

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
v.	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 3:09-cv-0298-N
STANFORD INTERNATIONAL BANK, LTD., et al.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	
<hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/>		
RALPH S. JANVEY, et al.	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
v.	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-03980-N
WILLIS OF COLORADO INC., et al.	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

SCHEDULING ORDER

This matter is before the Court on (a) the Expedited Request for Entry of Scheduling Order and Motion to Approve Proposed Settlement of Claims Against the BMB Defendants, to Enter the Bar Order and to Enter the Final Judgments and Bar Orders filed by Ralph S. Janvey (the “Receiver”), as Receiver for the Receivership Estate in *SEC v. Stanford International Bank, Ltd.*, No. 3:09-CV-0298-N (N.D. Tex.) (the “SEC Action”), and the Official Stanford Investors Committee (the “Committee”), as a party to the SEC Action and, along with the Receiver, as a plaintiff in *Janvey v. Willis of Colorado Inc.*, No. 3:13-CV-03980-N (N.D. Tex.) (the “Janvey Litigation”), and Samuel Troice, Martha Diaz, Paula Gilly Flores, Punga Punga Financial, Ltd., Manual Canabal, Daniel Gomez and Promontora Villa Marina, C.A., on behalf of a putative

class of Stanford investors (collectively, the “Investor Plaintiffs”), as plaintiffs in *Troice v. Willis of Colorado, Inc.*, No. 3:09-CV-1274-N (N.D. Tex.) (the “Troice Litigation”)¹ [SEC Action, ECF No. 2383; Janvey Litigation, ECF No. 106] (the “Scheduling/Approval Motion”), and (b) Plaintiffs’ Motion for an Award of Attorneys’ Fees in Connection with the Settlements with Willis and BMB Defendants [SEC Action, ECF No. 2398; Janvey Litigation, ECF No. 109] (the “Attorneys’ Fees Motion”).²

The Motions concern a proposed settlement (the “Settlement”) involving, on the one hand, the Receiver; the Committee; the Court-appointed Examiner, John J. Little (the “Examiner”);³ and the Investor Plaintiffs; and, on the other hand, BMB and Paul D. Winter, Dependent Executor of the Estate of Robert S. Winter, Deceased (“Winter” and together with BMB, the “BMB Defendants”) as defendants in the Janvey Litigation and the Troice Litigation. Capitalized terms not otherwise defined in this order shall have the meaning assigned to them in the settlement agreement attached as Exhibit 1 to the appendix accompanying the Scheduling/Approval Motion (the “Settlement Agreement”).

In the Scheduling/Approval Motion, the Plaintiffs seek the Court’s approval of the terms of the Settlement, including entry of a final bar order in the SEC Action (the “Bar Order”) and entry of final judgments and bar orders in the Janvey Litigation and the Casanova Litigation (the “Final Judgments and Bar Orders”).

After reviewing the terms of the Settlement and considering the arguments presented in the Motions, the Court preliminarily approves the Settlement as adequate, fair, reasonable, and

¹ The Receiver, the Committee and the Investor Plaintiffs are collectively referred to herein as “Plaintiffs.”

² The Scheduling/Approval Motion and the Attorneys’ Fees Motion are collectively referred to herein as the “Motions.”

³ The Examiner executed the Settlement Agreement to indicate his approval of the terms of the Settlement and to confirm his obligation to post Notice on his website, as required herein, but is not otherwise individually a party to the Settlement Agreement, the Janvey Litigation, or the Troice Litigation.

equitable. Accordingly, the Court enters this scheduling order to: (i) provide for notice of the terms of the Settlement, including the proposed Bar Order in the SEC Action and the proposed Final Judgments and Bar Orders in the Janvey Litigation and the Casanova Litigation; (ii) set the deadline for filing objections to the Settlement, the Bar Order, the Final Judgments and Bar Orders, or the Attorneys' Fees Motion; (iii) set the deadline for responding to any objection so filed; and (iv) set the date of the final approval hearing regarding the Settlement, the Bar Order in the SEC Action, the Final Judgments and Bar Orders in the Janvey Litigation and the Casanova Litigation and the Attorneys' Fees Motion (the "Final Approval Hearing"), as follows:

1. Preliminary Findings on Potential Approval of the Settlement: Based upon the Court's review of the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the arguments presented in the Motions, and the Motions' accompanying appendices and exhibits, the Court preliminarily finds that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and equitable; has no obvious deficiencies; and is the product of serious, informed, good-faith, and arm's-length negotiations. The Court, however, reserves a final ruling with respect to the terms of the Settlement until after the Final Approval Hearing referenced below in Paragraph 2.

2. Final Approval Hearing: The Final Approval Hearing will be held before the Honorable David C. Godbey of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, United States Courthouse, 1100 Commerce Street, Dallas, Texas 75242, in Courtroom 1505, at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, January 20, 2017, which is a date at least ninety (90) calendar days after entry of this Scheduling Order. The purposes of the Final Approval Hearing will be to: (i) determine whether the terms of the Settlement should be finally approved by the Court; (ii) determine whether the Bar Order attached as Exhibit C to the Settlement Agreement should be entered by the Court in the SEC Action; (iii) determine whether the Final Judgments and Bar

Orders attached as Exhibit D to the Settlement Agreement should be entered by the Court in the Janvey Litigation and the Casanova Litigation; (iv) rule upon any objections to the Settlement, the Bar Order, or the Final Judgments and Bar Orders; (v) rule upon the Attorneys' Fees Motion; and (vi) rule upon such other matters as the Court may deem appropriate.

3. Notice: The Court approves the form of Notice attached as Exhibit A to the Settlement Agreement and finds that the methodology, distribution, and dissemination of Notice described in the Motion: (i) constitute the best practicable notice; (ii) are reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise all Interested Parties, including the plaintiffs in the Other BMB Litigation⁴, of the Settlement, the releases therein, and the injunctions provided for in the Bar Order and the Final Judgments and Bar Orders; (iii) are reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise all Interested Parties of the right to object to the Settlement, the Bar Order, and the Final Judgments and Bar Orders, and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (iv) constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice; (v) meet all requirements of applicable law, including the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including Due Process), and the Rules of the Court; and (vi) will provide to all Persons a full and fair opportunity to be heard on these matters. The Court further approves the form of the publication Notice attached as Exhibit F to the Settlement Agreement. Therefore:

a. The Receiver is hereby directed, no later than twenty-one (21) calendar days after entry of this Scheduling Order, to cause the Notice in substantially the same form attached as Exhibit A to the Settlement Agreement to be sent via electronic mail, first class mail,

⁴ The "Other BMB Litigation," as defined in the BMB Settlement Agreement, includes: (i) *Rupert v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 20090C116137, filed on September 14, 2009 in Texas state court (Bexar County) (the "Rupert Litigation"); (ii) *Casanova v. Willis of Colorado, Inc., et al.*, C.A. No. 3:10-CV-1862-O, filed on September 16, 2010 in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas (the "Casanova Litigation"); (iii) *Rishmague v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 2011C12585, filed on March 11, 2011 in Texas state court (Bexar County)(the "Rishmague Litigation"); and (iv) *MacArthur v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 2013-07840, filed on February 8, 2013 in Texas state court (Harris County)(the "MacArthur Litigation").

or international delivery service to all Claimants; to be sent via electronic service to all counsel of record for any Person who is, at the time of Notice, a party in any case included in *In re Stanford Entities Securities Litigation*, MDL No. 2099 (N.D. Tex.) (the “MDL”), the SEC Action, the Troice Litigation, the Janvey Litigation, or the Other BMB Litigation who are deemed to have consented to electronic service through the Court’s CM/ECF System under Local Rule CV- 5.1(d); sent via certified mail to plaintiffs’ counsel in the Rupert Litigation, the Rishmague Litigation and the MacArthur Litigation; and to be sent via facsimile transmission and/or first class mail to any other counsel of record for any other Person who is, at the time of service, a party in any case included in the MDL, the SEC Action, the Troice Litigation, the Janvey Litigation, or the Other BMB Litigation.

b. The Receiver is hereby directed, no later than twenty-one (21) calendar days after entry of this Scheduling Order, to cause the notice in substantially the same form attached as Exhibit F to the Settlement Agreement to be published once in the national edition of *The Wall Street Journal* and once in the international edition of *The New York Times*.

c. The Receiver is hereby directed, no later than twenty-one (21) calendar days after entry of this Scheduling Order, to cause the Settlement Agreement, the Motions, this Scheduling Order, the Notice, and all exhibits and appendices attached to these documents, to be posted on the Receiver’s website (<http://stanfordfinancialreceivership.com>). The Examiner is hereby directed, no later than twenty-one (21) calendar days after entry of this Scheduling Order, to cause the Settlement Agreement, the Motions, this Scheduling Order, the Notice, and all exhibits and appendices attached to these documents, to be posted on the Examiner’s website (<http://lpflaw.com/examiner-stanford-financial-group>).

d. The Receiver is hereby directed promptly to provide the Settlement

Agreement, the Motions, this Scheduling Order, the Notice, and all exhibits and appendices attached to these documents, to any Person who requests such documents via email to Margaret Hagelman, an attorney at Strasburger & Price, LLP, at margaret.hagelman@strasburger.com, or via telephone by calling Margaret Hagelman at 210-250-6001. The Receiver may provide such materials in the form and manner that the Receiver deems most appropriate under the circumstances of the request.

e. No less than ten days before the Final Approval Hearing, the Receiver shall cause to be filed with the Clerk of this Court written evidence of compliance with subparts (a) through (d) of this Paragraph, which may be in the form of an affidavit or declaration.

4. Objections and Appearances at the Final Approval Hearing: Any Person who wishes to object to the terms of the Settlement, the Final Bar Order in the SEC Action, the Final Judgments and Bar Orders or the Attorneys' Fees Motion, or who wishes to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, must do so by filing an objection, in writing, with the Court in the SEC Action (3:09-CV-0298-N), by ECF or by mailing the objection to the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, 1100 Commerce Street, Dallas, Texas 75242, no later than December 30, 2016. All objections filed with the Court must:

- a. contain the name, address, telephone number, and (if applicable) an email address of the Person filing the objection;
- b. contain the name, address, telephone number, and email address of any attorney representing the Person filing the objection;
- c. be signed by the Person filing the objection, or his or her attorney;
- d. state, in detail, the basis for any objection;
- e. attach any document the Court should consider in ruling on the Settlement,

the Bar Order, the Final Judgments and Bar Orders or the Attorneys' Fees Motion; and

f. if the Person filing the objection wishes to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, make a request to do so.

