OBJECTION OF FLAGSTAR BANK, FSB TO THE RECEIVER'S FIRST INTERIM APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL AND PAYMENT OF FEES AND COSTS

Case 2:11-cv-08607-R-DTB Document 48 Filed 03/12/12 Page 1 of 6 Page ID #:960

Flagstar Bank, FSB ("Flagstar") hereby objects to the Receiver's "First Interim Application for Approval and Payment of Fees and Costs to Thomas C. Hebrank, as Receiver". The application does not comply with the Local Rules; the application does not comply with the SEC guidelines on paying receivers; the application does not allocate the Receiver's fees and costs to the various separate partnerships and entities under the Receiver's control; the application improperly seeks to comingle or substantively consolidate the various entities without this Court's prior approval or notice to the various affected parties and does, in effect, what the SEC has accused the Defendants of doing: inappropriately comingling the assets of the various entities. The Receiver also inappropriately seeks to be paid from Flagstar's cash collateral. For all these reasons, as set forth below in more detail, the Court should deny the Receiver's application.

1. The Application does not comply with the Local Rules or SEC guidelines.

Local Rule 7-3 requires a conference of counsel prior to filing motions. While there are certain exceptions listed in Local Rule 16-12, a receiver's application for payment of fees and costs is not among them. Prior to filing his application, the Receiver was required to contact the other parties in the case to discuss his proposed application. This was not done. Had the Receiver complied with the local rules, some of the objections to his application might have been avoided. Further, the Local Rule requires, if the parties are unable to reach a resolution, the moving party to include in the Notice of Motion a statement to the following effect: "This motion is made following the conference of counsel pursuant to a Local Rule 7-3 which took place on (date)." No such statement is set forth in the Receiver's application.

Because the Receiver has not complied with the Local Rules the Receiver's application should be denied.

It also does not appear from the Receiver's application that the Receiver complied with the SEC's rules concerning the payment of receivers. Those rules require a receiver seeking compensation to provide the SEC with a copy of the application prior to its filing and allow the SEC thirty days to review it and provide comments to it, prior to the filing. A true and correct copy of the SEC rules is attached hereto as Exhibit "1". There is nothing set forth in the Receiver's application that indicates that the Receiver complied with these rules. Indeed, it

appears that the rules were not complied with because the required certification is not attached to

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

the Receiver's application.

The Receiver seeks to inappropriately comingle the assets of the various partnerships and entities.

2.

Flagstar is a secured creditor of Copeland Properties Ten, LP ("CP Ten"). It has a security interest by way of a mortgage on real property owned by CP Ten in Troy, Michigan. The loan balance as of December 1, 2011 was approximately \$8,827,000. Flagstar is currently having the property appraised but believes the property is worth significantly less than the debt by at least a few million dollars. At the present time the property is rented and cash flows and throws off excess cash to CP Ten. Flagstar has a security interest in the rents generated from the operation of the property. Those rents are Flagstar's cash collateral.

As previously explained to the Court, both Flagstar and partners in CP Ten do not believe CP Ten should be in receivership because CP Ten is a net creditor of receivership estate and the Receiver's services are not benefiting CP Ten, quite the opposite. The Receiver's application demonstrates this.

The Receiver does not attempt in his fee application to allocate his fees, the fees of his employees, or the costs to the twenty-three limited partnerships that were placed under his control or to the other entities such as Copeland Wealth Management. Instead, the Receiver has invented six categories into which he has allocated the fees and costs. It is, therefore, impossible for the parties or the Court to determine what services were rendered by the Receiver and his staff to which particular entity and how much of that particular entity's assets should be taken by the Receiver to pay for his fees and costs. It is not appropriate for CP Ten or the Flagstar's cash collateral to be used by the Receiver to fund his activities related to other partnerships or to the Copeland Wealth Management entities. Nowhere in the Receiver's application does the Receiver explain from what assets he intends to pay his fees. The Receiver has represented, a number of times, that he is not comingling the assets of the various partnerships and that he is maintaining them separate. Yet, by his application the Receiver seeks to comingle the assets when he has no authority to do so. Indeed, he is attempting to do the exact thing that the SEC has claimed 14365.1:1579757.1

5

Copeland did, inappropriately comingle the assets of the various separate partnerships.

The Receiver has not sought and this Court has not issued an order substantively consolidating the partnerships or the Copeland entities. Flagstar's cash collateral should not be used to subsidize the Receiver for activities taken that have nothing to do with CP Ten and its property. Similarly, the CP Ten partners should not have to pay for the Receiver's work related to other partnerships or the Copeland entities. This is the exact reason the CP Ten partners and Flagstar have sought to exclude CP Ten from the receivership. CP Ten is a net creditor of the other receivership entities, it cash flows, and it does not need a receiver to manage its property which consists of a fully-leased facility on a triple-net lease.

3. Conclusion.

For the reasons set forth above, this Court should deny the Receiver's application and order that in any future fee application the Receiver files the time and expenses the Receiver seeks compensation for be broken down and allocated to the partnership or entity which received the services and explain from which entity the Receiver seeks to be paid, how much and why.

DATED: March 12, 2012

ERVIN COHEN & JESSUP LLP

By: /s/ Peter A. Davidson

PETER A. DAVIDSON,

Attorneys for Flagstar Bank, FSB

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and **not a party to this action**. I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. My business address is 9401 Wilshire Boulevard, Ninth Floor, Beverly Hills, CA 90212-2974.

On March 12, 2012, I served true copies of the following document(s) described as OBJECTION OF FLAGSTAR BANK, FSB TO THE RECEIVER'S FIRST INTERIM APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL AND PAYMENT OF FEES AND COSTS on the interested parties in this action as follows:

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

BY MAIL: I enclosed the document(s) in a sealed envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed in the Service List and placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with Ervin Cohen & Jessup LLP's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that the correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.

BY CM/ECF NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING: I electronically filed the document(s) with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system. Participants in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the CM/ECF system. Participants in the case who are not registered CM/ECF users will be served by mail or by other means permitted by the court rules.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct and that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made.

Executed on March 12, 2012, at Beverly Hills, California.

/s/ Lore Pekrul Lore Pekrul

ERVIN COHEN & JESSUPLP

1 **SERVICE LIST** 2 3 4 BY ELECTRONIC FILING 5 David M Rosen Rosend@sec.gov Edward G Fates tfates@allenmatkins.com, bcrfilings@allenmatkins.com 6 Francis Emmet Quinlan, Jr Frank.Quinlan@ndlf.com, sue.love@ndlf.com 7 John M McCoy, III mccoyj@sec.gov 8 9 Michael S Leib mleib@maddinhauser.com, bwislinski@maddinhauser.com Peter Alan Davidson pdavidson@ecjlaw.com 10 Spencer E Bendell bendells@sec.gov, LAROFiling@sec.gov, marcelom@sec.gov 11 William P Tooke wtooke@mechlaw.com 12 13 **BY U.S. MAIL** 14 Local Counsel for Flagstar Bank, FSB 15 Michael S. Leib, Esq. Maddin, Hauser, Wartell, Roth & Heller, PC 28400 Northwestern Hwy., 3rd Floor 16 Southfield, MI 48034 17 18 19 **20** 21 22 23 24 25 **26**

27

28