

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA
CIVIL DIVISION**

STATE OF FLORIDA
OFFICE OF FINANCIAL REGULATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

CASE NO.: 50-2021-CA-008718-XXXX-MB

NATIONAL SENIOR INSURANCE, INC.
D/B/A SEEMAN HOLTZ,
MARSHAL SEEMAN,
CENTURION INSURANCE SERVICES
GROUP, LLC, BRIAN J. SCHWARTZ,
EMERALD ASSETS 2018, LLC,
INTEGRITY ASSETS 2016, LLC,
INTERGRITY ASSETS, LLC,
PARA LONGEVITY 2014-5, LLC,
PARA LONGEVITY 2015-3, LLC,
PARA LONGEVITY 2015-5, LLC,
PARA LONGEVITY 2016-3, LLC,
PARA LONGEVITY 2016-5, LLC,
PARA LONGEVITY 2018-3, LLC,
PARA LONGEVITY 2018-5, LLC,
PARA LONGEVITY 2019-3, LLC,
PARA LONGEVITY 2019-5, LLC,
PARA LONGEVITY 2019-6, LLC,
PARA LONGEVITY VI, LLC,
SH GLOBAL, LLC N/K/A PARA
LONGEVITY V, LLC, ALTRAI GLOBAL,
LLC A/K/A ALTRAI HOLDINGS, LLC,
VALENTINO GLOBAL HOLDINGS, LLC,
AMERITONIAN ENTERPRISES, LLC,
SEEMAN-HOLTZ CONSULTING CORP.,
CENTURION ISG Holdings, LLC,
CENTURION ISG Holdings II, LLC,
CENTURION ISG (Europe) Limited,
CENTURION ISG SERVICES, LLC,
CENTURION ISG FINANCE GROUP, LLC,
CENTURION FUNDING SPV I LLC,
CENTURION FUNDING SPV II LLC,
GRACE HOLDINGS FINANCIAL, LLC,
PRIME SHORT TERM CREDIT INC.,

Defendants.

THE ESTATE OF ERIC CHARLES HOLTZ,
SEEMAN HOLTZ PROPERTY AND CASUALTY, LLC
F/K/A SEEMAN HOLTZ PROPERTY AND CASUALTY,
INC., SHPC HOLDINGS I, LLC,

Relief Defendants.

CORPORATE MONITOR'S SEVENTH REPORT

Pursuant to Section XX of the September 14, 2021 [*Agreed Order Granting Plaintiff's Consent Motion for Appointment of Corporate Monitor and Related Injunctive Relief*](#) (the "Agreed Order"), this Court's Corporate Monitor, Daniel J. Stermer (the "Corporate Monitor"), hereby provides this seventh report ("Report" or "Seventh Report") of the actions taken by the Corporate Monitor since the filing of the Corporate Monitor's Sixth Report on January 3, 2023, and states:

A. Overview

Many Noteholders and creditors have asked the following questions and comments in an effort to better understand the status of this matter and what lies ahead:

- Where did my money go and why has there not been any explanation to date?
- Why is this taking so long?
- I thought the Notes were fully backed by the Portfolio of life settlement policies and Seeman Holtz Property and Casualty?
- Will there ever be enough information to take this matter to trial?
- Why haven't criminal charges been brought against those involved?

As to the question of where did the money go, and why there has not been any explanation as to same, as the Corporate Monitor has written in his prior Reports, the Corporate Monitor and his team expected to find a full and complete set of books and records when the Corporate Monitor was appointed as Corporate Monitor, particularly understanding depth and breadth of the Seeman Holtz organization. Much to the Corporate Monitor's and his team's surprise, or maybe not, the Corporate Monitor did not find such and the Corporate Monitor and his team have been and

continue to try and obtain all of the bank statements and related check images necessary to work to recreate a full and complete set of books and records, based upon independent and reliable sources, as opposed to relying upon any specific records that the Corporate Monitor and his team found at the corporate offices and in electronic formats. As Noteholders and creditors have seen by following the docket in this matter, the Corporate Monitor and his team have issued and served approximately thirty-four subpoenas to various entities, individuals, and financial institutions requesting various documents, including, but not limited to, bank statements and other financial information. That process is ongoing and the Corporate Monitor continues to receive additional documentation for analysis.