No Person will be permitted to appear at the Final Approval Hearing without filing a written objection and request to appear at the Final Approval Hearing as set forth in subparts (a) through (f) of this Paragraph. Copies of any objections filed must be served by ECF, or by email or first class mail, upon each of the following:

Edward C. Snyder
Jesse R. Castillo
Castillo Snyder, P.C.
One Riverwalk Place
700 N. St. Mary's, Suite 405
San Antonio, Texas 78205
Telephone: (210) 630-4200
Facsimile: (210) 630-4210
Email: esnyder@casnlaw.com

and

David N. Kitner
Strasburger & Price LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 4400
Dallas, TX 75250-100
Telephone: (214) 651-4300
Facsimile: (214) 651-4330
Email: david.kitner@strasburger.com

and

Ralph S. Janvey, Esq.
Krage & Janvey, LLP
2100 Ross Avenue, Suite 2600
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 397-1912
Facsimile: (214) 220-0230
Email: rjanvey@kjllp.com

and

Kevin M. Sadler, Esq.
Baker Botts LLP
1001 Page Mill Road
Building One, Suite 200
Palo Alto, California 94304-1007
Telephone: (650) 739-7518
Facsimile: (650) 739-7618
Email: kevin.sadler@bakerbotts.com

and

Judith R. Blakeway
Strasburger & Price, LLP
2301 Broadway
San Antonio, Texas 78215
Telephone: (210) 250-6000
Facsimile: (210) 250-6100
Email: judith.blakeway@strasburger.com

and

Douglas J. Buncher
Neligan Foley LLP
325 N. St. Paul, Suite 3600
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 840-5320
Facsimile: (214) 840-5301
Email: dbuncher@neliganlaw.com

and

John J. Little
Little Pedersen Fankhauser
901 Main Street, Suite 4110
Dallas, TX 75202
Telephone: (214) 573-2307
Facsimile: (214) 573-2323
Email: jlittle@lpf-law.com

And

Bradley W. Foster
Andrews Kurth LLP
1717 Main Street, Suite 3700
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: 214-659-4646
Facsimile: 214-659-4401
Email: bradfoster@andrewskurth.com

and

Nicholas Lanza
McCormick, Lanza & McNeel, LLP
4950 Bissonnet Street
Bellaire, TX 77401
Telephone: 713-523-0400
Facsimile: 713-668-6417
Email: nlanza@mlm-lawfirm.com

and

Paul K. Nesbitt
Kelly, Sutter & Kendrick, P.C.
3050 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 200
Houston, Texas 77056
Telephone: 713-595-6000
Fax: 713-595-6001
pnesbitt@ksklawyers.com

Any Person filing an objection shall be deemed to have submitted to the jurisdiction of this Court for all purposes of that objection, the Settlement, the Bar Order, and the Final Judgments and Bar Orders. Potential objectors who do not present opposition by the time and in the manner set forth above shall be deemed to have waived the right to object (including any right to appeal) and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing and shall be forever barred from raising such objections in this action or any other action or proceeding. Persons do not need to appear at the Final Approval Hearing or take any other action to indicate their approval.

5. Responses to Objections: Any Party to the Settlement may respond to an

objection filed pursuant to Paragraph 4 by filing a response in the SEC Action no later than January 13, 2017. To the extent any Person filing an objection cannot be served by action of the Court's CM/ECF system, a response must be served to the email and/or mailing address provided by that Person.

6. Adjustments Concerning Hearing and Deadlines: The date, time, and place for the Final Approval Hearing, and the deadlines and date requirements in this Scheduling Order, shall be subject to adjournment or change by this Court without further notice other than that which may be posted by means of ECF in the MDL, the SEC Action, the Janvey Litigation, the Troice Litigation and the Other BMB Litigation (under the federal civil action numbers for such matters).

7. Retention of Jurisdiction: The Court shall retain jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or connected with the proposed Settlement.

8. Entry of Injunction: If the Settlement is approved by the Court, the Court will enter a Final Bar Order in the SEC Action and the Final Judgments and Bar Orders in the Janvey Litigation and the Casanova Litigation. If entered, such orders will permanently enjoin all Persons, including without limitation all Interested Parties, Stanford Investors, and Claimants, among others, from bringing, encouraging, assisting, continuing, or prosecuting any Settled Claims against any of the BMB Defendants or any of the BMB Released Parties (subject to certain exceptions applicable to Winter as set forth in paragraphs 38 and 41 of the Settlement Agreement), including all claims asserted in the Troice Litigation, the Janvey Litigation, and the Other BMB Litigation, whether pending before the Court or not.


9. Stay of Proceedings: The Janvey Litigation, the Troice Litigation, and the Other BMB Litigation are hereby stayed as to the BMB Defendants, except to the extent necessary to

give effect to the Settlement.

10. Use of Order: Under no circumstances shall this Scheduling Order be construed, deemed, or used as an admission, concession, or declaration by or against the BMB Defendants of any fault, wrongdoing, breach or liability. Nor shall the Order be construed, deemed, or used as an admission, concession, or declaration by or against Plaintiffs that their claims lack merit or that the relief requested is inappropriate, improper, or unavailable, or as a waiver by any party of any defenses or claims he or she may have. Neither this Scheduling Order, nor the proposed Settlement Agreement, or any other settlement document, shall be filed, offered, received in evidence, or otherwise used in these or any other actions or proceedings or in any arbitration, except to give effect to or enforce the Settlement or the terms of this Scheduling Order.

11. Entry of This Order: This Scheduling Order shall be entered separately on the dockets in the SEC Action, the Janvey Litigation, the Troice Litigation, and the Other BMB Litigation (under the federal civil action numbers for such matters).

SIGNED October 19, 2016.


DAVID C. GODBEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,	§	
	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
v.	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 3:09-cv-0298-N
STANFORD INTERNATIONAL BANK, LTD., et al.,	§	
	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

RALPH S. JANVEY, et al.	§	
	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
v.	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-03980-N
WILLIS OF COLORADO INC., et al.	§	
	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

NOTICE OF SETTLEMENT AND BAR ORDER PROCEEDINGS

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Ralph S. Janvey, in his capacity as the Court-appointed Receiver for the Stanford Receivership Estate (the “Receiver”), the Official Stanford Investors Committee (the “Committee”), and Samuel Troice, Martha Diaz, Paula Gilly-Flores, Punga Punga Financial, Ltd., Manuel Canabal, Daniel Gomez Ferreiro and Promotora Villa Marino, C.A. (collectively, the “Investor Plaintiffs” and with the Receiver and the Committee, the “Plaintiffs”), have reached an agreement (the “Settlement Agreement”) to settle all claims asserted or that could have been asserted against Bowen, Miclette & Britt, Inc. (“BMB”), and Robert S. Winter (Deceased) and Paul D. Winter, Dependent Executor of the Estate of Robert S. Winter, Deceased (collectively, “Winter” and together with BMB, the “BMB Defendants”) by

the Receiver and the Committee in *Janvey v. Willis of Colorado, Inc., et al.*, No. 3:13-CV-03980-N (N.D. Tex.) (the “Janvey Litigation”), and by the Investor Plaintiffs in *Troice v. Willis of Colorado, Inc. et al.*, No. 3:09-CV-1274-L (N.D. Tex.) (the “Troice Litigation”), with the settlement of claims against Winter being subject to certain exceptions set forth in paragraphs 38 and 41 of the Settlement Agreement.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that the Plaintiffs have filed in *SEC v. Stanford Int’l Bank, Ltd.*, No. 3:09-cv-0298-N (N.D. Tex.) (the “SEC Action”) an Expedited Request for Entry of Scheduling Order and Motion to Approve Proposed Settlement of Claims Against the BMB Defendants, to Enter the Bar Order, and to Enter the Final Judgments and Bar Orders (the “Scheduling/Approval Motion”), and a Motion for Plaintiffs’ Attorneys’ Fees (the “Attorneys’ Fees Motion,” and together with the Scheduling/Approval Motion, the “Motions”). Copies of the Settlement Agreement, the Motions, and other supporting papers may be obtained from the Court’s docket in the SEC Action [ECF No. _____], and will also be available on the websites of the Receiver (<http://www.stanfordfinancialreceivership.com>) and the Examiner (www.lpf-law.com/examiner-stanford-financial-group/). Copies of these documents may also be requested by email, by sending the request to margaret.hagelman@strasburger.com; or by telephone, by calling Margaret Hagelman at 210-250-6001. All capitalized terms not defined in this Notice of Settlement and Bar Order Proceedings are defined in the Settlement Agreement, attached as Exhibit 1 of the Appendix to the Scheduling/Approval Motion.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that the Scheduling/Approval Motion requests that the Court approve the Settlement and enter bar orders permanently enjoining all Persons¹,

¹“Person” means any individual, entity, governmental authority, agency or quasi-governmental person or entity, worldwide, of any type, including, without limitation, any individual, partnership, corporation, estate, limited liability company, trust, committee, fiduciary, association, proprietorship, organization, or business, regardless of location, residence, or nationality.

including, without limitation, all Interested Parties,² Stanford Investors,³ and Claimants,⁴ from pursuing Settled Claims,⁵ including claims that you may possess and/or may have already asserted, against the BMB Defendants.

²“Interested Parties” as defined herein and in the BMB Settlement Agreement, means “the Receiver, the Receivership Estate, the Committee, the members of the Committee, Plaintiffs, the plaintiffs in the Other BMB Litigation, the Stanford Investors, the Claimants, the Examiner, the Joint Liquidators, or any other Person or Persons who have or may have claims against BMB Released Parties or the Receivership Estate, or who are alleged by the Receiver, the Committee, or other Person or entity on behalf of the Receivership Estate to be liable to the Receivership Estate, whether or not a formal proceeding has been initiated.”

³“Stanford Investors” means customers of Stanford International Bank, Ltd., who, as of February 16, 2009, had funds on deposit at Stanford International Bank, Ltd., and/or were holding certificates of deposit issued by Stanford International Bank, Ltd.

⁴“Claimants” refers generally to any Persons who have submitted a Claim to the Receiver or to the Joint Liquidators.

