emitió un acuerdo, autorizando la operación relativa a Vallarta bajo la legislación concursal estadounidense. Sin embargo, dicha resoluciobn no tiene efecto sobre las autoridades gubernamentales mexicanas, ni elimina autorizaciones, consentimientos, registros, permisos, actos notariales u otros requisitos exigidos por el derecho mexicano, ni tampoco determina definitivamente las controversias existentes en México respecto de gobierno corporativo o autoridad, por lo que pudiera ser nulo si tribunales mexicanos resuelven la nulidad de las asambleas y Ruas y con ello de la representacion de quienes iniciaron el proceso de bancarrota en Delaware de manera ilegitima.
Por consiguiente, la Orden de Delaware no constituye por sí sola una determinación de que todas las transmisiones y actos contemplados en el Contrato puedan consumarse y surtir plenos efectos jurídicos en México. Subsiste, por tanto, una cuestión jurídica sustancial respecto de la posibilidad de consumar válidamente la operación bajo el derecho mexicano y, consecuentemente, respecto del cumplimiento de la Condición Suspensiva contemplada en la Cláusula Sexta del Contrato.

3. Autoridad para celebrar y consumar la operación.
Desde abril de 2025 persiste una controversia judicial respecto de la validez de las Resoluciones Unánimes de Accionistas de Controladora de fecha 28 de marzo de 2025 y, consecuentemente, respecto de la autoridad derivada directa o indirectamente de dichas resoluciones para actuar en nombre y representación de Controladora.
Dicha cuestión continúa pendiente de resolución por los tribunales mexicanos competentes y puede incidir tanto en la validez y eficacia del Contrato, como en la autoridad de quienes pretendan realizar los actos necesarios para su consumación, incluyendo endosos de acciones, resoluciones corporativas, modificaciones a los libros sociales y demás instrumentos de transmisión, lo que representa una incertidumbre en la validez y eficacia en dicho contrato.

4. Riesgo para Tresmare derivado del pago del Precio Total.
Consideramos particularmente importante hacer de su conocimiento que estas circunstancias pueden incidir materialmente en la posibilidad de que Tresmare obtenga en México la titularidad y el pleno ejercicio de los derechos correspondientes a las

acciones, activos y demás derechos objeto del Contrato.
Conforme a los términos del propio Contrato, Tresmare deberá efectuar el pago del Precio Total de US$2,000,000.00, y Controladora no se encuentra obligada a entregar posesión, títulos, endosos, cesiones o demás instrumentos de transmisión sino hasta que dicho precio haya sido íntegramente pagado y se encuentre disponible. Asimismo, determinados actos, registros y autorizaciones necesarios para hacer plenamente efectiva la operación en México únicamente pueden realizarse o tramitarse después del Cierre. Mas aun, considerando que las PIMs del 28 de Juinio del 2025 se encuentra activas, En consecuencia, mientras subsistan las cuestiones jurídicas antes señaladas respecto del Concurso Mercantil, las medidas cautelares y la autoridad para disponer de los bienes y acciones de Controladora, existe el riesgo de que Tresmare entregue los US$2,000,000.00 sin tener certeza de que podrá adquirir válidamente en México la totalidad de las acciones, activos y derechos contemplados en el Contrato, ser reconocida como legítima titular de los mismos y ejercer plenamente los correspondientes derechos corporativos, económicos, administrativos y operativos.
La resolucion de Delaware no elimina este riesgo, ya que la propia resolucion preserva expresamente los requisitos del derecho mexicano y la actuación de las autoridades mexicanas.

Por lo tanto, al estar vigente una orden del tribunal mexicano que prohibe venta de activos y al estar aun en litigio la representacion legitima de Controladora, no se puede ejecutar el Contrato ni emtregar lo ofrecido, mucho menos recibir ningun pago de su representada.

Controladora y quien suscribe con la representacion legitimamente oorgada, se reservan expresamente todos los derechos, acciones y defensas que correspondan conforme al derecho mexicano y demás legislación aplicable.

Esta comunicacion se hace de conformidad con lo estipulado en el Contraton y deja sin efecto cualquier otra previa, que contradiga en todo o en parte lo que aqui se le informa.

Agradeceré confirmar por este mismo medio la recepción de la presente comunicación y quedo a su disposición para cualquier aclaración respecto de su contenido.

Atentamente,

Eduardo Albor
Apoderado Legal
Controladora Dolphin, S.A. de C.V.