The Corporate Monitor's team continues to analyze all of the pertinent information and bank records/data that has been received to trace how and when funds that came in from Noteholders, to create a starting point of review for each Noteholder Proof of Claim Form, and analyze where and when funds went out to Noteholders over time, if any. This is neither a simple nor straightforward process. Rather, this is a very complex process given the interwoven set of entities where funds moved rather freely as soon as they were received. The Corporate Monitor and his team are in the process of doing the necessary tracing and ticking and tying to see what happened, and try to maximize the recovery for Noteholders and other parties in interest.

Should the Corporate Monitor and his team trace money to a third party which should be returned to the Monitorship Estate, they will review the facts, data, and information and then apply applicable law to determine how best to seek recovery of those funds. Each potential recovery source/third party transaction has to be reviewed independently from others to determine next best steps, as litigation can be time consuming, slow, and costly. Given those variables, litigation is

only one of the options to be considered when reviewing how best to proceed relative to that potential recovery source/third party. Again, this is a time-consuming process.

As the Corporate Monitor has discussed, the Corporate Monitor works on many matters similar to this and he and his team are, even though it may appear to the contrary, moving at a pace that is faster than normal, including conducting a Claims Process when they did. Not that it is any solace to Noteholders, but the Corporate Monitor has been involved in other matters where years have gone by before a similar claims process has even been proposed. At base, the Corporate Monitor and his team are working as hard as they can to do so now, with the intent of preparing an initial proposed plan of distribution to the Court. The Corporate Monitor cannot give you a date or amount of what this initial proposed plan may look like as many variables could change before that is done, including, but not limited to, finalizing the over 1,450 Proof of Claim Forms received which the Corporate Monitor and his team are in the process of reviewing and reconciling. Moreover, the Corporate Monitor could recover additional sums to the Monitorship Estate during this time as well.

The Corporate Monitor and his team continue to work towards a full and complete understanding of all of the finances involved in this matter but cannot and will not be in a position to do so until all of the necessary financial data/information/documents are received, reviewed, and analyzed. While the Corporate Monitor cannot provide Noteholders and creditors with any firm timeline, the Corporate Monitor intends to report out exactly what his findings are on a global basis. The Corporate Monitor has and continues to do so on smaller, discreet issues such as the Due To/Due From Seeman Holtz Property and Casualty claims, which allowed the Corporate Monitor to enter into a settlement which brought \$2,250,000.00 back into the Monitorship Estate, and the Corporate Monitor could receive additional monies based upon the potential sale of

some/all of the SHPC agencies. As Noteholders and creditors are aware, Seeman Holtz Property and Casualty was foreclosed upon by its Secured Lender prior to the Corporate Monitor's appointment.

Noteholders and creditors are also aware of the Corporate Monitor's efforts to refinance and/or sell the Life Settlement Portfolio,¹ which was, at the time of the Corporate Monitor's appointment, made up of 61 life insurance policies. The Corporate Monitor sought and obtained court permission to embark on a process to resolve the amount that was outstanding and due to that Secured Lender. The Corporate Monitor and his team negotiated a reduced Release Price with the Secured Lender, but, after extensive and tireless efforts, the Corporate Monitor did not receive any Qualified Bids that met the reduced Release Price and the Life Settlement Portfolio was taken over by the Secured Lender. The relationship with that Secured Lender commenced back in 2019. Unfortunately, the Company had not been able to make any of the required payments, and thus the Secured Lender had to pay (or advance) the required monthly premiums on the underlying policies in the Life Settlement Portfolio. The Corporate Monitor and his team did not make the original deal with the Secured Lender but did try to refinance it. But the market spoke, and spoke loudly, and given the absence of any Qualified Bids, the Secured Lender foreclosed on the Life Settlement Portfolio. As a result, the Life Settlement Portfolio is no longer an asset of the Monitorship Estate.

As previously written, including in Reports, the Secured Lender collateralized its lien as necessary in December 2018 into early 2019, well before the Noteholders' July 25, 2015 Promissory Note and Security Agreement and other related documents. Again, the Corporate

¹ The Corporate Monitor's review of many of the Notes has also shown, generally, that only the Grace Holdings Notes detailed a specific policy at Schedule 2 of the Note and identified one or more policies that purportedly secured that Note, including policy number, insurance company, face amount, and insured. Pursuant to the Grace Holdings Notes and related document, Grace Holdings Noteholders were purportedly secured for the amount of their Note by the policy described in Schedule 2, as were many other Noteholders for the purported amount of their Notes as well.