⁵“Settled Claims” means any action, cause of action, suit, liability, claim, right of action, debt, sums of money, covenants, contracts, controversies, agreements, promises, damages, contribution, indemnity, specific performance, attorney’s fees and demands whatsoever, whether or not currently asserted, known, suspected, existing, or discoverable, and whether based on federal law, state law, foreign law, common law, or otherwise, and whether based on contract, tort, statute, law, equity or otherwise, that a Releasor ever had, now has, or hereafter can, shall, or may have, directly, representatively, derivatively, or in any other capacity, for, upon, arising from, relating to, or by reason of any matter, cause, or thing whatsoever, that, in full or in part, concerns, relates to, arises out of, or is in any manner connected with (i) the Stanford Entities (defined below), (ii) any certificate of deposit, depository account, or investment of any type with any one or more of the Stanford Entities, (iii) any one or more of the BMB Defendants’ relationship(s) with any one or more of the Stanford Entities, (iv) the BMB Defendants’ provision of services to any of the Stanford Entities, and any other acts, representations, errors, or omissions by the BMB Defendants for or related to the Stanford Entities, or (v) any matter that was asserted in, could have been asserted in, or relates to the subject matter of the SEC Action, the Troice Litigation, the Janvey Litigation, the Other BMB Litigation, or any proceeding concerning the Stanford Entities pending or commenced in any Forum. “Settled Claims” specifically includes, without limitation, all claims each Releasor does not know or suspect to exist in his, her, or its favor at the time of release, which, if known by that Person, might have affected their decisions with respect to this Agreement and the Settlement (“Unknown Claims”). Each Releasor expressly waives, releases, and relinquishes any and all provisions, rights, and benefits conferred by any law or principle, in the United States or elsewhere, which governs or limits the release of unknown or unsuspected claims, including, without limitation, California Civil Code § 1542, which provides:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

Each Releasor acknowledges that he, she, or it may hereafter discover facts different from, or in addition to, those which such Releasor now knows or believes to be true with respect to the Settled Claims, but nonetheless agrees that the Agreement, including the releases granted therein, will remain binding and effective in all respects notwithstanding such discovery. Unknown Claims include contingent and non-contingent claims, whether or not concealed or hidden, without regard to the subsequent discovery or existence of different or additional facts. These provisions concerning unknown and unsuspected claims and the inclusion of Unknown Claims in the definition of Settled Claims were separately bargained for and are an essential element of the Settlement Agreement.

“Stanford Entities” means Robert Allen Stanford, James M. Davis, Laura Pendergest-Holt, Gilbert Lopez, Mark Kuhrt, Stanford International Bank, Ltd., Stanford Group Company, Stanford Capital Management, LLC, Stanford Financial Group, the Stanford Financial Bldg Inc., the entities listed in Exhibit B to Settlement Agreement, and any entity of any type that was owned or controlled by Robert Allen Stanford, James M. Davis, Laura Pendergest-Holt,

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that the settlement amount is Twelve Million Eight Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$12,850,000) in United States currency (the “Settlement Amount”). The Settlement Amount, less any fees and costs awarded by the Court to the attorneys for Plaintiffs and expenses paid by the Receiver (the “Net Settlement Amount”), will be deposited with and distributed by the Receiver pursuant to a Distribution Plan hereafter to be approved by the Court in the SEC Action (see subparagraph e below).

This matter may affect your rights and you may wish to consult an attorney.

The material terms of the Settlement Agreement are as follows:

- a) BMB will pay or cause to be paid the Settlement Amount, which will be deposited with the Receiver as required pursuant to the Settlement Agreement;
- b) Plaintiffs will fully release the BMB Defendants and the BMB Released Parties⁶ from all Settled Claims (subject to certain exceptions applicable to Winter as set forth in paragraphs 38 and 41 of the Settlement Agreement);
- c) The Settlement Agreement requires entry of a Final Bar Order in the SEC Action, and entry of Final Judgments and Bar Orders in the Janvey Litigation and the Casanova Litigation, which permanently enjoin all Persons, including,

Gilbert Lopez, Mark Kuhrt, Stanford International Bank, Ltd., Stanford Group Company, Stanford Capital Management, LLC, Stanford Financial Group, or the Stanford Financial Bldg Inc., on or before February 16, 2009.

⁶“BMB Released Parties” means BMB, its insurers (including, but not limited to, Endurance American Specialty Insurance Company and Great American E & S Insurance Company) and their past, present, and future, and direct and indirect parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, related entities, divisions, partnerships, corporations, directors, officers, legal and equitable owners, shareholders, members, managers, principals, distributees, attorneys, trustees, general and limited partners, lenders, executors, administrators, heirs, beneficiaries, assigns, predecessors, predecessors-in-interest, successors, successors-in-interest, and reinsurers, and their past and present employees, associates, agents, and representatives, specifically including but not limited to Robert S. Winter (deceased) and Paul D. Winter, Dependent Executor of the Estate of Robert S. Winter, deceased, and their respective heirs, assigns, and estates. Notwithstanding the foregoing, “BMB Released Parties” does not include any Person, other than the BMB Defendants, against whom, as of the Agreement Date, any of the Plaintiffs was asserting a claim or cause of action in any Forum, and does not include any Person who becomes employed by, related to, or affiliated with the BMB Defendants after the Agreement Date and whose liability, if any, arises out of or derives from actions or omissions unrelated to the BMB Defendants, and which occurred before such Person became employed by, related to, or affiliated with the BMB Defendants.

without limitation, all Interested Parties, Stanford Investors, and Claimants, whether before the Court or not, from bringing or continuing any legal proceeding or asserting, encouraging, assisting, continuing, or prosecuting any cause of action, including contribution or indemnification claims, arising from or relating to a Settled Claim, against any of the BMB Defendants or any of the BMB Released Parties, including without limitation the Troice Litigation, the Janvey Litigation, and the Other BMB Litigation⁷, whether pending before the Court or not (subject to certain exceptions applicable to Winter as set forth in paragraphs 38 and 41 of the Settlement Agreement);

- d) The Receiver will disseminate notice of the Settlement Agreement (i.e. this Notice) to Interested Parties, through one or more of the following: mail, email, international delivery, CM/ECF notification, facsimile transmission, and/or publication on the Examiner (www.lpf-law.com/examiner-stanford-financial-group/) and Receiver (<http://www.stanfordfinancialreceivership.com>) websites;
 - e) The Receiver will develop and submit to the Court for approval a plan for disseminating the Net Settlement Amount (the “Distribution Plan”);
 - f) Under the Distribution Plan, once approved, the Net Settlement Amount will be distributed by the Receiver, under the supervision of the Court, to Stanford Investors who have submitted Claims that have been allowed by the Receiver;
- and

⁷The “Other BMB Litigation” includes: (i) *Rupert v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 20090C116137, filed on September 14, 2009 in Texas state court (Bexar County); (ii) *Casanova v. Willis of Colorado, Inc., et al.*, C.A. No. 3:10-CV-1862-O, filed on September 16, 2010 in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas; (iii) *Rishmague v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 2011C12585, filed on March 11, 2011 in Texas state court (Bexar County); and (iv) *MacArthur v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 2013-07840, filed on February 8, 2013 in Texas state court (Harris County).

- g) The Troice Litigation will be dismissed with prejudice as to the BMB Defendants, with each party bearing its own costs and attorneys' fees.

Attorneys for the Committee and the Investor Plaintiffs seek a fee award based upon 25% of the Settlement Amount, pursuant to 25% contingency fee agreements with the Committee and the Investor Plaintiffs. Twenty-five percent of the net recovery from the Settlement is to be calculated, but shall not exceed \$3,212,500.00.

The final hearing on the Motion is set for [_____], 2016 (the "Final Approval Hearing"). Any objection to the Settlement Agreement or its terms, the Scheduling/Approval Motion, the Final Bar Order, the Final Judgments and Bar Orders, or the Attorneys' Fees Motion, must be filed, in writing, with the Court in the SEC Action no later than [insert date of 21st day before Final Approval Hearing]. Any objections not filed by this date will be deemed waived and will not be considered by the Court. Those wishing to appear and to orally present their written objections at the Final Approval Hearing must include a request to so appear within their written objections.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE	§	
COMMISSION,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
v.	§	Civil Action No. 3:09-cv-0298-N
	§	
STANFORD INTERNATIONAL BANK,	§	
LTD., <i>et al.</i> ,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	
	§	

FINAL BAR ORDER

Before the Court is the Expedited Request for Entry of Scheduling Order and Motion to Approve Proposed Settlement of Claims Against the BMB Defendants,¹ to Enter the Bar Order, and to Enter the Final Judgments and Bar Orders, (the “Motion”) of Ralph S. Janvey, the Receiver for the Receivership Estate (the “Receiver”) and a plaintiff in *Janvey, et al. v. Willis of Colorado Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-03980-N-BG (the “Janvey Litigation”); the Court-appointed Official Stanford Investors Committee (the “Committee”), as a party to this action and a plaintiff in the Janvey Litigation; and Samuel Troice, Martha Diaz, Paula Gilly-Flores, Punga Punga Financial, Ltd., Manuel Canabal, Daniel Gomez Ferreiro and Promotora Villa Marino, C.A. (collectively, the “Investor Plaintiffs”), plaintiffs in the Janvey Litigation (Messrs. Troice and Canabal only) and in *Troice, et al. v. Willis of Colorado Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 3:09-cv-01274-L (the “Troice Litigation”) (collectively, the Receiver, the Committee and the Investor Plaintiffs are the “Plaintiffs”). [ECF No. ____]. The Motion concerns a proposed settlement (the “BMB Settlement”) involving the Plaintiffs and the BMB Defendants.

¹ The “BMB Defendants” refers, collectively, to Bowen, Mickette & Britt, Inc. (“BMB”) and Paul D. Winter, Dependent Executor of the Estate of Robert S. Winter, Deceased (“Winter”).

The Court-appointed Examiner signed the BMB Settlement Agreement² as Chairperson of the Committee and as Examiner solely to evidence his support and approval of the BMB Settlement and to confirm his obligations to post the Notice on his website, but is not otherwise individually a party to the BMB Settlement, the Janvey Litigation, or the Troice Litigation.

Following notice and a hearing, and having considered the filings and heard the arguments of counsel, the Court hereby GRANTS the Motion.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Troice Litigation, the Janvey Litigation, and this case all arise from a series of events leading to the collapse of Stanford International Bank, Ltd. (“SIBL”). On February 16, 2009, this Court appointed Ralph S. Janvey to be the Receiver for SIBL and related parties (the “Stanford Entities”). [ECF No. 10]. After years of diligent investigation, the Plaintiffs believe that they have identified claims against a number of third parties, including the BMB Defendants, that Plaintiffs claim enabled the Stanford Ponzi scheme. In the Troice Litigation and the Janvey Litigation, the Investor Plaintiffs allege, *inter alia*, that the BMB Defendants aided and abetted violations of the Texas Securities Act and aided, abetted or participated in a fraudulent scheme and a conspiracy. In addition, in the Janvey Litigation, the Receiver and the Committee allege, *inter alia*, that the BMB Defendants aided, abetted or participated in breaches of fiduciary duty, aided, abetted or participated in a fraudulent scheme, and aided, abetted or participated in fraudulent transfers. The BMB Defendants have denied and continue to deny any and all allegations of wrongdoing.