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:	)	Chapter 11
	)	
BYJU'S ALPHA, INC.,	)	Case No. 24-10140 (JTD)
	)	
Debtor.	)	
	)	
BYJU'S ALPHA, INC.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Adv. Proc. No. 24-50013(JTD)
	)	
CAMSHAFT CAPITAL FUND, LP, *et al.*,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	**Re: Adv. D.I. Nos. 7, 22, 28, 46**

ORDER ON FINDING OF CONTEMPT

Debtor BYJU's Alpha, Inc. ("Debtor"), was a special purpose financing vehicle formed in September 2021 to borrow $1.2 billion in five-year term loans. Following a series of defaults and disputes with management, the Debtor's lenders took control of the company. With new management in place, the lenders learned that the Debtor's sole asset -- approximately $533 million in cash previously in the Debtor's possession (the "Assets") -- had been transferred to defendant Camshaft Capital Fund, LP, a hedge fund operated by a single individual, William Cameron Morton ("Mr. Morton").

On the same day that Debtor filed their chapter 11 petition for bankruptcy, Debtor commenced this adversary proceeding against Camshaft Capital Fund, LP, Camshaft Capital Advisors, LLC, Camshaft Capital Management, LLC (collectively "Camshaft") seeking to avoid the transfers as fraudulent. Shortly thereafter, Debtor filed an Emergency Motion for Limited

Expedited Discovery (Adv. D.I. 7), to which Camshaft objected. Following a hearing on February 16, 2024, Debtor's motion was granted, and Debtor issued its discovery to Camshaft.

On February 27, 2024, the Court held a status conference, at the urgent request of the Debtor, to discuss deficiencies in Camshaft's discovery responses. The parties agreed to continue discussions, but the next day Camshaft filed an Emergency Motion for Protective Order, seeking to limit the information it was required to share with the Debtor. (Adv. D.I. 28).

At a hearing on March 1, 2024, the Court denied Camshaft's motion and ordered Camshaft, through its controlling individual, Mr. Morton, to produce all the information requested by Debtor by the end of the day (the "March 1 Order"). The Court further ordered that if the information was not produced, a hearing would be held on March 4, 2024, to discuss whether an order to show cause would be issued. Though Mr. Morton was not ordered to appear at the March 4 hearing, the Court directed Camshaft's counsel to advise Mr. Morton that his presence was requested by the Court and that it would be in his best interest to attend.

Camshaft failed to comply with the March 1 Order. Accordingly, on March 4, 2024, yet another hearing was held. Counsel for Camshaft informed the Court that they advised Mr. Morton to comply with the Court's March 1 Order and produce the information requested by the Debtors but he refused. Counsel confirmed that the information sought is exclusively in Mr. Morton's possession and that without Mr. Morton's cooperation, the discovery that has been propounded on Camshaft cannot be answered.

In light of the failure of Camshaft, acting by and through its sole officer Mr. Morton, to comply with the Court's March 1 Order, the Court issued an Order to Show Cause ("Show Cause Order")(Adv. D.I. 56), directing Mr. Morton to appear in person on March 14, 2024, at 10:00 a.m. in Courtroom 5 of the United States Bankruptcy Court in Wilmington, Delaware, and show

cause why he and Camshaft should not be held in civil contempt of Court for their failure to comply with this Court's order. The Show Cause Order included notice that the Court would consider all possible sanctions against Camshaft and Mr. Morton, including placing Mr. Morton in civil confinement until he purges himself of such contempt.

A show cause hearing was held on March 14, 2024. Mr. Morton failed to appear as ordered and failed to comply with this Court's order to produce the information requested by the Debtor.

Based upon Mr. Morton's repeated and continued inaction, it is clear that he believes he is exempt from compliance with this Court's orders. His non-compliance is interfering with the Debtor's ability to properly administer its bankruptcy estate.

Accordingly, it is therefore **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED** that:

1. Camshaft and Mr. Morton are in contempt of court by refusing to produce the information sought in discovery, as directed in the March 1 Order. As monetary sanctions for their contempt, **Camshaft and Mr. Morton shall each remit to the Clerk of Court the sum of $10,000 for each day they remain in contempt of the Court's March 1 Order.** These monetary sanctions shall begin on this day and shall accrue each day thereafter until: (i) the Debtor confirms receipt of the information Camshaft was ordered to produce; and (ii) all fines which have accrued are paid to the Clerk of the Bankruptcy Court in cash or certified funds.

2. The Clerk of the Bankruptcy Court shall serve the U.S. Marshals Service with a certified copy of this Order immediately upon it being filed on the docket in this case.

3. The Court will issue a separate bench warrant for civil confinement. Mr. Morton may secure his release upon compliance with the March 1 Order.

Dated: March 14, 2024

JOHN T. DORSEY, U.S.B.J.