Monitor wrote extensively about issues such as this in his Initial Report dated October 14, 2021, at Section V-A, his Second Report dated January 12, 2022, at Section J, his Third Report dated April 12, 2022, at Section L, and his Fourth Report dated July 1, 2022, at Section D.

Turning to the question “Will I ever have enough information to give to the State to bring this case to trial?,” there are a host of answers that apply but the Corporate Monitor’s response begins with: the Office of Financial Regulation (“OFR”) commenced this enforcement action which is a civil litigation matter wherein they allege certain facts and then apply the facts to a number of causes of action, including, but not limited to, Securities Fraud under Florida law, Sale of Securities by Unregistered Dealer, Issuer or Associated Person, Acting as Unregistered Investment Advisers or Associated Persons, Sale of Unregistered Securities, False Statements to OFR, and other relief. The OFR has the burden of proving up each of the causes of action alleged in their Complaint, and thus has to prove sufficient facts to do so. The OFR’s case is, for all intents and purposes, a separation undertaking from the Corporate Monitor’s duties and responsibilities which he has described in previous responses, Reports, updates, and above.

As to questions asked as to why certain individuals are not being prosecuted and/or in jail: the Order of Appointment of Corporate Monitor grants the Corporate Monitor the authority to “cooperate with regulatory and other government authorities with regard to any inquiry and to provide access and produce records upon request, with or without subpoena.” Order dated 09/14/21, ¶13(EE). If called upon to do so, the Corporate Monitor will fully cooperate with law enforcement authorities. Under Florida law, active criminal investigations conducted by state or local law enforcement are confidential until a charge is filed or an investigation is closed. Only the investigating agency has authority to release information about an ongoing investigation.

Therefore, the Corporate Monitor is not at liberty to confirm or deny the existence of any criminal investigation with respect to the conduct of any parties or non-parties to the above-captioned case.

The Corporate Monitor truly does appreciate, understand, and respect the Noteholders' frustrations - it is understandable – but, again, the Corporate Monitor did not create this situation and he and his team are working as effectively, efficiently, and as expeditiously as possible under the circumstances and given the complexity and lack of proper record keeping by the former management of the entities in the Monitorship.

The Corporate Monitor does think it is important to speak with and personally respond to each and every Noteholder who calls and/or reaches out but understands his answers will never suffice and/or fully alleviate Noteholders' concerns, pressures, and anger - the Corporate Monitor has and will continue to do his level-headed best, along with his professionals, to investigate this matter and quickly and completely as possible and try and maximize the recovery for Noteholders.

B. Narrative of Events

Since the filing of the Corporate Monitor's Sixth Report, the Corporate Monitor has continued to perform his duties under the Agreed Order. Specifically, the Corporate Monitor continued his efforts to monetize assets and work to recover funds, began and continued reviewing and analyzing proofs of claims, continued to update the informational website, responded to inquiries from Noteholders and creditors, prepared a joint motion, along with the Office of Financial Regulation, seeking to appoint the Corporate Monitor as receiver, worked closely with the parties in the case, and focused on investigating claims and additional areas for potential recovery for the benefit of Noteholders and other parties in interest of the current Monitorship Estate.

This Seventh Report should be read in conjunction with the [*Corporate Monitor's Initial Report*](#) (the "Initial Report") filed on October 14, 2021, the [*Corporate Monitor's Second Report*](#) filed on January 12, 2022, the [*Corporate Monitor's Third Report*](#) filed on April 12, 2022, the [*Corporate Monitor's Fourth Report*](#) filed on July 1, 2022, the [*Corporate Monitor's Fifth Report*](#) filed on October 3, 2022, and the [*Corporate Monitor's Sixth Report*](#) filed on January 3, 2023. The Corporate Monitor and his professionals continue their investigation into all aspects of the Consenting Corporate Defendants, related entities, and individuals so as to better understand their interconnectivity and relationship with an eye towards maximizing recovery for Noteholders and other parties in interest. Not all sections of the Initial Report, Second Report, Third Report, Fourth Report, Fifth Report, and Sixth Report are clarified and/or expanded upon in this Seventh Report as some sections will require additional time, research, and investigation and the Corporate Monitor is not prepared (or able, based upon current status or available information), at this time, to address in detail all aspects of the ongoing investigation(s). Such matters will be addressed in future reports to be prepared and filed by the Corporate Monitor.²