Lengthy, multiparty negotiations led to the BMB Settlement. In these negotiations, potential victims of the Stanford Ponzi scheme were well-represented. The Investor Plaintiffs,

² The “BMB Settlement Agreement” refers to the Settlement Agreement that is attached as Exhibit 1 of the Appendix to the Motion.

the Committee—which the Court appointed to “represent[] in this case and related matters” the “customers of SIBL who, as of February 16, 2009, had funds on deposit at SIBL and/or were holding certificates of deposit issued by SIBL (the ‘Stanford Investors’)” (ECF No. 1149)—the Receiver, and the Examiner—who the Court appointed to advocate on behalf of “investors in any financial products, accounts, vehicles or ventures sponsored, promoted or sold by any Defendant in this action” (ECF No. 322)—all participated in the extensive, arm’s-length negotiations that ultimately resulted in the BMB Settlement and the BMB Settlement Agreement. The parties reached an agreement-in-principle in May 2016 and subsequently executed the BMB Settlement Agreement.

Under the terms of the BMB Settlement, BMB will pay or cause to be paid \$12,850,000 to the Receivership Estate, which (less attorneys’ fees and expenses) will be distributed to Stanford Investors. In return, the BMB Defendants seek global peace with respect to all claims that have been, could have been, or could be asserted against any of the BMB Defendants and any of the BMB Released Parties by any Person arising out of or related to the events leading to these proceedings, and with respect to all claims that have been, could have been, or could be asserted against any of the BMB Defendants and the BMB Released Parties by any Person arising from or related to any of the BMB Defendants’ relationship with the Stanford Entities (subject to certain exceptions applicable to Winter as set forth in paragraphs 38 and 41 of the Settlement Agreement). Obtaining such global peace is a critical and material component of the Settlement. Accordingly, the BMB Settlement is conditioned, among other things, on the Court’s approval and entry of this Final Bar Order enjoining any Person from asserting, maintaining or prosecuting claims against any of the BMB Defendants or any of the BMB Released Parties (subject to the aforementioned exceptions applicable to Winter), as set forth more fully herein.

On _____, 2016, the Plaintiffs filed the Motion. [ECF No. ____]. The Court thereafter entered a Scheduling Order on _____, 2016 [ECF No. ____], which, *inter alia*, authorized the Receiver to provide notice of the BMB Settlement, established a briefing schedule on the Motion, and set the date for a hearing. On _____, 2016, the Court held the scheduled hearing. For the reasons set forth herein, the Court finds that the terms of the BMB Settlement Agreement are adequate, fair, reasonable, and equitable, and that the BMB Settlement should be and is hereby **APPROVED**. The Court further finds that entry of this Final Bar Order is appropriate.

II. ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED** as follows:

1. Terms used in this Final Bar Order that are defined in the BMB Settlement Agreement, unless expressly otherwise defined herein, have the same meaning as in the BMB Settlement Agreement.

2. The Court has “broad powers and wide discretion to determine the appropriate relief in [this] equity receivership,” including the authority to enter the Final Bar Order. *SEC v. Kaleta*, 530 F. App’x 360, 362 (5th Cir. 2013) (internal quotations omitted); *see also SEC v. Parish*, No. 2:07-cv-00919-DCN, 2010 WL 8347143 (D.S.C. Feb. 10, 2010). Moreover, the Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action, and the Plaintiffs are proper parties to seek entry of this Final Bar Order.

3. The Court finds that the methodology, form, content and dissemination of the Notice: (i) were implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Scheduling Order; (ii) constituted the best practicable notice; (iii) were reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise all Interested Parties, including the plaintiffs in the Other BMB

Litigation³, of the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement, the releases therein, and the injunctions provided for in this Final Bar Order and in the Final Judgments and Bar Orders to be entered in the Janvey Litigation and the Casanova Litigation; (iv) were reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise all Interested Parties of the right to object to the BMB Settlement, this Final Bar Order, the Final Judgments and Bar Orders to be entered in the Janvey Litigation and the Casanova Litigation, and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (v) were reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice; (vi) met all applicable requirements of law, including, without limitation, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including Due Process), and the Rules of the Court; and (vii) provided to all Persons a full and fair opportunity to be heard on these matters.

4. The Court finds that the BMB Settlement was reached following an extensive investigation of the facts and resulted from vigorous, good faith, arm's-length negotiations involving experienced and competent counsel. The claims asserted against the BMB Defendants contain complex and novel issues of law and fact that would require a substantial amount of time and expense to litigate, with a significant risk that Plaintiffs may not ultimately prevail on their claims. By the same token, it is clear that the BMB Defendants would never agree to the terms of the BMB Settlement unless they were assured of global peace with respect to all claims that have been, could have been, or could be asserted against any of the BMB Defendants and any of the BMB Released Parties by any Person arising out of or related to the events leading to these proceedings, and with respect to all claims that have been, could have been, or could be asserted

³ The "Other BMB Litigation" is defined in the BMB Settlement Agreement to include the following additional actions relating to the same subject matter as the Troice Litigation and the Janvey Litigation: (i) *Rupert v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 20090C116137, filed on September 14, 2009 in Texas state court (Bexar County); (ii) *Casanova v. Willis of Colorado, Inc., et al.*, C.A. No. 3:10-CV-1862-O, filed on September 16, 2010 in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas (the "Casanova Litigation"); (iii) *Rishmague v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 2011C12585, filed on March 11, 2011 in Texas state court (Bexar County); and (iv) *MacArthur v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 2013-07840, filed on February 8, 2013 in Texas state court (Harris County).

against any of the BMB Defendants and any of the BMB Released Parties by any Person arising from or related to the BMB Defendants' relationship with the Stanford Entities (subject only to the aforementioned exceptions applicable to Winter). The injunction against such claims is therefore a necessary and appropriate order ancillary to the relief obtained for victims of the Stanford Ponzi scheme pursuant to the BMB Settlement. *See Kaleta*, 530 F. App'x at 362 (entering bar order and injunction against investor claims as "ancillary relief" to a settlement in an SEC receivership proceeding); *Parish*, 2010 WL 8347143 (similar).

5. Pursuant to the BMB Settlement Agreement and upon motion by the Receiver, this Court will approve a Distribution Plan that will fairly and reasonably distribute the net proceeds of the BMB Settlement to Stanford Investors who have Claims approved by the Receiver. The Court finds that the Receiver's claims process and the Distribution Plan contemplated in the BMB Settlement Agreement have been designed to ensure that all Stanford Investors have received an opportunity to pursue their claims through the Receiver's claims process previously approved by the Court. [ECF No. 1584].

6. The Court further finds that the Parties and their counsel have at all times complied with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11.

7. Accordingly, the Court finds that the BMB Settlement is, in all respects, fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best interests of all Persons claiming an interest in, having authority over, or asserting a claim against any of the BMB Defendants and any of the BMB Released Parties, the Stanford Entities or the Receivership Estate, including but not limited to the Plaintiffs, the Claimants, and all other Interested Parties. The BMB Settlement, the terms of which are set forth in the BMB Settlement Agreement, is hereby fully and finally approved. The

Parties are directed to implement and consummate the BMB Settlement in accordance with the terms and provisions of the BMB Settlement Agreement and this Final Bar Order.

8. Pursuant to the provisions of Paragraph 38 of the BMB Settlement Agreement, as of the Settlement Effective Date, the BMB Defendants and the BMB Released Parties are hereby completely released, relinquished, acquitted, and forever discharged, with prejudice, from all Settled Claims by the Plaintiffs, including, without limitation, the Receiver on behalf of the Receivership Estate and each of the Plaintiffs' respective past and present, direct and indirect, parent entities, subsidiaries, affiliates, heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors and assigns, in their capacities as such and anyone who can claim through any of them, except that this release does not extend to, shall not include, and shall not alter, limit, or otherwise affect, the final judgment entered in favor of the Receiver against Winter in *Janvey v. Hamric*, Case No. 3:13-cv-00775-N-BG, Doc. No. 257 (the "Winter Final Judgment"). Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Bar Order, the Receiver reserves all rights to pursue recovery of the Winter Final Judgment to the maximum extent permitted by the Order Granting Application for Turnover Order, *In re Robert S. Winter, deceased*, Case No. 435,100 in the Probate Court No. 4 of Harris County, Texas (the "Turnover Order"), and nothing in this Bar Order or the BMB Settlement Agreement or the BMB Settlement shall be construed to impair or limit the Receiver's rights to collect the full amount of the Winter Final Judgment or make any recovery pursuant thereto in accordance with the terms of the Turnover Order.

9. As of the Settlement Effective Date, the Plaintiffs Released Parties are hereby completely released, acquitted, and forever discharged from all Settled Claims by the BMB Defendants, and each of the BMB Defendants' respective parent entities, subsidiaries, affiliates, heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors and assigns, in their capacities as such.

10. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Final Bar Order, the foregoing releases do not release the Parties' rights and obligations under the BMB Settlement or the BMB Settlement Agreement or bar the Parties from seeking to enforce or effectuate the terms of the BMB Settlement or the BMB Settlement Agreement.

11. The Court hereby permanently bars, restrains and enjoins the Receiver, the Plaintiffs, the Claimants, all other Interested Parties⁴, and all other Persons or entities, whether acting in concert with the foregoing or claiming by, through, or under the foregoing, or otherwise, all and individually, from directly, indirectly, or through a third party, instituting, reinstating, intervening in, initiating, commencing, maintaining, continuing, proceeding, filing, encouraging, soliciting, supporting, participating in, collaborating in, or otherwise prosecuting, against any of the BMB Defendants or any of the BMB Released Parties, now or at any time in the future, any action, lawsuit, cause of action, claim, investigation, demand, complaint, or proceeding of any nature, including but not limited to litigation, arbitration, or other proceeding, in any Forum, whether individually, representatively, directly, derivatively, on behalf of a class or putative class, as a member of a class or putative class, or in any other capacity whatsoever, that, in whole or in part, in any way concerns, relates to, is based upon, arises from, or is in any manner connected with (i) the Stanford Entities, (ii) any certificate of deposit, depository account, or investment of any type with any one or more of the Stanford Entities, (iii) any one or more of the BMB Defendants' relationship(s) with any one of the Stanford Entities, (iv) the BMB Defendants' provision of services to any of the Stanford Entities, and any other acts, errors

⁴ "Interested Parties," as defined herein and in the BMB Settlement Agreement, means "the Receiver, the Receivership Estate, the Committee, the members of the Committee, Plaintiffs, the plaintiffs in the Other BMB Litigation, the Stanford Investors, the Claimants, the Examiner, the Joint Liquidators, or any other Person or Persons who have or may have claims against the BMB Released Parties or the Receivership Estate, or who are alleged by the Receiver, the Committee, or any other Person or entity on behalf of the Receivership Estate to be liable to the Receivership Estate, whether or not a formal proceeding has been initiated."

or omissions by the BMB Defendants for or related to the Stanford Entities, (v) any matter that was asserted in, could have been asserted in, or relates to the subject matter of this case, the Troice Litigation, the Janvey Litigation, the Other BMB Litigation, or any other proceeding concerning the Stanford Entities pending or commenced in any Forum, or (vi) any Settled Claim. The foregoing specifically includes, but is not limited to, any claim, however denominated, seeking contribution, indemnity, damages, or other remedy where the alleged injury to such Person, entity, or Interested Party, or the claim asserted by such Person, entity, or Interested Party, is based upon such Person's, entity's, or Interested Party's liability to any Plaintiff, Claimant, or Interested Party arising out of, relating to, or based in whole or in part upon money owed, demanded, requested, offered, paid, agreed to be paid, or required to be paid to any Plaintiff, Claimant, Interested Party, or other Person or entity, whether pursuant to a demand, judgment, claim, agreement, settlement or otherwise. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this bar order does not extend to, shall not include, and shall not alter, limit, or otherwise affect the Receiver's right or ability to pursue and collect the full amount of the Winter Final Judgment or make any recovery pursuant thereto in accordance with and to the maximum extent permitted by the Turnover Order.

