

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT
BRIDGEPORT DIVISION**

	X	
	:	
In re:	:	Chapter 11
	:	
HO WAN KWOK, <i>et al.</i> , ¹	:	Case No. 22-50073 (JAM)
	:	
Debtors.	:	(Jointly Administered)
	:	
	X	
	:	
LUC A. DESPINS, CHAPTER 11	:	
TRUSTEE,	:	
	:	Adv. Proceeding No. 23-05013
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	
	:	
	:	
HCHK TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,	:	
HCHK PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, INC.,	:	
LEXINGTON PROPERTY AND STAFFING, INC.,	:	
HOLY CITY HONG KONG VENTURES, LTD.,	:	
ANTHONY DIBATTISTA, YVETTE WANG,	:	
and BRIAN HOFMEISTER (in his capacity	:	
as assignee),	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	X	

**MOTION OF CHAPTER 11 TRUSTEE TO AUTHORIZE AND COMPEL DISCOVERY
ON PROPOSED INVETERNORS SHIH HSIN YU, 1332156 B.C. LTD, GWGPNZ
LIMITED, JAPAN HIMALAYA LEAGUE, INC. AND AUTHORIZING DISCOVERY
ON ADDITIONAL PARTIES**

¹ The Debtors in these chapter 11 cases are Ho Wan Kwok (also known as Guo Wengui, Miles Guo, and Miles Kwok, as well as numerous other aliases) (last four digits of tax identification number: 9595), Genever Holdings LLC (last four digits of tax identification number: 8202) and Genever Holdings Corporation. The mailing address for the Trustee, Genever Holdings LLC, and the Genever Holdings Corporation is Paul Hastings LLP, 200 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10166 c/o Luc A. Despins, as Trustee for the Estate of Ho Wan Kwok (solely for purposes of notices and communications).

Luc A. Despins, in his capacity as the chapter 11 trustee (the “Trustee” or “Plaintiff”) appointed in the chapter 11 case (the “Chapter 11 Case”) of Ho Wan Kwok (the “Debtor” or “Mr. Kwok”), plaintiff in the above-captioned adversary proceeding, hereby submits this motion (the “Motion”), in connection with the *Proposed Intervenor’s Motion to Intervene in Adversary Proceeding* [Adv. Proc. 23-05013, Docket No. 60] (the “Motion to Intervene”), for an order pursuant to Rule 26(d)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (the “Civil Rules” or “FRCP”), made applicable to this adversary proceeding by Rule 7026 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the “Bankruptcy Rules” or “FRBP”), authorizing the Trustee to serve limited discovery on Shin Hsin Yu (“Mr. Yu”), 1332156 B.C. LTD (“1332156 B.C.”), GWGOPNZ Limited (“GWGOPNZ”), Japan Himalaya League, Inc. (“Japan Himalaya” and, collectively with Mr. Yu, 1332156 B.C., and GWGOPNZ, the “Proposed Intervenor’s”) and other relevant parties, and to compel the Proposed Intervenor and other relevant parties to timely respond to the Trustee’s discovery requests.² In support of the Motion, the Trustee respectfully states as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. The Proposed Intervenor is requesting the right to intervene in the adversary proceeding on the purported basis that they are *bona fide* creditors of the HCHK Entities who have a right to be heard. They hold themselves out as *de facto* representatives of the HCHK Entities’ creditors, but it is noteworthy that no other creditors have sought to intervene in this adversary proceeding. The Trustee intends to oppose intervention on several grounds, including that the Proposed Intervenor do not, in fact, hold *bona fide* claims against the HCHK Entities, that the Proposed Intervenor are actually under the control of the Debtor and/or his associates, and that

² Capitalized terms used but not otherwise defined herein have the meanings set forth in the *Adversary Complaint* [Adv. Proc. Docket No. 1] (the “Complaint”).

the funds they purportedly “invested” in the HCHK Entities, if any, are proceeds of fraudulent conduct for which the Debtor has been criminally charged. Allowing the Proposed Intervenors to participate in this litigation would be tantamount to letting the Debtor himself intervene for the purpose of keeping his assets away from this estate; yet, that is effectively the result the Proposed Intervenors seek. In support of his forthcoming objection, the Trustee needs, and is entitled to, limited discovery from the Proposed Intervenors and other relevant parties related to these issues.