The Corporate Monitor will file and serve this Seventh Report as he has all prior Reports pursuant to Paragraph 53 of the Agreed Order. In addition to the preparation and filing of his Reports, the Corporate Monitor has updated his website with the Initial Report, Second Report, Third Report, Fourth Report, Fifth Report, and Sixth Report, in addition to uploading all filings in this matter under the Court Documents section of his website: <http://nationalseniormonitorship.com/> and the addition of the Claims Process Documents and

² This Seventh Report does not provide an exhaustive list of actions taken by the Corporate Monitor and/or in the OFR Enforcement Action and the Corporate Monitor's website is updated regularly with all filings/orders in the OFR Enforcement Action and Noteholders and other parties in interest should visit the Corporate Monitor's website periodically to see all of the activity occurring in the OFR Enforcement Action, some of which involves the Corporate Monitor while others involve the Parties to the OFR Enforcement Action.

Millstein v. Marshal Seeman, et al. – SHPC Claims Settlement Related sections to the website. All of this reporting and updating is being done to comply with the directives of the Court and to be as transparent as possible, under the difficult facts and circumstances of this case.

C. Claims Process

As set forth in the Corporate Monitor’s prior Reports, the Court entered an Order setting **August 31, 2022**,³ as the deadline by which claimants were required to return completed Proofs of Claim forms to the Corporate Monitor. Below is a summary of claims received as of the date of this Seventh Report⁴:

Total # of Claims	1,437
Total # of Individualized Claimants	1,139
Total Amount of Claims	\$342,065,044
Total Amount of Noteholder-related Claims	\$308,402,933
Total Amount of Trade/non-individual Noteholder Creditor Claims	\$33,662,110

The Corporate Monitor has commenced the process to review all claims submitted to date and commenced a reconciliation process related to the Claims that have been filed by Noteholders and other creditors. The Corporate Monitor has and will continue to follow up with Noteholders and other creditors as necessary as part of the claims review and reconciliation process should the Corporate Monitor need clarification and/or further information/documentation from a Noteholder and/or other creditor.

³ The Claims Bar Date was extended through and including October 31, 2022, by the federal court as part of the settlement reached in the class action case captioned *Millstein, et al. v. Marshal Seeman, et al.*, Case No. 21-CV-6 1179-RAR (S.D. Fla. 2021).

⁴ On March 30, 2023, the Corporate Monitor filed his Motion for Authorization to File Protective Proof of Claim on Behalf of Noteholders Who Failed to File Claims. That Motion will be set for hearing before the Court as soon as practicable. As of the filing of the Motion, approximately 120 Noteholders had not filed Proof of Claim totaling approximately \$15,707,061.91 in the aggregate of monies invested by these Noteholders.

D. Vantage IRA Issues

A number of Noteholder/Vantage IRA Account Holders have indicated that they have received a 1099-R from Vantage and inquired why they received same. Vantage has advised that should any IRA Account Holder not pay the required Annual Fee to Vantage that it, after providing notice to the IRA Account Holder, resigns as IRA Custodian due to non-payment of the Annual Fee, and then issues a 1099-R which is reported as a taxable distribution to the IRA Account Holder, even though no actual cash was distributed to the IRA Account Holder. Vantage then closes the IRA Account and asserts it is no longer responsible for same.

If this occurs, the Noteholder/IRA Account Holder may not be able to transfer the IRA Account to another IRA Custodian if the attempted transfer is in excess of the 60 day window that the IRS allows for an asset to be rolled into another qualified account. Each Noteholder/IRA Account Holder should consult with their attorney, financial advisor, and/or tax preparer regarding this issue to determine what each individual Noteholder/IRA Account Holder's options are for rolling it into another account as neither the Corporate Monitor nor Vantage are in a position to provide any guidance to Noteholders/IRA Account Holders in this situation.

Every Noteholder/IRA Account Holder is encouraged to investigate the status of their IRA Account with their IRA Account Custodian to determine the status of their IRA Account as it is possible that the IRA Account Custodian may have resigned previously which could create a taxable event for the Noteholder/IRA Account Holder.

Moreover, Vantage has advised that they will not lower the value of debt instruments. Unlike other assets held in IRAs, Vantage views that debt instruments are subject to additional tax reporting when the debt associated with those instruments is lowered or discharged. The tax

reporting obligations of a creditor can often be an afterthought in these situations, but a failure by a creditor to file a Form 1099-C may result in severe penalties under IRC §§ 6721 and 6722.