12. The BMB Defendants shall file motions to dismiss with prejudice, motions for summary judgment, or similar dispositive motions in all of the Other BMB Litigation not pending before this Court⁵, which motions shall include this Final Bar Order as an exhibit. The plaintiffs in the Other BMB Litigation shall not oppose such dispositive motions, and are hereby permanently enjoined and barred from continuing to prosecute the Other BMB Litigation.

⁵ *Rupert v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 20090C116137, filed on September 14, 2009 in Texas state court (Bexar County); *Rishmague v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 2011C12585, filed on March 11, 2011 in Texas state court (Bexar County); and *MacArthur v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 2013-07840, filed on February 8, 2013 in Texas state court (Harris County).

13. Nothing in this Final Bar Order shall impair or affect or be construed to impair or affect in any way whatsoever, any right of any Person, entity, or Interested Party to (a) claim a credit or offset, however determined or quantified, if and to the extent provided by any applicable statute, code, or rule of law, against any judgment amount, based upon the BMB Settlement or payment of the Settlement Amount by or on behalf of the BMB Defendants and the BMB Released Parties; (b) designate a “responsible third party” or “settling person” under Chapter 33 of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code; or (c) take discovery under applicable rules in other litigation; provided, however, for the avoidance of doubt that nothing in this paragraph shall be interpreted to permit or authorize (x) any action or claim seeking to recover any monetary or other relief from any of the BMB Defendants or the BMB Released Parties, or (y) the commencement, assertion or continuation of any action or claim against any of the BMB Defendants or the BMB Released Parties, including any action or claim seeking to impose any liability of any kind (including but not limited to liability for contribution, indemnification or otherwise) upon any of the BMB Defendants or BMB Released Parties.

14. The BMB Defendants and the BMB Released Parties have no responsibility, obligation, or liability whatsoever with respect to the cost associated with or the content of the Notice; the notice process; the Distribution Plan; the implementation of the Distribution Plan; the administration of the BMB Settlement; the management, investment, disbursement, allocation, or other administration or oversight of the Settlement Amount, any other funds paid or received in connection with the BMB Settlement, or any portion thereof; the payment or withholding of Taxes; the determination, administration, calculation, review, or challenge of claims to the Settlement Amount, any portion of the Settlement Amount, or any other funds paid or received in connection with the BMB Settlement or the BMB Settlement Agreement; or any losses,

attorneys' fees, expenses, vendor payments, expert payments, or other costs incurred in connection with any of the foregoing matters. No appeal, challenge, decision, or other matter concerning any subject set forth in this paragraph shall operate to terminate, cancel or modify the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement or this Final Bar Order.

15. Nothing in this Final Bar Order or the BMB Settlement Agreement and no aspect of the BMB Settlement or negotiation thereof is or shall be construed to be an admission or concession of any violation of any statute or law, of any fault, liability or wrongdoing, or of any infirmity in the claims or defenses of the Parties with regard to any of the complaints, claims, allegations or defenses in the Troice Litigation, the Janvey Litigation, the Other BMB Litigation, or any other proceeding. The BMB Defendants expressly deny any liability or wrongdoing with respect to the matters alleged in the complaints in the Troice Litigation, the Janvey Litigation, the Other BMB Litigation and any other claims related to the Stanford Entities.

16. BMB is hereby ordered to deliver or cause to be delivered the Settlement Amount in accordance with the terms of Paragraphs 20 and 25 of the BMB Settlement Agreement. Further, the Parties are ordered to act in conformity with all other provisions of the BMB Settlement Agreement.

17. Without in any way affecting the finality of this Final Bar Order, the Court retains continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over the Parties for purposes of, among other things, the administration, interpretation, consummation, and enforcement of the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement, the Scheduling Order, and this Final Bar Order, including, without limitation, the injunctions, bar orders, and releases described herein, and to enter orders concerning implementation of the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement, the Distribution Plan, and any payment of attorneys' fees and expenses to Plaintiffs' counsel.

18. The Court expressly finds and determines, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b), that there is no just reason for any delay in the entry of this Final Bar Order, which is both final and appealable, and immediate entry by the Clerk of the Court is expressly directed.

19. This Final Bar Order shall be served by counsel for the Plaintiffs, via email, first class mail or international delivery service, on any person or entity that filed an objection to approval of the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement, or this Final Bar Order.

Signed on _____, 2016

DAVID C. GODBEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

RALPH S. JANVEY, et al.	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-03980-N
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
WILLIS OF COLORADO INC., et al.	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

FINAL JUDGMENT AND BAR ORDER

Before the Court is the Expedited Request for Entry of Scheduling Order and Motion to Approve Proposed Settlement of Claims Against the BMB Defendants,¹ to Enter the Bar Order and to Enter the Final Judgments and Bar Orders (the “Motion”) of Ralph S. Janvey, the Receiver for the Stanford Receivership Estate in *SEC v. Stanford International Bank, Ltd., et al.*, Civil Action No. 3:09-CV-0298-N (the “SEC Action”) and a plaintiff in this action; the Court-appointed Official Stanford Investors Committee (the “Committee”) as a party to the SEC Action and a plaintiff in this action; and Samuel Troice, Martha Diaz, Paula Gilly-Flores, Punga Punga Financial, Ltd., Manuel Canabal, Daniel Gomez Ferreiro and Promotora Villa Marino, C.A. (collectively, the “Investor Plaintiffs”), plaintiffs in this action (Messrs. Troice and Canabal only) and in *Troice, et al. v. Willis of Colorado Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 3:09-cv-01274-L (the “Troice Litigation”) (collectively, the Receiver, the Committee and the Investor Plaintiffs are the “Plaintiffs”) [ECF No. ____]. The Motion concerns a proposed settlement (the “BMB Settlement”) involving Plaintiffs and the BMB Defendants. The Court-appointed Examiner

¹ The “BMB Defendants” refers collectively to Bowen, Miclette & Britt, Inc. (“BMB”) and Paul D. Winter, Dependent Executor of the Estate of Robert S. Winter, Deceased (“Winter”).

signed the BMB Settlement Agreement² as Chairperson of the Committee and as Examiner solely to evidence his support and approval of the BMB Settlement and to confirm his obligations to post the Notice on his website, but is not otherwise individually a party to the BMB Settlement, this action, or the Troice Litigation.

Following notice and a hearing, and having considered the filings and heard the arguments of counsel, the Court hereby GRANTS the Motion.

I. INTRODUCTION

The SEC Action, the Troice Litigation, and this case all arise from a series of events leading to the collapse of Stanford International Bank, Ltd. (“SIBL”). On February 16, 2009, this Court appointed Ralph S. Janvey to be the Receiver for SIBL and related parties (the “Stanford Entities”). [SEC Action, ECF No. 10]. After years of diligent investigation, the Plaintiffs believe that they have identified claims against a number of third parties, including the BMB Defendants, that Plaintiffs claim enabled the Stanford Ponzi scheme. In the Troice Litigation and this case, the Investor Plaintiffs allege, *inter alia*, that the BMB Defendants aided and abetted violations of the Texas Securities Act and aided, abetted or participated in a fraudulent scheme and a conspiracy. In addition, in this case, the Receiver and the Committee allege, *inter alia*, that the BMB Defendants aided, abetted or participated in breaches of fiduciary duty, aided, abetted or participated in a fraudulent scheme, and aided, abetted or participated in fraudulent transfers. The BMB Defendants have denied and continue to deny any and all allegations of wrongdoing.

Lengthy, multiparty negotiations led to the BMB Settlement. In these negotiations, potential victims of the Stanford Ponzi scheme were well-represented. The Investor Plaintiffs, the Committee—which the Court appointed to “represent[] in this case and related matters” the

² The “BMB Settlement Agreement” refers to the Settlement Agreement that is attached as Exhibit 1 of the Appendix to the Motion.

“customers of SIBL who, as of February 16, 2009, had funds on deposit at SIBL and/or were holding certificates of deposit issued by SIBL (the ‘Stanford Investors’)” [SEC Action, ECF No. 1149]—the Receiver, and the Examiner—who the Court appointed to advocate on behalf of “investors in any financial products, accounts, vehicles or ventures sponsored, promoted or sold by any Defendant in this action” [SEC Action, ECF No. 322]—all participated in the extensive, arm’s-length negotiations that ultimately resulted in the BMB Settlement and the BMB Settlement Agreement. The Parties reached an agreement-in-principle in May 2016 and subsequently executed the BMB Settlement Agreement.

Under the terms of the BMB Settlement, BMB will pay or cause to be paid \$12,850,000 to the Receivership Estate, which (less attorneys’ fees and expenses) will be distributed to Stanford Investors. In return, the BMB Defendants seek global peace with respect to all claims that have been, could have been, or could be asserted against any of the BMB Defendants and any of the BMB Released Parties by any Person arising out of or related to the events leading to these proceedings, and with respect to all claims that have been, could have been, or could be asserted against any of the BMB Defendants and the BMB Released Parties by any Person arising from or related to any of the BMB Defendants’ relationship with the Stanford Entities (subject to certain exceptions applicable to Winter as set forth in paragraphs 38 and 41 of the Settlement Agreement). Obtaining such global peace is a critical and material component of the Settlement. Accordingly, the BMB Settlement is conditioned on, among other things, the Court’s approval and entry of this Final Judgment and Bar Order enjoining any Person from asserting, maintaining or prosecuting claims against any of the BMB Defendants or any of the BMB Released Parties (subject to the aforementioned exceptions applicable to Winter), as set forth more fully herein.

