## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

V.

Case No. 3:09-CV-0298-N

STANFORD INTERNATIONAL BANK, LTD., ET AL.,

Defendants.

# RECEIVER'S FOURTH MONTHLY REPORT REGARDING FEES AND EXPENSES INCURRED AS A RESULT OF THE CLAIMS PROCESS

Receiver Ralph S. Janvey (the "<u>Receiver</u>") hereby files his Fourth Monthly Report Regarding Fees and Expenses Incurred as a Result of the Claims Process (the "<u>Fourth</u> <u>Monthly Report</u>"), respectfully stating as follows:

#### BACKGROUND

As noted in the Receiver's April 27, 2012 Estimated Budget Letter, the Receiver stated that he would "submit monthly reports to the Court reflecting the fees and expenses incurred by the Receiver as a result of the claims process." [See Doc. 1583 at 4.] On June 8, 2012, the Receiver submitted his First Monthly Report Regarding Fees and Expenses Incurred as a Result of the Claims Process (the "First Monthly Report") for the period ending May 31, 2012. [See Doc. 1618.] On July 10, 2012, the Receiver submitted his Second Monthly Report Regarding Fees and Expenses Incurred as a Result of the Claims Process (the "Second Monthly Report") for the period ending June 30, 2012. [See Doc. 1641.] And on August 10, 2012, the Receiver submitted his Third Monthly Report Regarding Fees and Expenses Incurred as a Result

of the Claims Process (the "<u>Third Monthly Report</u>") for the period ending July 31, 2012. [*See* Doc. 1676.]

#### STATUS OF PROFESSIONAL FEES & EXPENSES

The Receiver now hereby submits his Fourth Monthly Report for the period ending August 31, 2012, which also updates the figures initially provided in the First, Second, and Third Monthly Reports.<sup>1</sup> As of August 31, 2012, **\$2,388,447.63** in professional fees and expenses were incurred as a result of the claims process. The fees and expenses related to the claims process that are attributable to each of the Receiver's professional firms are as follows:

GILARDI & CO. LLC				
REPORT PERIOD	PROFESSIONAL FEES	EXPENSES		
First Monthly Report (as of May 31, 2012)	\$143,991.25	\$339,260.19		
Second Monthly Report (June 1-30, 2012)	\$246,503.66	\$9,141.09		
Third Monthly Report (July 1-31, 2012)	\$245,596.97	\$15,189.57		
Fourth Monthly Report (August 1-31, 2012)	\$416,174.02	\$1,537.98		
Gilardi Total (as of August 31, 2012)	\$1,052,265.90	\$365,128.83		

FTI CONSULTING, INC.			
REPORT PERIOD	PROFESSIONAL FEES	EXPENSES	
First Monthly Report (as of May 31, 2012)	\$167,317.20	\$0.00	
Second Monthly Report (June 1-30, 2012)	\$89,735.60	\$0.00	
Third Monthly Report (July 1-31, 2012)	\$184,634.80	\$0.00	
Fourth Monthly Report (August 1-31, 2012)	\$286,457.60	\$54.65	
FTI Total (as of August 31, 2012)	\$728,145.20	\$54.65	

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.			
REPORT PERIOD	PROFESSIONAL FEES	EXPENSES	
First Monthly Report (as of May 31, 2012)	\$53,948.80	\$792.74	
Second Monthly Report (June 1-30, 2012)	\$65,978.00	\$303.67	
Third Monthly Report (July 1-31, 2012)	\$52,016.00	\$490.39	
Fourth Monthly Report (August 1-31, 2012)	\$69,144.80	\$178.65	
Baker Botts Total (as of August 31, 2012)	\$241,087.60	\$1,765.45	

The amounts detailed in the First, Second, and Third Monthly Reports have been slightly revised as a result of additional fee and expense information received after those Reports were originally submitted to the Court.

In April 2012, the Receiver estimated that "the claims process — from notice through claims reconciliation and determination — [would] cost approximately \$3.85 million in expenses and professional fees." [See Doc. 1583 at 1.] As of August 31, 2012, approximately \$1.46 million of this budget remained. The Receiver is continuing to reconcile thousands of claims (discussed in more detail in the "Ongoing Activities" section below) and must still send out notices of deficiency and determination to claimants. Following the issuance of notices of determination, the Receiver anticipates receiving a number of objections, some of which may require Court intervention. The volume of objections and the necessity of litigation with respect to such objections will likely be the most important factors determining whether the Receiver will need authorization from the Court to expend funds in excess of his initial \$3.85 million estimate.

#### **ONGOING ACTIVITIES**

The following is an update concerning the activities of the Receiver and his professionals with regard to claims processing:

- The Receivership received 18,945 claims through August 31, 2012 as a result of the Court-approved claims process. Of these, 3,745 were received online; 10,812 were received through mail or delivery; 3,894 were received via electronic mail; and 494 were received via fax.
- In accordance with the Court's Bar Date Order, as of August 31, 2012, Gilardi had sent 8,491 confirmations to claimants via e-mail or mail stating that the Receivership had received their claim forms. This work is ongoing due to the high volume of claims received in the days leading up to and including the Bar Date.
- Gilardi, Stanford Staff, and FTI have continued to make significant progress reconciling both CD and non-CD claims. The following statistics reflect the status of the 31,048 claims (whether CD or non-CD) received through both the prior claims process and the Court-approved claims process as of September 7, 2012:
  - Reconciliation activities regarding 10,619 claims were completed.

- 8,044 claims were being manually reconciled by Gilardi in the first instance and were only escalated to Stanford Staff or FTI where necessary or appropriate. As of September 7, 2012: (a) Gilardi was reconciling 2,602 CD claims; (b) Stanford Staff was reconciling 4,005 CD and non-CD claims; (c) FTI was reconciling 1,165 CD claims; and (d) Gilardi and FTI were appending additional claims-related data to 272 claims.
- 2,124 claims were deficient due to a lack of required information on the claimants' claim forms. Gilardi has already contacted hundreds of such claimants to obtain the necessary information prior to the issuance of formal notices of deficiency, which the Receiver expects to send in the near future.
- o 3,129 claims were duplicates of claims already submitted by the same claimants.
- 7,132 claims (many of which were received in the days immediately prior to or following the Bar Date) were in the beginning stages of intake processing, initial review, and claim type determination.
- As discussed above, Baker Botts drafted and submitted the Third Monthly Report on August 10, 2012 and continued to monitor and oversee the claims process and fees and expenses related thereto.
- Through August 31, 2012, the Receivership received approximately 7,100 telephone calls (of which over 3,600 were escalated to a customer service representative) and approximately 9,300 inquiries via electronic mail.
- The Receiver's social media campaign regarding the Bar Date Order resulted in approximately 23.8 million views by users through August 31, 2012. Moreover, there have been approximately 93,000 visitors to the claims process website; 335,000 page views; and 111,000 document downloads.

Dated: September 11, 2012 Respectfully submitted,

#### BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

By: <u>/s/ Kevin M. Sadler</u>

Kevin M. Sadler
Texas Bar No. 17512450
kevin.sadler@bakerbotts.com
Robert I. Howell
Texas Bar No. 10107300
robert.howell@bakerbotts.com
David T. Arlington
Texas Bar No. 00790238
david.arlington@bakerbotts.com
1500 San Jacinto Center
98 San Jacinto Blvd.
Austin, Texas 78701-4078
Tel: 512.322.2500

Fax: 512.322.2501

Timothy S. Durst
Texas Bar No. 00786924

Texas Bar No. 00786924 tim.durst@bakerbotts.com 2001 Ross Avenue Suite 600 Dallas, Texas 75201-2980

Tel: 214.953.6500 Fax: 214.953.6503

ATTORNEYS FOR RECEIVER RALPH S. JANVEY

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

On September 11, 2012, I electronically submitted the foregoing document with the clerk of the court of the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Texas, using the electronic case filing system of the court. I hereby certify that I have served the Court-appointed Examiner, all counsel and/or pro se parties of record electronically or by another manner authorized by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5(b)(2).

/s/ Kevin M. Sadler	
Kevin M. Sadler	