2. The Proposed Intervenors have objected to the Trustee’s discovery on the grounds that no discovery is permissible at this time under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26. According to the Proposed Intervenors, they should be allowed to intervene—and begin filing pleadings, briefing, and otherwise participate as litigants in the adversary proceeding—*before* the Trustee and this Court have the opportunity to test the veracity of the Proposed Intervenors’ purported interests in the HCHK Entities, which are the sole basis upon which they seek intervention. This logic has it backwards: unless and until the Proposed Intervenors have demonstrated that they have a legitimate basis to participate in this litigation, they should not be allowed to do so. To proceed otherwise would waste significant resources of this chapter 11 estate.

3. The Trustee firmly believes discovery will show that the Proposed Intervenors are ultimately within the Debtor’s and his associates’ control and influence and will only serve as a mouthpiece for their interests. These associates include Xuebing Wang, a director of 1332156 B.C. Ltd and an emissary of the Debtor’s “Himalaya Alliance,” who is believed to have signed purported loan agreements on behalf of HCHK Entities when they were under the Debtor’s control. Allowing the Proposed Intervenors to participate in this litigation before ascertaining the true nature of their interests would give them exactly what they want: an ability to obstruct and

delay progress in this case, which has been the overriding strategy of the Debtor and his family members and associates from day one.³

4. The Proposed Intervenor's only argument against discovery rests on a procedural technicality and has no merit. They contend that the discovery is impermissible at this time under FRCP 26(d)(1) because the parties to the adversary proceeding have not held a Rule 26(f) conference. This argument fails for multiple reasons.

5. First, and most importantly, FRCP 26(d)(1) expressly permits the Court to order discovery prior to a Rule 26(f) conference for good cause shown. Good cause exists to permit the limited discovery the Trustee seeks here regarding the Motion to Intervene because the discovery is highly relevant to the relief being sought, is not overly burdensome, and has the potential to save the estate significant resources by resolving issues relevant to intervention now, instead of later, after the litigation has proceeded. In other words, the discovery the Trustee seeks will serve a gatekeeping function by helping the Court determine whether the Proposed Intervenor is a proper participant in this litigation before they exercise the rights of participants. This is analogous to the early "jurisdictional discovery" courts routinely authorize to help determine whether personal jurisdiction exists over a defendant before the litigation proceeds against that defendant.

6. Second, although no formal Rule 26(f) conference has occurred, the Trustee has held a conference with the Proposed Intervenor related to the discovery he seeks at this time. This conference occurred on July 20, 2023, during which counsel for the Trustee explained to the Proposed Intervenor the limited discovery he needs relating to the intervention request and the

³ To be clear, the Trustee does not oppose the standing of the Proposed Intervenor to object to the Motion with respect to the Channeling Injunction and Exculpation Provision, which relate to claims such parties may have against the Assignee. However, the Trustee believes that the Channeling Injunction and Exculpation provision are the only aspect of the Settlement Agreement with respect to which the Proposed Intervenor's views could be considered.

basis for such discovery. This conference was not intended to be a Rule 26(f) conference—indeed, such a conference is *impossible* where, as here, the “parties” at issue are not yet parties to the adversary proceeding—however, the conference served the same purpose for present purposes as that required by Rule 26(f). No further conference should be necessary.

7. For these reasons, the Trustee respectfully requests an order authorizing the Trustee to serve the limited discovery attached hereto on the Proposed Intervenor and certain other parties related to the Motion to Intervene and compelling them to respond to such requests by no later than (i) 48 hours after the entry of an order in connection with this Motion as to the Written Discovery Requests (defined below), and (ii) as to the Deposition Requests (defined below), at dates to be set by the Trustee in consultation with counsel to the Proposed Intervenor in advance of any deadline to respond to the Motion to Intervene. This response timeline is necessary due to the fact that the Trustee’s deadline to respond to the Motion to Intervene is August 7, 2023.

BACKGROUND

I. HCHK Adversary Proceeding and Intervention Request

8. On June 8, 2023, the Trustee commenced the adversary proceeding by filing the Complaint, which seeks declaratory rulings that the HCHK Entities are alter egos of, or such entities and/or their purported assets are equitably owned by, the Debtor, and seeks an injunction against any commencement or continuation of the Assignment Proceedings. The Trustee also filed, on June 8, 2023, an emergency *ex parte* motion [Adv. Proc. 23-05013, Docket No. 4] (the “TRO Motion”) for a temporary restraining order, and, on June 9, 2023, a supplemental emergency *ex parte* TRO motion related to the Application and IMA with G-News [Adv. Proc. 23-05013, Docket No. 14].

9. On June 12, 2023, the Court granted its *Order Granting in Part Emergency Ex Parte Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction* [Adv. Proc. 23-05013, Docket No. 18] (the “TRO Order”).

10. On June 23, 2023, the Trustee filed his *Motion, Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9019, Regarding Settlement with Assignee of HCHK Entities Under New York Court Assignment Proceedings* [Adv. Proc. 23-05013, Docket No. 25] (the “9019 Motion”).

11. On July 5, 2023, the Proposed Intervenors filed their *Objection to Trustee’s 9019 Motion* [Adv. Proc. 23-05013, Docket No. 40] (the “Himalaya Objection”).

12. On July 17, 2023, the Proposed Intervenors filed their Motion to Intervene. The motion states, among other things, that the Proposed Intervenors are *bona fide*, good faith creditors of the HCHK Entities and have claims against the HCHK Entities totaling more than \$27 million. The Proposed Intervenors assert that they have a substantial financial interest in the outcome of the adversary proceeding, and thus should be permitted to intervene.

13. The Trustee has only limited information available to him at present concerning the Proposed Intervenors. Specifically, the Trustee understands the Proposed Intervenors are, by all indicia, associates of or controlled by associates of the Debtor and acting on the Debtor’s behalf. As illustrated in the *Trustee’s Omnibus Reply in Support of Motion, Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9019, Settlement with Assignee of HCHK Entities, and (II) in Response to Objections* [Adv. Proc. 23-05013, Docket No. 45] (the “Omnibus Reply”):

- a. **Mr. Yu** is, upon information and belief, a member of the Debtor’s Himalaya Farm organization, having paid \$1.5 million to an account belonging to Himalaya International Clearing Transactions, a Debtor-controlled entity purportedly owned by William Je (known to Mei Guo as “Uncle William”), which account was seized by the United States Government in connection with the Debtor’s criminal case. It is not clear how Mr. Yu is a creditor of the HCHK Entities, given that the documentation supposedly evidencing transfers of funds from Mr. Yu, attached as

Exhibit A to the Himalaya Objection, in fact demonstrates the transfer of funds from an entity called Kalixun Trading Limited.

- b. **1332156 B.C.** is, upon information and belief, controlled by the Debtor through individuals who are members of the Debtor's Himalaya Farm organization branch based in British Columbia, Canada (the "British Columbia Farm"). The authorized signatory of 1332156 B.C. on the loan agreement between 1332156 B.C., as lender, and HCHK Property and HCHK Technologies, as borrowers, attached as Exhibit B to the Himalaya Objection, is an individual named Yanchun Liu. Upon information and belief, Yanchun Liu is a member of the British Columbia Farm and an associate of the Debtor who, among other things, participated in one or more of the Debtor's NFSC events. Yanchun Liu has also, upon information and belief, directed millions of dollars to the Debtor's investment and/or cryptocurrency ventures (which are the subject of the Government's criminal case against the Debtor).
- c. **GWGPNZ** is, upon information and belief, controlled by the Debtor through individuals who are members of the Debtor's Himalaya Farm organization branch based in New Zealand. According to public documentation obtained from the New Zealand Companies Office, the Director of GWGPNZ is Xuebing Wang, an individual who, upon information and belief, is a close associate of the Debtor. *In January 2023, Xuebing Wang visited protestors in front of the Trustee's home, where he praised the protestors for their efforts, awarded them prizes, and expressed thanks on behalf of the "Himalaya Alliance."*
- d. **Himalaya Japan** is, upon information and belief, controlled by the Debtor through individuals who are members of the Debtor's Himalaya Farm organization branch based in Japan (the "Japan Farm"). The authorized signatory of Himalaya Japan on the purported loan agreement between Himalaya Japan and HCHK Property, attached as Exhibit D to the Himalaya Objection, is an individual named Shuai Guo. *As of February 2023, Shuai Guo was Chief Executive Officer of the Rule of Law Society IV, Inc., a purported non-profit entity controlled by the Debtor.* In addition, upon information and belief, Shuai Guo is a member of the Japan Farm and was a prominent participant in the Debtor's protest campaign against Paul Hastings' office in Tokyo, Japan in late 2022 and early 2023.

II. Discovery Requests

14. A week ago, on July 20, 2023, counsel for the Trustee had a conference with counsel for the Proposed Intervenors, Joseph Pastore and Melissa Rose McClammy, concerning the discovery the Trustee seeks in relation to the Motion to Intervene. During the call, counsel for the Trustee explained the nature of the discovery needed and the basis for such discovery.

15. On July 21, 2023, counsel for the Trustee served limited requests for admission (the “RFAs”), attached hereto as **Exhibit A**; interrogatories (the “Interrogatories”), attached hereto as **Exhibit B**; requests for production of documents (the “RFP,” and, together with the Interrogatories and RFAs, the “Written Discovery Requests”), attached hereto as **Exhibit C**; and Bankruptcy Rule 7030 and Civil Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notices and subpoenas on the Proposed Intervenor, as well as on Xuebing Wang (“Mr. X. Wang”) and Kalixun Trading Limited (“Kalixun Trading,” together with Mr. X. Wang, the “Additional Related Parties” and the deposition notices and subpoenas of the Proposed Intervenor and the Additional Related Parties the “Deposition Requests,” and, the Deposition Requests together with the Written Discovery Requests the “Discovery Requests”), attached hereto as **Exhibit D**.

16. The Additional Related Parties are relevant parties to the Trustee’s Discovery Requests. Exhibit A to the Himalaya Objection shows that Kalixun Trading has allegedly transferred \$1.55 million to HCHK Property Management Inc. (“HCHK Property Management”). As for Mr. X. Wang, apart from his role as a director of one of the Proposed Intervenor, GWGOPNZ, and his prominent visit on behalf of “Himalaya Alliance” to the protestors outside the Trustee’s home, upon information the belief, Mr. X. Wang is also the signatory on behalf of HCHK Property Management and HCHK Technologies Inc. of the purported loan agreements with the Proposed Intervenor, which form the basis of the Proposed Intervenor’s claim as *bona fide*, good faith creditors of the HCHK Entities.⁴

⁴ In addition, the Trustee is also seeking depositions of the Debtor and Yvette Wang in connection with the Motion to Intervene. The Trustee has not yet served formal notices or subpoenas but is in the process of meeting and conferring with counsel for the Debtor and Ms. Wang regarding the depositions, which are complicated by the fact that both individuals are presently incarcerated.

17. On July 24, 2023, counsel for the Proposed Intervenor confirmed that they were in receipt of the Trustee's Discovery Requests, and on July 25, 2023, indicated to counsel for the Trustee that they would not comply with the Trustee's discovery requests.

18. On July 26, 2023, counsel for the Proposed Intervenor served counsel for the Trustee with the *HCHK Creditors' Omnibus Objection to the Trustee's Requests for the Production of Documents, Interrogatories, Subpoenas and Requests for Admission* in which they object and refuse to respond to any of the Trustee's Discovery Requests. This objection is attached hereto as **Exhibit E**.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

19. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334 and the *Standing Order of Reference* from the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut. This is a core proceeding within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 157(b).

20. Venue in this District is proper pursuant to 28 U.S. C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

21. The basis for the relief sought by this Motion is Bankruptcy Rule 7026.

ARGUMENT

I. Requested Limited Discovery Is Warranted Under Rule 26(d)(1)

22. Although a party generally may not seek discovery from any source before the parties meet and confer as required by Civil Rule 26(f), a party may seek discovery before the Rule 26(f) conference if the court so orders. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d)(1). In determining whether to authorize discovery prior to a Rule 26(f) conference, the requesting party need only satisfy a "flexible standard of reasonableness and good cause." *Digital Sin, Inc. v. Does 1-176*, 279 F.R.D. 239, 241 (S.D.N.Y. 2012) (quoting *Ayyash v. Bank Al-Madina*, 233 F.R.D. 325, 326-27 (S.D.N.Y. 2005)) (granting plaintiffs' *ex parte* motion seeking permission to take expedited discovery to

identify defendants in an action). *See also Stern v. Cosby*, 246 F.R.D. 453, 457 (S.D.N.Y.2007) (finding good cause to grant plaintiff's request for expedited discovery where defendants' alleged conduct was "highly troubling" and expedited response was reasonable because alleged circumstances could have "endangered the integrity of the judicial process").

23. The Trustee has readily satisfied the good cause standard here. As an initial matter, the discovery the Trustee seeks is both highly relevant and narrowly tailored to the relief at issue. The Proposed Intervenor's rely in the Motion to Intervene on the unsupported factual assertion that they are *bona fide*, good faith creditors of the HCHK Entities, and should be allowed to intervene on that basis. The discovery seeks to test the veracity of that assertion. Specifically, the Trustee is seeking document discovery and sworn testimony from the Proposed Intervenor's and related persons concerning, among other things, (i) the nature of their relationships with the HCHK Entities, Yvette Wang, the Debtor, and other individuals and entities related to the Debtor, and (ii) information concerning their alleged claims, including how they arose and whether any interest or principal payments have been made on such claims.

24. Good cause also exists for the requested discovery because of the gate-keeping function it will assist the Court in performing. The Proposed Intervenor's—just like all other Debtor-related individuals and entities in this case—appear set on obstructing and delaying this adversary proceeding and the chapter 11 case more generally as much as possible. This is clear to the Trustee based on, among other things, the Proposed Intervenor's' close ties to the protesters at the Trustee's home and his law firm's offices earlier in this case. Under these circumstances, it is critical for the Court to assess the true nature of the Proposed Intervenor's' interests in the HCHK Entities, their relationships to the Debtor, and whether they are acting in good faith *before* they are allowed to intervene and begin participating in the litigation at significant cost to this estate.

25. This situation can be analogized to the frequent circumstance where a court permits limited jurisdictional discovery to determine whether it has personal jurisdiction over a defendant. *See, e.g., Vista Food Exchange, Inc. v. Champion Foodservice, LLC*, 124 F. Supp. 3d 301, 313 (S.D.N.Y. 2015) (“The Court has broad discretion in determining whether or not to permit discovery aimed at establishing personal jurisdiction.”) (internal quotations omitted); *Genpharm Inc. v. Pliva-Lachema A.S.*, 361 F. Supp. 2d 49, 58 (E.D.N.Y. 2005) (“A court may allow discovery to aid in the determination of whether it has personal jurisdiction.”). The function in that circumstance is the same as it is here: to determine whether a person is an appropriate party to the litigation before allowing it to proceed with respect to such party.

II. Proposed Intervenors’ Additional Arguments Lack Merit

26. In the omnibus objection to the Discovery Requests they served on July 26, the Proposed Intervenors raise additional issues which they contend preclude the discovery the Trustee is seeking, including the timeframe for compliance with the requests, the proposed location of the requested depositions, and the service of interrogatories and requests for admissions on purported non-parties to the litigation. None of these arguments has merit.

27. First, the Trustee’s proposed timeframe for the Proposed Intervenors’ compliance with the Discovery Requests is not unreasonable. While the time is truncated as compared to the ordinary deadlines set forth in Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court is permitted to order a shortened response period. *See Avila v. Target Corp.*, 21-CV-907 (PKC)(JMW), at *4 (E.D.N.Y. Sep. 22, 2021) (“The Court possesses significant discretion . . . to modify the sequence or timing of discovery pursuant to Rule 26(d).”) (internal quotations omitted). A shortened period is warranted here because of the deadline to respond to the Motion to Intervene, which is August 7, 2023 (the “Response Deadline”).

28. Second, the Deposition Requests are not defective because they ask for the depositions to occur in the United States, in the offices of the counsel to the Trustee in New York. The Proposed Intervenor may be located in foreign countries; however, they have purposefully availed themselves of this Court's jurisdiction by seeking to intervene in this Adversary Proceeding. It follows that any depositions should take place near this Court.⁵ It is notable that Mr. X. Wang, a Proposed Intervenor's director, had absolutely no difficulty finding and appearing at the Trustee's house in Connecticut, and therefore should have no trouble appearing for a deposition in Manhattan.

29. Third, the Proposed Intervenor's argument that non-parties are not appropriate targets of the Written Discovery Requests is similarly unpersuasive. As an initial matter, it is not subject to reasonable dispute that non-parties may be subpoenaed for the production of documents under Rule 45, and the Trustee is immediately prepared to serve such subpoenas if the Court grants this motion. To the extent the Proposed Intervenor is taking the position the interrogatories and requests for admissions cannot be served on non-parties, that argument elevates form over substance. The discovery that the Trustee is seeking relates specifically to the Motion to Intervene that *the Proposed Intervenor have filed in this Court*. In that sense, the present circumstances are no different than those at issue in a contested matter in the main bankruptcy case in which the opponent of a motion is, of course, free to seek all available Rule 26 discovery from movants. Here, the Proposed Intervenor are clearly "parties" to their Motion to Intervene, and thus they are appropriate subjects of discovery.

⁵ See *SEC v. Aly*, 320 F.R.D. 116, 118 (S.D.N.Y. 2017) (under Civil Rule 26(c) "courts retain substantial discretion to designate the site of a deposition" when the parties are unable to reach agreement).

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the Trustee respectfully requests entry of an order granting the relief requested in the Motion and such other relief as is just and proper.

Dated: July 27, 2023
New Haven, Connecticut

LUC A. DESPINS,
CHAPTER 11 TRUSTEE

By: /s/ Patrick R. Linsey
Patrick R. Linsey (ct29437)
NEUBERT, PEPE & MONTEITH, P.C.
195 Church Street, 13th Floor
New Haven, Connecticut 06510
(203) 781-2847
plinsey@npmlaw.com

and

Nicholas A. Bassett (*pro hac vice* pending)
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
2050 M Street NW
Washington, D.C., 20036
(202) 551-1902
nicholasbassett@paulhastings.com

and

Avram E. Luft (*pro hac vice* pending)
Douglass Barron (*pro hac vice* pending)
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10166
(212) 318-6079
aviluft@paulhastings.com

Counsel for the Chapter 11 Trustee

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT
BRIDGEPORT DIVISION**

	X	
	:	
In re:	:	Chapter 11
	:	
HO WAN KWOK, <i>et al.</i> , ¹	:	Case No. 22-50073 (JAM)
	:	
Debtors.	:	(Jointly Administered)
	:	
	X	
	:	
LUC A. DESPINS, CHAPTER 11	:	
TRUSTEE,	:	
	:	Adv. Proceeding No. 23-05013
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	
	:	
	:	
HCHK TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,	:	
HCHK PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, INC.,	:	
LEXINGTON PROPERTY AND STAFFING, INC.,	:	
HOLY CITY HONG KONG VENTURES, LTD.,	:	
ANTHONY DIBATTISTA, YVETTE WANG,	:	
and BRIAN HOFMEISTER (in his capacity	:	
as assignee),	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	X	

**[PROPOSED] ORDER AUTHORIZING AND COMPELLING DISCOVERY ON
PROPOSED INVETERNORS SHIH HSIN YU, 1332156 B.C. LTD, GWGPNZ
LIMITED, JAPAN HIMALAYA LEAGUE, INC. AND AUTHORIZING DISCOVERY
ON ADDITIONAL PARTIES**

¹ The Debtors in these chapter 11 cases are Ho Wan Kwok (also known as Guo Wengui, Miles Guo, and Miles Kwok, as well as numerous other aliases) (last four digits of tax identification number: 9595), Genever Holdings LLC (last four digits of tax identification number: 8202) and Genever Holdings Corporation. The mailing address for the Trustee, Genever Holdings LLC, and the Genever Holdings Corporation is Paul Hastings LLP, 200 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10166 c/o Luc A. Despins, as Trustee for the Estate of Ho Wan Kwok (solely for purposes of notices and communications).

The Court having considered the motion (the “Motion”)² seeking an order authorizing the Trustee to serve limited discovery on Shin Hsin Yu (“Mr. Yu”), 1332156 B.C. LTD (“1332156 B.C.”), GWGOPNZ Limited (“GWGOPNZ”), Japan Himalaya League, Inc. (“Japan Himalaya” and, collectively with Mr. Yu, 1332156 B.C., and GWGOPNZ, the “Proposed Intervenors”) and on Xuebing Wang (“Mr. X. Wang”) and Kalixun Trading Limited (“Kalixun Trading,” together with Mr. X. Wang, the “Additional Related Parties”), and to compel the Proposed Intervenors to timely respond to the Trustee’s discovery requests, all as more fully set forth in the Motion; and this Court having jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334 and the *Standing Order of Reference* from the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut; and this Court having found that this is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2); and this Court having found that venue of this proceeding and the Motion in this district is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408(2) and 1409; and this Court having found that the relief requested in the Motion is in the best interests of the estate, its creditors, and other parties in interest; and due and sufficient notice of the Motion having been given under the particular circumstances; and it appearing that no other or further notice need be given; and upon all of the proceedings had before this Court; and any objections to the relief requested herein having been withdrawn or overruled on the merits; and after due deliberation and sufficient cause appearing therefor, it is hereby ORDERED THAT

1. The Motion is granted as set forth herein.
2. The Trustee is authorized to serve the Discovery Requests upon the Proposed Intervenors and the Additional Related Parties.

² Capitalized terms used but not otherwise defined herein have the meanings set forth in the Motion.

3. The Proposed Intervenors are hereby directed to fully comply with the Written Discovery Requests no later than 48 hours after the entry of this Order.

4. The Proposed Intervenors are hereby directed to fully comply with the Deposition Requests at dates to be set by the Trustee in consultation with counsel to the Proposed Intervenors in advance of any deadline to respond to the Motion to Intervene.

5. The Trustee is authorized and empowered to take all actions necessary to effectuate the relief granted in this Order.

6. The terms and conditions of this Order shall be immediately effective and enforceable upon its entry.

7. This Court shall retain jurisdiction to hear and determine all matters arising from the implementation, interpretation, and/or enforcement of this Order.