On _____, 2016, the Plaintiffs filed the Motion. [ECF No. ____]. The Court thereafter entered a Scheduling Order on _____, 2016 [ECF No.], which, *inter alia*, authorized the Receiver to provide notice of the BMB Settlement, established a briefing schedule on the Motion, and set the date for a hearing. On _____, 2016, the Court held the scheduled hearing. For the reasons set forth herein, the Court finds that the terms of the BMB Settlement Agreement are adequate, fair, reasonable, and equitable, and that the BMB Settlement should be and is hereby **APPROVED**. The Court further finds that entry of this Final Judgment and Bar Order is appropriate.

II. ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED** as follows:

1. Terms used in this Final Judgment and Bar Order that are defined in the BMB Settlement Agreement, unless expressly otherwise defined herein, have the same meaning as in the BMB Settlement Agreement.

2. The Court has “broad powers and wide discretion to determine the appropriate relief in [this] equity receivership,” including the authority to enter this Final Judgment and Bar Order. *SEC v. Kaleta*, 530 F. App’x 360, 362 (5th Cir. 2013) (internal quotations omitted); *see also SEC v. Parish*, No. 2:07-cv-00919-DCN, 2010 WL 8347143 (D.S.C. Feb. 10, 2010). Moreover, the Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action, and the Plaintiffs are proper parties to seek entry of this Final Judgment and Bar Order.

3. The Court finds that the methodology, form, content and dissemination of the Notice: (i) were implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Scheduling Order; (ii) constituted the best practicable notice; (iii) were reasonably calculated, under the circumstances,

to apprise all Interested Parties, including the plaintiffs in the Other BMB Litigation³, of the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement, the releases therein, and the injunctions provided for in the Final Bar Order to be entered in the SEC Action, this Final Judgment and Bar Order, and the Final Judgment and Bar Order to be entered in the Casanova Litigation; (iv) were reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise all Interested Parties of the right to object to the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement, the Final Bar Order to be entered in the SEC Action, this Final Judgment and Bar Order, and the Final Judgment and Bar Order to be entered in the Casanova Litigation, and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (v) were reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice; (vi) met all applicable requirements of law, including, without limitation, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including Due Process), and the Rules of the Court; and (vii) provided to all Persons a full and fair opportunity to be heard on these matters.

4. The Court finds that the BMB Settlement was reached following an extensive investigation of the facts and resulted from vigorous, good faith, arm's-length negotiations involving experienced and competent counsel. The claims asserted against the BMB Defendants contain complex and novel issues of law and fact that would require a substantial amount of time and expense to litigate, with a significant risk that Plaintiffs may not ultimately prevail on their claims. By the same token, it is clear that the BMB Defendants would never agree to the terms of the BMB Settlement unless they were assured of global peace with respect to all claims that have been, could have been, or could be asserted against any of the BMB Defendants and any of the

³ The "Other BMB Litigation" is defined in the BMB Settlement Agreement to include (i) *Rupert v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 20090C116137, filed on September 14, 2009 in Texas state court (Bexar County); (ii) *Casanova v. Willis of Colorado, Inc., et al.*, C.A. No. 3:10-CV-1862-O, filed on September 16, 2010 in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas (the "Casanova Litigation"); (iii) *Rishmague v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 2011C12585, filed on March 11, 2011 in Texas state court (Bexar County); and (iv) *MacArthur v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 2013-07840, filed on February 8, 2013 in Texas state court (Harris County).

BMB Released Parties by any Person arising out of or related to the events leading to these proceedings, and with respect to all claims that have been, could have been, or could be asserted against any of the BMB Defendants and any of the BMB Released Parties by any Person arising from or related to the BMB Defendants' relationship with the Stanford Entities (subject only to the aforementioned exceptions applicable to Winter). The injunction against such claims is therefore a necessary and appropriate order ancillary to the relief obtained for victims of the Stanford Ponzi scheme pursuant to the BMB Settlement. *See Kaleta*, 530 F. App'x at 362 (entering bar order and injunction against investor claims as "ancillary relief" to a settlement in an SEC receivership proceeding); *Parish*, 2010 WL 8347143 (similar).

5. Pursuant to the BMB Settlement Agreement and upon motion by the Receiver in the SEC Action, this Court will approve a Distribution Plan that will fairly and reasonably distribute the net proceeds of the BMB Settlement to Stanford Investors who have Claims approved by the Receiver. The Court finds that the Receiver's claims process and the Distribution Plan contemplated in the BMB Settlement Agreement have been designed to ensure that all Stanford Investors have received an opportunity to pursue their Claims through the Receiver's claims process previously approved by the Court. [SEC Action ECF No. 1584].

6. The Court further finds that the Parties and their counsel have at all times complied with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11.

7. Accordingly, the Court finds that the BMB Settlement is, in all respects, fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best interests of all Persons claiming an interest in, having authority over, or asserting a claim against any of the BMB Defendants and any of the BMB Released Parties, the Stanford Entities or the Receivership Estate, including but not limited to the Plaintiffs, the Claimants, and all other Interested Parties. The BMB Settlement, the terms of

which are set forth in the BMB Settlement Agreement, is hereby fully and finally approved. The Parties are directed to implement and consummate the BMB Settlement in accordance with the terms and provisions of the BMB Settlement Agreement and this Final Judgment and Bar Order.

8. Pursuant to the provisions of Paragraph 38 of the BMB Settlement Agreement, as of the Settlement Effective Date, the BMB Defendants and the BMB Released Parties are hereby completely released, relinquished, acquitted, and forever discharged, with prejudice, from all Settled Claims by the Plaintiffs, including, without limitation, the Receiver on behalf of the Receivership Estate and each of the Plaintiffs' respective past and present, direct and indirect, parent entities, subsidiaries, affiliates, heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors and assigns, in their capacities as such and anyone who can claim through any of them, except that this release does not extend to, shall not include, and shall not alter, limit, or otherwise affect, the final judgment entered in favor of the Receiver against Winter in *Janvey v. Hamric*, Case No. 3:13-cv-00775-N-BG, Doc. No. 257 (the "Winter Final Judgment"). Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Final Judgment and Bar Order, the Receiver reserves all rights to pursue recovery of the Winter Final Judgment to the maximum extent permitted by the Order Granting Application for Turnover Order, *In re Robert S. Winter, deceased*, Case No. 435,100 in the Probate Court No. 4 of Harris County, Texas (the "Turnover Order"), and nothing in this Final Judgment and Bar Order or the BMB Settlement Agreement or the BMB Settlement shall be construed to impair or limit the Receiver's rights to collect the full amount of the Winter Final Judgment or make any recovery pursuant thereto in accordance with the terms of the Turnover Order.

9. As of the Settlement Effective Date, the Plaintiffs Released Parties are hereby completely released, acquitted, and forever discharged from all Settled Claims by the BMB

Defendants, and each of the BMB Defendants' respective parent entities, subsidiaries, affiliates, heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors and assigns, in their capacities as such.

10. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Final Judgment and Bar Order, the foregoing releases do not release the Parties' rights and obligations under the BMB Settlement or the BMB Settlement Agreement or bar the Parties from seeking to enforce or effectuate the terms of the BMB Settlement or the BMB Settlement Agreement.

11. The Court hereby permanently bars, restrains and enjoins the Receiver, the Plaintiffs, the Claimants, all other Interested Parties⁴, and all other Persons or entities, whether acting in concert with the foregoing or claiming by, through, or under the foregoing, or otherwise, all and individually, from directly, indirectly, or through a third party, instituting, reinstating, intervening in, initiating, commencing, maintaining, continuing, proceeding, filing, encouraging, soliciting, supporting, participating in, collaborating in, or otherwise prosecuting, against any of the BMB Defendants or any of the BMB Released Parties, now or at any time in the future, any action, lawsuit, cause of action, claim, investigation, demand, complaint, or proceeding of any nature, including but not limited to litigation, arbitration, or other proceeding, in any Forum, whether individually, representatively, directly, derivatively, on behalf of a class or putative class, as a member of a class or putative class, or in any other capacity whatsoever, that, in whole or in part, in any way concerns, relates to, is based upon, arises from, or is in any manner connected with (i) the Stanford Entities, (ii) any certificate of deposit, depository account, or investment of any type with any one or more of the Stanford Entities, (iii) any one or

⁴ "Interested Parties," as defined herein and in the BMB Settlement Agreement, means "the Receiver, the Receivership Estate, the Committee, the members of the Committee, Plaintiffs, the plaintiffs in the Other BMB Litigation, the Stanford Investors, the Claimants, the Examiner, the Joint Liquidators, or any other Person or Persons who have or may have claims against the BMB Released Parties or the Receivership Estate, or who are alleged by the Receiver, the Committee, or any other Person or entity on behalf of the Receivership Estate to be liable to the Receivership Estate, whether or not a formal proceeding has been initiated."

more of the BMB Defendants' relationship(s) with any one of the Stanford Entities, (iv) the BMB Defendants' provision of services to any of the Stanford Entities, and any other acts, errors or omissions by the BMB Defendants for or related to the Stanford Entities, (v) any matter that was asserted in, could have been asserted in, or relates to the subject matter of this case, the Troice Litigation, the SEC Action, the Other BMB Litigation, or any other proceeding concerning the Stanford Entities pending or commenced in any Forum, or (vi) any Settled Claim. The foregoing specifically includes, but is not limited to, any claim, however denominated, seeking contribution, indemnity, damages, or other remedy where the alleged injury to such Person, entity, or Interested Party, or the claim asserted by such Person, entity, or Interested Party, is based upon such Person's, entity's, or Interested Party's liability to any Plaintiff, Claimant, or Interested Party arising out of, relating to, or based in whole or in part upon money owed, demanded, requested, offered, paid, agreed to be paid, or required to be paid to any Plaintiff, Claimant, Interested Party, or other Person or entity, whether pursuant to a demand, judgment, claim, agreement, settlement or otherwise. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this bar order does not extend to, shall not include, and shall not alter, limit, or otherwise affect the Receiver's right or ability to pursue and collect the full amount of the Winter Final Judgment or make any recovery pursuant thereto in accordance with and to the maximum extent permitted by the Turnover Order.

