

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

In re:

WOODBIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC,
et al.,¹

Remaining Debtors.

MICHAEL GOLDBERG, in his capacity as Liquidating
Trustee of the WOODBRIDGE LIQUIDATION TRUST,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ASCENSUS, LLC d/b/a PROVIDENT TRUST GROUP,
ADMINISTRATOR AND CUSTODIAN FOR THE
BENEFIT OF QUN HONG YIN ROTH IRA; QUN HONG
YIN A/K/A LILY YIN; QUN HONG YIN, AS TRUSTEE
OF THE QUN HONG DOMISSY YIN LIVING TRUST,

Defendants.

Chapter 11

Case No. 17-12560 (BLS)

(Jointly Administered)

Adversary Proceeding

Case No. 19-_____ (BLS)

**COMPLAINT OBJECTING TO CLAIMS AND COUNTERCLAIMING
FOR AVOIDANCE AND RECOVERY OF AVOIDABLE TRANSFERS,
EQUITABLE SUBORDINATION, FOR SALE OF UNREGISTERED
SECURITIES, FRAUD, AND FOR AIDING AND ABETTING FRAUD**

¹ The Remaining Debtors and the last four digits of their respective federal tax identification numbers are as follows: Woodbridge Group of Companies, LLC (3603) and Woodbridge Mortgage Investment Fund 1, LLC (0172). The Remaining Debtors' mailing address is 14140 Ventura Boulevard, #302, Sherman Oaks, California 91423

The Woodbridge Liquidation Trust (the “Liquidation Trust” or “Plaintiff”) formed pursuant to the *First Amended Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Liquidation of Woodbridge Group of Companies, LLC and Its Affiliated Debtors* dated August 22, 2018 (Bankr. Docket No. 2397) (as it may be amended, modified, supplemented, or restated from time to time, the “Plan”²), as and for its *Complaint Objecting to Claims and Counterclaiming for Avoidance and Recovery of Avoidable Transfers, Equitable Subordination, For Sale Of Unregistered Securities, Fraud, And For Aiding And Abetting Fraud* (this “Complaint”) against Ascensus, LLC d/b/a Provident Trust Group, custodian for the benefit of Qun Hong Yin Roth IRA; Qun Hong Yin a/k/a Lily Yin; and Qun Hong Yin, as Trustee of the Qun Hong Domissy Yin Living Trust (“Defendants”), alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Since at least August 2012 until shortly before they sought bankruptcy protection, Woodbridge Group of Companies, LLC and its many hundreds of debtor affiliates (collectively, the “Debtors”) were operated by their founder and principal, Robert Shapiro (“Shapiro”), as a Ponzi scheme. As part of this fraud, Shapiro utilized the Debtors to raise over one billion dollars from approximately 10,000 investors as either Noteholders or Unitholders (collectively, “Investors”).

2. Those Investors often placed a substantial percentage of their net worth (including savings and retirement accounts) with the Debtors and now stand to lose a significant portion of their investments and to be delayed in the return of the remaining portion. The quality

² Capitalized terms used but not otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the Plan.

of the Investors' lives will likely be substantially and adversely affected by the fraud perpetrated by Shapiro.

3. Investors were often told that they were investing money to be loaned with respect to particular properties owned by third parties, that those properties were worth substantially more than the loans against the properties, and that they would have the benefit of a stream of payments from these third parties for high-interest loans, protected by security interests and/or mortgages against such properties. In reality, these statements were lies. Investors' money was almost never used to make high-interest loans to unrelated, third-party borrowers, there was no stream of payments, Investors' money was commingled and used for an assortment of expenses, including maintaining a lavish lifestyle for Shapiro and his family, brokers' commissions, overhead (largely for selling even more notes and units to investors), and payment of principal and interest to existing investors. The money that was used to acquire property (almost always owned by a disguised affiliate) cannot be traced to any specific Investor. These are typical characteristics of Ponzi schemes.