Each Noteholder/IRA Account Holder is in a unique and individualized situation and should engage those professionals who can assist them with their particular need(s) – some professionals may be more passive vs. active and that may be better for a given individual’s circumstance but we cannot and will not provide any particularized and/or individualized guidance and/or recommendations and we do not maintain any information about any professional and/or alternative IRA Custodian that we can share. The Corporate Monitor has heard from Noteholders/IRA Account Holders that they have utilized various provisions of applicable law/code based upon the advice of their engaged professional but the Corporate Monitor does not know who those professional are – again, that strategy may be beneficial for that Noteholder/IRA Account Holder but may not be for another which is why each Noteholder/IRA Account Holder would need to research and engage an attorney, tax preparer, and/or financial advisor that understands your overall picture and the status of the Seeman Holtz matter and your Notes/IRA and how best to utilize any/all provisions of applicable law/code.

E. Joint Motion to Appoint Receiver

On March 23, 2023, the Corporate Monitor, together with Plaintiff, State of Florida Office of Financial Regulation (“OFR”), filed a *Joint Motion to Appoint Receiver* (the “Receiver Motion”), seeking the entry of an order appointing the Corporate Monitor as receiver for the Consenting Corporate Defendants. The Receiver Motion was filed as the Corporate Monitor, with the consent of the OFR, believes that converting this monitorship into a receivership is necessary and appropriate to facilitate the wind up of the Consenting Corporate Defendants’ affairs, including the liquidation of assets, disposition and prosecution of claims, and to facilitate litigation

against third-parties, which will benefit the Consenting Corporate Defendants, shareholders, members, investors, and creditors.

As set forth in the Receiver Motion, the remaining assets of the Consenting Corporate Defendants will be intangible and include litigation claims, clawback claims, and other possible forms of recovery against third-parties.

As set forth in the Receiver Motion, a copy of which may be reviewed on the monitorship website: <https://nationalseniormonitorship.com>, the appointment of a receiver, (a) will assist in the distribution of restitution to noteholders and creditors, as authorized by § 517.191, Florida Statutes, will streamline litigations against third-parties, (b) will lift the stay of litigation and allow for the receiver to commence claims against third-parties, and (c) will give the receiver standing to assert claims against third-parties and avoid the defenses that might otherwise be raised against the Consenting Corporate Defendants.

The Corporate Monitor believes that vesting him with the powers of a receiver is appropriate at this juncture in the case, to facilitate the orderly wind up of the businesses, bring claims, and distribute proceeds to Noteholders and creditors, consistent with the existing claim process.

A hearing to consider the Receiver Motion is presently scheduled for May 10, 2023.

F. IRS Form 1099s for 2022

A number of Noteholders/IRA Account Holders have inquired about the issuance of IRS Form 1099s for 2022 as they have not received one as of yet from the Monitorship Estate. The Monitorship Estate has not and will not be issuing 1099s for 2022 as no monies were actually disbursed to Noteholders and 1099s are for actual cash disbursed. The Corporate Monitor cannot speak to whether an IRA Account Custodian, such as Vantage, Midland, and/or another IRA

Account Custodia may, as appropriate, issues 1099(s) for any IRA Account(s) that a Noteholder may have with them.

G. Summary of Cash Activity

As of March 24, 2023, the Corporate Monitor's book cash balance is \$2,088,163.00.⁵ Attached is the Monitorship Cash Flow Summary for the period from the inception of the Monitorship Estate through March 24, 2023 – see **Exhibit 1**.

As set forth in the Corporate Monitor's prior reports, the settlement between the Corporate Monitor, Seeman Holtz Property and Casualty, LLC f/k/a Seeman Holtz Property and Casualty, Inc. ("SHPC"), and Hamilton HM 11 Bermuda, HSCM F1 Master Fund Ltd., a Bermuda corporation, and HS Select I, LLC, a Georgia limited liability company (collectively, the "Lenders") only as to the Due to/Due From⁶ was approved by the Court and SHPC paid the sum of **\$2,250,000.00** (the "Initial Settlement Payment") to the Corporate Monitor pursuant to the SHPC Settlement. In exchange for the Initial Settlement Payment, the Corporate Monitor executed certain lien satisfaction/terminations that were filed by one or more Consenting Corporate Defendants and certain releases and provided them to SHPC for filing.

Additional terms of the SHPC Settlement require SHPC to pay to the Corporate Monitor, within ten (10) calendar days following SHPC's receipt of net cash from any sale or disposition of

⁵ Pre-appointment of the Corporate Monitor, certain of the Consenting Corporate Defendants maintained three (3) bank accounts at US Bank. After his appointment, the Corporate Monitor maintained the existing Accounts at US Bank, then closed two (2) of the Accounts and maintained one (1) account at US Bank. The Corporate Monitor has opened a new bank account at First Horizon Bank and completed his transitioning from US Bank to First Horizon Bank as the account at US Bank was closed on June 23, 2022.

⁶ The phrase "Due To/Due From" herein refers to an amount that may be due to one entity from another entity and a "netting" of the various amounts that may be due to one entity which would be due from the other entity.

SHPC, SHPC’s assets, or a portion thereof, an additional amount of money according to the below table:⁷

Net cash proceeds received by senior lenders from sale or disposition of SHPC assets	Additional Monies Owed to Corporate Monitor, prorated with 0% owed at beginning of range and 100% owed at top of range.
\$0 – \$135,000,000.00	\$0
\$135,000,001.00 – \$200,572,000.00	\$2,246,959.00
\$200,572,001.00-300,000,000.00	\$10,000,000.00

As set forth in prior Reports, the SHPC Settlement will provide meaningful proceeds for utilization in the Claims Process, payment of expenses, and to fund further investigation for potential additional recoveries that may be available to the Corporate Monitor on behalf of the Consenting Corporate Defendants.

To date, no additional funds have been received from SHPC pursuant to the SHPC Settlement.

In addition to the Corporate Monitor’s SHPC Settlement, the Corporate Monitor has received: (i) \$250,000.00 that was due from Secured Lender as part of the Corporate Monitor’s efforts to refinance/sell the Portfolio; and (ii) \$451,336.77 from the *Millstein, et al. v. Marshal Seeman, et al.* class action settlement with SHPC, which are proceeds from a settlement separate and apart from the Corporate Monitor’s SHPC settlement referenced above.

H. Discovery

Since the filing of the Sixth Report, the Corporate Monitor served subpoenas *duces tecum* upon (i) Fifth Third Bank; (ii) JPMorgan Chase Bank; and (iii) U.S. Bank. In addition, the

⁷ By way of example, should SHPC receive US \$150,000,000.00, the Monitor would receive an additional US \$514,005.75.

Corporate Monitor conducted the deposition of Gary A. Woodfield, the personal representative of the estate of Eric Charles Holtz, on January 17, 2023. As set forth above, as of the filing of this Seventh Report, the Corporate Monitor and his team have issued and served approximately thirty-four subpoenas to various entities, individuals, and financial institutions requesting various documents, including, but not limited to, bank statements and other financial information.

The Corporate Monitor and his team have reviewed and continue to analyze the various documents produced in response to the subpoenas issued and served by the Corporate Monitor.

Moreover, the Corporate Monitor and his team are in discussions with various third parties to obtain documents, data, and information from those third parties, in a cooperative fashion, and hope to be able to meet with and interview representatives of those third parties without the need for formal discovery filings.

I. Monitorship Website/Communications with Noteholders

As set forth in the prior Reports and above, the Corporate Monitor established a separate website for this matter to inform all parties in interest of the Monitorship's activities: <https://nationalseniormonitorship.com> (the "Website").

The Corporate Monitor will post this Seventh Report on the Website, along with all prior Reports. In addition, the Corporate Monitor will send an email communication to Noteholders and the Corporate Monitor's email Distribution List advising of the filing of this Seventh Report and its being posted on the Website and provide a copy of this Report as an attachment to the email to be sent to Noteholders.

The Corporate Monitor continues to upload all filings with the Court to the Website in a dedicated section entitled Court Documents so that Noteholders and all parties in interest have access to same in one centralized location.

The Corporate Monitor will continue to update the Website with court filings, news and updates, reports from the Corporate Monitor, answers to frequently asked questions, important dates and deadlines, and other pertinent information. Additionally, the Corporate Monitor has and will continue to respond promptly to inquiries received from Noteholders and other parties in interest in the Corporate Monitor Inbox seeking answers to questions on various issues/concerns impacting Noteholders and other parties in interest in this matter. Many Noteholders trusted the Consenting Corporate Defendants and Consenting Individual Defendants with substantial sums of their savings, with their retirement plans, and with their and their families' futures. The Corporate Monitor respectfully asks for Noteholders' continued patience and understanding during the Corporate Monitor's investigation of the Consenting Corporate Defendants and the process being to attempt to maximize recovery in a very challenging case.

CORPORATE MONITOR'S CERTIFICATION

I, Daniel J. Stermer, this Court's Corporate Monitor, hereby certify, under the penalties of perjury, that the forgoing Corporate Monitor's Seventh Report is true and accurate to the best of my personal knowledge and belief.

/s/ Daniel J. Stermer

Daniel J. Stermer

Dated: April 3, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

BERGER SINGERMANN LLP
Counsel for Corporate Monitor
525 Okeechobee Boulevard, Suite 1250
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
Tel. (561) 241-9500
Fax (561) 998-0028

By: /s/ *Brian G. Rich*

Brian G. Rich
Florida Bar No. 38229
brich@bergersingerman.com
Gavin C. Gaukroger
Florida Bar No. 76489
ggaukroger@bergersingerman.com
Michael J. Niles
Florida Bar No. 107203
mniles@bergersingerman.com
DRT@bergersingerman.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I **HEREBY CERTIFY** that on April 3, 2023, the foregoing was filed using the Florida E-Portal Filing System, which served a copy of the foregoing electronically upon all electronic service parties. I further certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by electronic transmission upon all parties on the attached Service List.

By: /s/ *Brian G. Rich*
Brian G. Rich

SERVICE LIST

<p>A. Gregory Melchior, Esq., Chief Counsel George C. Bedell, III, Esq., Chief Counsel <i>Office of General Counsel</i> <i>Florida Office of Financial Regulation</i> 200 East Gaines Street Tallahassee, FL 32309 Greg.Melchior@flofr.gov George.Bedell@flofr.gov Sharon.Sutor@flofr.gov <i>Counsel for Plaintiff</i></p>	<p>Scott Alan Orth, Esq. <i>Law Offices of Scott Alan Orth</i> 3860 Sheridan Street, Ste. A Hollywood, FL 33021 scott@orthlawoffice.com service@orthlawoffice.com eserviceSAO@gmail.com <i>Attorney for Defendant Marshal Seeman, Twenty-six Defendant Entities</i></p>
<p>Jeffrey H. Sloman, Esq. <i>Stumphauzer Foslid Sloman & Kolaya, PLLC</i> One Biscayne Tower 2 South Biscayne Boulevard, Suite 1600 Miami, FL 33131 jsloman@sfslaw.com <i>Attorneys for Defendants Brian J. Schwartz and Ameritonian Enterprises, LLC</i></p>	<p>Daniel J. Stermer, Esq. <i>Development Specialists, Inc.</i> 500 W. Cypress Creek Road, Suite 400 Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309 dsterner@DSIConsulting.com <i>Corporate Monitor</i></p>
<p>Susan Yoffee, Esq. Gary A. Woodfield, Esq. <i>Nason Yeager Gerson Harris & Fumero, P.A.</i> 3001 PGA Boulevard, Suite 305 Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410 syoffee@nasonyeager.com gwoodfield@nasonyeager.com sdaversa@nasonyeager.com <i>Counsel for The Estate of Eric Charles Holtz</i></p>	<p>Victoria R. Morris, Esq. Andrew C. Lourie, Esq. Kobre & Kim LLP 201 South Biscayne Boulevard, Suite 1900 Miami, FL 33131 Andrew.Lourie@kobrekim.com Victoria.Morris@kobrekim.com <i>Attorneys for Relief Defendant Seeman Holtz Property and Casualty LLC</i></p>
<p>David L. Luikart III, Esq. Hill, Ward & Henderson, P.A. 101 East Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 3700 Tampa, FL 33602 Dave.luikart@hwhlaw.com Michelle.armstrong@hwhlaw.com <i>Attorneys for Prime Short Term Credit, Inc.</i></p>	<p>Joshua W. Dobin, Esq. James C. Moon, Esq. Meland Budwick, P.A. 3200 Southeast Financial Center 200 South Biscayne Boulevard Miami, FL 33131 jdobin@melandbudwick.com jmoon@melandbudwick.com mramos@melandbudwick.com <i>Attorneys for Teleios LS Holdings V DE, LLC and Teleios LS Holdings IV DE, LLC</i></p>

<p>Bernard Charles Carollo, Jr., Esq. John J. Truitt, Esq. William Leve, Esq. Vernon Litigation Group 8985 Fontana Del Sol Way Naples, FL 34109 bcarollo@vernonlitigation.com jtruitt@vernonlitigation.com wleve@vernonlitigation.com nzumaeta@vernonlitigation.com <i>Attorneys for Edwin and Karen Ezrine, Intervenor And Tom Echolds, Interested Party</i></p>	<p>Gary M. Murphree, Esq. Brandy Abreu, Esq. AM Law, LC 10743 SW 104th Street Miami, FL 33186 gmm@amlaw-miami.com babreu@amlaw-miami.com mramirez@amlaw-miami.com pleadings@amlaw-miami.com <i>Attorneys for Zoe Seijas and Victor Seijas, Jr., Trustees of Victor Seijas Living Trust</i></p>
<p>Harris J. Koroglu, Esq. Shutts & Bowen LLP 200 South Biscayne Boulevard, Suite 4100 Miami, FL 33131 hkoroglu@shutts.com <i>Attorneys for MCM 301 Yamato LLC</i></p>	<p>Angela C. Flowers, Esq. Kubicki Draper 13906 N.E. 20th Avenue, Building 500 Ocala, FL 34470 Af-kd@kubickidraper.com <i>Attorneys for Pelican Capital Management, LLC</i></p>
<p>Adam J. Ruttenberg, Esq. Arent Fox Schiff, LLP 800 Boylston Street, 32nd Floor Boston, MA 02199 Adam.ruttenberg@afslaw.com <i>Attorney for Pelican Capital Management, LLC</i></p>	

EXHIBIT 1

	Actual Cash Receipt and Disbursement Activity					Cumulative Total
	2021 4-Months	2022 12-Months	Jan-23 1-Month	Feb-23 1-Month	Mar-23 1-Month	
Cash Receipts						
Insurance Commissions	63,402	140,447	10,509	8,191	6,544	229,093
Settlement/Litigation Proceeds	-	2,250,000	-	776,337	-	3,026,337
Interest	-	-	-	332	-	332
Other Receipts	56,242	30,637	-	-	-	86,878
Total Cash Receipts	119,643	2,421,084	10,509	784,860	6,544	3,342,639
Operating Disbursements						
Payroll & Taxes	69,399	61,200	5,816	5,799	5,602	147,816
Purchased Services	19,719	92,737	4,786	3,531	2,400	123,172
Insurance	-	705	-	267	-	972
Utilities	3,106	2,295	-	-	-	5,401
Rent	-	37,000	-	37,010	-	74,010
Other	1,370	3,851	1	31	1	5,254
Total Operating Disbursements	93,594	197,788	10,604	46,637	8,003	356,625
Professional Fees						
Legal	-	308,667	-	-	-	308,667
Monitor Fees	-	216,518	-	-	-	216,518
Financial Advisor (DSI)	-	211,393	-	-	-	211,393
Tax Accountant	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Professionals	-	89,817	-	75,000	-	164,817
Total Professional Fees	-	826,395	-	75,000	-	901,395
Total Disbursements	93,594	1,024,183	10,604	121,637	8,003	1,258,020
Net Cash Flow	26,050	1,396,901	(95)	663,223	(1,459)	2,084,620
Cash Balance						
Beginning Cash Book Balance	3,544	29,593	1,426,494	1,426,399	2,089,622	3,544
Intercompany Receipts	-	87,342	-	2,045,000	-	2,132,342
Intercompany Disbursements	-	(87,342)	-	(2,045,000)	-	(2,132,342)
Net Cash Flow	26,050	1,396,901	(95)	663,223	(1,459)	2,084,620
Ending Cash^[1]	29,593	1,426,494	1,426,399	2,089,622	2,088,163	2,088,163
Bank Reconciliation						
Outstanding Checks	3,202	250	2,129	75,805	-	
Outstanding Wires	-	-	-	-	-	
Outstanding Deposits	-	-	-	-	-	
Adjusted Book Balance	32,795	1,426,743	1,428,529	2,165,427	2,088,163	
Actual Bank Balance	32,795	1,426,743	1,428,529	2,165,427	2,088,163	
Check	-	(0)	-	(0)	(0)	

Notes:

[1] Final ending Cash Balance is as of 03/24/23.