12. Nothing in this Final Judgment and Bar Order shall impair or affect or be construed to impair or affect in any way whatsoever, any right of any Person, entity, or Interested Party to (a) claim a credit or offset, however determined or quantified, if and to the extent provided by any applicable statute, code, or rule of law, against any judgment amount, based upon the BMB Settlement or payment of the Settlement Amount by or on behalf of the BMB

Defendants and the BMB Released Parties; (b) designate a “responsible third party” or “settling person” under Chapter 33 of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code; or (c) take discovery under applicable rules in other litigation; provided, however, for the avoidance of doubt that nothing in this paragraph shall be interpreted to permit or authorize (x) any action or claim seeking to recover any monetary or other relief from any of the BMB Defendants or the BMB Released Parties, or (y) the commencement, assertion or continuation of any action or claim against any of the BMB Defendants or the BMB Released Parties, including any action or claim seeking to impose any liability of any kind (including but not limited to liability for contribution, indemnification or otherwise) upon any of the BMB Defendants or BMB Released Parties.

13. The BMB Defendants and the BMB Released Parties have no responsibility, obligation, or liability whatsoever with respect to the cost associated with or the content of the Notice; the notice process; the Distribution Plan; the implementation of the Distribution Plan; the administration of the BMB Settlement; the management, investment, disbursement, allocation, or other administration or oversight of the Settlement Amount, any other funds paid or received in connection with the BMB Settlement, or any portion thereof; the payment or withholding of Taxes; the determination, administration, calculation, review, or challenge of claims to the Settlement Amount, any portion of the Settlement Amount, or any other funds paid or received in connection with the BMB Settlement or the BMB Settlement Agreement; or any losses, attorneys’ fees, expenses, vendor payments, expert payments, or other costs incurred in connection with any of the foregoing matters. No appeal, challenge, decision, or other matter concerning any subject set forth in this paragraph shall operate to terminate, cancel or modify the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement or this Final Judgment and Bar Order.

14. Nothing in this Final Judgment and Bar Order or the BMB Settlement Agreement and no aspect of the BMB Settlement or negotiation thereof is or shall be construed to be an admission or concession of any violation of any statute or law, of any fault, liability or wrongdoing, or of any infirmity in the claims or defenses of the Parties with regard to any of the complaints, claims, allegations or defenses in this action, the Troice Litigation, the SEC Action, the Other BMB Litigation, or any other proceeding. The BMB Defendants expressly deny any liability or wrongdoing with respect to the matters alleged in the complaints in this action, the Troice Litigation, the SEC Action, the Other BMB Litigation, and any other claims related to the Stanford Entities.

15. BMB is hereby ordered to deliver or cause to be delivered the Settlement Amount in accordance with the terms of Paragraphs 20 and 25 of the BMB Settlement Agreement. Further, the Parties are ordered to act in conformity with all other provisions of the BMB Settlement Agreement.

16. Without in any way affecting the finality of this Final Judgment and Bar Order, the Court retains continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over the Parties for purposes of, among other things, the administration, interpretation, consummation, and enforcement of the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement, the Scheduling Order, and this Final Judgment and Bar Order, including, without limitation, the injunctions, bar orders, and releases herein, and to enter orders concerning implementation of the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement, the Distribution Plan, and any payment of attorneys' fees and expenses to Plaintiffs' counsel.

17. The Court expressly finds and determines, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b), that there is no just reason for any delay in the entry of this Final Judgment and

Bar Order as to the BMB Defendants, which is both final and appealable as to the BMB Defendants, and immediate entry by the Clerk of the Court as to the BMB Defendants is expressly directed.

18. This Final Judgment and Bar Order shall be served by counsel for the Plaintiffs, via email, first class mail or international delivery service, on any person or entity that filed an objection to approval of the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement, or this Final Bar Order.

19. All relief as to the BMB Defendants that is not expressly granted herein, other than Plaintiffs' request for approval of Plaintiffs' attorneys' fees, which will be addressed by a separate order, is denied. This is a final judgment. The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter Judgment as to the BMB Defendants in conformity herewith.

Signed on _____, 2016

DAVID C. GODBEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

SALVADOR CASANOVA, ET AL.	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	CIVIL ACTION No. 3:10-CV-1862-N-BL
v.	§	
	§	
WILLIS OF COLORADO, INC., ET AL.	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

FINAL JUDGMENT AND BAR ORDER

By Order entered _____, 2016 (the “Final Bar Order”), this Court approved a proposed settlement (the “BMB Settlement”) involving Ralph S. Janvey, the Receiver for the Stanford Receivership Estate in *SEC v. Stanford International Bank, Ltd., et al.*, Civil Action No. 3:09-CV-0298-N (the “SEC Action”) and a plaintiff in *Janvey, et al. v. Willis of Colorado Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-03980-N-BG (the “Janvey Litigation”); the Court-appointed Official Stanford Investors Committee (the “Committee”) as a party to the SEC Action and a plaintiff in the Janvey Litigation; and Samuel Troice, Martha Diaz, Paula Gilly-Flores, Punga Punga Financial, Ltd., Manuel Canabal, Daniel Gomez Ferreiro and Promotora Villa Marino, C.A. (collectively, the “Investor Plaintiffs”), plaintiffs in the Janvey Litigation (Messrs. Troice and Canabal only) and in *Troice, et al. v. Willis of Colorado Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 3:09-cv-01274-L (the “Troice Litigation”) (collectively, the Receiver, the Committee and the Investor Plaintiffs are the “Troice-Janvey Plaintiffs”); and the BMB Defendants.¹ The Court-appointed

¹ The “BMB Defendants” refers collectively to Bowen, Miclette & Britt, Inc. (“BMB”) and Paul D. Winter, Dependent Executor of the Estate of Robert S. Winter, Deceased (“Winter”).

Examiner signed the BMB Settlement Agreement² as Chairperson of the Committee and as Examiner solely to evidence his support and approval of the BMB Settlement and to confirm his obligations to post the Notice on his website, but is not otherwise individually a party to the BMB Settlement, the Janvey Litigation, or the Troice Litigation.

I. INTRODUCTION

The SEC Action, the Troice Litigation, the Janvey Litigation, and this case all arise from a series of events leading to the collapse of Stanford International Bank, Ltd. (“SIBL”). On February 16, 2009, this Court appointed Ralph S. Janvey to be the Receiver for SIBL and related parties (the “Stanford Entities”). [SEC Action, ECF No. 10]. After years of diligent investigation, the Troice-Janvey Plaintiffs believe that they have identified claims against a number of third parties, including the BMB Defendants, that the Troice-Janvey Plaintiffs claim enabled the Stanford Ponzi scheme. The Troice-Janvey Plaintiffs and the plaintiffs in this action allege, *inter alia*, that the BMB Defendants aided and abetted violations of the Texas Securities Act and aided, abetted or participated in a fraudulent scheme and a conspiracy. In addition, in the Janvey Litigation, the Receiver and the Committee allege, *inter alia*, that the BMB Defendants aided, abetted or participated in breaches of fiduciary duty, aided, abetted or participated in a fraudulent scheme, and aided, abetted or participated in fraudulent transfers. The BMB Defendants have denied and continue to deny any and all allegations of wrongdoing.

Lengthy, multiparty negotiations led to the BMB Settlement. In these negotiations, potential victims of the Stanford Ponzi scheme were well-represented. The Investor Plaintiffs, the Committee—which the Court appointed to “represent[] in this case and related matters” the

² The “BMB Settlement Agreement” refers to the Settlement Agreement that is attached as Exhibit 1 of the Appendix to the Expedited Request for Entry of Scheduling Order and Motion to Approve Proposed Settlement of Claims Against the BMB Defendants, to Enter the Bar Order, and to Enter the Final Judgments and Bar Orders (the “Motion”) filed in the SEC Action and the Janvey Litigation.

“customers of SIBL who, as of February 16, 2009, had funds on deposit at SIBL and/or were holding certificates of deposit issued by SIBL (the ‘Stanford Investors’)” [SEC Action, ECF No. 1149]—the Receiver, and the Examiner—who the Court appointed to advocate on behalf of “investors in any financial products, accounts, vehicles or ventures sponsored, promoted or sold by any Defendant in this action” [SEC Action, ECF No. 322]—all participated in the extensive, arm’s-length negotiations that ultimately resulted in the BMB Settlement and the BMB Settlement Agreement. The Parties reached an agreement-in-principle in May 2016 and subsequently executed the BMB Settlement Agreement.

Under the terms of the BMB Settlement, BMB will pay or cause to be paid \$12,850,000 to the Receivership Estate, which (less attorneys’ fees and expenses) will be distributed to Stanford Investors. In return, the BMB Defendants seek global peace with respect to all claims that have been, could have been, or could be asserted against any of the BMB Defendants and any of the BMB Released Parties by any Person arising out of or related to the events leading to these proceedings, and with respect to all claims that have been, could have been, or could be asserted against any of the BMB Defendants and the BMB Released Parties by any Person arising from or related to any of the BMB Defendants’ relationship with the Stanford Entities (subject to certain exceptions applicable to Winter as set forth in paragraphs 38 and 41 of the BMB Settlement Agreement). Obtaining such global peace is a critical and material component of the BMB Settlement. Accordingly, the BMB Settlement is conditioned on, among other things, the Court’s approval and entry of this Final Judgment and Bar Order enjoining any Person from asserting, maintaining or prosecuting claims against any of the BMB Defendants or any of the BMB Released Parties (subject to the aforementioned exceptions applicable to Winter), as set forth more fully herein.

On _____, 2016, the Troice-Janvey Plaintiffs filed the Motion in the SEC Action and the Janvey Litigation. [SEC Action ECF No. ____; Janvey Action ECF No. ____]. The Court thereafter entered a Scheduling Order on _____, 2016 [SEC Action ECF No. ____; Janvey Action ECF No. ____], which, *inter alia*, authorized the Receiver to provide Notice of the BMB Settlement, established a briefing schedule on the Motion, and set the date for a hearing. On _____, 2016, the Court held the scheduled hearing. For the reasons set forth in the Final Bar Order and herein, the Court finds that the terms of the BMB Settlement Agreement are adequate, fair, reasonable, and equitable; and the Court approves the BMB Settlement. The Court further finds that entry of this Final Judgment and Bar Order is appropriate.

II. ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED** as follows:

1. Terms used in this Final Judgment and Bar Order that are defined in the BMB Settlement Agreement, unless expressly otherwise defined herein, have the same meaning as in the BMB Settlement Agreement.

2. The Court has “broad powers and wide discretion to determine the appropriate relief in [this] equity receivership,” including the authority to enter this Final Judgment and Bar Order. *SEC v. Kaleta*, 530 F. App’x 360, 362 (5th Cir. 2013) (internal quotations omitted); *see also SEC v. Parish*, No. 2:07-cv-00919-DCN, 2010 WL 8347143 (D.S.C. Feb. 10, 2010). Moreover, the Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action, and the Troice-Janvey Plaintiffs are proper parties to seek entry of this Final Judgment and Bar Order.