4. Because the Debtors operated as a Ponzi scheme, obtaining new money from Investors into the Ponzi scheme conferred no net benefit on the Debtors; on the contrary, each new investment was a net negative. Money was siphoned off to pay the expenses described above, so that the Debtors actually received only a fraction of the investment dollars. New money also perpetuated the Ponzi scheme, enabling the Debtors to return fictitious profits to early Investors; in the absence of new investment, the house of cards would fall (as it eventually did). At the same time, each investment created an obligation to return to the defrauded Investor

100% of the investment, such that each new investment increased the Debtors' liabilities and ultimately left them unable to satisfy their aggregate liabilities.

5. The purpose of this lawsuit is (i) to object to the Claims (defined below) so that Defendants are not further compensated at the expense of legitimate creditors for activities that advanced the Ponzi scheme and further drove the Debtors into insolvency, (ii) to recover monies previously paid to Defendants by reason of these activities or as fictitious profits on Defendants' Claims, and (iii) to the extent the Claims, or any new or amended Claims, survive, to equitably subordinate them.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. The Court has jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 157(a) and 1334. Counts I, II, III, IV, V, and VI of this adversary proceeding are core within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2)(B), (C), (F), and (H). Counts VII, VIII, and IX are non-core. Venue of this adversary proceeding is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

THE PARTIES

The Liquidation Trust

7. On December 4, 2017 (the "Initial Petition Date"), certain of the Debtors commenced voluntary cases under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. Other of the Debtors also filed voluntary chapter 11 cases either on the Initial Petition Date or within the following four months (collectively, the "Bankruptcy Cases").

8. On October 26, 2018, this Court entered an order confirming the Plan (Bankr. Docket No. 2903).

9. The Plan provides for, *inter alia*, the establishment of a the Liquidation Trust on the Effective Date of the Plan for the benefit of the Liquidation Trust Beneficiaries in accordance with the terms of the Plan and the Liquidation Trust Agreement. *See* Plan §§ 1.75, 5.4.

10. The Effective Date of the Plan occurred on February 15, 2019.

11. On February 25, 2019, the Court entered an order closing the Bankruptcy Cases of all Debtors except Woodbridge Group of Companies, LLC and Woodbridge Mortgage Investment Fund 1, LLC (together, the “Remaining Debtors”). The Remaining Debtors’ Bankruptcy Cases are being jointly administered under Case No. 17-12560 (KJC).

12. On the Effective Date, the Liquidation Trust was automatically vested with all of the Debtors’ and the Estates’ respective rights, title, and interest in and to all Liquidation Trust Assets. *See* Plan § 5.4.3. Further, the Liquidation Trust, as successor in interest to the Debtors, has the right and power to file and pursue any and all Liquidation Trust Actions without any further order of the Bankruptcy Court. *Id.* § 5.4.15. “Liquidation Trust Actions” include, *inter alia*, “all Avoidance Actions and Causes of Action held by the Debtors or the Estates” *Id.* § 1.76.

13. In addition to its status as successor in interest to the Debtors and their estates, the Liquidation Trust also holds claims held by Investors who elected to contribute to the Liquidation Trust certain causes of action that those Investors possess against individuals such as the Defendants (the “Contributed Claims”) attached hereto as Exhibit 3. *Id.* § 1.28 (defining “Contributed Claims” to include “All Causes of Action that a Noteholder or Unitholder has

against any Person that is not a Released Party and that are related in any way to the Debtors, their predecessors, their respective affiliates, or any Excluded Parties, including ... all Causes of Action based on, arising out of, or related to the marketing, sale, and issuance of any Notes or Units; ... all Causes of Action based on, arising out of, or related to the misrepresentation of any of the Debtors' financial information, business operations, or related internal controls; and ... all Causes of Action based on, arising out of, or related to any failure to disclose, or actual or attempted cover up or obfuscation of, any of the conduct described in the Disclosure Statement, including in respect of any alleged fraud related thereto”).

Defendants

14. Defendant Qun Hong Yin, a/k/a Lily Yin, is an individual residing in the State of California. Upon information and belief, Defendant Qun Hong Yin is a financial advisor who rendered investment advice. Upon information and belief, Defendant, Qun Hong Yin is the Trustee and beneficiary of the Qun Hong Domissy Yin Living Trust established and operated in San Diego, California.

15. Defendant Ascensus, LLC d/b/a Provident Trust Group, is a corporation operating and established in the state of Delaware, with its principal place of business in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Upon information and belief Ascensus, LLC d/b/a Provident Trust Group is an administrator and custodian of IRA assets and the trustee who controls and maintains the IRA for the benefit of Qun Hong Yin, Roth IRA.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS

16. Defendants were scheduled by the Debtors for claims against the Debtors as identified on Exhibit 1 hereto (collectively, the “Claims”). The Claims are based on Notes and Units held by Defendants.

17. Defendants engaged in activities that generated investments in the Debtors. Defendants were in the business of selling investment products, including the Debtors’ Notes and/or Units, to retail investors. Defendants, either individually or through others, solicited and sold Notes and/or Units to investors. Defendants received commission payments from the Debtors on account of Notes and/or Units sold to investors.

18. Within the two years preceding the Initial Petition Date, Defendants received transfers from the Debtors totaling not less than the amount set forth on Exhibit 2 hereto (the “Two Year Transfers”), including commission payments and Prepetition Distributions from the Ponzi scheme in respect of the Claims. The precise transfers – including the transferor, its petition date, the date of each transfer, and the amount of each transfer – are set forth on Exhibit 2.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANTS)

Avoidance and Recovery of Actual Intent Fraudulent Transfers – Bankruptcy Code

19. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

20. The Two Year Transfers constituted transfers of the Debtors’ property.

21. The Two Year Transfers were made by the Debtors with actual intent to hinder or delay or defraud their creditors insofar as either (i) the services to be provided in exchange for such transfers would perpetuate a Ponzi scheme, or (ii) such transfers were prepetition distributions of fictitious profits from the Ponzi scheme in respect of the Claims.

22. The Two Year Transfers were made to or for the benefit of Defendants.

23. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff is entitled to judgment pursuant to Bankruptcy Code sections 548(a), 550(a), and 551: (a) avoiding the Two Year Transfers free and clear of any claimed interest of Defendants, (b) directing that the Two Year Transfers be set aside, and (c) recovering such Two Year Transfers or the value thereof from Defendants for the benefit of the Liquidation Trust.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANTS)

Avoidance and Recovery of Constructive Fraudulent Transfers – Bankruptcy Code

24. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

25. The Two Year Transfers constituted transfers of the Debtors' property.

26. The Two Year Transfers were made by the Debtors for less than reasonably equivalent value at a time when the Debtors (i) were insolvent; and/or (ii) were engaged or about to engage in business or a transaction for which any capital remaining with the Debtors were an unreasonably small capital; and/or (iii) intended to incur, or believed that Debtors would incur, debts beyond their ability to pay as such debts matured.

27. The Two Year Transfers were made to or for the benefit of Defendants.

28. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff is entitled to judgment pursuant to Bankruptcy Code sections 548(a), 550(a), and 551: (a) avoiding the Two Year Transfers free and clear of any claimed interest of Defendants, (b) directing that the Two Year Transfers be set aside, and (c) recovering such Two Year Transfers or the value thereof from Defendants for the benefit of the Liquidation Trust.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANTS)

Avoidance and Recovery of Actual Intent Voidable Transactions – State Law

29. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

30. The Two Year Transfers constituted transfers of the Debtors' property.

31. The Two Year Transfers were made by the Debtors with actual intent to hinder or delay or defraud their creditors insofar as either (i) the services to be provided in exchange for such transfers would perpetuate a Ponzi scheme, or (ii) such transfers were prepetition distributions of fictitious profits from the Ponzi scheme in respect of the Claims.

32. The Two Year Transfers were made to or for the benefit of Defendants.

33. Debtors that made one or more of the Two Year Transfers has at least one creditor with an allowable unsecured claim for liabilities, which claim remained unsatisfied as of the Petition Date.

34. The Two Year Transfers are avoidable under applicable law – California Civil Code section 3439.04(a)(1) and/or comparable provisions of law in other jurisdictions that have adopted the Uniform Voidable Transactions Act, the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act or

the Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act – by a creditor holding an allowed unsecured claim and thus by Plaintiff pursuant to Bankruptcy Code section 544(b).

35. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff is entitled to judgment pursuant to Bankruptcy Code sections 544(b), 550(a), and 551: (a) avoiding the Two Year Transfers free and clear of any claimed interest of Defendants, (b) directing that the Two Year Transfers be set aside, and (c) recovering such Two Year Transfers or the value thereof from Defendants for the benefit of the Liquidation Trust.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANTS)

Avoidance and Recovery of Constructive Voidable Transactions – State Law

36. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

37. The Two Year Transfers constituted transfers of the Debtors' property.

38. The Two Year Transfers were made by the Debtors for less than reasonably equivalent value at a time when the Debtors (i) were insolvent; and/or (ii) were engaged or was about to engage in business or a transaction for which any capital remaining with the Debtors were an unreasonably small capital; and/or (iii) intended to incur, or believed that it would incur, debts beyond their ability to pay as such debts matured.

39. The Two Year Transfers were made to or for the benefit of Defendants.

40. At the times of, and/or subsequent to, each of the Two Year Transfers, each Debtor that made one or more of the Two Year Transfers has at least one creditor with an

allowable unsecured claim for liabilities, which claim remained unsatisfied as of the Petition Date.

41. The Two Year Transfers are avoidable under applicable law – California Civil Code section 3439.04(a)(2) and/or comparable provisions of law in other jurisdictions that have adopted the Uniform Voidable Transactions Act, the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act or the Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act – by a creditor holding an allowed unsecured claim and thus by Plaintiff pursuant to Bankruptcy Code section 544(b).

42. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff is entitled to judgment pursuant to Bankruptcy Code sections 544(b), 550(a), and 551: (a) avoiding the Two Year Transfers free and clear of any claimed interest of Defendants, (b) directing that the Two Year Transfers be set aside, and (c) recovering such Two Year Transfers or the value thereof from Defendants for the benefit of the Liquidation Trust.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANTS)

Objection to Claims (Bankruptcy Code Section 502(d))

43. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

44. The Claims are not allowable because:
- a. Defendants have received property, *i.e.*, the Transfers, recoverable under Bankruptcy Code section 550; and/or
 - b. Defendants received a transfer, *i.e.*, the Transfers, avoidable under Bankruptcy Code section 544, 547, or 548.

45. In either event, the Claims must be disallowed under Bankruptcy Code section 502(d) unless and until Defendants have fully repaid the amount, or turned over any such property, for which Defendants are is liable under Bankruptcy Code section 550.

SITXH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANTS)

Equitable Subordination of Claims

46. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

47. By providing services that helped perpetuate a Ponzi scheme, Defendants engaged in inequitable conduct.

48. Defendants' inequitable conduct has resulted in injury to the Debtors' estates and their other creditors and/or has conferred an unfair advantage on Defendants.

49. Principles of equitable subordination require that any claims asserted by Defendants be equitably subordinated to all other claims against the Debtors.

50. Equitable subordination as requested herein is consistent with the provisions and purposes of the Bankruptcy Code.

51. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff is entitled to judgment pursuant to Bankruptcy Code section 510(c) equitably subordinating any and all claims that Defendants may assert against any of the Debtors, whatever the origin of those claims, including, without limitation, the Claims and any claims that may be asserted under Bankruptcy Code section 502(h), to all other claims against the Debtors.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANTS)

Sale of Unregistered Securities (Securities Act Sections 5(a), 5(c), and 12(a))

52. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

53. The Notes and Units sold by Defendants were securities within the meaning of the Securities Act.

54. No registration statement was filed or in effect with the SEC pursuant to the Securities Act with respect to the securities issued by the Debtors as described in this Complaint and no exemption from registration existed with respect to these securities.

55. From on or about July 2012 through at least December 4, 2017, Defendants directly and indirectly:

- a. made use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to sell securities, through the use or medium of a prospectus or otherwise;
- b. carried or caused to be carried securities through the mails or in interstate commerce, by any means or instruments of transportation, for the purpose of sale or delivery after sale; and/or
- c. made use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails to offer to sell or offer to buy through the use or medium of any prospectus or otherwise any security,

without a registration statement having been filed or being in effect with the SEC as to such securities.

56. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants violated Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 77e(a) and 77e(c).

57. The Investors who contributed their claims to the Liquidation Trust purchased the unregistered securities issued by the Debtors and as a direct and proximate result sustained significant damages. Accordingly, the Liquidation Trust has standing under Section 12(a)(1) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77l(a)(1), to bring a cause of action seeking damages based on Defendants' violations of Section 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act.

58. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff is entitled to judgment holding Defendants jointly and severally liable for the sale of unregistered securities in an amount as set forth on Exhibit 3, or in an amount to be proven at trial.

EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANTS)

Fraud

59. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

60. Defendants misrepresented the facts to Investors, including by making affirmative misrepresentations and by concealing and failing to disclose the true facts. Among the misrepresentations were that Investors were often told that they were investing money to be loaned with respect to particular properties owned by third parties, that those properties were worth substantially more than the loans against the properties, and that they would have the benefit of a stream of payments from these third parties for high-interest loans, protected by security interests and/or mortgages against such properties.

61. In reality, these statements were lies. Investors' money was almost never used to make high-interest loans to unrelated, third-party borrowers, and there was no stream of

payments; instead, Investors' money was commingled and used for an assortment of expenses, including maintaining a lavish lifestyle for Shapiro and his family, brokers' commissions, overhead (largely for selling even more Notes and Units to Investors), and payment of principal and interest to existing investors. The money that was used to acquire properties (almost always owned by a disguised affiliate) cannot be traced to any specific Investor.

62. Defendants made these misrepresentations knowingly, with scienter, and with intent to defraud Investors.

63. The Investors who contributed their claims to the Liquidation Trust justifiably relied on Defendants' misrepresentations of facts, and as a direct and proximate result sustained hundreds of millions of dollars in damages.

64. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff is entitled to judgment holding Defendants jointly and severally liable for fraud in an amount as set forth in Exhibit 3, or in an amount to be proven at trial.

NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANTS)

Aiding and Abetting Fraud

65. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

66. Shapiro – an architect of the fraud – also misrepresented the facts to Investors, and did so knowingly, with scienter, and with intent to defraud Investors. The Investors who contributed their claims to the Liquidation Trust justifiably relied on Shapiro's misrepresentations of facts, and as a direct and proximate result sustained hundreds of millions of dollars in damages.

67. Defendants knowingly and substantially assisted Shapiro in defrauding Investors and were aware of Shapiro's fraud and acted knowingly in providing substantial and material assistance to Shapiro.

68. Defendants substantially benefited by receiving income, commissions, and bonuses.

69. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff is entitled to judgment holding Defendants jointly and severally liable for aiding and abetting fraud as set forth in Exhibit 3, or in an amount to be proven at trial.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, by reason of the foregoing, Plaintiff requests that the Court enter judgment:

1. On the first and second claims for relief, (a) avoiding the Two Year Transfers of \$4,208.33, free and clear of any claimed interest of Defendants, (b) directing that the Two Year Transfers be set aside, and (c) ordering Defendants to pay to Plaintiff the amount of the Two Year Transfers; provided, however, that the Defendants shall not be liable for any Transfers that are set-offs as Prepetition Distributions to the Claims;

2. On the third and fourth claims for relief, (a) avoiding the Two Year Transfers of \$4,208.33, free and clear of any claimed interest of Defendants, (b) directing that the Two Year Transfers be set aside, and (c) ordering Defendants to pay to Plaintiff the amount of the Two Year Transfers; provided, however, that Defendants shall not be liable for any Transfers that are set-offs as Prepetition Distributions to the Claims;

3. On the fifth claim for relief, sustaining the objection to the Claims, decreeing that the Defendants take nothing therefrom, and directing the Claims Agent to strike any Scheduled claim from the official Claims Register;

4. On the sixth claim for relief, equitably subordinating any and all claims that Defendants may assert against any of the Debtors or their estates, whatever the origin of those claims, including, without limitation, the Claims and any claims that may be asserted under Bankruptcy Code section 502(h), to all other claims against the Debtors or their estates;

5. On the seventh claim for relief, holding Defendants jointly and severally liable for net damages in the amount of \$72,418.76 for Notes sold, or in an amount to be proven at trial, arising from Defendants' sale of unregistered securities;

6. On the eighth claim for relief, holding Defendants jointly and severally liable for fraud for net damages in the amount of \$72,418.76 for Notes sold, or in an amount to be proven at trial;

7. On the ninth claim for relief, holding Defendants jointly and severally liable for aiding and abetting fraud for net damages in the amount of \$72,418.76 for Notes sold, or in an amount to be proven at trial; and

8. On all claims for relief, awarding Plaintiff prejudgment interest as permitted by law, costs of suit, and such other and further relief as is just and proper.

Dated: December 2, 2019

/s/ Colin R. Robinson

Bradford J. Sandler (DE Bar No. 4142)
Andrew W. Caine (CA Bar No. 110345)
Colin R. Robinson (DE Bar No. 5524)
PACHULSKI, STANG, ZIEHL & JONES LLP
919 North Market Street, 17th Floor
P.O. Box 8705
Wilmington, DE 19899-8705 (Courier 19801)
Telephone: (302) 652-4100
Facsimile: (302) 652-4400
Email: bsandler@pszjlaw.com
acaine@pszjlaw.com
crobinson@pszjlaw.com

*Counsel to Plaintiff Michael Goldberg, in his
capacity as Liquidating Trustee of the Woodbridge
Liquidation Trust*

EXHIBIT 1

Claims and Investments

Scheduled and Filed Claims

Creditor	Scheduled Claims			Filed Claims			Type
	Schedule	Amount	C/U/D	Claim No.	Amount	Classification	
Qun Hong Yin	F	\$50,000.00	C/U/D				Unit
Prov. Tr Gp - FBO Qun Hong Yin Roth IRA	F	41,500.00	C/U/D				Unit
The Qun Hong Domissy Yin LT	F	30,000.00					Note
The Qun Hong Domissy Yin LT	F	50,000.00	D				Unit
The Qun Hong Domissy Yin LT	F	50,000.00	D				Unit
Totals		\$221,500.00			\$0.00		

Investment Principal and Distributions

Investor Name	Type	Total Outstanding Principal	Prepetition Distributions	Net Principal
Qun Hong Yin	Unit	\$50,000.00	\$2,750.02	\$47,249.98
Prov. Tr Gp - FBO Qun Hong Yin Roth IRA	Unit	41,500.00	242.08	41,257.92
The Qun Hong Domissy Yin LT	Note	30,000.00	1,283.33	28,716.67
The Qun Hong Domissy Yin LT	Unit	100,000.00	1,777.79	98,222.21
Totals		\$221,500.00	\$6,053.22	\$215,446.78

EXHIBIT 2

Commission Payments

Debtor	Ck. No.	Petition Date	Clear Date	Name	Receipts	Disbursements
WOODBIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	23035	12/04/17	07/19/17	QUN HONG LIN (LILY YIN)		\$ 3,000.00
WOODBIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	22670	12/04/17	07/03/17	QUN HONG LIN (LILY YIN)	\$ 291.67	
WOODBIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	22670	12/04/17	07/03/17	QUN HONG LIN (LILY YIN)		1,000.00
WOODBIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	19868	12/04/17	05/15/17	QUN HONG LIN (LILY YIN)		<u>500.00</u>
TOTALS - 2 YEAR					\$ 291.67	\$ 4,500.00
NET DISBURSEMENTS - 2 YEAR						\$ 4,208.33

EXHIBIT 3

Broker(s): Qun Hong Lin

Investor Name	Outstanding Investor Principal Amounts		Net/Allowed Claim Amounts	
	Class 3	Class 5	Class 3	Class 5
BOYAN CHI	\$ 25,000.00	\$ -	\$ 23,809.05	\$ -
WEI WANG	50,000.00	-	48,609.71	-
Totals	<u>\$ 75,000.00</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ 72,418.76</u>	<u>\$ -</u>