

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

In re:

WOODBIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC,  
*et al.*,<sup>1</sup>

Remaining Debtors.

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

Plaintiff,

vs.

FIC, LLC,

Defendant.

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  
AND FOR EQUITABLE SUBORDINATION**

---

<sup>1</sup> 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”<sup>2</sup>), as and for its *Complaint Objecting to Claims and Counterclaiming for Avoidance and Recovery of Avoidable Transfers and for Equitable Subordination* (this “Complaint”) against FIC, LLC (“Defendant”), 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 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

---

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

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 Claim (defined below) so that Defendant is 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 Defendant by reason of these activities or as fictitious profits on the Claim, and (iii) to the extent the Claim, 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. This adversary proceeding is a core proceeding within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2)(B), (C), (F), and (H). In any event, Plaintiff consents to entry of final orders or judgment by this Court. 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 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.

***Defendant***

13. Defendant FIC, LLC, is a corporation formed in accordance with the laws of Utah. Upon information and belief, Leslie Kesten is a financial advisor or financial coach who owns and operates Defendant FIC, LLC. Upon information and belief, Defendant FIC invested monies with the Debtor and sold units to investors or performed services on behalf of the Debtor.

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS**

***The Fraud***

14. At least since July 2012 until shortly before they sought bankruptcy protection, the Debtors were operated as a Ponzi scheme. As this Court explained in its order confirming the Plan:

The evidence demonstrates, and the Bankruptcy Court hereby finds, that (i) beginning no later than July 2012 through December 1, 2017, Robert H. Shapiro used his web of more than 275 limited liability companies, including the Debtors, to conduct a massive Ponzi scheme raising more than \$1.22 billion from over 8,400 unsuspecting investors nationwide; (ii) the Ponzi scheme involved the payment of purported returns to existing investors from funds contributed by new investors; and (iii) the Ponzi scheme was discovered no later than December 2017.

15. The securities sold by Defendant (*i.e.*, the Debtors' Notes and Units) were not registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC") or applicable state

securities agencies and there was no applicable exemption from registration. Nor was Defendant registered as broker-dealers with the SEC or applicable state agencies.

16. 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. Shapiro and his lieutenants, represented to Investors that the Debtors' profits would be generated by the difference between the interest rate the Debtors charged its third-party borrowers and the interest rate it paid Investors.

17. 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 items, 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. These are typical characteristics of Ponzi schemes.

18. 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, as such money enabled the Debtors to return fictitious "profits" to early Investors – an essential component of the scheme, because "repaying" early Investors led to new investments, without which 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.

***The Proof(s) of Claim***

19. Defendant filed Claim Nos. 6928 and 6929, and were scheduled by the Debtors for claims against the Debtors as identified in particular on Exhibit 1 hereto (collectively, the "Claims"). The Claims are based on Notes and payables claimed by Defendant.

***The Transfers***

20. Within the 90 days preceding the relevant transferor's petition date, Defendant received Prepetition Distributions of fictitious profits from the Ponzi scheme in respect of the Claims and payable payments totaling not less than the amount set forth on Exhibit 2 hereto (the "90 Day Transfers"). 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.

21. Within the two years preceding the Initial Petition Date, Defendant received transfers 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**

**Avoidance and Recovery of Preferential Transfers**

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

23. The 90 Day Transfers constituted transfers of the Debtors' property.

24. The 90 Day Transfers were made to or for the benefit of Defendant on account of an antecedent debt and while the Debtors were insolvent. The affirmative assertion that the Debtors were insolvent at the times of the 90 Day Transfers is not intended and does not shift the burden of proof or alter the presumption of insolvency provided by Bankruptcy Code section 547(f).

25. By virtue of the 90 Day Transfers, Defendant received more than he would have received if the 90 Day Transfers had not been made and Defendant received a distribution pursuant to a chapter 7 liquidation.

26. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff is entitled to judgment pursuant to Bankruptcy Code sections 547(b), 550(a), and 551: (a) avoiding the 90 Day Transfers in the amount of \$40,238.40, free and clear of any interest of Defendant, (b) directing that the 90 Day Transfers be set aside, and (c) recovering the 90 Day Transfers or the value thereof from Defendant for the benefit of the Liquidation Trust.

**SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANT)**

**Avoidance and Recovery of Actual Intent Fraudulent Transfers – Bankruptcy Code**

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

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

29. 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.

30. The Two Year Transfers were made to or for the benefit of Defendant.

31. 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 Defendant, (b) directing that the Two Year Transfers be set aside, and (c) recovering such Two Year Transfers or the value thereof from Defendant for the benefit of the Liquidation Trust.

### **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANT)**

#### **Avoidance and Recovery of Constructive Fraudulent Transfers – Bankruptcy Code**

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

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

34. 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.

35. The Two Year Transfers were made to or for the benefit of Defendant.

36. 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 Defendant, (b) directing that the Two Year Transfers be set aside, and (c) recovering such Two Year Transfers or the value thereof from Defendant for the benefit of the Liquidation Trust.

**FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANT)**

**Avoidance and Recovery of Actual Intent Voidable Transactions – State Law**

37. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the aforementioned paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
38. The Two Year Transfers constituted transfers of the Debtors' property.
39. 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.
40. The Two Year Transfers were made to or for the benefit of Defendant.
41. 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.
42. 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).
43. 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 Defendant, (b) directing that the Two Year Transfers be set aside, and (c) recovering such Two Year Transfers or the value thereof from Defendant for the benefit of the Liquidation Trust.

**FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANT)**

**Avoidance and Recovery of Constructive Voidable Transactions – State Law**

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

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

46. 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.

47. The Two Year Transfers were made to or for the benefit of Defendant.

48. 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.

49. 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).

50. 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 Defendant, (b) directing that the Two Year Transfers be set aside,

and (c) recovering such Two Year Transfers or the value thereof from Defendant for the benefit of the Liquidation Trust.

**SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANT)**

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

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

52. The Claims are not allowable because:

- a. Defendant has received property, *i.e.*, the Transfers, recoverable under Bankruptcy Code section 550; and/or
- b. Defendant has received a transfer, *i.e.*, the Transfers, avoidable under Bankruptcy Code section 544, 547, or 548.

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

**SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (AGAINST DEFENDANT)**

**Equitable Subordination of Claims**

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

55. By providing services that helped perpetuate a Ponzi scheme, Defendant engaged in inequitable conduct.

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

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

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

59. 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 Defendant 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.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

1. On the first claim for relief, (a) avoiding the 90 Day Transfers free and clear of any interest of Defendant, (b) directing that the 90 Day Transfers in the amount of \$40,238.40 be set aside, and (c) ordering Defendant to pay to Plaintiff the amount of the 90 Day Transfers;

2. On the second and third claims for relief, (a) avoiding the Two Year Transfers free and clear of any claimed interest of Defendant, (b) directing that the Two Year Transfers be set aside, and (c) ordering Defendant to pay to Plaintiff the amount of the Two Year Transfers, \$76,558.40; provided, however, that Defendant shall not be liable for any Transfers that are set-off as Prepetition Distributions to the Claims filed by the Defendant;

3. On the fourth and fifth claim for relief, (a) avoiding the Two Year Transfers free and clear of any claimed interest of Defendant, (b) directing that the Two Year Transfers be set aside, and (c) ordering Defendant to pay to Plaintiff the amount of Two Year

Transfers; provided, however, that the Defendant shall not be liable for any Transfers that are set-off as Prepetition Distributions to the Claims of Defendant;

4. On the sixth claim for relief, sustaining the objection to the Claims, decreeing that Defendant take nothing therefrom, and directing the Claims Agent to strike the Claims from the official Claims Register;

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

6. 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 4, 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 A**

## Exhibit A

## Claims and Investments

## Scheduled and Filed Claims

Creditor	Scheduled Claims			Filed Claims			Type
	Schedule	Amount	C/U/D	Claim No.	Amount	Classification	
FIC LLC	F	\$18,544.73	C/U/D	6928	\$18,544.73	Unsecured	Trade Payable
FIC LLC	F	25,000.00	C/U/D	6929	25,000.00	Unsecured	Note
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$43,544.73</b>			<b>\$43,544.73</b>		

## Investment Principal and Distributions

Investor Name	Type	Total Outstanding Principal	Prepetition Distributions	Net Principal
FIC LLC	Note	\$25,000.00	\$3,279.85	\$21,720.15
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$25,000.00</b>	<b>\$3,279.85</b>	<b>\$21,720.15</b>



# **EXHIBIT B**

Commission Payments

Debtor	Ck. No.	Petition Date	Clear Date	Name	Receipts	Disbursements
WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	23136	12/04/17	11/14/17	FIC LLC		6,160.00
WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	25005	12/04/17	11/14/17	FIC LLC		2,158.40
WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	23135	12/04/17	10/31/17	FIC LLC		8,920.00
WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	22711	12/04/17	09/20/17	FIC LLC		20,000.00
WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	23187	12/04/17	09/05/17	FIC LLC		3,000.00
TOTALS - 90 DAY					-	40,238.40
NET DISBURSEMENTS - 90 DAY						40,238.40
WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	21290	12/04/17	06/05/17	FIC LLC		4,000.00
WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	20834	12/04/17	05/25/17	FIC LLC	2,000.00	
WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	20834	12/04/17	05/25/17	FIC LLC		8,000.00
WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	21010	12/04/17	05/25/17	FIC LLC		7,175.00
WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	21011	12/04/17	05/25/17	FIC LLC		2,680.00
WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	21009	12/04/17	05/25/17	FIC LLC		1,000.00
WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	20740	12/04/17	05/08/17	FIC LLC		6,000.00
WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	18022	12/04/17	03/03/17	FIC LLC		3,465.00
WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	15379	12/04/17	12/20/16	FIC LLC		4,000.00
TOTALS - 2 YEAR (INCL. 90 DAY)					\$ 2,000.00	\$ 76,558.40
NET DISBURSEMENTS - 2 YEAR (INCL. 90 DAY)						\$ 74,558.40

# **EXHIBIT A**

## Exhibit A

## Claims and Investments

## Scheduled and Filed Claims

Creditor	Scheduled Claims			Filed Claims			Type
	Schedule	Amount	C/U/D	Claim No.	Amount	Classification	
FIC LLC	F	\$18,544.73	C/U/D	6928	\$18,544.73	Unsecured	Trade Payable
FIC LLC	F	25,000.00	C/U/D	6929	25,000.00	Unsecured	Note
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$43,544.73</b>			<b>\$43,544.73</b>		

## Investment Principal and Distributions

Investor Name	Type	Total Outstanding Principal	Prepetition Distributions	Net Principal
FIC LLC	Note	\$25,000.00	\$3,279.85	\$21,720.15
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$25,000.00</b>	<b>\$3,279.85</b>	<b>\$21,720.15</b>

# **EXHIBIT B**

Exhibit B  
Commission Payments

Debtor	Ck. No.	Petition Date	Clear Date	Name	Receipts	Disbursements
WOODBRIAGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	23136	12/04/17	11/14/17	FIC LLC		6,160.00
WOODBRIAGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	25005	12/04/17	11/14/17	FIC LLC		2,158.40
WOODBRIAGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	23135	12/04/17	10/31/17	FIC LLC		8,920.00
WOODBRIAGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	22711	12/04/17	09/20/17	FIC LLC		20,000.00
WOODBRIAGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	23187	12/04/17	09/05/17	FIC LLC		3,000.00
TOTALS - 90 DAY					-	40,238.40
NET DISBURSEMENTS - 90 DAY						40,238.40
WOODBRIAGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	21290	12/04/17	06/05/17	FIC LLC		4,000.00
WOODBRIAGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	20834	12/04/17	05/25/17	FIC LLC	2,000.00	
WOODBRIAGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	20834	12/04/17	05/25/17	FIC LLC		8,000.00
WOODBRIAGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	21010	12/04/17	05/25/17	FIC LLC		7,175.00
WOODBRIAGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	21011	12/04/17	05/25/17	FIC LLC		2,680.00
WOODBRIAGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	21009	12/04/17	05/25/17	FIC LLC		1,000.00
WOODBRIAGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	20740	12/04/17	05/08/17	FIC LLC		6,000.00
WOODBRIAGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	18022	12/04/17	03/03/17	FIC LLC		3,465.00
WOODBRIAGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC	15379	12/04/17	12/20/16	FIC LLC		4,000.00
TOTALS - 2 YEAR (INCL. 90 DAY)					\$ 2,000.00	\$ 76,558.40
NET DISBURSEMENTS - 2 YEAR (INCL. 90 DAY)						\$ 74,558.40