3. The Court finds that the methodology, form, content and dissemination of the Notice: (i) were implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Scheduling Order; (ii) constituted the best practicable notice; (iii) were reasonably calculated, under the circumstances,

to apprise all Interested Parties, including the plaintiffs in the Other BMB Litigation³, of the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement, the releases therein, and the injunctions provided for in the Final Bar Order to be entered in the SEC Action, this Final Judgment and Bar Order, and the Final Judgment and Bar Order to be entered in the Janvey Litigation; (iv) were reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise all Interested Parties of the right to object to the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement, the Final Bar Order to be entered in the SEC Action, this Final Judgment and Bar Order, and the Final Judgment and Bar Order to be entered in the Janvey Litigation, and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (v) were reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice; (vi) met all applicable requirements of law, including, without limitation, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including Due Process), and the Rules of the Court; and (vii) provided to all Persons a full and fair opportunity to be heard on these matters.

4. The Court finds that the BMB Settlement was reached following an extensive investigation of the facts and resulted from vigorous, good faith, arm's-length negotiations involving experienced and competent counsel. The claims asserted against the BMB Defendants contain complex and novel issues of law and fact that would require a substantial amount of time and expense to litigate, with a significant risk that the Troice-Janvey Plaintiffs and the plaintiffs herein may not ultimately prevail on their claims. By the same token, it is clear that the BMB Defendants would never agree to the terms of the BMB Settlement unless they were assured of global peace with respect to all claims that have been, could have been, or could be asserted

³ The "Other BMB Litigation" is defined in the BMB Settlement Agreement to include (i) *Rupert v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 20090C116137, filed on September 14, 2009 in Texas state court (Bexar County); (ii) this action; (iii) *Rishmague v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 2011C12585, filed on March 11, 2011 in Texas state court (Bexar County); and (iv) *MacArthur v. Winter, et al.*, Case No. 2013-07840, filed on February 8, 2013 in Texas state court (Harris County).

against any of the BMB Defendants and any of the BMB Released Parties by any Person arising out of or related to the events leading to these proceedings, and with respect to all claims that have been, could have been, or could be asserted against any of the BMB Defendants and any of the BMB Released Parties by any Person arising from or related to the BMB Defendants' relationship with the Stanford Entities (subject only to the aforementioned exceptions applicable to Winter). The injunction against such claims is therefore a necessary and appropriate order ancillary to the relief obtained for victims of the Stanford Ponzi scheme pursuant to the BMB Settlement. *See Kaleta*, 530 F. App'x at 362 (entering bar order and injunction against investor claims as "ancillary relief" to a settlement in an SEC receivership proceeding); *Parish*, 2010 WL 8347143 (similar).

5. Pursuant to the BMB Settlement Agreement and upon motion by the Receiver in the SEC Action, this Court will approve a Distribution Plan that will fairly and reasonably distribute the net proceeds of the BMB Settlement to Stanford Investors who have Claims approved by the Receiver. The Court finds that the Receiver's claims process and the Distribution Plan contemplated in the BMB Settlement Agreement have been designed to ensure that all Stanford Investors have received an opportunity to pursue their Claims through the Receiver's claims process previously approved by the Court. [SEC Action ECF No. 1584].

6. Accordingly, the Court finds that the BMB Settlement is, in all respects, fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best interests of all Persons claiming an interest in, having authority over, or asserting a claim against any of the BMB Defendants and any of the BMB Released Parties, the Stanford Entities or the Receivership Estate, including but not limited to the plaintiffs in this action, the Troice-Janvey Plaintiffs, the Claimants, and all other Interested Parties.

7. The Court hereby permanently bars, restrains and enjoins the Receiver, the plaintiffs in this action, the Troice-Janvey Plaintiffs, the Claimants, all other Interested Parties⁴, and all other Persons or entities, whether acting in concert with the foregoing or claiming by, through, or under the foregoing, or otherwise, all and individually, from directly, indirectly, or through a third party, instituting, reinstating, intervening in, initiating, commencing, maintaining, continuing, proceeding, filing, encouraging, soliciting, supporting, participating in, collaborating in, or otherwise prosecuting, against any of the BMB Defendants or any of the BMB Released Parties, now or at any time in the future, any action, lawsuit, cause of action, claim, investigation, demand, complaint, or proceeding of any nature, including but not limited to litigation, arbitration, or other proceeding, in any Forum, whether individually, representatively, directly, derivatively, on behalf of a class or putative class, as a member of a class or putative class, or in any other capacity whatsoever, that, in whole or in part, in any way concerns, relates to, is based upon, arises from, or is in any manner connected with (i) the Stanford Entities, (ii) any certificate of deposit, depository account, or investment of any type with any one or more of the Stanford Entities, (iii) any one or more of the BMB Defendants' relationship(s) with any one of the Stanford Entities, (iv) the BMB Defendants' provision of services to any of the Stanford Entities, and any other acts, errors or omissions by the BMB Defendants for or related to the Stanford Entities, (v) any matter that was asserted in, could have been asserted in, or relates to the subject matter of this action, the Janvey Litigation, the Troice Litigation, the SEC Action, the Other BMB Litigation, or any other proceeding concerning the

⁴ "Interested Parties," as defined herein and in the BMB Settlement Agreement, means "the Receiver, the Receivership Estate, the Committee, the members of the Committee, [the Troice-Janvey] Plaintiffs, the plaintiffs in the Other BMB Litigation, the Stanford Investors, the Claimants, the Examiner, the Joint Liquidators, or any other Person or Persons who have or may have claims against the BMB Released Parties or the Receivership Estate, or who are alleged by the Receiver, the Committee, or any other Person or entity on behalf of the Receivership Estate to be liable to the Receivership Estate, whether or not a formal proceeding has been initiated."

Stanford Entities pending or commenced in any Forum, or (vi) any Settled Claim. The foregoing specifically includes, but is not limited to, any claim, however denominated, seeking contribution, indemnity, damages, or other remedy where the alleged injury to such Person, entity, or Interested Party, or the claim asserted by such Person, entity, or Interested Party, is based upon such Person's, entity's, or Interested Party's liability to any plaintiff, Claimant, or Interested Party arising out of, relating to, or based in whole or in part upon money owed, demanded, requested, offered, paid, agreed to be paid, or required to be paid to any plaintiff, Claimant, Interested Party, or other Person or entity, whether pursuant to a demand, judgment, claim, agreement, settlement or otherwise. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this bar order does not extend to, shall not include, and shall not alter, limit, or otherwise affect the Receiver's right or ability to pursue and collect the full amount of the final judgment entered in favor of the Receiver against Winter in *Janvey v. Hamric*, Case No. 3:13-cv-00775-N-BG, Doc. No. 257 (the "Winter Final Judgment") or make any recovery pursuant thereto in accordance with and to the maximum extent permitted by the Order Granting Application for Turnover Order, *In re Robert S. Winter, Deceased*, Case No. 435,100 in the Probate Court No. 4 of Harris County, Texas (the "Turnover Order"). Further, nothing in this Final Judgment and Bar Order or the BMB Settlement Agreement or the BMB Settlement shall be construed to impair or limit the Receiver's rights to collect the full amount of the Winter Final Judgment or make any recovery pursuant thereto in accordance with the terms of the Turnover Order.

8. Nothing in this Final Judgment and Bar Order shall impair or affect or be construed to impair or affect in any way whatsoever, any right of any Person, entity, or Interested Party to (a) claim a credit or offset, however determined or quantified, if and to the extent provided by any applicable statute, code, or rule of law, against any judgment amount, based

upon the BMB Settlement or payment of the Settlement Amount by or on behalf of the BMB Defendants and the BMB Released Parties; (b) designate a “responsible third party” or “settling person” under Chapter 33 of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code; or (c) take discovery under applicable rules in other litigation; provided, however, for the avoidance of doubt that nothing in this paragraph shall be interpreted to permit or authorize (x) any action or claim seeking to recover any monetary or other relief from any of the BMB Defendants or the BMB Released Parties, or (y) the commencement, assertion or continuation of any action or claim against any of the BMB Defendants or the BMB Released Parties, including any action or claim seeking to impose any liability of any kind (including but not limited to liability for contribution, indemnification or otherwise) upon any of the BMB Defendants or BMB Released Parties.

9. The BMB Defendants and the BMB Released Parties have no responsibility, obligation, or liability whatsoever with respect to the cost associated with or the content of the Notice; the notice process; the Distribution Plan; the implementation of the Distribution Plan; the administration of the BMB Settlement; the management, investment, disbursement, allocation, or other administration or oversight of the Settlement Amount, any other funds paid or received in connection with the BMB Settlement, or any portion thereof; the payment or withholding of Taxes; the determination, administration, calculation, review, or challenge of claims to the Settlement Amount, any portion of the Settlement Amount, or any other funds paid or received in connection with the BMB Settlement or the BMB Settlement Agreement; or any losses, attorneys’ fees, expenses, vendor payments, expert payments, or other costs incurred in connection with any of the foregoing matters. No appeal, challenge, decision, or other matter concerning any subject set forth in this paragraph shall operate to terminate, cancel or modify the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement or this Final Judgment and Bar Order.

10. Nothing in this Final Judgment and Bar Order, the Final Bar Order or the BMB Settlement Agreement and no aspect of the BMB Settlement or negotiation thereof is or shall be construed to be an admission or concession of any violation of any statute or law, of any fault, liability or wrongdoing, or of any infirmity in the claims or defenses of the parties with regard to any of the complaints, claims, allegations or defenses in this action, the Troice Litigation, the Janvey Litigation, the Other BMB Litigation, or any other proceeding. The BMB Defendants have always denied and continue to expressly deny any liability or wrongdoing with respect to the matters alleged in the complaints in this action, the Troice Litigation, the Janvey Litigation, the Other BMB Litigation, and any other claims related to the Stanford Entities.

11. Without in any way affecting the finality of this Final Judgment and Bar Order, the Court retains continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over the parties to this action for purposes of, among other things, the administration, interpretation, consummation, and enforcement of the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement, the Scheduling Order, the Final Bar Order, and this Final Judgment and Bar Order, including, without limitation, the injunctions, bar orders, and releases herein, and to enter orders concerning implementation of the BMB Settlement, the BMB Settlement Agreement, and the Distribution Plan.

12. The Court expressly finds and determines, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b), that there is no just reason for any delay in the entry of this Final Judgment and Bar Order as to the BMB Defendants, which is both final and appealable as to the BMB Defendants, and immediate entry by the Clerk of the Court as to the BMB Defendants is expressly directed.

13. All relief as to the BMB Defendants that is not expressly granted herein is denied. This is a final judgment. The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter Judgment as to the BMB

Defendants in conformity herewith.

Signed on _____, 2016

DAVID C. GODBEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE